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The following report highlights findings from a statewide survey of transitions practices in Ohio Adult Basic and Literacy Education (ABLE) programs. The Ohio ABLE Transitions Survey was conducted in the spring of 2010 by staff of the ABLE Evaluation and Design Project at The Ohio State University.

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of the survey was to collect data on the types of transitions-related activities that are taking place in ABLE programs, difficulties that programs are encountering, and possible ways in which the Board of Regents (OBR) and State Leadership Network (SLN) can better assist the programs with implementation. Each ABLE program was asked to provide a collective response that would reflect the program’s practices as a whole.

**METHODOLOGY**

OSU project staff, in conjunction with OBR, decided that a statewide electronic survey would be the most effective evaluation method. The online instrument was developed using feedback from OBR and the ABLE Transitions Task Force, as well as the Advisory Committee for the OSU ABLE Evaluation and Design Project.

OSU project staff used a mixed method approach to elicit responses to questions organized into three categories: 1) general transitions activities, 2) Stackable Certificates, and 3) Student Achievement Record. The survey contained 38 qualitative and quantitative questions. Three of these questions were designed to redirect respondents to other parts of the survey based on their answers (skip logic) in order to tailor the questions and their sequencing to the responses offered.

Specific steps in the survey development and implementation process included the following:

1. OSU project staff drafted initial survey questions.
2. OBR reviewed and refined initial questions.
3. Based on feedback, the OSU project staff completed revisions to the survey questions.
4. OSU ABLE Project Advisory Committee reviewed questions and suggested changes.
5. Northeast ABLE Resource Center and OBR provided input on questions related to the Oral Communication Certificate.
6. Based on feedback, OSU project staff further refined and formatted survey.
7. OSU ABLE Project Advisory Committee and Transitions Task Force piloted the survey.
8. OSU project staff finalized the survey based on pilot feedback.
9. On April 1st, 2010, OSU project staff disseminated the survey link via email to 72 ABLE programs as designated in the FY10 ABLE Program Directory. This included the 68 ABLE programs that provide instruction throughout the State, as well as four programs that provide only EL Civics courses.
10. On April 2, the survey was promoted in the OBR publication *Friday Facts*.
11. The survey was available online for approximately 30 days and was closed at the end of April.

The survey instrument is included in the Appendix of this report.
All ABLE programs throughout the state were emailed the link to complete the online survey, including those that provide only EL Civics courses. Of the 72 ABLE programs listed in the FY 2010 ABLE Program Directory, representatives of 49 programs responded to the survey. This resulted in a response rate of 68%.

Each respondent was asked to select his/her ABLE program from a drop-down menu provided at the end of the survey. Based on responses provided by 48 of the 49 survey respondents, OSU project staff determined distribution by the four ABLE regions: Region 1 (Northeast Ohio), Region 2 (Central/Southeast Ohio), Region 3 (Southwest Ohio), and Region 4 (Northwest Ohio). The results are illustrated in the following chart.

According to the data, response rates were nearly equal among the four ABLE regions. This distribution indicates that the data sample collected is a fair representation of the ABLE network throughout the four regions of the state.
PART 1: TRANSITIONS

The first section of the survey (Items 1-16) was designed to collect feedback from respondents specific to the topic of transitions.

Defining Transitions (Item 1)

The first item on the survey was an open-ended question that asked respondents to describe how their ABLE programs define transitions. Most commented that their programs consider transitions as facilitating student movement within and between ABLE and other educational systems. Specifically, 33 of 49 responses cited the transition to postsecondary education (67%), and 23 cited the transition to employment (47%). Other comments focused on the design of instructional and support services within the ABLE programs.

OSU project staff further analyzed the broad themes that emerged from the response data by adapting them to the Ohio ABLE Transitions Framework. The table below offers a summary of this analysis. The shaded boxes denote the most frequently cited responses. Note that some comments were multifaceted, referring to several elements in the framework; as such, some comments were counted more than once in the analysis. The entire Transitions Framework is included in the Appendix for reference.

Table: Item 1
How does your program define transitions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of the Transition Framework</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Percent (N=49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Component for Transitions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Develop and deliver instructional program that facilitates student transitions</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Implement contextualized curricula</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Model selected postsecondary facets combined with ABLE instructional delivery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Services for Transitions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Build awareness of postsecondary and work options</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Provide comprehensive goal setting activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Incorporate individual and group advising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Provide comprehensive support services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the structure of the Transitions Framework, response data suggests an understanding among respondents of ABLE within the University System of Ohio context. Most comments (61%) included definitions that related to instructional programming (a). Approximately 20% commented on the provision of comprehensive supports (g). There were fewer comments related to building awareness of postsecondary and work options (d; 16%) and contextualized curricula (b; 14%). Only 2% cited postsecondary facets (c) and advising (f) in their definitions.
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Incorporating Transitions into the Student Experience Model (Item 2)

Based on research regarding student retention, the Student Experience Model (SEM) is routinely used by ABLE programs. As such, Item 2 on the survey was an open-ended question that asked respondents to describe how their programs have incorporated transitions into the SEM during their program activities.

Comments were analyzed in terms of their relationship to the structure of the SEM. By necessity, some multifaceted comments were counted more than once in the analysis. The following table summarizes these results. A copy of the Student Experience Model is included in the Appendix for reference.

Table: Item 2
How have you incorporated transitions into the Student Experience Model?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of the Student Experience Model</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Percent (N=49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Orientation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Preparing for instruction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Planning instruction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Teaching</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Reflecting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Monitoring student performance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Follow-up</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 73% of the comments cited orientation (a) as a means by which programs have integrated transitions into the SEM. Types of orientation activities that were specified included hosting speakers from local Education Opportunity Centers, facilitating career interest surveys, and using the Transitions Toolkit.

The remaining six elements of the model were each referenced by less than one-third of the comments. Among these, the two most frequently cited were teaching (d; 31%) and planning instruction (c; 27%). Less than 5% of the comments referenced follow-up (g).

Other methods described in the comments that programs use to integrate transitions included:
- Readiness classes tailored to specific career pathways.
- Postsecondary entrance exam preparation.
- Contextualizing curriculum based on student needs/goals.

Transitions Class (Items 3-4)

Item 3 on the survey asked respondents whether their programs offered a transitions class. More than three-fourths of the respondents (78%) indicated that their programs did offer such a class, while the remaining 22% specified that their programs did not offer a transitions course.
Only the 38 respondents who indicated that their programs offered a transitions class continued to the next question on the survey (Item 4). The 11 other respondents who indicated that they did not have a transitions class skipped Item 4 and were redirected to Item 5.

Item 4 asked the 38 respondents to describe their programs’ transitions class and explain how it differed from standard programming. Similar to Item 1, comments provided for this item have been analyzed according to their placement within the structure of the Ohio ABLE Transitions Framework. Some comments referenced multiple elements of the Transitions Framework and were therefore counted more than once in the analysis.

Table: Item 4

*Please describe your transitions class and how it is different from other classes you offer.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of the Transition Framework</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Percent (N=38)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Component for Transitions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Develop and deliver instructional program that facilitates student transitions</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Implement contextualized curricula</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Model selected postsecondary facets combined with ABLE instructional delivery</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Services for Transitions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Build awareness of postsecondary and work options</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Provide comprehensive goal setting activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Incorporate individual and group advising</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Provide comprehensive support services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In describing transitions classes, comments touched upon all seven elements of the Transitions Framework. Similar to the first item on the survey, 76% of the comments cited instructional programming (a) as part of their transitions class. A notable percentage of comments (40%) also cited postsecondary facets (c) and building awareness of postsecondary and work options (d). The remaining four elements were referenced by less than 16% of the responses. Less than 3% of the comments described their programs’ transitions class as providing comprehensive goal setting activities (e).

Some comments described ways in which a program’s transitions course differed from its other courses. These included:
- Incorporating materials used in postsecondary classes.
- Providing math instruction for a medical career field.
- Facilitating the class at a community college or university campus.

**Program Changes (Items 5-6)**

Items 5 and 6 prompted respondents to rate the extent to which they had changed their programs’ management and instruction in order to incorporate transitions. To do so, respondents were asked to rate these changes using the following scale: *no change, minimal change, significant change*, and *complete change*.

