As a continuation of a 1966 project, the National University Extension Association (NUEA), under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education (USOE), conducted 20 regional adult basic education training institutes in the summer of 1967. Three educational experiments were carried over—an accelerated national program for preparation of teachers for the educationally deprived, application of educational technology to the problems of teaching basic skills to adults, and an experiment in creative educational federalism. Elaborations in 1967 included development of a national core curriculum, conferences for participating universities and state directors, teacher-trainer institutes conducted by universities in each USOE region, pre- and in-service training programs organized at the local level, and design for an evaluation system. In Part 1 of this report, the staff, definitions, finances, and a review of the 1966 and 1967 functions of the USOE, NUEA, participating institutes, and state directors are given. Part 2 contains details of the production of the curriculum guide and materials, and program evaluation. In Part 3, participant costs for 3-week and 2-week sessions are described. Part 4 includes descriptions of the staff and its functions and of the communications network. (AJ)
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ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

The following terms are used throughout this report:

Abbreviations

- ABE - Adult Basic Education
- NAPSAE - National Association of Public School Adult Education
- NUEA - National University Extension Association
- USOE - United States Office of Education

Definitions

- Administrators' Institutes - the institutes conducted by designated universities in all nine USOE regions for the purpose of training ABE personnel in fiscal policies and practices relevant to ABE programs and other administrative aspects of local, state, regional and national ABE programs.

- Adult Functional Illiterate - see Educationally Disadvantaged Population.

- Curriculum Guide - recommended curriculum content for the 1967 ABE training program of teacher-trainers and administrators which was forwarded to participating universities.

- Educationally Disadvantaged Population - those people from the age of 18 through 64, who have not completed the eighth grade, or its functional equivalency.

- Institute Director (Administrative Coordinator) - the individual responsible for the administrative requirements of a regional institute.

- National Curriculum Advisory Group - a group of individuals selected to develop a national curriculum guide for the 1967 ABE training program. The membership represented highly knowledgeable practitioners and academic professionals in ABE.
Pre-institute Seminar - the seminar for approximately 108 staff aides and 18 program directors to provide training in the latest educational technology and orientation to the ABE curricula.

Program Director - the individual designated to direct the educational and program requirements of an institute.

Project Director, NUEA - a professional educator designated by NUEA to organize and manage the 1966 ABE program.

Project Manager, NUEA - a staff member of NUEA with responsibility for the 1967 ABE program.

Region - any one of the nine USOE geographical areas.

Staff Aide (Staff Associate) - a person assigned to an institute in a USOE region to assist the program director and regular staff. A staff aid might be: (1) an experienced teacher who has demonstrated exceptional ability in dealing with his professional peers, ABE teachers and students, and the problems associated with ABE programs; (2) returning Peace Corps volunteers, VISTA, or National Teacher Corps members; or (3) a graduate student in a school of education who is interested in adult basic education and who will be available for the duties associated with adult basic education.

State ABE Director - the person designated by a state to organize and supervise its ABE programs.

State Directors' Advisory Group - a group of nine individuals representing all state directors of adult basic education.

Student (ABE) - the educationally disadvantaged person enrolled in an adult basic education class.

Teacher (ABE) - the person engaged in teaching the educationally disadvantaged student and who will be helped by programs involving the teacher-trainer.

Teacher-Trainer - the person who will train ABE teachers after participating in a teacher-trainer institute.
Teacher-Trainer Institutes - the institutes conducted by designated universities in each USOE region to prepare ABE teacher-trainers to assist with local pre-service and in-service training programs for other ABE teachers.

University Staff Specialist in ABE - a year-round employee of a university in each USOE region who will serve as consultant to state directors, local ABE administrators and teachers in the region.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The National University Extension Association, under an extended and amended grant from the U. S. Office of Education, will conduct twenty (20) regional adult basic education teacher, teacher-trainer and administrator institutes in June, July, and August of 1967. In 1966, NUEA conducted nine (9) teacher-trainer institutes under the same grant. The 1966 project was reviewed in the first and second progress reports submitted by NUEA, and will be completely evaluated in the final 1966 report, to be submitted on October 30, 1967.

On April 13, 1967, NUEA's proposal requesting extension of the 1966 project was accepted by USOE as the specifications governing the 1967 project. Work on the 1967 project began on March 1, 1967. A letter of authorization permitting 1967 project activities as of that date was received from the USOE Contracts Branch Grant Office on March 14, 1967.

