

Frequently Asked Questions

Utah State Board of Education

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
Will the Technical Assistance Meeting on January 20th be recorded?	Yes. The recording can be access through this link: https://youtu.be/s92nLi-cUVA
Where can I learn more about Integrated Education and Training (IET) and Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE)?	This google doc includes links to several resources on IET and/or IELCE. These resources will be posted on the Adult Education eMedia Hub within the next two weeks.
<p>Question 6 is described as optional and may be used to explain or contextualize data related to Questions 1–5, including instances where alternative math data sources are used. Could you clarify how points are awarded for Question 6 overall?</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• If a program uses Question 6 to explain alternative math data that are not reflected in the tables for Question 1, can that narrative be used to earn the points available under Question 1(b) and 1(e) (i.e., up to four points total)?• Beyond supporting points already associated with Questions 1–5, does Question 6 itself carry any additional points, or is it strictly contextual and explanatory?	<p>Question 6 is not worth any points on its own but provides an opportunity for programs to add any context to any of the previous prompts. The state team will consider the narrative and may make scoring adjustments based on the information provided.</p>

<p>The rubric defines program effectiveness as earning at least 20 points out of 44 total points (approximately 45%). For programs that offer only ELL services, however, the total number of points available appears to be closer to 20–24, depending on how math data is scored under Question 6. Would it be possible to define effectiveness as achieving 45% of the points <u>available</u> to a program, rather than a fixed point total, to ensure entities outside of school districts remain eligible?</p>	<p>All programs must meet the same demonstrated effectiveness criteria, and the cutoff will not be adjusted. However, programs may use Question 6 to provide context or outside data.</p>
<p>Can you give us examples of supplanting?</p>	<p>“Supplement, not supplant” is a fiscal rule designed to ensure that federal money is used to add to (supplement) the resources available for adult education, rather than replacing (supplanting) existing state or local funding.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last year, your program used state funds to pay for the salary of an ESL instructor. This year, you use AEFLA funds to pay for that same instructor’s salary so you can shift the state funds to a different department. • Your local school board policy requires all instructors to receive 20 hours of safety training. Using AEFLA funds for this training is supplanting because it is a pre-existing requirement of your organization. • You provide a digital literacy workshop to the general public using local funds, but you charge the exact same workshop to your AEFLA grant when it is provided to English Language Learners.

P&I – Are we allowed to write in paid tutors for our program?	Yes. You will need to work with your sheriff's office to determine if this is an option and how individuals will be paid.
Do I need to submit a separate demonstrated effectiveness application for each funding source I intend to apply for?	No. Each provider will demonstrate effectiveness once. All who meet the demonstrated effectiveness threshold may apply for any (or all) of the funding sources available.
What are some examples of justifiable or appropriate admin costs above 5%?	<p>All admin costs need to be reasonable, necessary, and allocable. Any admin cost could potentially be appropriate, but you would need to demonstrate that you would be unable to meet the requirements of the grant without a waiver.</p> <p>Example: Launching the proposed IET program requires 40+ hours of interagency planning and contract negotiation that falls outside of direct classroom instruction.</p>
Can you share the slides from the Technical Assistance Meeting?	Yes. Here is the link to access the slides from the meeting: TA Meeting Slides
Why were points for clean data omitted on the Demonstrated Effectiveness application this year?	The revised application is very straightforward as far as which data to include and where to find it. The additional points would be superfluous.
Do you want us to run the (demonstrated effectiveness) report(s) with or without removing the K-12 dual enrolled students?	All students should be included.

For the Demonstrated Effectiveness Application, do you want digital signatures or is that just for the final application if a program qualifies?	Digital signatures should be included on both applications. The signatures on the demonstrated effectiveness application specifically respond to the debarment statements and verify eligibility. The signatures on the final application indicate support for the application and an agreement to use any awarded funds to support the projects proposed in the application.
We have had growth in our ESL program. Could I increase the amount requested in our grant to potentially fund new classes?	Yes. There is no set amount that a program can apply for.
I am not sure I am using the correct numbers from tables 4 and 4a to fill out the pre-grant questions. Is there a guide somewhere which I can print?	Response: Please refer to the Demonstrated Effectiveness Technical Assistance Guide for step-by-step directions and screenshots.
When it comes to budgeting for the federal grant, do I report that annually (like x for year 1, 1.04x for year 2, 1.08x for year 3) or do I just provide one number and then all that math is done behind the scenes?	For each AEFLA grant submitted, include the budget for one year. The amount received in years two and three remains static unless there are increases or decreases in the federal allocation, in which case the change will be applied equally to all providers.
On the monthly report within UASIS, what do the %s indicate under the different levels?	The percentages indicate the number of students who have made a level gain at that level over the amount students enrolled at that level. The monthly report is a summary report. The level breakdown comes from NRS table 4, which provides a more in depth view. Talk to your USBE technical assistant if you'd like to schedule UASIS training to explore these reports further.