For this analysis, the choices have been converted into a numerical scale from 1 (*no change*) to 4 (*complete change*). The table below summarizes the frequency of responses and mean scores; the shaded boxes denote the most frequently cited response for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table: Items 5-6</th>
<th>Extent of changes to program management and instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>To what extent have you made changes in program management in order to incorporate transitions?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>To what extent have you made changes in program instruction in order to incorporate transitions?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For both questions, nearly all respondents were divided between perceiving the extent of change as being either *minimal* (2) or *significant* (3). With regard to Item 5, the majority (55%) rated the extent of change to program management as being *minimal*, while the second largest proportion of respondents (41%) rated it as being *significant*. These ratings resulted in an average score of 2.43.
The converse of this trend was reflected in the results to Item 6, as the majority (51%) rated the extent of change to program instruction as being *significant*, followed by 47% who rated it as being *minimal*. This resulted in an average score of 2.55, which was slightly higher than that of the previous question.

**Transitions Activities (Items 7-8)**

Similar to the previous two questions, Items 7 and 8 asked respondents to rate their programs’ transitions activities and the state’s support of these activities using the following scale: *poor, fair, good,* and *excellent*.

For this analysis, the choices have been converted into a numerical scale from 1 (*poor*) to 4 (*excellent*). The table below summarizes the frequency of responses and mean scores; the shaded boxes denote the most frequently cited response for each question.

**Table: Items 7-8**

*Overall ratings to program transitions activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Overall, how would you rate your program’s transitions activities?</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2.88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Overall, how would you rate state guidance for your program’s transitions activities?</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2.55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Item 7, 67% rated their programs’ transitions activities as *good*, the second highest proportion of respondents (22%) rated them as *fair*. This resulted in a positive mean score of 2.88.

Results for Item 8 were mixed. Rating the guidance provided by the state for transitions activities, 21 respondents indicated that it had been *good* (43%) while 22 indicated that it had been *fair* (45%). With few ratings at either extreme of the rating scale, the average score for this question was 2.55, which is very near the median point of the rating scale (2.50).

**Marketing (Items 9-10)**

Items 9 and 10 asked respondents about their marketing practices. Specifically, these questions collected information on the target audiences and methods.

For Item 9, respondents were presented with six choices and were instructed to select all applicable answers. The results of Item 9 are summarized in the following table in the order of response frequency.
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Table: Item 9

To whom are you marketing transitions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent (N=49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career centers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community colleges</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-stop</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently marketing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results suggest that most of the respondents were actively marketing transitions; only two indicated that they were not engaged in any marketing efforts. Nearly all of the respondents (92%) indicated that they were marketing transitions to students. Slightly more than half indicated that they were directing marketing efforts toward career centers (53%), community colleges (51%), and/or one-stops (51%).

Of the 15 respondents (31%) who selected “other” as their response to this question:

- Four specified that their marketing efforts were aimed at potential students, including high school students, college students, former ABLE students, and community residents.
- Three identified community centers such as family resource centers and churches as the focus of their marketing.
- Two indicated that their strategy involved marketing to libraries.
- Two identified universities, both public and private, as the target of their marketing initiatives.
- Two cited ABLE program partnerships as integral to their marketing efforts, including partnerships with public school districts.
- One respondent identified the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services as a marketing target.
- Another wrote that his/her program was marketing to the United Way.

Item 10 was an open-ended question that inquired about the methods that programs were using to market transitions. The themes that emerged from the response data included direct contact (e.g., phone, email), flyers/brochures, media advertisements (e.g., newspaper, radio), partners, and by word of mouth. The following table summarizes the results in order of frequency. Please note that multifaceted comments were counted more than once in the analysis.
Table: Item 10  
How are you marketing transitions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Themes</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Percent (N=49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flyers/brochures</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct contact</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media advertisements</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the 49% of comments that referenced the use of flyers and/or brochures, many programs noted that they were distributing these materials to partners, as well as past, current, and potential students. Forty-three percent of the comments cited direct contact with students, including former GED recipients, current students, and students at career centers. Nearly 41% of the comments indicated that programs were relying on their partners to market their services. Many have been collaborating with partners to increase awareness in order to garner more referrals. Media advertisements, cited in 31% of the comments, included advertising in local newspapers, on television, and through websites.

Articulation Agreements (Item 11)

Item 11 was an open-ended question that asked respondents to specify the institutions with which they have articulation agreements. Note that some respondents listed organizations with which their programs have general partnerships, such as community service centers. However, since articulation agreements are not applicable to some of these partnerships, these responses were excluded from the analysis. Only comments that listed specific institutions relevant to articulation agreements were considered valid responses. These responses have been grouped by category and are summarized in the following table.

Table: Item 11  
List the institutions with which you have articulation agreements to facilitate student transitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Number of References</th>
<th>Percent (N=49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Centers</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Tri-County Career Center</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Polaris Career Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Upper Valley JVS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Butler Tech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Columbiana County Career &amp; Technical Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. C-TEC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Canton City Schools Adult Community Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Cuyahoga Valley Career Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. EHOVE Career Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Number of References</th>
<th>Percent (N=49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j. Knox County Career Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Lorain County JVS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Madison Adult Career Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Maplewood Career Center Adult Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Miami Valley Career Technology Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Pickaway-Ross Career and Technology Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Pioneer Career and Technology Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Sandusky Career Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Vantage Career Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Warren County Career Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Colleges</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Sinclair Community College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Central Ohio Technical College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Cuyahoga Community College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Eastern Gateway Community College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. North Central State College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Belmont Technical College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Clark State Community College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Columbus State Community College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Edison Community College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Lakeland Community College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Lorain County Community College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Rhodes State College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Rio Grande Community College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Southern State Community College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Stark State College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Washington State Community College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Zane State College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Universities</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Kent State University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. University of Akron Wayne College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Ohio University Chillicothe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Shawnee State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Wright State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public School Districts</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Columbus City Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Greenville City Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Springfield City Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proprietary Colleges</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Bryant &amp; Stratton College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Stautzenberger College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Ohio Business College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly half (47%) of the responses specified articulation agreements with career centers. The same percentage of responses cited articulation agreements with community colleges, followed
by 14% that identified public universities. A small percentage of responses (6%) attributed program articulation agreements with both proprietary (for-profit) colleges and school districts.

Eleven respondents (22%) commented that their programs did not have any articulation agreements with other institutions. Of these, approximately half of the respondents clarified that their programs have informal agreements with community colleges and career centers to help facilitate student transitions.

**Rewards and Challenges (Items 12-14)**

Items 12, 13, and 14 were open-ended questions that asked respondents to describe the rewards and challenges of student transitions, as well as ways in which their programs have addressed some of the challenges related to transitions. The comments generated from each of these questions have been analyzed according to common themes and response frequency. Please note that multifaceted comments were counted more than once in the analysis.

For Item 12, respondents were asked to describe the most rewarding aspects of student transitions. The results are summarized in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Themes</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Percent (N=49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping students reach their postsecondary goals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing/experiencing students succeed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing success stories from former students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating students to go beyond the GED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping student increase their test scores</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing students’ confidence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plurality of comments (37%) cited the most rewarding aspect as being the satisfaction of helping students reach their postsecondary goals. Nearly 29% of the comments noted that the experience of seeing students succeed was very rewarding. Others wrote that they were encouraged to hear success stories from their former students with regard to their academic and career-related achievements (14%).

For Item 13, respondents were asked to describe the most challenging aspects of student transitions. The results are summarized in the following table.
Table: Item 13  
*What are the most challenging aspects of student transitions for your program?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Themes</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Percent (N=49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of sufficient resources</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of persistence among students</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment/marketing difficulties</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student apathy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly half (45%) of all comments stated that the most challenging aspect to facilitating transitions was a lack of sufficient program resources. Some respondents wrote that there was insufficient funding available to fully implement transitions activities. The additional costs related to conducting a separate transitions class, purchasing additional curriculum, and staffing the class were also noted as significant barriers. Others indicated that a lack of time to fully implement initiatives and build successful partnerships was a significant challenge for the programs.

Among the other comments provided:
- Thirty-five percent noted that there was a lack of persistence among students to earn more than a passing score on the GED or a Basic or Advanced Certificate.
- Ten percent commented on the difficulty they have had communicating with academic advisors about increasing recruitment and/or awareness of program services.
- Four percent noted that it has been challenging getting some students to appreciate the value of continuing their education.