The 1966 program design was retained for the 1967 program. Specifically, the three major educational experiments of broad national scope carried through the 1966 program into the 1967 program are: (1) an accelerated national program for the preparation of teachers for the educationally deprived population, (2) a broad scale application of educational technology to the problems of teaching basic skills to adults and, (3) an experiment in creative educational federalism.
Further elaborations of the 1967 ABE Training Program are outlined as follows:

A. Program Elements

The program that emerged from the educational experiments of the 1966 teacher-trainer institutes that will be maintained for the 1967 ABE Training Program consist of five distinct and vital elements:

1. A National Core Curriculum

A national curriculum advisory committee developed a core curriculum for review by USOE. In bringing together the most knowledgeable practitioners and academic professionals in the country, the committee was able to benefit from the interaction of different viewpoints. This procedure had the added advantage of facilitating local acceptance of the curriculum, since the advisory committee had broad geographical representation.

2. National and Regional Conferences

National and regional conferences for participating universities and state directors of adult basic education were held for the purpose of discussing the core curriculum, and modifying it where necessary to meet regional needs, orienting conferees to the conceptual scheme of the program, and discussing the administrative relationships that would exist among participating institutions.

3. Teacher-Trainer Institutes

Teacher-trainer institutes were conducted by designated universities in each of the nine (9) Office of Education regions. The institutes provided intensive training for ABE teacher-trainers selected by state directors of adult basic education. The goal of this training was to prepare the participants to return to their local areas and train other teachers in the application of the most advanced teaching techniques and use of the best available ABE materials.
4. **Pre- and In-Service Training Programs at Local Level**

Teacher-training at this level was organized by state and local ABE administrators and conducted by teacher-trainer institute participants. Local ABE teacher-training programs have been conducted during the past academic year.

5. **Evaluation**

A system was designed to evaluate the entire program, including general and operational goals. The evaluation will provide data which can be used to improve ABE teacher selection criteria, change curricula, methods, materials, and administrative procedures, as indicated, and identify state and local ABE needs.

For these purposes, instruments were designed to measure four types of change which could be effected by the accelerated teacher-training program:

a. the knowledge acquired by teacher-trainers during the course of the institute,

b. the attitude of teacher-trainers regarding problems associated with adult basic education,

c. the behavior of teacher-trainers in their post-institute professional activities, and

d. the durability of changes in knowledge and attitudes of teacher-trainers.

**B. Functional Components**

The experience of the 1966 Teacher-Trainer Institutes, as well as the assessment of its effect at the local, state and national levels, precipitated certain changes in the 1967 ABE Training Program. These changes were proposed by NUEA and accepted by USOE. A review of the 1966 functions and the 1967 additions follow:

1. **USOE Functions**

The basic USOE functions for the 1966 ABE Teacher-Trainer Institutes were as follows:
a. selection of the universities which subcontracted with NUEA for institutes,

b. selection of the national advisory committee to develop the core curriculum,

c. review of the core curriculum,

d. relationships with state and local ABE administrators, and

e. overall coordination of program elements and participants.

In addition to the USOE functions listed above, the following functions were to be performed by the USOE during the 1967 ABE Training Program:

a. the preparation of a general plan for further development of the ABE program, related training institutes and such special plans as would be necessary, and

b. the review of all supplemental curricula and related material developed by NUEA, NAPSAE, and/or advisory groups for use in the 1967 ABE Training Program.

2. NUEA Functions

The basic NUEA functions for the 1966 ABE Teacher-Trainer Institutes were as follows:

a. preparation and negotiation of subcontracts, subject to USOE approval,

b. development of rules, regulations, and forms for travel, stipend, and dependency allowances in accordance with USOE rules and regulations,

c. coordination of the nine (9) institute programs,

d. coordination of the activities of NUEA consultant groups and organizations who were involved in the program,

e. preparation and implementation of the evaluation system, subject to USOE approval,

f. preparation of reports regarding the institutes and program evaluation, and
g. audit of travel, stipend and dependency allowances made by subcontractors.

In addition to the NUEA functions listed above, the following functions were to be performed by the NUEA during the 1967 ABE Training Program:

a. coordination and support of the activities of the university staff specialists and graduate assistants in adult basic education,

b. preparation, in cooperation with USOE, for a pre-institute seminar to train staff aides in adult basic education,

c. revision and improvement of the evaluation of the total program and the negotiation of a subcontract to have this service performed,

d. increase of two institutes for teachers and teacher-trainers and the addition of nine regional institutes for the preparation of ABE administrators,

e. designation of an administrative coordinator for each participating institute who would have overall administrative authority and a program director who would manage the educational requirements of the institute. Hopefully, division of these responsibilities would expedite communications between the institute and NUEA staff; that channel of communication being between the institute administrative coordinator and the NUEA project manager.

3. Institutional Functions

The basic functions of the participating institutes for the 1966 ABE Teacher-Trainer Institutes were as follows:

a. selection and employment of institute staff including both administrative and teaching personnel,

b. provision of instructional and residential facilities for participants,

c. provision of liaison and support services for NUEA evaluation and follow-up activities,
d. provision of a training design incorporating the national core curriculum adapted to meet regional needs as determined by the institute in cooperation with state ABE directors,

e. preparation of a syllabus reflecting the training design for submission to NUEA, and

f. payment of participants' travel, stipend and dependency allowances.

