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The Training

- **Who:** Maryland’s 34 program administrators at their fall 2006 meeting

- **Purpose:** To analyze data trends over a five year time period, FY 2002-FY 2006
  - To encourage them to think about using trend data analysis for program improvement
  - To motivate their interest in program data by using easy-to-read graphs
The Activity

Introduced the activity with a PowerPoint presentation that reviewed

- Qualitative & quantitative data
- How to analyze & interpret data
- Why & how to use data for different purposes, audiences, etc.
The Evidence

◆ Divided into 5 groups, each group with programs of similar enrollment size
◆ Each group was given an “Evidence” packet for a MD program which contained 23 federal data charts spanning FYs 2002-2006
◆ State staff was given the state “Evidence” packet
Some Clues

- **Evidence Structure**
  - Charts 1-4 ➔ Demographics
  - Charts 5-9 ➔ Pre-Test/Post-Test Matches
  - Charts 10-13 ➔ EFL Completions
  - Charts 14-17 ➔ Average Contact Hours
  - Charts 18-23 ➔ Major Education & Employment Goals
PROGRAM #3 LEARNERS WITH A PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST MATCH (Federal)

FY 2002: 9 of 157 (6%)
FY 2003: 13 of 141 (9%)
FY 2004: 35 of 159 (22%)
FY 2005: 188 of 309 (61%)
FY 2006: 364 of 611 (60%)
CHART #17

PROGRAM #3 LEARNERS' CONTACT HOURS FOR ESL EDUCATIONAL FUNCTIONING LEVELS (Federal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>ESL Beginning Literacy</th>
<th>ESL Beginning</th>
<th>ESL Low Intermediate</th>
<th>ESL High Intermediate</th>
<th>ESL Low Advanced</th>
<th>ESL High Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Some More Clues

◆ These were provided in the instructions for the activity and included clues such as:

  ■ Trends: Stable? Steady increase or decrease? Erratic spikes? Patterns that stand out & differences across categories & groups of learners

  ■ Percentage changes: 10% or more merits a question, but always check the number
The Process

- Reviewed the program evidence
- Made some observations relative to the program’s efforts to meet the core Maryland/NRS goals
- Could also pose some questions to ask about the data/program results.
Considering the Evidence

- Based on the available evidence, each group presented its findings to the whole group in five minutes or less.
- "Set the scene" by stating the program’s demographics (Charts #1-#4).
- Then presented at least one of the program’s successes and one area that could be explored for program improvement.
Next Steps

- A training will be held for each program’s data entry specialist
- They will learn how to *create* trend and annual charts for data from the federal level down to the teacher level