For Item 14, respondents were asked to describe how their programs have addressed challenges related to student transitions. The results are summarized in the following table.

Table: Item 14  
*How have you addressed challenges with student transitions in your program?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Themes</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Percent (N=49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-setting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward system</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments widely varied, as respondents cited a number of different methods that they have used to address challenges related to student transitions. The most frequently cited methods were communication (16%) and support services (16%).
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With regard to communication, respondents noted that they have been increasing their communications with students using multiple methods (e.g., phone calls, letters, email). Some wrote that they have been conducting more staff meetings and have been proactive in communicating with partners. For support services, some wrote that they have been focusing on locating and sharing more resources with students, as well as providing encouragement to students in pursuit of their goals.

Other methods mentioned to address these challenges included:
- Facilitating more partnerships.
- Adding additional curriculum to address students’ goals and soft skills.
- Developing a marketing plan to attract students.
- Working with students to set realistic goals.
- Using rewards/incentives for attendance.

**Tools and Resources (Items 15-16)**

Item 15 instructed respondents to identify the tools or resources that they were using to facilitate student transitions within their programs. Respondents were presented with 10 choices and were instructed to select all applicable answers. The following table summarizes the data results for this question in order of response frequency.

**Table: Item 15**

*What tools or resources are you using to facilitate student transitions?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent (N=49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABLE Transitions Framework</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABE Test Alignment</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stackable Certificates Memo and Guidance (September 2009)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Resource Center Network</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National College Transition Network (NCTN)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLE Transitions Repository</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBR Q&amp;A documents</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorkKeys Test Alignment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIFL (National Institute for Literacy) transition listserv</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly all respondents (94%) identified the ABLE Transitions Framework as a resource they use to facilitate student transitions. Most respondents also indicated that they use the TABE Test Alignment (78%), the Stackable Certificates Memo and Guidance (71%), and the Ohio Resource Center Network (69%).

The remaining resources were identified by less than half of the respondents. These included the National College Transition Network (49%); the ABLE Transitions Repository and the OBR.
Q&A documents (45% each); and the WorkKeys Test Alignment (41%). The resource cited by the smallest percentage of respondents (27%) was the NIFL transition listerv.

Thirteen respondents (27%) identified other tools and resources that they use to facilitate transitions. These included:

**Local resources**
- One respondent wrote that his/her program staff members research issues related to transitions and use the information toward content development.
- Another cited local adult workforce education requirements as a resource.

**Regional resources**
- Four respondents cited the Central Ohio EDR 1 Go Prepared curriculum as a resource used by their programs.
- One cited regional collaborative grant produced materials.
- One respondent noted that his/her program uses syllabi from college and university developmental education courses.

**Statewide resources**
- Two respondents cited the Ohio Career Information System (OCIS).
- One referred to the resource document *Promising Practices: Suggestions for Program Improvement from Ohio ABLE Practitioners* from the OBR website.

**Nationally developed resources**
- One respondent wrote that his/her program uses textbooks on transitions, including *Preparing for College Math* and *Preparing for College English*.
- Another respondent cited information and training resources such as LearningExpress Library, KeyTrain, and SkillsTutor.
- One identified the COMPASS college placement test as a resource.

As a follow-up, Item 16 asked respondents to identify additional materials or resources that would help support their programs’ transitions efforts. Analysis of the responses generated from this open-ended question is summarized in the following table according to common themes and response frequency. Some multifaceted comments were counted more than once in the analysis.
### Table: Item 16

**What additional tools or resources would help support your transitions efforts?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Themes</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Percent (N=49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/state guidance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to implement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource sharing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the comments, the most frequently cited resource needed was additional funding (25%). Some respondents specified that increased funding was necessary to fully staff the transitions programs and supply them with appropriate texts and materials. One noted that his/her program does not have enough funding to fully take advantage of the resources listed under the previous survey question (Item 15).

Comments regarding the need for more policy and guidance from the state accounted for approximately 12% of the survey respondents. Some commented on encountering resistance from secondary and postsecondary partners regarding test scores and referrals; these respondents suggested that OBR work to convince these institutions to improve their cooperation with ABLE programs. One comment described the need for the state to provide a standard definition of transitions, as well as more guidance on how to use the Stackable Certificates effectively.

Ten percent of the comments stated that programs needed more time to properly facilitate transitions. One respondent wrote that his/her program has the necessary tools, but has not had sufficient time to use them. Another wrote that teachers need more time in the classroom to fully implement the resources that are available to them.

The remaining tools and resources identified by the respondents each accounted for less than 10% of the comments provided. Among these:

- Comments on professional development (8%) referenced the need for more training on assessment alignments and Stackable Certificates.
- Comments regarding curriculum (6%) included the need for more contextualized curriculum in the classrooms. Another respondent wrote that there needs to be more college level texts and developmental math texts available.
- For comments on marketing (6%), two mentioned that OBR should lead a statewide marketing campaign on transitions.
- Some respondents mentioned an interest in sharing program practices, including items developed in other Economic Development Regions (6%).
- Regarding assessments (4%), one said that he/she would like more information on TABE alignment in relation to college testing (e.g., COMPASS, ACCUPLACER). Another wrote that he/she would like a standardized assessment that would more accurately test ESOL students’ abilities in reading and writing.
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PART 2: STACKABLE CERTIFICATES

The second section of the survey (Items 17-24) was designed to collect feedback from respondents on the topic of Stackable Certificates.

Certificates Issued to Date (Item 17)

Item 17 asked respondents to estimate a range that best represents the number of Stackable Certificates that they had issued to date. Respondents were presented with six answer choices and were asked to select one for each certificate. These choices and the resulting data are summarized in the following table. Note that the shaded boxes indicate the most frequently cited response for each certificate category.

Table: Item 17
How many Stackable Certificates have you issued to date?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-35</th>
<th>More than 35</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Certificates</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Certificates</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication Certificates</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the results, 78%-80% of the respondents indicated that their programs had not issued any certificates. For the Basic and Advanced Certificates, a small portion of respondents (8%-10%) indicated that their programs had issued 1 to 5 certificates to date. The results were similar for the Oral Communication Certificates, although one respondent indicated his/her program had issued 6 to 10, while another indicated 11 to 20.

As of July 2010, data available through ABLELink specifies that 60 Basic Certificates, 6 Advanced Certificates, and 75 Oral Communication Certificates have been issued to date.

Difficulties Issuing Certificates (Items 18-20)

Items 18, 19, and 20 asked respondents to identify conditions that make it difficult to issue the Basic, Advanced, and the Oral Communication Certificate, respectively. Respondents were presented with seven choices and were instructed to mark all that applied for each certificate. The results of these questions are summarized in the following figure and table.
By summing the total number of responses across all three types of certificates, results show that the most frequently cited answers were student lack of interest (64), lack of access to multiple assessments (62), and issuing policies (50). The remaining four answers were cited less frequently (40-41 each).

Table: Items 18-20
What conditions make it difficult for you to issue the Basic, Advanced, and Oral Communication Certificates?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Basic Certificate</th>
<th>Advanced Certificate</th>
<th>Oral Communication Certificate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student lack of interest</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access to multiple assessments</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuing policies</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of student retention</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment costs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of student mastery of benchmarks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 140 126 72
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As illustrated in the previous table, difficulties related to issuing certificates were most often cited as being relevant to the Basic Certificate (140) followed by the Advanced Certificate (126). There were consistently fewer responses related to the Oral Communication Certificate (72) for all seven answer choices.

**Difficulties with the Basic Certificate**

For the Basic Certificate, more than half of the 49 survey respondents identified “student lack of interest” (57%) and “lack of access to multiple assessments” (53%) as the greatest challenges. Also notable was the choice “issuing policies”, which was cited by 43% of the respondents. Among the 19 individuals (39%) who selected “other”:

- Five commented that the Basic Certificate has little demonstrated value, and that both students and instructors were skeptical of its worth. Some respondents wrote that postsecondary institutions and employers do not accept the certificate, which makes it difficult to understand the incentive for students to obtain it.
- Four respondents commented that there was a lack of clarity from OBR regarding certificate policies and guidelines.
- Three commented that obtaining the Basic Certificate may actually be detrimental to students if they do not also obtain a GED or an Advanced Certificate.
- Two respondents described the difficulty they faced in documenting benchmarks, with one stating that full mastery of the benchmarks was an unrealistic expectation for students.
- Respondents also commented on the need for better access to multiple tests and more funding.