In addition to the institute functions listed above, the following functions were to be performed by participating institutes during the 1967 ABE Training Program:

a. designation of the institute administrative coordinator to conduct all official communication with NUEA relative to the training program,

b. designation at nine (9) regional institutes of a university staff specialist and a graduate assistant for pre-institute planning and program development and for post-institute consultation with state and local ABE officials upon request,

c. notification to assigned teachers, teacher-trainers, administrators, and staff aides of travel, stipend and dependency regulations, costs of available housing and eating facilities, and

d. cooperation with state ABE directors, at regional meetings, in the adaptation of the curriculum guide to meet state and local needs.

4. State ABE Directors Functions

The basic functions of the state ABE directors for the 1966 Teacher-Trainer Institutes were as follows:

a. designing, in cooperation with other members of the national curriculum advisory council, a national core curriculum for suggested implementation during the institutes,

b. selecting the participants for summer institutes on a basis of 20 individuals per state, and
c. providing information of state and local needs to the participating institutes.

In addition to the functions listed above, state ABE directors were to assist USOE and NUEA, upon request, in the overall planning of the 1967 ABE Training Program.

C. Program Implementation

The expansion and diversification of the 1967 ABE Training Program which included two different types of training institutes would demand considerable expansion of program development activities.

The clarification of training objectives, standardization of certain institute basic training activities and the continuity in the training program would require a full professional staff of specialists in curriculum and educational technology charged with the following tasks:

1. precise definition of training needs,
2. statement of specific objectives for the training programs,
3. translation of these objectives into curriculum content,
4. complete communication with institutes, and
5. synchronization of training objectives and evaluation.

These tasks would be carried out effectively only with the full participation of, and cooperation among the USOE Adult Basic Education Branch, the NUEA staff, NAPSAE, state ABE directors and institute program personnel. The NUEA program development staff would provide the following services:

1. coordination of all organizations' efforts,
2. development and distribution of memos, monographs, guides and materials lists to institutes, state and local ABE organizations and national organizations concerned with Adult Basic Education,
3. visitation of institutes to assist with curriculum, educational technology, and general review of institute activities,
4. maintenance of communications with institute program directors at all times,
5. coordination of curriculum matters and evaluation team efforts, and

6. maintenance of communications with university staff specialists, and provision of assistance upon request.

D. Finances

A careful review of the 1966 program indicated the need for changes in certain operational elements of the original 1966 ABE project. These changes were proposed by NUEA and accepted by USOE at the time that the grant extension was approved. Subsequently, additional changes were agreed upon when new factors dictated the need for modification. The fiscal aspects of the changes which would be required to expand and upgrade the quality of the 1967 training programs are:

1. the expansion of the training program to include adult basic education administrators,

2. the expansion of the number of training institutes from 9 to 20 for coverage of ABE administrators and teachers,

3. the addition of a special pre-institute seminar to provide training in the latest educational technology for approximately 108 staff aides (staff associates). These staff aides would be assigned to institutes as assistants of regular institute staff members to facilitate the use of individualized instruction techniques. After completion of the institutes, the training and experience achieved by the staff aides would make more qualified people available for employment in ABE programs,

4. the employment of year-round university staff specialists and graduate assistants in adult basic education who are thoroughly familiar with the content, methods and materials of the curriculum to assist in pre-institute planning, directing institute training, and providing professional assistance to participants when they return to their local areas to implement acquired skills and knowledge in pre-service and in-service training programs for ABE teachers, and
5. the increase of professional program development staff to improve the curriculum and expand the quality and quantity of educational media utilized at the various institutes.
II. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

A. The Curriculum Guide

The Curriculum Guide (National Core Curriculum) was produced in its final form by means of a series of three steps consisting of two national meetings and a conference within each USOE region.

A Summary of this procedure is outlined below:

1. National Curriculum Advisory Group

The National Curriculum Advisory Council, composed of individuals who were knowledgeable in ABE and curriculum development, was held in Washington, D.C., on March 6-7, 1967. Nine (9) state ABE directors representing each USOE region and staff members from USOE, NUEA and NAPSAE with three (3) consultants for each of these organizations proposed to:

a. draft a general structure for the program of the 1967 ABE Training Program,

b. produce an outline of curriculum content appropriate to the institutes, and

c. expedite communications among USOE, NUEA, NAPSAE and administrators of state ABE programs regarding the 1967 National Adult Basic Education Teacher-Training Program.

