

**Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth
Office of Adult Education and Spanish Speaking Affairs**

**Curriculum Practitioners' Task Force
Minutes – December 3, 2004**

- Update on ABE Federal Consortium and State Curriculum Issues
- ALP – Current Status and Report on State Meeting – 11/22/04
- Review of ESL Content Standards and Subcommittee Report
- Discussion on Term – English Proficiency Level
- Review of GED Content Standards and Subcommittee Report

Attendees: Lynn Aldrich-Spearing, Linda Colagross, Dianne Duthie, Laura Gates, Mary Hemmen, Michelle Irwin, Susan Ledy, Jeff McNeal, Marilyn Reichardt, Bob Rickard, Jane Rudisill, Jo Pamment, Pat Walstra, Carole Wells, Bonnie Vondracek

Pat Walstra welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the agenda with the group. She then asked for any additions or changes to the agenda. It was requested that the ABE content standards be added to the agenda. The minutes were reviewed by the committee. Jeff McNeal made a motion to accept the minutes. Carole Wells seconded the motion. No discussion. Minutes were passed unanimously

Linda Colagross discussed the federal consortium with the group. She reviewed how the decision was made to join the ABE consortium and what had been accomplished thus far. She also stated that the federal group will be contracting with a vendor to assist with ABE content standards. However, Linda further discussed that the vendor will assist with the development of the action plan rather than the actual standards/format, etc. Linda requested the committee's assistance in completing the action plan. The next meeting in Washington will probably be sometime in the late spring/early summer. Linda will chair the ABE Content Standards Sub-committee. She requested volunteers from the task force. Mary Hemmen and Susan Ledy volunteered. The ABE subcommittee members will include: Linda Colagross – Chair, Laura Gates, Mary Hemmen, Susan Ledy, Jo Pamment, and Carol Wells, Additional individuals with expertise in ABE were discussed. Linda will contact the members to set up a meeting.

Jo Pamment and Carole Wells provided the task force with copies of the final draft of the ESL Content Standards. A discussion ensued on whether or not the curriculum which will accompany the content standards needs to be tied to CASAS.

Michelle Irwin stated that her students often come for the purpose of getting a GED so she wants some type of summative assessment linked to the curriculum. Michelle also stated that learning disabilities needs to be part of everything that is produced by the task force.

Dianne Duthie addressed the committee regarding the ALP Meeting and the progress of the pilot project. She shared the positive results from the form that is currently in the field and the changes that were made based on input. Dianne will share the final draft with the committee for feedback prior to implementation next fall. Dianne stated that she had talked with Jim Parker of the federal government and asked him what he wanted for an ALP. He informed her that what the federal government is requesting is exactly what Michigan is proposing. Dianne further stated that the feds call it an Individual Educational Plan (IEP) rather than an Adult Learning Plan (ALP). The committee discussed their concerns regarding the term IEP as it usually refers to the plan written for special education. Dianne thanked the committee for all of their hard work. The committee requested that the final ALP be placed online. Dianne agreed that this would be a very good idea and would look into having it done for next fall.

Dianne also requested that the committee look at a definition for English Proficiency Level. Lynn Aldrich-Spearing stated that what is needed are literate adult definitions for ESL functioning levels, especially the definition of English Proficiency Level. Carole and Jo will research a definition.

Discussion on the ESL content standards continued. Jo discussed that the ESL subcommittee would like to send the ESL standards on to the State Department. Carole and Jo walked the group through the ESL standards. Jane Rudisill made a motion to include a numbering system on the ESL Content Standards so that there was consistency among the standards. Marilyn Reichardt seconded the motion. Discussion ensued on whether or not the standards should look the same across the curriculum. A vote was taken with 13 ayes and 1 nay. Vote carried. The form will be numbered and the standards will be sent to the state as a Draft. Pat thanked Jo and Carole and their committee.

Discussion ensued on the term English Language Proficiency. Linda Colagross, Tony, Lagos, and Gary Tweddle addressed the issue with the group. Linda stated that there is a report that is needed for 107 and it has four categories. One of the categories is English Language Proficiency. Tony stated that 235 is the CASAS score that is used to enter GED, but so many students come in at lowest levels it would be nice to see proficiency at specific levels, such "Achievement of a least one (1) educational functioning level as approved by the DLEG-pre- and post-test assessment."

Gary Tweddle discussed the current language written for English language proficiency as he was part of that committee. He informed the committee that once a student becomes English proficient you get our 10%, however, once they become English proficient you can't keep them in that specific program. He states that the State aid act says that under the 10% rule, one of the ways to obtain the funding for a student is for him/her to achieve basic English proficiency. Gary discussed the NRS definition and stated that the goal of the program would be a valid question to ask. One possible definition provided by the group was: the completion of the highest level of ESL that assesses at or above a 9.0 grade level or above. Jo Pamment expressed concerns that there are really many different levels of English proficiency. Michelle discussed that if students want to continue on after 9.0 grade level, they can be served in high school completion courses.

Jeff McNeal asked Literacy Councils about what level they can serve them. He states his council serves up to 8.0. Susan Ledy says if they score at 9.0 grade level they need to go to adult education. Susan states that most of their ESL students are at the lower levels. The BEST assessment is used by Ledy's center. Mary Hemmen reported that Literacy Councils in Detroit use 8.0 as their highest level, although most students function at the lowest level of ABE. It was discussed that 8.0 is used in various parts of the state as the highest level of functioning prior to referring the student to another educational entity.

The committee continued to discuss the definition of basic English proficiency which could be attaining the equivalent of 9.0 or above or a score of 236.

The group came to consensus that: Basic English proficiency is defined as the attainment of the highest assessment score as determined by the DLEG approved pre- and post-assessment instrument. Bob Rickard made a motion to approve this definition, Carole seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The recommendation will be sent to the state.

The GED subcommittee discussed the draft content standards. The group discussed using ASE 1 and ASE 2 in GED. Laura Gates went through the reading and writing GED standards. Michelle Irwin discussed how real-world applications could be put under each of the objectives, such as:

Qualifying statement
Objective
Real world application

Laura made a motion that the group should look at reading content standards as the final format (minus the line under the phrase "The adult learner" and combining ASE I and ASE II into one curriculum framework for GED) and that the standards be brought back to the group for approval at the next meeting

and a draft sent to the state at that time. The motion was seconded by Michelle. Thirteen voted in favor of the motion with one opposed. Reading, Writing, and Math will be reviewed by the group in January and then sent to the state. Bob Rickard discussed changes to the Science Content Standards. These will be further discussed at the January meeting.

Pat asked for any additional comments prior to adjournment. No additional information was provided. Bob Rickard made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Jo Pamment seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.