**Difficulties with the Advanced Certificate**

Similar to the Basic Certificate, the two most frequently identified difficulties for issuing the Advanced Certificate were “lack of access to multiple assessments” (51%) and “student lack of interest” (43%). These two choices were followed by “lack of student retention” (39%) and “issuing policies” (37%). Among the 12 respondents (25%) who selected “other”:

- One respondent noted that most students do not want to stay the length of time necessary to obtain the Advanced Certificate. Another wrote that most students are in the program specifically to earn their GED as soon as possible in order to quickly gain employment.
- Two comments expressed skepticism regarding the value of the certificate. One mentioned that it lacks currency among stakeholders. The other questioned why students would be motivated to obtain an Advanced Certificate since it has no bearing on the admittance tests that students are required to take to enter a career center or college.
- Respondents commented on the lack of resources necessary to teach up to the 12.9 grade level. Lack of funding was also mentioned.
- One commented on the lack of follow-through by instructors.
- One cited the need for multiple tests and benchmarks.
**Difficulties with the Oral Communication Certificate**

While there were fewer responses related to the Oral Communication Certificate, the pattern of responses was similar to that of the other certificates. The three most frequently cited difficulties were “student lack of interest” (31%), “lack of access to multiple assessments” (22%), and “issuing policies” (22%). Of the 10 respondents (20%) who indicated “other”:

- Three commented on the lack of necessary resources, citing the need for more technology and equipment options, multiple tests, and more funding.
- One commented that most students who enter his/her program are focused primarily on developing survival vocabulary for employment.

**Program Changes (Items 21-23)**

Items 21, 22, and 23 prompted respondents to rate the extent to which they had made changes to their programs in order to issue the Basic, Advanced, and Oral Communication Certificate. Specifically, respondents were asked to rate changes in program management, data management, and program instruction using the following scale: *no change, minimal change, significant change, and complete change*.

For this analysis, the choices have been converted into a numerical scale from 1 (*no change*) to 4 (*complete change*). The table below summarizes the frequency distribution and mean score for each question, with the shaded boxes denoting the most frequently cited responses.

**Table: Items 21-23**

**Extent of program change in relation to Stackable Certificates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Minimal change</th>
<th>Significant change</th>
<th>Complete change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. To what extent have you made changes in program management in order to issue the Basic, Advanced, or Oral Communication Certificates?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. To what extent have you made changes in data entry and data management in order to issue the Basic, Advanced, or Oral Communication Certificates?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. To what extent have you made changes in program instruction in order to issue the Basic, Advanced, or Oral Communication Certificates?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents indicated that they had made minimal changes to program management, data management, and program instruction. Nearly one-fourth of the respondents...
indicated that they had not implemented any degree of change to program management; approximately one-third gave similar ratings to data management and program instruction. The range of mean scores (1.73-1.83) confirms that there was little variability among the responses to these three questions.

Tools and Resources (Item 24)

Item 24 was an open-ended question that asked respondents to identify additional tools or resources that would help support their efforts in issuing the Basic, Advanced, or Oral Communication Certificate. The table below summarizes the results in order of frequency. Some multifaceted comments were counted more than once in the analysis.

Table: Item 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Themes</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Percent (N=49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy/state guidance</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy-in</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data tracking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The most frequently cited theme was the need for more guidance from the state on Stackable Certificates (27%). Many commented that they wanted more detailed information on how to properly issue the certificates. Others said that the benchmark requirements were too arduous, and should be either revised or reduced. Respondents specifically noted the difficulty in documenting benchmark requirements that are not covered by standardized assessments.
- Over 20% of the comments cited the need for more buy-in on Stackable Certificates by students, employers, and postsecondary institutions.
- Twelve percent of the comments cited the need for more funding, especially with costs associated with implementing secondary assessments.
- Approximately 12% of the comments cited the need to market the certificates to students, employers, and postsecondary institutions, as an effective marketing strategy could help achieve more buy-in of the certificates among stakeholders.
- Some comments cited the need for better access to multiple assessments (8%).
- Other comments mentioned the need for more time (8%). One respondent wrote that his/her program could not justify the amount of time it takes to facilitate the testing requirements since there is rarely enough time to cover all of the class material.
- Six percent noted the need for professional development designed to provide information on the value and procedures of the Stackable Certificates.
A small portion of comments (4%) mentioned that it would be helpful to have software that diagnoses gaps, prescribes remedial plans, and tracks progress in benchmark attainment for students.

**PART 3: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT RECORD**

The third section of the survey (Items 25-35) was designed to collect feedback from respondents regarding the Student Achievement Record (SAR).

**Awareness of the SAR (Items 25-27)**

The first question in this section (Item 25) asked respondents to indicate whether they were aware of the Student Achievement Record.

**Figure: Item 25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>43 (88%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty-three of the 49 survey respondents (88%) indicated that they were aware of the SAR. For the five respondents (10%) who indicated they were unaware, the survey provided them with a brief explanation of the Student Achievement Record before redirecting them to the end of the survey. By design, the one respondent who gave no answer to this question was also redirected to the end of the survey.

The 43 respondents who gave an affirmative response to this question continued to the next question (Item 26), which asked them to indicate whether they used the Student Achievement Record. The results of this question are summarized in the following figure.
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Although all 43 respondents were aware of the SAR, only 19 (44%) indicated that they used it. These respondents were redirected to Items 28-35 to answer questions related to their use of the SAR.

The remaining 24 (56%) who indicated that they did not use the SAR were directed to Item 27, which asked them to identify the conditions that prevented them from using the record. Respondents were presented with four choices and were asked to select all that were applicable. After answering this question, these respondents were directed to the end of the survey, skipping the remaining survey questions on the SAR. The following table summarizes the results of this item.

**Table: Item 27**

*What conditions are preventing you from using the Student Achievement Record?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent (N=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No requests</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of awareness by students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of awareness by partners</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 24 respondent who were aware of the SAR but did not use it, almost 80% attributed this to a lack of requests. Nearly half (46%) cited a lack of student awareness as being a significant factor, while 21% cited a lack of awareness by partners.
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Of the six (25%) who selected “other” as their response to this question, some specified their answer. Among these:

- One wrote that his/her program seldom uses the SAR because it is rarely necessary to do so. Another commented that the use of the SAR was not high among the priorities of his/her program.
- Another commented that students generally do not see a need for the SAR.
- One respondent said that his/her program does not have time to use the SAR due to the time demands related to ABLELink data entry.
- One noted that a software glitch that spools incorrect phone numbers has prevented his/her program from using the SAR.

**Using the SAR (Item 28)**

The 19 respondents who had indicated they use the Student Achievement Record skipped Item 27 (conditions preventing use of the SAR) to complete the remaining eight questions on the survey (Items 28-35). Item 28 asked them to provide feedback on how they use the SAR. Respondents were presented with three choices and were instructed to select all applicable answers.

**Table: Item 28**

*How do you use the Student Achievement Record?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent (N=19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verify student information for a partner or third party (e.g., case worker, postsecondary institutions, etc.)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide to student</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twelve of the 19 respondents (63%) indicated that their programs used the SAR to verify student information for partners or third party institutions. Slightly less than half (47%) indicated that they used the SAR to provide it to their students. Of the eight respondents (42%) who selected “other” as their answer to this question, some specified their answer. Among these:

- Three wrote that their programs provide the SAR to students in their portfolios at graduation.
- Two comments referred to accountability, with one specifying that his/her program uses the SAR to review student work.
- When a student moves to another program, two respondents wrote that their program sends the SAR to the new institution.

**Requests for the SAR (Item 29)**

The next question on the survey (Item 29) asked the 19 respondents to identify who has been requesting the SAR most frequently. Respondents were presented with four choices and were instructed to select all applicable answers. The following table summarizes the results.
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Table: Item 29
Who is requesting the Student Achievement Record most frequently?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent (N=19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No requests</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An equal percentage of respondents (32%) identified both students and partners as having made the most frequent SAR requests. However, five respondents (26%) indicated that their programs had received no SAR requests. Other entities specified by the respondents included caseworkers, distance learning partners, and a Youth Build Coordinator.