The following materials were prepared by NUEA and distributed at the meeting to serve as a basis for discussion:

1. Background Statement

This document describes the 1966 ABE Teacher Training Program -- its general organization, the institute curricula, the preliminary data
relevant to the effectiveness of the program--and generally, describes the provisions of the grant for the 1967 ABE Teacher Training Program.

2. Suggested Curriculum Topics for 1967 Institutes

These lists of suggested curriculum topics served to stimulate discussion and provided a guide for further curriculum development.

The representative state ABE directors, consultants and representatives of USOE, NUEA and NAPSAE met in full-group session for presentation of the 1967 program and discussion of salient issues. USOE made the formal presentation and led subsequent discussion which was concerned primarily with provision within the 1967 grant for "Staff Aides" and "University Staff Specialists"--concepts new to the 1967 ABE program. Jules Pagano, Director, Adult Education Division, USOE, spoke to the entire group on the concept of Adult Basic Education and USOE plans and programs in this area. Derek Nunney, Chief, ABE Programs, USOE, particularized subsequent discussion to the 1967 program and institute curricula. The consensus of opinion was that two kinds of institutes were needed:

a. Administrator Institutes

b. Teacher, Teacher-Trainer Institutes

It was decided that one (1) two-week institute for administrators and one (1) three-week institute for teachers, teacher-trainers would be held respectively in each OE region. Regarding the latter, curriculum would be designed for teachers or teacher-trainers, depending on the needs of the region.

Participants, then, were divided into five task forces -- three to produce topic outlines for administrator institute curricula, and two to produce topic outlines for teacher and teacher-trainer institutes. These lists were distributed to stimulate discussion and were compiled into two "master" lists, one for each of the two kinds of institutes, by a committee selected by USOE from among the participants at this meeting.
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The five original task force groups recovered for consideration of the master lists of curriculum topics. Subsequently, each participant submitted a copy of the master lists indicating his interest or priority rating of each curriculum topic and any additions to the lists that he felt were appropriate.

After the conclusion of the meeting, USOE and NUEA staff members revised the two master lists of curriculum topics on the basis of participant-interest ratings. The revised lists, as well as some narrative reflecting group thinking on possible methods to be used in the institutes, were published in the first edition of the Curriculum Guide.

The general structure of the 1967 program that evolved from the March 6, and 7, 1967 meeting in Washington, D. C., deviated only slightly from the structure discussed by USOE and NUEA prior to the meeting. First, USOE and NUEA had anticipated that only three (3) institutes for administrators would be conducted in 1967, but the representatives of state ABE directors requested one (1) for each region.

The concept of "Master Teacher" outlined in the 1967 NUEA grant proposal was discarded and replaced conceptually by teacher institutes and teacher-trainer institutes. Administratively, replacement of the "master teacher" concept was accommodated by increasing the number of administrator institutes and leaving the second regional institute (either teacher or teacher-trainer), to the option of the region. Perhaps it is more accurate to state that the term "master teacher" was defined, rather than stating that the concept was discarded. In this light, the implied deviation from NUEA plans is not a deviation but a refinement of the 1967 ABE program plans.

The procedure followed for producing the curriculum guide was very effective. It allowed each participant to express his problems and to see that a general curriculum guide could accommodate solutions to almost
every problem. The quality of participation in the task groups suggests that every task group member felt that his contribution was worthwhile.

2. National Meeting of State ABE Directors

The second step in the development of the 1967 curriculum guide was a national meeting of March 16-17, 1967 in Chicago, Illinois. In addition to the participants of the National Curriculum Advisory Council, all state ABE directors, representatives of participating universities, USOE, NUEA and NAPSAE staff were in attendance at this meeting. The primary purpose of that meeting was to discuss:

a. philosophy and goals,
b. curriculum guide,
c. administrative structure and fiscal management,
d. the part to be played by participating universities, and
e. the role of state ABE directors.

The first edition (March 7, 1967) of the curriculum guide, including the list of curriculum topics for both administrator, teacher, and teacher-trainer institutes, was mailed to each state director for perusal before this meeting. Handouts at the meeting included the 1967 program, and the curriculum guide, prepared by the curriculum advisory group.

At the beginning of the meeting, the 1967 ABE Training Program was described in detail to all state directors and university representatives. Chaired by USOE, the ABE Branch Chief and Program Development Section Chief made presentations and led subsequent general discussion, which was concerned primarily with administrative and fiscal procedures. Following the general session, state directors and university representatives were grouped according to USOE regions to discuss the regional institutes and the curriculum guide. Representatives of NUEA attended all meetings to observe and answer questions.

Curriculum topics were rated in terms of interest or priority for inclusion in institute curricula. State directors only made such ratings
and submitted them to USOE and NUEA personnel at the conclusion of the meeting. Ratings of interest or priority made by state directors for each curriculum topic listed in the guide were compiled by NUEA staff members. A final edition of the curriculum guide was then published, listing each original curriculum topic accompanied by a composite of the state directors' ratings, which ranged from "medium" to "high" interest or priority. The final edition of the curriculum guide was distributed to all state directors and university representatives for use in regional planning conferences.

