The Fiscal Year-1986 310 catalog includes more than
350 projects funded under Section 310 of the Adult Education Act,
with a total investment of almost $8 million. Analysis of 310 project
information submitted by states came to the following conclusions,
among others: (1) staff development is the highest priority for 310
projects, nationally (32 percent of document funds); (2)
employability projects show a dramatic decrease in support compared
to last year; (3) "other" organizations receive the largest amount of
funds; (4) many projects gave no data to information-gathering
efforts; (5) the funding of adoptions and adaptations of previously
developed innovations continues, although the validity of the claims
of innovation is not known; (6) the average cost of 310 projects is
$22,000; (7) more than 100 projects are funded at $5,000 or less, and
an additional 84 received no more than $10,000; (8) little attention
is being paid to dissemination of project results, perhaps because of
underfunding. (This paper contains a summary of the 310 projects by
geographic areas, types of organizations involved, and subjects of
projects.) (KC)
Introduction

The Fiscal Year 1986 310 Catalog includes over 350 projects, with a total investment of almost $8 million. This paper analyzes the 310 project information submitted by States, draws conclusions about the state of the overall 310 program, and offers recommendations for improving the effort.

310 Investments by Geographic Areas

State 310 programs in the Northeast have made dissemination of information and promising practices a priority this year. Volunteer program development is also heavily supported. These States have funded a large percentage of this year's Employability projects (60%). Computer use in ABE is also important here.

The South is sponsoring large numbers of literacy programs, staff development efforts and computer projects in FY-86.

Central states have also selected staff development as a priority, with computer and literacy projects as significant, but lesser priorities.

The Western area states are strong on ESL, and give some priority to computer use, literacy programs, and staff development. (See Table 1 on page 2)

Types of Organizations Involved in 310 Activities

As in the past, local education agencies (LEAs) receive the largest number of 310 grants but "other" institutions (including State Departments of Education) administer the largest amount of funds. Community colleges and universities have also been funded for a large share of projects. Vocational institutions and community-based organizations continue to have little involvement in the 310 funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>COM. COLL.</th>
<th>UNIV.</th>
<th>CBO</th>
<th>VOCAT.</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>$2,255,000</td>
<td>$968,000</td>
<td>$2,095,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$127,000</td>
<td>$2,340,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1: Number of Projects by Subject, and DAE Areas*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>AREA 1</th>
<th>AREA 2</th>
<th>AREA 3</th>
<th>AREA 4</th>
<th>TOTALS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>COM</td>
<td>VOL</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ME, NH, VT, MA, CT, RI, NY, NJ, PA, MD, DE, DC, PR, VI)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA CN CL COR ADM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(VA, NC, SC, TN, GA, AL, MS, FL, AR, LA, OK, TX)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA CN CL COR ADM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WV, OH, KY, IN, MI, WI, IL, MN, IA, MO, KS, NE, SD, ND)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA CN CL COR ADM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MT, WY, CO, NM, AZ, UT, ID, WA, OR, NV, CA, AK, HI, TERR.)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA CN CL COR ADM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** See page 4 for identification of subject area titles.
Two Year Trends

It appears that two areas receive more support in FY-86 than last year...and a few are receiving less support. Specifically, Staff Development, and Literacy Programs show substantially increased funding. Technology (including computers), Assessment, ESL, Employability, Disabled Adults and Correctional Education receive substantially less support than in FY-85. However, the FY-86 Catalog documents fundings of over $1 million less than the FY-85 Catalog, and this accounts for some reductions.

**TABLE 3: Comparison of Project Subject Areas - FY-85 and FY-86, by Number**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DIS</th>
<th>LIT</th>
<th>TEC/COMP</th>
<th>VOL</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>GED</th>
<th>DIP</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>ESL</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>REC</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>ADI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># FY-85:</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># FY-86:</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8/41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4: Comparison of Subject Areas - FY-85 and FY-86 by Fundings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DIS</th>
<th>LIT</th>
<th>TEC/COMP</th>
<th>VOL</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>GED</th>
<th>DIP</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>ESL</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>REC</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>ADM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ FY-85</td>
<td>2.1 Mil.</td>
<td>1 Mil.</td>
<td>570,000</td>
<td>1.2 Mil.</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>572,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>278,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>294,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ FY-86</td>
<td>2.5 Mil.</td>
<td>1.2 Mil.</td>
<td>804,000</td>
<td>204/565,000</td>
<td>514,000</td>
<td>338,000</td>
<td>261,000</td>
<td>217,000</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>199,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ FY-85</td>
<td>623,000</td>
<td>198,000</td>
<td>316,000</td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>198,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ FY-86</td>
<td>181,000</td>
<td>172,000</td>
<td>141,000</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>97,000</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of 310 Areas

In FY-1986 Staff Development projects remain the largest funded area, with the second largest number of projects. Dissemination, Literacy, Computer, and Volunteer projects round out the top five areas of funding.