Feedback (Items 30-31)

Items 30 and 31 were two open-ended questions that asked respondents to comment on the feedback that they had received (if any) from students and partners regarding their use of the Student Achievement Record. Some respondents provided multiple comments for each question.

For Item 30, respondents were asked if they had received any feedback from students concerning how they were using the SAR. Of the 19 respondents surveyed in this section, eight provided comments. Four of the respondents commented that they have not received any feedback from students using the SAR. Among the other respondents:
- Two wrote that students generally requested the SAR if they were transferring to another program or employer.
- Two commented that students provided the SAR to their families and employers to show completion of their work.
- One also added that some students have used the SAR to obtain a better job when returning to their native countries.

Similar to the previous question, Item 31 asked respondents to comment on any feedback that they had received from partners or others (e.g., case workers, postsecondary institutions) with regard to how they were using the SAR. Again, eight respondents provided comments. Five of them indicated that they have not received any feedback from partners. Of the remaining respondents:
- One wrote that partners have been using the SAR to show student outcomes to their program administration.
- Another wrote that partners have used it for students transferring to their programs.
- One commented that a Youth Build Coordinator has used it as an update tool for student files. For example, after a TABE or practice test session, the respondent updates ABLELink and provides the Youth Build Coordinator with updated achievement reports for each student.
Marketing (Item 32)

Item 32 asked the 19 respondents who had indicated they were using the SAR to identify to whom they have been marketing the Student Achievement Record. Respondents were presented with six choices and were instructed to select all applicable answers.

**Table: Item 32**

*To whom are you marketing the Student Achievement Record?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent (N=19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not currently marketing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community colleges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-stop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than half of the respondents (53%) indicated that they were not marketing the SAR. Among those who were, the plurality (37%) indicated that they were marketing the SAR to students. The remaining answer choices – including career centers, community colleges, and one-stops – were each identified by only one respondent.

**Recommended the SAR (Items 33-34)**

Item 33 asked the 19 respondents who had indicated they were using the SAR whether or not they would recommend it to other ABLE programs. Fifteen of the 19 respondents (78%) answered that they would, while two indicated that they would not. Two of the 19 respondents did not provide a response to this question. The results of Item 33 are summarized in the following figure.
In a follow-up to the previous question, Item 34 asked respondents to elaborate if they had answered “no” to Item 33. Of the two respondents who indicated that they would not recommend the SAR to other programs:

- One wrote that he/she did not have access to ABLELink.
- The other commented that his/her program did not have a dedicated support staff member for ABLELink, leaving the program coordinator and one teacher to manage all of this work. The respondent added that his/her program had neither the time nor the funds to promote such activities.

**Suggestions for Improvement (Item 35)**

Item 35 was an open-ended question that asked respondents to list any suggestions that they had for improving the Student Achievement Record. Among the few comments that were provided:

- One respondent wrote that the SAR would be more useful if employers and postsecondary institutions recognized its legitimacy.
- Another said that it would be good to include the Educational Functioning Level (EFL) on the form, adding that the numbers on the assessments mean very little to a student or someone outside of ABLE.
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

The final section of the survey (Item 36) allowed respondents to provide any additional comments they had concerning transitions, Stackable Certificates, or the Student Achievement Record. The following summarizes the response data according to topic and frequency.

Table: Item 36
Do you have other comments about transitions, Stackable Certificates, or the Student Achievement Record?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Percent (N=49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stackable Certificates</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement Record</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transitions

Of the comments provided by respondents, 11 (22%) were on the topic of transitions. Among these:

- Four respondents wrote that their programs needed more funding from the state in order to adequately facilitate transitions. One wrote that because of ever increasing state requirements, the administrative and developmental costs of transitions activities are becoming cost prohibitive. Another commented that while the state is continuously increasing the number of initiatives that ABLE programs are required to facilitate, it does not provide these programs with additional funding or resources, making the implementation of new initiatives very difficult.
- One commented that much of the emphasis with transitions is on postsecondary enrollment. However, since many students just want to find jobs, there should be more of an emphasis on transitioning students into the workforce.
- One wrote that ABLE instructors and staff have been forced to spend more time meeting quotas; as a result, the focus of ABLE is shifting away from the students.
- Another commented that his/her program has had very limited success in facilitating a postsecondary transitions class. After marketing the class to 150 GED graduates, only one enrolled in the course.
- Two referred back to Items 5 and 6, which asked respondents to rate the extent to which they had made changes to program management and instruction relevant to transitions. Both wrote that they had rated these items low because their programs were already providing transitions services; therefore, few changes were necessary.

Stackable Certificates

Twelve comments (25%) were made with regard to Stackable Certificates, making it the most frequently cited topic under this item. Of the comments provided:

- Nine respondents wrote about the lack of acceptance for Stackable Certificates among stakeholders. Several noted that students have little interest in the certificates, perceiving
them as having little value. Some wrote that most employers and postsecondary institutions do not see the certificates as meaningful. One respondent noted that the certificates will have little credibility until they are recognized throughout the state on many different levels.

- Two wrote of the need for a marketing campaign to educate employers and postsecondary institutions on the value of the certificates. One noted that the OBR should take responsibility for promoting the certificates since individual ABLE programs cannot effectively market them on their own.
- Two commented that they would like more information on how other programs have addressed the documentation requirements for issuing the certificates.
- One respondent criticized the Basic Certificate, saying that most students do not want to be certified as having skills below a ninth-grade level. He/she noted that many students find the idea of the Basic Certificate to be degrading, especially those who have a high school diploma or GED.

**Student Achievement Record**

The only comment made regarding the SAR was that it was too new to adequately judge its merits.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As previously stated, this report presents the results of Ohio Transitions Survey 2010. This survey was intended to capture an overall ABLE program perspective about transitions, Stackable Certificates, and the Student Achievement Record.

As a whole, ABLE programs in Ohio are rising to the challenges presented by the statewide transitions efforts. Programs appear to be making steady progress in strengthening ABLE while extending ABLE’s reach through established and emerging collaborations. Encouragement along with sustained support (e.g., policy, guidance, professional development, resources) can help to maintain this positive momentum.

The sections and associated text that follow recap survey methodology and selected survey results. In the spirit of continuous improvement, specific recommendations for OBR consideration are included in a bulleted list at the end of each section.

SURVEY DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION

As stated previously, responses to this survey were collected from 49 of the 72 ABLE programs, resulting in a response rate of 68%. Because the responses were evenly spread across the four regions of the state, these can be considered a representative sample of the ABLE programs in Ohio. In this regard, the implementation of this survey instrument was successful. At a later date, this survey can be conducted again using similar methodology to collect follow-up data from the respondents. In addition, focus groups can be conducted to generate additional data on any set or subset of topics within this survey.

- **Consider repeating this survey at a later date for comparison purposes.**
- **Conduct focus groups with the Transitions Task Force committees and other stakeholders on select topics from this evaluation.**

TRANSITIONS

Defining Transitions

Over half of respondents connected transitions to postsecondary education in their definitions, and nearly half of them related transitions to employment. In addition, more than three-fourths of respondents indicated that their programs currently were offering transitions classes. From these findings it seems that Ohio is making forward progress in embedding transitions into ABLE programming.

In the specific definitions of transitions and in the descriptions of transitions classes, comments generally focused more on instruction than on support services. To fully integrate the Ohio
ABLE Transitions Framework, both components need to be equally represented in ABLE programming.

- *Create a Support Services for Transitions professional development offering.*

**Transitions and the SEM**

Similar to the needs related to the Transitions Framework, survey results suggest that ABLE programs could benefit from State support in the integration of transitions in the Student Experience Model. Nearly three-fourths of programs reported that they are including transitions in their orientation activities. However, to maintain the energy created in these initial activities, additional guidance is likely needed.

