



Desk Monitoring Fact Sheet

What is desk monitoring?

Desk monitoring is an approach to reviewing and tracking program performance by using quantitative data from the state's management information systems (LEIS for community colleges and LACES for CBO's). Annual one-page desk monitoring reports will be developed by the System Office for each Basic Skills program and will include data related to enrollment and attendance trends, program demographics, assessment, retention, fiscal expenditures, and core indicators of performance.

What are the advantages of desk monitoring?

1. It relies on data that programs already collect and report.
2. It is inexpensive to implement.
3. It requires no additional burden to local programs.
4. The data can be used to establish trends and compare programs' performance over time or to state standards/averages.
5. Local directors can use the monitoring report to engage staff in program improvement efforts based on meaningful data.
6. System Office staff can communicate on a regular basis with local staff about performance, technical assistance, and anticipated changes, rather than once every five years as occurs with on-site monitoring.

What types of data does the report include?

See the next page for an example.

Does desk monitoring replace on-site monitoring?

No. Despite its significant advantages, we realize that desk monitoring can never completely substitute for on-site monitoring because desk monitoring cannot collect direct information on a program's processes and procedures. Program activities such as goal setting, instruction, and assessment procedures cannot be quantified and can be effectively evaluated only through observation. Moreover, desk monitoring does not allow interaction with program staff or students or allow first-hand observation of the program environment and setting. Such experiences often add an insight into programs that desk monitoring cannot provide.

For these reasons, the System Office will provide desk monitoring reports annually and will continue with the five-year cycle of on-site monitoring visits. The findings from desk reviews can be used to focus the more-intensive on-site reviews and to identify technical assistance needs. Alternatively, on-site reviews can identify the need for more-intensive desk monitoring. Coordinating both approaches will allow North Carolina to make the most efficient use of data to evaluate programs and promote improvement efforts.

How can I use desk monitoring to promote program improvement?

Desk monitoring gives local programs a snapshot of their program's performance for the previous year. Programs can engage their staff in examining the data, discussing possible causes for problem areas, asking probing questions, and identifying strategies to address the identified needs. When coupled with an ongoing review of current data, program self-assessments, classroom observations, and a review of research findings, programs can develop a structure and process that can lead to meaningful program improvement.

In addition, the System Office will be providing training workshops and tools that will describe ways to interpret the data, access a variety of technical assistance resources, and maximize local program improvement efforts.

2008 – 2009 Local Program Desk Monitoring Report

Program: XYZ Community College	County: Blue Sky	Allocation: \$2,115,657
--------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------

ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE

Enrollment & Attendance Trends									
2007		2008		2009				Contact Hours/ Student	
Enrollment	Contact Hours	Enrollment	Contact Hours	Enrollment	+ or - from 08	Contact Hours	+ or - from 08	09	State Average
2969	318,915	2960	322,761	3,308	+12%	419,849	+30%	127	115

DEMOGRAPHICS, ASSESSMENT, RETENTION, AND FISCAL

Demographics				Assessment		Retention		Fiscal			
% ABE	% ASE	% ESL	# of Comp. Ed students	% pre-and post- tested	# w/ hrs but not post- tested	Retention Rate	% students leaving before 12 hrs	Cost per student	Diff. from state (State = \$681)	Cost per hour	Diff. from state (State = \$5.80)
66%	23%	11%	118	71%	159	97%	6%	\$680	-\$1	\$5.04	-\$.76

CORE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE

Educational Functioning Levels	Target % for Level Completion	Actual % of Level Completion	Met Goal	Did Not Meet Goal	Average Contact Hours/Level	
ABE Beginning Literacy	19%	32%	+13	0	349	
ABE Beginning Basic Education	38%	55%	+17	0	152	
ABE Intermediate Low	39%	54%	+15	0	140	
ABE Intermediate High	38%	45%	+7	0	122	
Adult Secondary Education Low	45%	54%	+9	0	109	
ESL Beginning Literacy	42%	33%	0	-9	33	
ESL Beginning Low	45%	65%	+20	0	84	
ESL Beginning High	38%	53%	+15	0	104	
ESL Intermediate Low	36%	46%	+10	0	92	
ESL Intermediate High	34%	38%	+4	0	85	
ESL Advanced	15%	21%	+6	0	116	
Totals			+116	-9		
Overall Level Completion Score			+107			
Follow-Up Goals	Target Percent	Percent Attained	Met Goal	Did Not Meet Goal	# and % of Students with Goal	
					# with goal	% of all students
Placement in unsubsidized employment	20%	49%	+29	0	63	2%
Retention in unsubsidized employment	26%	18%	0	-8	104	5%
High school completion (GED & AHS)	50%	75%	+25	0	307	10%
Placement in postsecondary education or training	33%	84%	+51	0	178	6%
Totals			+105	-8		
Overall Follow-Up Goal Achievement Score			+97			
Overall Pluses & Minuses			+221	-17		
Total Score			+204			