TABLE 5: Number and Funding of Projects by Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>Additional Cross Reference Projects</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Average Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$2,489,000</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,156,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>804,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>565,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>514,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>338,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>261,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Program</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>217,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>204,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>199,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>181,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>172,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Adults</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>141,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Linkage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>97,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS: 356 $7,790,000 $22,000 (average)
Staff Development

Of the 53 projects funded, universities have received the largest number of grants again this year: 29 at $1.55 million (62% of funds). A few SDEs are administering the funds directly, for conferences and small grants to districts. The trend, however, is still to fund large educational institutions to provide training on a statewide or regional basis. States are spending an average of $47,000 per project.

Projects of special interest:

- A community college is developing an orientation training tape for North Carolina ABE instructors,

- New York is training adult educators to provide staff instruction on teaching writing, in preparation for the new GED writing component,

- California is funding a university to provide staff development statewide to facilitate the implementation of CBAE at all levels.

Dissemination

This area continues to grow, with 32 projects (and an additional 11 projects with related dissemination components).

"Other" institutions dominate this area, receiving $772,000, or 2/3 of the funding. Average funding per project is $36,000.

Projects of special interest:

- The California and Florida dissemination networks continue to identify exemplary instructional strategies and products, and to aid in their adoption by local programs,

- Minigrants are being funded by Kentucky, New York and California to assist the local adoption of innovative projects such as National Diffusion Network (NDN) programs,

- Pennsylvania is supporting a second "Focus" project...this year in Program Management Techniques,

- A dissemination conference will be held in Virginia this summer to showcase local, State and NDN projects.
Literacy Programs

This area is the largest in number of projects - 62, with an average of $15,000 per project. LEAs are the largest set of grantees for literacy projects (22, 35%), but community colleges are also involved.

Projects of special interest:

- Puerto Rico has funded a farmer's association to develop a literacy program for local members and agriculture leaders.

- The City College of Chicago, in cooperation with the Native American Committee is developing curricular strategies for urban Native Americans.

- Boston University continues its intergenerational reading project for parents and children.

- South Dakota has funded a forestry camp to develop a learning style/multi-sensory approach to literacy instruction for young adults.

Computer-based ABE

States have funded 41 projects in this category, with 10 additional 310 projects using computers in some way. Average cost per project is $14,000. Use of computers for instructional and administrative purposes continues to be of high interest to ABE programs. A national conference was held in Minnesota last fall, and another is planned for summer, 1986 in Oregon.

Projects of special interest include two* that plan to apply to ED's Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) for national validation:

- The University of New Orleans has developed interactive software for ABE.

- Carnegie - Mellon University (PA) project is developing software to teach vocabulary and provide reading comprehension exercises.

- Also, a Massachusetts project is developing a guidebook on computer applications and software listings with recommended uses.

- North Carolina has funded six local projects to pilot the ABLE program, developed at Central Piedmont Community College.
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Volunteer Programs

Thirty-three projects are developing or promoting the use of volunteers for ABE. LEAs and other organizations are doing the bulk of the work.

Projects of special interest:

- **Puerto Rico's "Reading is Power" project** is an adaptation of a literacy model developed in cooperation with the Chicago Hispanic population,

- **Nebraska** continues its development of a statewide volunteer coordinator position to provide guidance to ABE programs.

Assessment

Projects in this area remain small in number with most in the $5-10,000 range.

Projects of special interest:

- **The California Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS)** is being implemented throughout the State, and, via the National Diffusion Network, in a number of other States.

- **Iowa** has funded a detailed and comprehensive analysis of learning needs and characteristics of low educational level adults

- **Pennsylvania State University** is conducting a longitudinal study of ABE's impact on welfare recipients' overall quality of life.

General Educational Development (GED)

A total of 24 projects involving GED testing preparation (15 direct, and 9 related projects) were funded in FY-86. LEAs and other organizations received the large percentage of grants. Average expenditure is $17,000.

Projects of special interest:

- **Connecticut** has funded projects to establish GED home study tutorial programs.

- **Pennsylvania** project is developing and adopting materials appropriate to self-study via correspondence.
Diploma Programs

These programs continue to develop at a moderate pace, mostly in the Northeast. Organizations have received grants that average $22,000. Of special interest is a Florida project that is in its second year of development of competency-based curriculum packages for 38 adult high school subjects.

Technology

This year's analysis separates computer use from other forms of technology. Therefore, the technology category is much smaller than in previous years. Eight projects average $26,000 in funding. But one of the 8 is $147,000, and 6 are $10,000 or less.

Projects of special interest:

- Pennsylvania State University is using its PENNARAMA TV Network to train adult literacy tutors,
- The A.E. program in Albany, NY is using a local cable system and other cable lines to air the Job Bank and KET GED Series throughout the State.

Life Skills

As usual, the Life Skills area has a large number of "cross-referenced" projects (11) in addition to the 16 found in the catalog section. The 16 projects are minimally funded at an average of $13,000.

Projects of special interest:

- Maryland's Project MAPP continues development of a CBAE Instructional Guide,
- Providence (RI) has established a cooperative program with Head Start agencies to help mothers acquire literacy skills and assist their children in educational development.