Who are core partners and where would I find them?	Under Utah's WIOA Plan, the core partners are the Department of Workforce Services (which includes Adult and Dislocated Worker Program, Youth Program, and Wagner-Peyser Act Programs), Adult Education, and Vocational Rehabilitation. This document lists the core and required partners: LINK
On the 2026 WIOA Demonstrated Effectiveness App, there is a spot for Federal ID # of provider, as well as DUNS number - do I need to submit both of these? I have the DUNS # already from our business office but wasn't provided with the Federal ID#	Previously funded applicants may omit this information as it is used to create an account in the UtahGrants system for disbursement of funds and their organizations are already in the system.
Can find out for me exactly which columns in the tables we should be using for our data ... for the application? Example... Q1 we are told to use Table 4a to derive our numerator and table 4 for the denominator... but not the exact columns. As I am getting improper fractions and 120% or above, I just want to be sure I am gathering the data from the correct columns.	Please refer to the Demonstrated Effectiveness Technical Assistance Guide for step-by-step directions and screenshots. The information for that section can be found on page 3.
When we turn in the 2026 WIOA Competition Demonstrated Effectiveness Application do we attach the "Scoring Rubrics" used based on the data?	The scoring rubric was for you benefit and meant to be a tool to use during your writing of the Demonstrated Effectiveness, so you understand where you'd likely score. It does not have to be submitted.
If we turn the scoring rubric in, how do we do that, as it is not in a format that allows us to write on it electronically.	The rubric does not have to be submitted.

Just to verify, the 2026 application we have is only 7 pages long and ends after question 6.	The Demonstrated Effectiveness tool is not very long and contains those 6 questions. Based on your answers, it may grow but not by much. Please keep in mind that the actual application for funding has not been provided and won't be unless your demonstrated effectiveness tool indicates you are eligible for funding. Applications for funding will be sent out on Feb. 16th, 2026 to qualifying entities.
Exactly which columns in the tables we should be using for our data ... for the application? Example... Q1 we are told to use Table 4a to derive our numerator and table 4 for the denominator... but not the exact columns. As I am getting improper fractions and 120% or above, I just want to be sure I am gathering the data from the correct columns.	Refer to the TA guide for screenshots and directions. Programs are scored in comparison for the state average, so scores over 100% are valid and will result in a higher score on that indicator.
Question 6 of the rubric does not show any possible points awarded. Does this mean that no points are awarded for this question, or does it mean that based on that answer the entire Demonstrated Effectiveness score is subjective?	Question 6 has been updated to clarify the scoring structure. Please refer to the Question 6 Clarification document for the specific point breakdown. Far from being subjective, this section allows applicants to provide qualitative context to their data, ensuring a comprehensive review of program impact.
There is specific language in 34 CFR 463.31-32 defining what a English language acquisition provider is and providing guidance on how they can meet outcomes requirements. However, Utah's demonstrative effectiveness process doesn't seem to take this guidance into consideration.	USBE ensures direct and equitable access by utilizing the same application process and evaluation criteria for all applicants. No applicant is excluded or predetermined for funding based on its organization type or specific services provided.