- *Guide programs to explicitly connect transitions with the elements of the SEM.*
- *Deliver professional development highlighting transitions within the context of the SEM.*

**Transitions and Change**

In terms of changes made to management and instruction, programs are fairly evenly divided between reporting either minimal change or significant change. Using a four-point rating scale, most responses to these questions resulted in scores that hovered near the scale’s median point (2.50). Based on these results, it is difficult to predict what level of change is needed to fully integrate transitions into the ABLE programs.

- *Consider repeating these two questions with ABLE programs at a later date to determine if there has been additional change over time.*

**State Support**

Early in the survey, respondents were asked to rate the State’s guidance in their transitions activities. The responses were nearly evenly split, resulting in an average rating score that fell between *fair* and *good*. It is likely that programs need more targeted information from OBR that explains the State’s vision and plan for transitions.

- *Upon release of this report to the field, provide ABLE programs with a strategic plan for transitions, including policy, support, and continuous improvement elements.*

**Marketing**

Survey results suggest that programs are using a variety of methods to actively market transitions to students and, to a lesser degree, partners. In addition, comments related to marketing arose in response to questions about challenges and needed tools. After reviewing these data together, programs may benefit from professional development on how to market for multiple purposes and to varied audiences.
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• Consider developing marketing strategy guides and samples for local adaptation.
• Include ABLE programs in efforts to create a statewide marketing campaign for the University System of Ohio.

Articulation

Programs are making strides in the formation of articulation agreements with educational partners as evidenced by the large number institutions listed by the respondents (Item 11), which accounted for nearly 75% of Ohio’s community colleges.

• Conduct a study of a subset of these ABLE-community college partnerships in order to create descriptions of successful collaborations.
• Collect and distribute descriptions of partnerships between ABLE programs and postsecondary institutions, including Adult Workforce Education (AWE) programs, as promising practices.

Rewards and Challenges

When asked about rewarding aspects of transitions, respondents offered comments exclusively related to students. Ohio ABLE has experienced much change based on transferred governance (from Ohio Department of Education to Ohio Board of Regents) and on State initiatives. However, it appears that these shifts have not had a negative impact on the core of the ABLE program – helping adult students meet basic educational goals.

• Maintain focus on providing high quality services to adult students.
• Continue to move transitions forward taking into account adult students at all Educational Functioning Levels within ABE/ASE and ESOL.

When asked about challenging aspects of transitions, many of the comments were again about students – student interest, recruitment, persistence. Based on research of student-centered education and student persistence, the Student Experience Model has not been reviewed and updated for some time.

• Continue to explore issues related to student-centered education and incorporate persistence research into supports.
• On a statewide level, use persistence research to inform and update the SEM.

Tools and Resources

A common theme in the response data was a need for more funding. However, with the current budgetary climate, it is assumed that additional funding will continue to be elusive. Other creative strategies are necessary to meet program needs. In addition to tools and resources recommended in other sections, suggestions include top-down and bottom-up approaches:
• Leverage other state initiatives, such as Shifting Gears and Developmental Education Initiative, to meet current needs.

• Share sample curricula. For example, EDR 1 Go Prepared was specifically mentioned in the survey responses.

• Include partners on task forces and in advisory groups to increase awareness and investment in the University System of Ohio.

STACKABLE CERTIFICATES

Issuing Certificates

Based on survey responses, the issuing of Stackable Certificates poses some challenges. Lack of student interest, lack of access to multiple assessments, and difficulties with issuing policies were cited by many of the respondents. Since the administration of this survey, OBR has adjusted the certificate assessment requirements. As such, recommendations related to respondent feedback on assessment are not applicable. However, there remains room for improvement in student interest/retention and policy. Multiple ratings and comments were offered related to the value of the certificates to students, employers, and postsecondary institutions.

• Provide programs with professional development in marketing techniques to increase perceived value and buy-in from stakeholder groups on the local level.

• Align messages within OBR so that all sectors (ABLE, AWE, community colleges, etc.) understand their respective roles and responsibilities in Stackable Certificates.

• Based on the Stackables Early Adopter Pilots and increased ABLE use, review and adjust the vision, structure, and requirements of the Stackable Certificate Initiative as needed.

Tools and Resources

Responses offered in this section of the survey mirror those offered for Item 16 (tools and resources needed for transitions). For this question, however, the need for state guidance was more pronounced in the responses.

• Consider developing a Stackable Certificate manual for administrators or fold specific guidance on certificates into the Ohio Performance Accountability Manual.

• Develop a Stackable Certificate training for administrators.

• Highlight connections to the Stackable Certificates in existing professional development (e.g., content area trainings, assessment trainings).
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Although 88% of respondents indicated awareness of the SAR, less than half (44%) indicated that the SAR is being used in their programs. The data suggest that the largest factor for this discontent is a lack of requests for the SAR. In additions, more than half of the programs are not actively marketing the tool. At this point, however, it may be too early in the implementation of the SAR to adequately judge its use.

- Allow additional time for the SAR’s use before adjusting its design, intent, or associated policies.
- Encourage programs to explore ways to provide the SAR before it is requested. For example, include the SAR in the student portfolio.
- Incorporate a Program Sharing session at the Fall Directors’ Meeting that would allow time for programs to discuss use and issues related to the SAR.

FINAL THOUGHTS

ABLE programs throughout the State have taken great strides in embedding transitions, the Stackable Certificates, and the Student Achievement Record into their programming. While most appear to be diligent in following policy and procedures, consistent themes arose in this survey that point to new and continuing needs. Many of these needs can be addressed within the ABLE system by continuing to improving collaborations between ABLE program staff and the ABLE leadership team at OBR. However, some issues can only be addressed externally through strengthening ABLE program partnerships with employers and postsecondary intuitions. Focused efforts within and between internal collaborations and external partnerships will help support ABLE programs with implementing these initiatives.
This appendix includes three documents referenced throughout the report:

- **Ohio Transitions Survey 2010**
  The results of this survey instrument are the basis for this report.

- **Ohio ABLE Transitions Framework**
  The framework was used to inform the analysis of the definitions of transitions as well as the descriptions of transitions classes.

- **Ohio ABLE Student Experience Model**
  This document was used in the analysis of incorporating transitions into the SEM.
Welcome to the Ohio ABLE Transitions Survey!

We, the staff of the OSU Evaluation and Design Project, are interested in your experience with student transitions.

To help us better understand how your program is addressing student transitions, please take a few minutes to answer the following questions about your local implementation policies and practices.

We ask that each program completes only one survey.

This survey should take you about 30-40 minutes. Individual responses will not be shared with anyone outside of OSU staff. The combined data will be summarized in a report for the Ohio Board of Regents ABLE staff to be used for continuous improvement.

Click "Next" to get started. If you would like to leave the questionnaire at any time, just click "Exit this survey." Your answers will be saved.

Please direct any questions to Adrienne Glandon. 1-800-848-4815, extension 8-3720 or glandon8@osu.edu

### 2. Transitions

1. How does your program define transitions?

2. How have you incorporated transitions into the Student Experience Model?

### 3. Transitions (Continued)

* 3. Are you offering a transitions class in your program?

   - Yes
   - No

### 4. Transitions (Continued)

4. Please describe your transitions class and how it is different from other classes you offer.

### 5. Transitions (Continued)
5. To what extent have you made changes in program management in order to incorporate transitions?
   - [ ] No change
   - [ ] Minimal change
   - [ ] Significant change
   - [ ] Complete change

6. To what extent have you made changes in program instruction in order to incorporate transitions?
   - [ ] No change
   - [ ] Minimal change
   - [ ] Significant change
   - [ ] Complete change

7. Overall, how would you rate your program's transitions activities?
   - [ ] Poor
   - [ ] Fair
   - [ ] Good
   - [ ] Excellent

8. Overall, how would you rate state guidance for your program's transitions activities?
   - [ ] Poor
   - [ ] Fair
   - [ ] Good
   - [ ] Excellent

6. Transitions (Continued)

9. To whom are you marketing transitions? (Mark all that apply)
   - [ ] Students
   - [ ] Career Centers
   - [ ] Community Colleges
   - [ ] One-Stop
   - [ ] Not Currently Marketing
   - [ ] Other (please specify)

   [ ]

   [ ]

   [ ]
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10. How are you marketing transitions?