3. Regional Meetings

The third step in the development of the curriculum guide followed the Chicago meeting. State ABE directors met with institute program directors at the USOE regional level. At this time, state directors modified the curriculum guide to the extent necessary to meet regional problems. This also gave university representatives an opportunity to learn more about the needs of the state ABE director, as well as to inform the directors of university capabilities in areas covered in the curriculum guide. USOE and NUEA program staff attended a number of these regional meetings in the capacity of resource personnel. The location and dates of regional meetings are shown in Table One:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Feb. 14, 15, 16</td>
<td>Boston, Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>April 4</td>
<td>Newark, New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>April 19</td>
<td>Raleigh, North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III &amp; IV</td>
<td>April 20, 21</td>
<td>New Orleans, Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>March 14-16</td>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>March 22, 23</td>
<td>Kansas City, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>April 25, 26</td>
<td>Houston, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>Denver, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>April 11</td>
<td>Long Beach, California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The end product of the three-step procedure for the development of the curriculum guide was the syllabi produced by participating universities.

The statement of work, contained in the purchase order issued to subcontractors, stipulated that an institute syllabus be submitted to the contractor by June 16, 1967, with a preliminary draft due on May 6, 1967. The syllabus is subject to approval by USOE and serves as a schedule of activities for the conduct of the institutes. The 1967 evaluation of the ABE training program will be based, in part, on the submitted syllabi.

B. Material Production and Distribution

Subsequent to the award of the extension of the ABE grant authorizing the 1967 project, USOE requested that NUEA provide certain materials for distribution at the pre-institute seminar and the summer institutes. In response to this request, NUEA provided the following material:

1. The pre-institute seminar at Wayne State University, May 20-26, 1967, provided the setting from which 24 hours of presentation were recorded on video tape by the Wayne State University Audio-Visual Center. Following the seminar, the tapes were brought to Washington, and scheduled for circulation in response to the requirements of program directors. Shipments of the films took place on June 30, 1967. Each institute will be responsible for forwarding the films to another institute, based upon a master shipping schedule.

   A brief description of each film was provided for the institutes. All films will be returned to NUEA at the conclusion of the institutes and will be available for other uses upon request.

2. A 150-page manual entitled, Educational Technology: Preparation and Use in Adult Basic Education Programs, has been prepared by NUEA. The first draft was distributed to participants at the pre-institute seminar at Wayne State University in May, 1967.

   NUEA staff has written much of the content and has selected supporting articles from professional sources. The manual contains suggested topics
such as, "The Role of Media in Adult Basic Education," "Planning Training Sessions," and "Aspects of Selected Media in Adult Basic Education." An extensive bibliography of publications and materials, helpful in expanding an understanding of the newer technology, practices, and applications to ABE, is included in the manual.

3. The impact of technology on education at all levels and the implementation of its innovative techniques has identifies the need for more attention to stating instructional objectives in measurable terms. The apparent need for ABE teacher familiarity with the "new" kind of instructional objectives has prompted the writing of the publication, "Instructional Objectives: One Approach to Definition" by NUEA. This paper is designed to assist those who are responsible for the development of courses and units of instruction. It is from the statement of instructional objectives in behavioral terms that answers can be derived in three basic areas: (1) what content shall be included? (2) how will instructional effectiveness be evaluated? and (3) which methods and materials are most appropriate?

4. The bibliography, "Materials for the Adult Basic Education Student," prepared by USOE and NUEA, includes a listing of materials relating to the following subject areas: communication skills, computation skills, social studies, the world of work, individual and family development and materials for the Spanish-speaking student. These publications serve as a concise reference for the institute participant and staff.

5. "Materials for the Adult Basic Education Administrator and Teacher," prepared by NUEA, includes the following bibliographical subject headings: programmed instruction, educational technology, administration, teaching methods and materials, understanding the ABE student, counseling and testing. The purpose of this bibliography is to make a specific source for ABE materials relative to administration available to the administrator and teacher.

6. Responding to the need for a current reference of individuals with competencies in areas related to adult basic education, a professional
consultants' directory was compiled by NUEA. This directory identifies individuals by name, address, present position, area of specialization, and dates of availability during the period that the institutes will be in session. This resource list was sent to administrative coordinators and program directors of institutes participating in the 1967 ABE Training Program in early June, 1967.

7. "The Administration of Adult Basic Education - A Manual of Training Materials" was prepared by the National Association for Public School Adult Education under a subcontract from the NUEA. The training materials are presented in two parts. The first is a series of case studies which have been developed around events occurring in the everyday reality of administering a program of adult basic education. Second, there is a series of program guidelines, which are meant to accomplish what the name implies -- suggest general approaches to handling specific situations which frequently arise in the administration of local programs of adult basic education.