English-as-a-Second Language (ESL)

As has been its 310 history, ESL support is low, in relation to the number of programs and students in the ABE field. Grantees are typically LEAs, and average cost is only $11,000.

Projects of special interest:

- A training kit for teaching competency-based ESL is under development in Florida,
- A large urban ESL program in Virginia is adopting the CASAS Assessment system.
. **Employability**

Sixty percent of these projects are located in the Northeast, and 72% are run by LEAs. Average funding is the lowest of all categories at $10,000 per project.

Projects of special interest:

- The White Plains (NY) Job Club project is being disseminated to five other local programs via "installation" grants,
- Washington State is developing an Occupational Information System, preparing a data base on job knowledge and opportunities to assist local ABE programs.

. **Recruitment**

This area remains a low priority for ABE programs, with only 17 projects (direct and related) funded. Average cost is low also, $13,000.

Projects of special interest:

- North Carolina is supporting an ABE Outreach Program for Native Americans to increase Indian participation,
- A project in Pennsylvania is combining TV and telephones to conduct statewide recruitment of potential ABE students.

. **Disabled Adults**

With only 11 projects funded for a total of $141,000, this area of development is a much lower priority than in FY-85 (28 projects at $316,000).

Of special interest is a project to demonstrate the use of a Virginia college campus as an instructional site for learning disabled adults.

. **Counseling**

This area includes only 3 projects. Of interest is a 3-year effort to conduct workshops throughout New York State on processes for improving the delivery of career counseling services.

. **Community Linkage**

None of the four projects for community linkage is located in a community-based organization. Range of funding is $5,000 to $70,000. Of interest is a University of Massachusetts project that is documenting community and adult education partnerships and is developing resources to facilitate collaboration.
Correctional Education

Seven projects average a low $12,000 in funding. Sponsorship is divided among universities, LEAs and correctional institutions. Project of interest: Pennsylvania State University has been funded to evaluate the effectiveness of computer courseware with low reading level inmates.

Administration

As in FY-85, this area receives little 310 support ($32,000). Yet, each of its projects is of considerable interest:

- The University of Arkansas is conducting an adult education graduate certification study,
- West Virginia is developing a data collection system,
- Maryland's Project MAPP Administration Manual has been written, and is being field-tested in 11 county ABE programs. This project is one of three components in the statewide implementation of a competency-based adult education system.
Conclusions

1. **Staff development** is the #1 priority for 310, nationally. Not only is the category heavily funded (32% of the documented funds), but also it is a component of many special projects. States in all four DAE geographic areas give it priority status.

2. **Employability projects** show a dramatic decrease in support (-71%) compared to last year. Only in the Northeast is it a priority.

3. "Other" organizations receive the largest amount of funds. Seven of these organizations are State Departments of Education.

4. This year's "voluntary" 310 projects information-gathering effort has netted over $1 million less than last year. And 13 States contributed no data. Another 7 States gave us information on only a few of their projects.

5. Only one CBO received funding for a 310 project this year.

6. The funding of adoptions, adaptions, and "installations" of previously developed innovations continues, and may be increasing. However, the validity claims of many of the innovations are not known.

7. While the average cost per 310 project is $22,000, over 100 projects are funded at $5,000 or less. Another 84 projects received no more than $10,000 to accomplish their objectives. Areas where funding seems particularly low are: Diploma Programs, Technology, ESL, Disabled Adults, Correctional Education, and Computer Programs.

8. While many of the projects apparently intend to develop "innovative methods, systems, materials or programs" (141 plan to develop one or more products) it is difficult to determine how these projects will "promote effective programs"* because many offered no information about plans for dissemination of project results. Again, the low level of funding for many projects may prohibit quality development, packaging and dissemination of products.

* see attached legislation.
The current Adult Education Act (as amended in 1978) provides federal funds to state departments of education to "expand educational opportunities for adults and to encourage the establishment of programs of adult education that will—(1) enable all adults to acquire basic skills necessary to function in society, (2) enable adults who so desire to continue their education to at least the level of completion of secondary school, and (3) make available to adults the means to secure training that will enable them to become more employable, productive, and responsible citizens."

As a condition of accepting federal funds, states must agree to carry out a number of provisions, including the use of not less than 10% of their federal funds for: "(1) special projects which will be carried out in furtherance of the purposes of this title (above), and which—(A) involve the use of innovative methods, including methods educating persons of limited English-speaking ability, systems, materials, or programs which may have national significance or be of special value in promoting effective programs under this title, or (3) involve programs of adult education, including education for persons of limited English-speaking ability, which are part of community school programs, carried out in cooperation with other Federal, federally assisted, State or local programs which have unusual promise in promoting a comprehensive or coordinated approach to the problems of persons with educational deficiencies; and (2) training persons engaged, or preparing to engage, as personnel in programs designed to carry out the purposes of this title."

NOTE: THE 1964 AMENDMENTS DID NOT CHANGE THE SECTION 316 REQUIREMENTS