11. List the institutions with which you have articulation agreements to facilitate student transitions.

7. Transitions (Continued)

12. What are the most rewarding aspects of student transitions for your program?

13. What are the most challenging aspects of student transitions for your program?

14. How have you addressed challenges with student transitions in your program?

8. Transitions (Continued)

15. What tools or resources are you using to facilitate student transitions? (Mark all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>选中标志</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABLE Transitions Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLE Transitions Repository</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National College Transition Network (NCTN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIFL (National Institute for Literacy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBR Q&amp;A documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Resource Center Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stackable Memo and Guidance (September 2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABE Test Alignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorkKeys Test Alignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify)____________________________

16. What additional tools or resources would help support your transitions efforts?

9. Stackable Certificates
17. How many Stackable Certificates have you issued to date?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-35</th>
<th>More than 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. What conditions make it difficult for you to issue the Basic Certificate? (Mark all that apply)

- [ ] Lack of Access to Multiple Assessments
- [ ] Assessment Costs
- [ ] Issuing Policies
- [ ] Student Lack of Interest
- [ ] Lack of Student Mastery of Benchmarks
- [ ] Lack of Student Retention
- [ ] Other (please specify)

19. What conditions make it difficult for you to issue the Advanced Certificate? (Mark all that apply)

- [ ] Lack of Access to Multiple Assessments
- [ ] Assessment Costs
- [ ] Issuing Policies
- [ ] Student Lack of Interest
- [ ] Lack of Student Mastery of Benchmarks
- [ ] Lack of Student Retention
- [ ] Other (please specify)
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20. What conditions make it difficult for you to issue the Oral Communication Certificate? (Mark all that apply)

☐ Lack of Access to Multiple Assessments
☐ Assessment Costs
☐ Issuing Policies
☐ Student Lack of Interest
☐ Lack of Student Mastery of Benchmarks
☐ Lack of Student Retention
☐ Other (please specify)

11. Stackable Certificates (Continued)

21. To what extent have you made changes in program management in order to issue the Basic, Advanced, or Oral Communication Certificates?

☐ No change
☐ Minimal change
☐ Significant change
☐ Complete change

22. To what extent have you made changes in data entry and data management in order to issue the Basic, Advanced, or Oral Communication Certificates?

☐ No change
☐ Minimal change
☐ Significant change
☐ Complete change

23. To what extent have you made changes in program instruction in order to issue the Basic, Advanced, or Oral Communication Certificates?

☐ No change
☐ Minimal change
☐ Significant change
☐ Complete change

12. Stackable Certificates (Continued)
24. What additional tools or resources would help support your efforts in issuing the Basic, Advanced, or Oral Communication Certificates?

13. Student Achievement Record

* 25. Are you aware of the ABLELink Student Achievement Record?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

14. Student achievement Record Explanation

The Student Achievement Record (SAR) was created as a way for programs to provide a brief “transcript” of their students’ academic outcomes while they attended the program. The SAR contains current contact information; general demographics; program entry, exit, and attendance; entry and exit levels; assessment records; and documentation of ABLE-related certificates received. Information identifying the issuing program, as well as the ABLE logo, is also clearly printed on the SAR.

The SAR is considered a student’s official documentation of his/her time in your program, and students may use their SAR when transferring to another ABLE program or postsecondary institution. When transferring to another ABLE program, for example, the program the student is transferring to may be able to use the existing assessment scores and avoid re-testing the student. If a student transfers to a career center, 2-year or 4-year college, or other postsecondary program, the SAR can provide documentation of academic achievement. Of course, the student may wish to have a copy for his or her own personal records.

The Student Achievement Report can be accessed from the Reports Menu in ABLELink. For a copy of the FY2010 Student Achievement Record Guide, please contact your State ABLE Consultant.

15. Student achievement Record (Continued)

* 26. Do you use the Student Achievement Record?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

16. Student achievement Record (No Answer)
27. What conditions are preventing you from using the Student Achievement Record? (Check all that apply)

- No requests
- Lack of awareness by partners
- Lack of awareness by students
- Other (please specify)

28. How do you use the Student Achievement Record? (Mark all that apply)

- Provide to student
- Verify student information for a partner or third party (e.g., case worker, postsecondary institution, etc.)
- Other (please specify)

29. Who is requesting the Student Achievement Record most frequently? (Mark all that apply)

- Students
- Partners (please specify)
- Other (please specify)
- No requests

Please specify partners and/or other

30. If you have received feedback from students who are using the Student Achievement Record, how are they using it?

31. If you have received feedback from partners or others (e.g., case workers, postsecondary institutions) who are using the Student Achievement Record, how are they using it?

18. Student achievement Record (Continued)
32. To whom are you marketing the Student Achievement Record? (Mark all that apply)

☐ Students
☐ One-Stop
☐ Career Centers
☐ Not Currently Marketing
☐ Community Colleges

Other (please specify)

33. Would you recommend that other ABLE programs use the Student Achievement Record?

☐ Yes
☐ No

34. If you would not recommend that other ABLE programs use the Student Achievement Record, why not?

Other (please specify)

35. Do you have any suggestions for improvement? If so, please list your suggestions.

Other (please specify)

19. Other Comments

36. Do you have other comments about transitions, Stackable Certificates, or the Student Achievement Record? If so, please provide your comments.

Other (please specify)

20. Follow-up

* 37. Please select your program from the following list

Program Name

Other (please specify)

38. May we contact you with any follow-up questions? If yes, please provide contact information.

Name:

Email Address:

Phone Number:
Ohio ABLE Transitions Framework

The Ohio ABLE Transitions Framework is organized by two primary categories: instructional and support services. The framework is constructed broadly to encompass requirements of both postsecondary and career/workplace transitions.

**INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM COMPONENT FOR TRANSITIONS**

*Provide instruction aimed at addressing the gaps in knowledge and skills needed for success in postsecondary education and the workplace (for example, algebra, reading, critical thinking).*

- **Develop and Deliver Instructional Program that Facilitates Student Transitions**
  - Provide an instructional program that is more immediately relevant to students’ educational/career interests, connected to students’ long-term goals (for example, reading/writing or mathematics in the context of a career field) and based on appropriate assessments.
  - Offer or connect to certificates/credentials that are aligned to a career pathway or other sequence of learning activities.
  - Integrate ABLE services with occupational instruction (for example, modular curriculum leading to a credential) within a postsecondary institution (for example, Adult Career-Technical Education, community colleges).

- **Implement Contextualized Curricula**
  - Teach basic education in context with the College Readiness Expectations and workplace education, and prepare students for academic rigors beyond ABE/ESOL NRS Level 6 (for example, TABE 12.9).
  - Align curricula to include academic and/or student success skills needed for entry into postsecondary education and workplace, using state ABLE benchmarks and/or postsecondary and/or workplace education (for example, Ohio College Readiness Expectations, ACHIEVE Benchmarks).

- **Model Selected Postsecondary Facets Combined with ABLE Instructional Delivery**
  - Model postsecondary education and training or the workplace by monitoring time in class, monitoring attendance, enforcing punctuality, etc.
  - Provide other features of postsecondary education and training where possible (for example, registration, reporting, assessment).
SUPPORT SERVICES FOR TRANSITIONS

The following set of supports is viewed as important and generally applicable across ABLE, but specific supports can also be developed and implemented for transitions work in the areas of career assessment and counseling, as well as advising when the student has enrolled in a postsecondary option.

- **Build Awareness of Postsecondary and Work Options**
  - Help students to understand the need to prepare beyond ABE NRS Level 6 (for example, TABE 12.9) and to understand options beyond the GED as an end goal.
  - Provide students with access to information, resources and services (for example, Ohio Board of Regents student portal, Ohio Learning Network), giving an opportunity to become familiar with postsecondary programs (for example, admissions processes, programs of study, credentials).
  - Explore different career profiles and entrance requirements for college majors and career fields.
  - Define and develop an organized curriculum, provided as a separate class or incorporated into the program, to address transitions issues (for example, course sequences, scheduling).

- **Provide Comprehensive Goal Setting Activities**
  - Set realistic goals that take into consideration the student’s academic achievements and assessment scores and using appropriate tools for checking goals (for example, SMART criteria).
  - Set both long- and short-term transition goals, and review on a regular basis.