<p>In the document titled, "Determining Application Eligibility When Conducting a Competition for Adult Education and Family Literacy Act Funds," there are several statements that make it seem that the Demonstrated Effectiveness data points should be specific to the services being provided by the applying program, and not necessarily on every aspect of student services, or are those statements in the TA interpreted differently by USBE, and if so, please clarify.</p>	<p>USBE requires applicants to provide data across all core areas to ensure a comprehensive assessment of a provider's capacity to deliver AEFLA services. While the TA guide notes that data should reflect services provided, 34 CFR § 463.24 requires all applicants to demonstrate effectiveness against the state's performance targets for <i>all</i> eligible individuals. This requirement is not intended as a bias against specialized programs; rather, it ensures that any program receiving federal funds is capable of helping students achieve the broad range of measurable skill gains required by the National Reporting System (NRS).</p>
<p>Also found in the TA guide is the following statement: "The application materials do not narrow or further restrict who can apply for federal AEFLA funds beyond federal criteria established in AEFLA section 203(5) and 34 CFR §§463.23-24." It seems that the current Demonstrated Efficiency rubric and form do not adhere to this given that it greatly diminishes possible points earned by programs that do not serve all WIOA services in their program. Specifically, it undermines programs whose services meet emergent learners without taking into account the much-needed service they provide. Please provide clarification.</p>	<p>USBE adheres strictly to 34 CFR §§463.23-24. The rubric does not restrict who can apply; rather, it establishes a uniform scale to measure 'effectiveness' as defined by federal law. Points are awarded based on the ability to move students toward the core outcomes mandated by WIOA.</p>

<p>Programs who do not provide all aspects of adult education are being asked to practice at a higher rate of effectiveness as compared to other programs. This is based on the above questions and the changes made to this year's rubric. This seems inequitable, and it seems clarification is needed pertaining to this concern.</p>	<p>The requirement to demonstrate effectiveness across the full range of AEFLA service areas is a federal mandate applied uniformly to all applicants, including School Districts, Community Colleges, and CBOs. This standard is not intended to single out any specific type of provider; in fact, several school districts and other traditional providers have been deemed ineligible for AEFLA funding because they could not demonstrate effectiveness in all required domains. While School Districts and LEAs may have access to separate State Adult Education funds to support specialized or limited services, those state-specific funds are governed by different legislative requirements than the federal AEFLA grant. To be eligible for AEFLA funds specifically, the federal government requires proof of a provider's capacity to deliver the full scope of WIOA-mandated outcomes. USBE applies these criteria equitably across all applicants to ensure that any program receiving federal investment is prepared to meet the comprehensive needs of adult learners as defined by the NRS.</p>
<p>Also, in a Program Memo from OCTAE 17-1 dated October 18, 2016, OCTAE is provider clarification that "the 'direct and equitable access' and 'same application process' requirements in section 231(c) and 34 CFR § 463.20(c)(1) and (c)(2) require that all applications be treated equitably in accordance with the same process – i.e., that they have the same opportunity to apply for and be considered for AEFLA funding." This doesn't seem to align with what was said during the recent webinar (i.e., "our intent is to fund programs that provide the full variety of programs under AEFLA"). Google Drive Folder Link</p>	<p>USBE ensures direct and equitable access by utilizing the same application process and evaluation criteria for all applicants. While the state's goal is to provide a comprehensive suite of adult education services across Utah, every application is evaluated individually based on its demonstrated ability to improve the range of measurable skills defined by the National Reporting System.</p>

<p>There is a discrepancy between the previous grant cycle vs. this one. What was the basis for the changes made? As an example, there were 13 points omitted from the previous forms and yet the scoring was only changed from 24 points to 20 points (this may be related to question 4 above).</p>	<p>The scoring adjustment reflects an evolution in our data collection systems. Previously, 9 points were allocated for 'data cleanliness,' which is now automated and no longer requires manual verification points. The remaining points were redistributed to Question 6 to allow applicants more space to provide context-driven evidence of their effectiveness, ensuring that qualitative successes are captured alongside quantitative data.</p>
<p>Our CBOs offer a service to students that no one else does, and perhaps no one else <i>wants</i> to. They work with students and get them to where they can be "reportable" for AEFLA. My concern is that if those programs aren't funded, what will happen to those students? The issue with the AEFLA Demonstrated Effectiveness application is that if you want to get funded, you have to offer services that fit nicely into the grant box. But students need more than just the AEFLA services and to get them there requires work and services as well. This is something that USBE just needs to be aware of and accommodate. This should be visible and apparent in the rubric.</p>	<p>We acknowledge the critical role CBOs play in reaching Utah's most vulnerable populations. While AEFLA funds are tied to specific federal performance indicators, we value these partnerships and encourage programs to use the narrative sections of the application to highlight how their specific model prepares students for long-term success and integration into the broader AEFLA system.</p>