8. "Adult Basic Education for Personal and Family Development," a curriculum guide for personal and family development was prepared by the U.S. Office of Education and edited by NUEA, as a resource for developing and strengthening adult basic education programs in recognition of the basic needs and concerns of individuals, families and communities.

9. "How to Re-Write Materials for Students" was originally presented at the Reading Clinic, State University of Iowa and deals with, as the title implies, procedures for re-writing materials for the adult student.

10. "Some Selected Examples of Public Library Activities Concerned with the Functionally Illiterate" was published by the American Library Association. These two articles were deemed to be useful and of interest to the participants of the 1967 Training Program. They were reproduced and distributed to the institutes.
C. Evaluation of 1967 ABE Training Program

NUEA solicited "Requests for Proposals" from four (4) universities and three (3) commercial companies for a subcontract to evaluate the 1967 ABE Training Program. From the proposals submitted, Educational Psychology Associates of Ann Arbor, Michigan was selected to complete the evaluation.

This evaluation follows the "System Analysis and Evaluation Model" employed in the assessment of the 1966 ABE Teacher-Training Program. The inputs into the 1967 ABE Training Program in terms of persons, products, and processes will be identified and evaluated. The relationships between the inputs and the outcomes will be determinable and will allow conclusions to be drawn with respect to the extent to which the general and operational objectives of the 1967 program were attained. Data obtained for the 1967 evaluation will permit analysis of short-range results of this year's program as well as contribute to an on-going analysis of the ABE project. In addition, the 1967 evaluation will be broader and more comprehensive. Selected hypotheses, based on the 1966 ABE Teacher-Trainer Program, will be generated and tested for statistical significance.

D. Institutes

Under the extension of the grant, twenty (20) institutes were subcontracted. These are identified according to location, type of institute and respective dates of conduct in Table Two.
## TABLE TWO: Location, Dates and Types of Institutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California, University of at Los Angeles</td>
<td>(T-T)</td>
<td>July 10 - July 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado, University of</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>July 17 - July 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut, University of</td>
<td>(T-T)</td>
<td>July 10 - July 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>July 10 - July 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington University</td>
<td>(T-T)</td>
<td>July 10 - July 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii, University of</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>July 31 - August 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa, University of</td>
<td>(T-T)</td>
<td>July 10 - July 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine, University of</td>
<td>(T-T)</td>
<td>July 10 - July 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri, University of at Kansas City</td>
<td>(T-T)</td>
<td>July 24 - August 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair State College</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>July 10 - July 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, State University of at Albany</td>
<td>(T-T)</td>
<td>July 24 - August 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>(T-T)</td>
<td>July 17 - August 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois University</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>July 24 - August 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma, University of</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>July 17 - July 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State College</td>
<td>(T-T)</td>
<td>July 17 - August 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina, University of</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>July 24 - August 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas, University of</td>
<td>(T-T)</td>
<td>July 10 - July 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>July 10 - July 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming, University of</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>June 19 - June 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) Institutes for Administrators
(T-T) Institutes for Teacher Trainers and Teachers

Regarding the institutes which have been approved to conduct the 1967 ABE Training Programs, the following points summarize program activities:

1. eleven (11) institutes will be conducted for teacher-trainers, retaining the goals, objectives and operational format of the 1966 summer institutes,

2. nine (9) additional institutes have been designated for ABE administrators,
3. A pre-institute seminar for staff aides in adult basic education was held at Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan. Two (2) representatives from each state, the Trust Territories and the District of Columbia were invited to participate in the seminar. The institute program staff aides were assigned to summer institutes as assistants to the regular staff. The purposes of the pre-institute seminar for staff aides were:

a. to provide supportive activities to regular staff necessary for maximizing overall program effectiveness of the institutes,

b. to permit increased opportunities for individualizing instruction at the institutes,

c. to allow staff aides to gain experience in the latest developments in educational technology, and

d. to offer trained personnel, who are thoroughly familiar with program objectives and functions, the opportunity for employment in adult basic education positions;

4. The number of participants in each institute for teacher-trainers and administrators was determined by an allocation formula for the region in which the institutes are located. The number of participants for the staff aide pre-institute seminar totaled 126 persons;

5. The duration of the institutes for teacher-trainers will be three (3) weeks; each day consisting of eight (8) hours of program activity, including instruction;

6. The duration of the institutes for administrators will be two (2) weeks; consisting of eight (8) hours of program activity per day, including instruction;