- **Incorporate Individual and Group Advising**
  - Tailor advising to individual student’s needs based on career assessment information, for example from Ohio Career Information System or other valid systems.
  - Offer career, personal and academic advising.
  - Provide academic support and monitoring (for example, coaching, tutoring).
  - Increase feeling of community within students in the program through group methods (for example, learning communities, peer to peer mentoring, cohorts).

- **Provide Comprehensive Support Services**
  - Examine and access resources from partners, including public workforce development programs and private employers.
  - Provide links to financial literacy and support for education/training, career exploration, etc.
  - Maintain partnerships to address needs of ABLE students (for example, Rehabilitation Services Commission, child care facilities, mental health facilities).
  - Continue support with students enrolled in postsecondary for one year (this assumes a common database between ABLE and postsecondary).
Student Experience Model*

Orientation**
- Rapport and Support Building
- Program and Student Information Sharing
- Learning Style Assessment
- LD Screening (if done during orientation)
- Diagnostic Testing
- Goal-Setting/Individual Learning Plan (ILP)
- Student Registration Form Completed

Preparing for Instruction
- Information about student’s prior knowledge
- Standards, components of performance and benchmarks to be addressed

Planning Instruction
- Assessment/screening results
- Lesson planning

Teaching
- Evidence-based instruction
- Methods to meet student needs

Reflecting
- Evaluation and reflection on what was learned
- New steps identified

Monitoring Student Performance
- Assessment and evaluation of student performance
- Regular review of progress
- Adjustment of goals and/or ILP

Reached Primary and/or Secondary Goal?

Revised ILP and Continue Instruction

Exit Program

Choose New Goal and Repeat Process

Follow-up

* The Student Experience Model may vary based upon program structure and student needs.
** Intervention and referral to other services may occur at anytime during the student’s experience in an ABLE
Recommendations

ITEM 1: SURVEY DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION
- Consider repeating this survey at a later date for comparison purposes.
- Conduct focus groups with the Transitions Task Force committees and other stakeholders on select topics from this evaluation.

OBR ABLE Program Staff Response:
It was agreed that to gather comparative results the survey should be repeated at another time. It was also agreed that Transition Task Force be used as a focus group to gather more information about major topics from the survey.

ITEM 2: TRANSITIONS
Defining Transitions
- Create a Support Services for Transitions professional development offering.

OBR ABLE Program Staff Response:
It was agreed that the support services part of the transitions framework is very important and the work has been assigned as part of the FY 2011 scopes of work for the NWRC and the OSU Evaluation and Design Project. The Transition Task Force is to continue the work of increasing the capacity of programs to effectively implement the Transitions Framework. To this end, professional development for the transitions work should be developed in this collaboration for the entire framework not just the instructional elements. In addition, some of the collaborative projects have materials that can be distributed to assist with this information for example EDR 5 and 7

Transitions and the SEM
- Guide programs to explicitly connect transitions with the elements of the SEM.
- Deliver professional development highlighting transitions within the context of the SEM.

OBR ABLE Program Staff Response:
It was agreed that this is a need since the SEM has not been addressed since its introduction. The PD has not been assigned to any resource center as right now but could be included at a later date.
Transitions and Change

- Consider repeating these two questions with ABLE programs at a later date to determine if there has been additional change over time.

**OBR ABLE Program Staff Response:**
*It was agreed that these questions could be included in any future survey about transitions.*

State Support

- Upon release of this report to the field, provide ABLE programs with a strategic plan for transitions, including policy, support, and continuous improvement elements.

**OBR ABLE Program Staff Response:**
*It was agreed that this should be a priority of the state program. To this end, a date has been set to create a strategic plan for transitions for the ABLE programs in Ohio. This plan will be developed this fall and will be released by early December.*

Marketing

- Consider developing marketing strategy guides and samples for local adaptation.
- Include ABLE programs in efforts to create a statewide marketing campaign for the University System of Ohio.

**OBR ABLE Program Staff Response:**
*It was agreed marketing will be one of the key elements of the strategic plan for transitions for the ABLE programs in Ohio. The marketing elements could provide regional examples to offer suggestions that have worked for other programs.*

Articulation

- Conduct a study of a subset of these ABLE-community college partnerships in order to create descriptions of successful collaborations.
- Collect and distribute descriptions of partnerships between ABLE programs and postsecondary institutions, including Adult Workforce Education (AWE) programs, as promising practices.

**OBR ABLE Program Staff Response:**
*This recommendation is being addressed by the Adult Learning Plan through major initiatives in the OBR such as the Developmental Education Initiative and Shifting Gears.*
Rewards and Challenges

- Maintain focus on providing high quality services to adult students.
- Continue to move transitions forward taking into account adult students at all Educational Functioning Levels within ABE/ASE and ESOL.
- Continue to explore issues related to student-centered education and incorporate persistence research into supports.
- On a statewide level, use persistence research to inform and update the SEM.

OBR ABLE Program Staff Response:
As stated before the transitions task force is continuing throughout this year. In addition, there are efforts to move and provide more direction in ESOL transition. As part of the FY 2011 scope of work for NERC, they are to disseminate resources and deliver training to the field on the issues and Best Practices in ESOL Transitions to postsecondary education. The timeframe for this work is by the end of FY 2011.

It was agreed that updating and revising the SEM should be addressed at this time. This task could be completed by the OSU project and processed through the project’s work with the Transition Task Force.

Tools and Resources

- Leverage other state initiatives, such as Shifting Gears and Developmental Education Initiative, to meet current needs.
- Share sample curricula. For example, EDR 1 Go Prepared was specifically mentioned in the survey responses.
- Include partners on task forces and in advisory groups to increase awareness and investment in the University System of Ohio.

OBR ABLE Program Staff Response:
All three of these recommendations are being addressed this year. The first recommendation is being addressed by two projects that DEI is proposing: one that includes CC and ABLE providers and one that addresses the branch campuses and ABLE providers.

The second recommendation is being addressed at the Fall Administrators” meeting which is focusing on collaborations and includes session on the good practices that have come out of the ABLE regional collaboratives.

The third recommendations will be a suggestion to the task forces that are in existence this year and throughout.
ITEM 3: STACKABLE CERTIFICATES

Issuing Certificates

- Provide programs with professional development in marketing techniques to increase perceived value and buy-in from stakeholder groups on the local level.
- Align messages within OBR so that all sectors (ABLE, AWE, community colleges, etc.) understand their respective roles and responsibilities in Stackable Certificates.
- Based on the Stackables Early Adopter Pilots and increased ABLE use, review and adjust the vision, structure, and requirements of the Stackable Certificate Initiative as needed.

OBR ABLE Program Staff Response:
The first two recommendations are being addressed by the Adult Learning Plan for the OBR. As the Stackable Certificate Initiative is no longer at the same level of priority, ABLE will need to wait to respond in more detail once the new FY 2011 Adult Learning Plan is finalized.

As to the third recommendation, one of the recent changes to the ABLE Stackable Certificate requirements is that programs no longer need to use two tests to determine completion of the testable items. One test is sufficient. The program must continue to use alternate assessments to ensure the achievement of the other non-testable competencies. (See Stackable Certificate Guidance, revised August 2010)

Tools and Resources

- Consider developing a Stackable Certificate manual for administrators or fold specific guidance on certificates into the Ohio Performance Accountability Manual.
- Develop a Stackable Certificate training for administrators.
- Highlight connections to the Stackable Certificates in existing professional development (e.g., content area trainings, assessment trainings).

OBR ABLE Program Staff Response:
Because the Adult Learning Plan is in development, there will be no additional materials created to support the ABLE Stackable Certificates at this time. Should the Adult Learning Plan support the continued efforts of the ABLE Stackable Certificates this could change during FY 2011.

In addition, the Stackable Guidance was revised during the summer of 2010. This revised document is available online for the convenience of the field.
STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT RECORD

- Allow additional time for the SAR’s use before adjusting its design, intent, or associated policies.
- Encourage programs to explore ways to provide the SAR before it is requested. For example, include the SAR in the student portfolio.
- Incorporate a Program Sharing session at the Fall Directors’ Meeting that would allow time for programs to discuss use and issues related to the SAR.

OBR ABLE Program Staff Response:

It was agreed that this should be included as an element of the strategic plan for transitions for the ABLE programs in Ohio. This plan will developed this fall and will be released by early December.