7. The duration of the pre-institute seminar for staff aides in adult basic education was one (1) week;

8. All institutes will provide housing, meals, and instruction in close proximity to each other, to the extent that is practical; thus, group activities after classes will be maximized;
9. the teacher-trainer and administrator institutes will be held during the months of July and August, 1967, with the exception of administrator institutes at the University of Wyoming, which was held from June 19 through June 30, 1967;

10. participants in the institutes for administrators will receive training in fiscal policies and practices within the administration of ABE programs; the organization and administration of pre-service and in-service teacher-training programs; curriculum development, and instructional techniques.
III. PARTICIPANT ALLOCATIONS AND ASSIGNMENTS

The grant extension proposal outlined four (4) classifications of participants and the costs related to each classification as follows:

1. Three-week participants, selected by state ABE directors, and paid tuition, travel and stipend.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>$ 625 each</td>
<td>$ 438,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Three-week participants, selected by federal agencies, and paid tuition only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>$ 225 each</td>
<td>$ 30,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Two-week participants selected by state ABE directors, and paid tuition, travel and stipend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>$ 465 each</td>
<td>$ 153,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Two-week participants, selected by state ABE directors, and paid tuition and travel only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>$ 245 each</td>
<td>$ 40,425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total participant allocations and related costs are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Three-Week Participants</th>
<th>864</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Two-Week Participants</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Participants</td>
<td>1,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost, Three-Week Participants</td>
<td>$468,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost, Two-Week Participants</td>
<td>193,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost, All Participants</td>
<td>662,775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allocations were begun within this framework of participant classification and cost. USOE established the state allocations according to the formula outlined in a memorandum of March 17, 1967, and these allocations were announced to state ABE directors in Chicago, on the same day. NUEA followed up this announcement with a written notice to each state ABE director confirming the allocation and requesting that the names of those filling the allocation be returned to NUEA on the form provided.

During this period, several meetings between the staff of USOE and NUEA took place. These conferences were designed to establish the allocation of participants to each of the eighteen (18) universities selected by USOE as sites for the 1967 institutes. Criteria guiding institute allocation included the desire of USOE that all institutes be similar in size to the degree practicable by the utilization of federal allocations to institutes located in regions where state participation would not be high, and the transfer of participants from one region to another would be minimal.

In conformity with this design of institute allocation and within the structure of the subcontract submitted to, and approved by USOE, as well as in conformity with the proposal for extension of the grant, NUEA signed purchase orders for the institutes which were released to university representatives who met in Ann Arbor, Michigan, on April 23, 1967. Subsequent changes directed by USOE in the
allocation and assignment of participants in Region IX necessitated a second purchase order for UCLA, to include provisions for a three-week, as well as a two-week institute at that site. Similarly, USOE requested that a 30-participant institute be subcontracted to the University of Hawaii. At that time, the question of modifying the allocation in Region IX was brought to the attention of USOE. Subsequently, NUEA was advised to proceed within the original allocation and make the additional arrangements with UCLA and the University of Hawaii. The net result of this decision was to increase the overall three-week allocation in Region IX by 59 participants.

On May 31, and June 5, 1967, NUEA met with USOE to discuss the adjustment of assigning participants within approved allocations to certain institutes. During the course of the May 31 meeting, NUEA was instructed to reconsider institute allocations and work towards an assignment of participants which would limit institutes to the 80 percent minimum allocation specified in the purchase orders, plus 5 percent. Transfers from regions with above-minimum number of participants were to be made to institutes with below-minimum participant expectations. Subsequently, a basic plan was worked out.

In structuring modifications of the two- and three-week institute allocations, several considerations had to be taken into account. Basically, these included the following points:

a. Three-Week Institutes

Failure to honor requests for additional slots would have resulted in a shortage of 70 participants below minimum institute requirements (plus 5 percent). USOE accommodated the additional requests, since the prospective participants were available and NUEA was able to meet minimum requirements with some excess. However, this required reallocation of some participants into other regions.
The institute at Hawaii warranted particular attention, inasmuch as 11 names had been submitted, but 15 additional participants were needed to meet minimum requirements. It was recommended, therefore, that these deficit slots be filled from Hawaii, Samoa, Guam, and the Trust Territories, rather than from the Mainland.

b. Two-Week Institutes

Failure to honor requests for additional slots would have resulted in a shortage of 44 participants below minimum institute requirements (plus 5 percent). USOE again accommodated the additional requests because the prospective participants were available and it was recommended that participants be transferred to other regions.

The adjustments outlined above met the criteria for assignment modification requested at the June 5 meeting. USOE took responsibility for intensifying recruitment where needed, and made arrangements with state ABE directors for transfer of participants out of regions. NUEA assisted USOE as directed.

The primary factors necessitating changes in assignment of participants were: (1) only 66 of the 162 three-week federal allocated participant slots were filled by federal agencies and (2) only 83 of the 165 two-week state non-stipend allocated participant slots were filled by state ABE directors. The above participant classifications were funded for less individual participant money, (no travel or stipend for federal, and no stipend for state participants), than corresponding two- and three-week slots. When additional requests for participant slots were honored in order to compensate other slots not filled, the overall cost per participant increased, and the total number of participants decreased.

The assignment of participants, which formed the basis for the final lists of participants forwarded to institute subcontractors, is summarized in the following tables.
### TABLE THREE

Three-Week Institutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>In Region Assignment</th>
<th>Out Region Assignment</th>
<th>Federal Assignment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IXa</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IXb</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IXc</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**
- IXa - Oregon State System of Higher Education
- IXb - UCLA
- IXc - University of Hawaii

### TABLE FOUR

Two-Week Institutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>In Region Stipend</th>
<th>In Region Non-Stipend</th>
<th>Out Region Stipend</th>
<th>Out Region Non-Stipend</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE

A. Description of Staff and Functions

Since the initiation of the 1967 ABE project coincided with the conduct of the 1966 ABE project, NUEA was able to maintain an experienced staff capable of inaugurating the 1967 ABE project with a minimum of delay. Required additional staff was secured in time to meet the requirements of the increase in the scope of the 1967 project. Policies governing the overall administration of the 1967 ABE project were established by the NUEA executive director in concert with the executive committee of the NUEA board of directors. Where appropriate, administrative policy and procedures were reviewed with USOE personnel. The overall responsibility for NUEA administration of the 1967 ABE project is that of the NUEA project manager. Organizationally, the staff is divided into two areas of responsibility under his direction.

The first area of responsibility involves program activities and is headed by the program director. Institute materials have been developed by the curriculum specialist, curriculum consultant, educational media consultant and the media technology consultant. These individuals have also served as resource persons at national and regional meetings, and have provided support for institute program directors upon request. The program staff monitors all aspects of program development and coordination, assists in the clarification of goals and objectives, and provides
professional and technical support for institute program staff. A senior institute coordinator and two additional institute coordinators have implemented participant allocation plans and have served as the primary communication link of NUEA with state ABE directors and institute and program directors. Administrative assistants have aided the professional staff by gathering information for publications, organizing data for evaluation, arranging meetings, and collecting resource materials.

The second area of responsibility is administered by the fiscal and systems manager. Tasks related to this activity include accounting and budgeting, purchasing and personnel, editing and format, printing and duplicating, and clerical services. The fiscal and systems manager is supported by a staff including an office manager, bookkeeper, editorial assistant and clerical personnel.

The 1966 ABE institute program is managed by the project director. Present responsibilities include the acquisition, process and interpretation of data necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of the 1966 institutes, and the preparation of final conclusions and recommendations based on this evaluation.

B. Communications

In a nation-wide training program, communication is a prime factor governing success or failure. In order to ensure maximum responsiveness to the dictates of the program, a communications network has been established between all participating individuals and institutions. Central to the network is a master distribution mailing list by which all interested personnel are kept informed of the progress of the project. This is supplemented by special-interest mailing lists to state ABE directors, institute personnel (administrative coordinators and program directors), and the evaluation subcontractor. A second medium of communication is
the scheduled conference between NUEA and USOE. NUEA staff meets at least twice a week with USOE counterparts for purposes of planning and coordinating joint responsibilities. Meeting with NAPSAE, state ABE directors and institute personnel, likewise have this objective. In addition, program objectives have been enumerated at two national meetings, March 5-6 and March 17-18, 1967, and the annual NUEA meeting at Ann Arbor, Michigan, from April 23-26, 1967.

Regarding routine communications, the nine USOE regions throughout the United States and its Trust Territories have been divided among three (3) NUEA institute coordinators (3 regions each), who serve as the main point of contact between NUEA and all personnel in those regions. Contact lists and records of communications (correspondence files, telegrams and records of phone conversations) are maintained on a daily basis.

C. **Purchase Orders**

Arrangements for summer institutes have been made through NUEA purchase orders. All purchase orders between NUEA and the institutes have been initiated. Addendums for the one-year retention of staff specialists have also been initiated with nine universities. To date, all purchase orders and addendums have been approved by NUEA, the institutes, and USOE, with the exception of UCLA, New York at Albany and Hawaii. These were received late, and are presently in the process of being approved.

D. **Finance**

The basic guidelines used in budgeting for the various activities performed under the grant have been those established in the submitted proposals. At present, NUEA's commitments under the grant indicate that there will be no over- or under-expenditure of authorized funds.
Prepayment of 90 per cent is being made to all institutes, prior to two weeks before their opening. This is still in process, since some institutes do not open until late July. Final audit, payment and resolution by the contracting officer of the 1966 institutes is in process. Expenditures are reported to USOE monthly, together with a technical report. Cash is requested from USOE on a quarterly basis.