A project was conducted to coordinate and facilitate the delivery of workplace literacy programs in business and industry in Idaho. The project began with an audioconference, followed by a 3-day workshop in December 1988 for new workplace literacy coordinators and coordinators from postsecondary education and the state Department of Employment. More than 600 companies were contacted and 31 programs were funded, involving more than 900 participants. Program components included General Educational Development tapes played over public television and offered in public libraries, with a computer program to supplement the tapes; programs with English as a Second Language (ESL) participants developed around safety and job description curriculum; and efforts to teach at the work station as well as in the classroom. Supervisors or company tutors worked with instructors to help present one-on-one instruction. Participants were encouraged to discuss the training in group activities in the classroom. The project also established an identification and referral network. A proposed child-care component was not developed. (This report includes documents from the project: child care agreement; steering committee members list and meeting minutes; third-party evaluation report; staff training materials such as a generic skills research and development questionnaire, an instrument developed by the Department of Manpower and Immigration, Saskatchewan, Canada; draft procedures and training manual; and news articles about the project.) (KC)
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INTRODUCTION
BACKGROUND

Idaho, in the northwestern United States, is bordered by Washington, Oregon, Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, and Canada. Idaho's economic base is geared to agriculture, mining, forestry, and manufacturing. It is a sparsely populated state with varied terrain of sagebrush prairie and forested mountains.

According to the census Bureau's 1986 statistical abstract of the United States, Idaho is rated as the most rural state in the nation with less than 20% of its population in metropolitan areas. Idaho's total population is just over one million, with only nine cities having a population greater than 10,000. Among the fifty states Idaho ranks thirteenth by size, but forty-second in population. Idaho's physical shape, environment, and size create considerable distances between population centers. Road travel is often circuitous because of mountain ranges and weather conditions.

Idaho is divided into six planning regions with a public postsecondary vocational-technical school, private industry council, and department of Employment local job service offices located in each of the planning regions. Through an agreement between the State Division of Vocational Education and the state department of Education, adult basic education services are provided through learning centers and outreach programs located at each of the six postsecondary vocational-technical schools.

The Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy is comprised of the Idaho Association of Private Industry Councils (IAPIC), the Consortium of area Vocational Education Schools (CAVES), and the Idaho department of Employment. The purpose of the Idaho Partnership or Workplace Literacy is to coordinate the effective delivery of basic literacy and occupational skills necessary for the increasing demands of the workplace.

The Idaho Association of Private Industry Councils is comprised of representatives from the six private industry councils in the state.

The Consortium of Area Vocational Education Schools is comprised of representatives from the six public postsecondary vocational-technical schools and the State Division of Vocational Education.

The Idaho Department of Employment has been designated by the Governor as the Administrative Entity for the Job Training Partnership Act funds for the state of Idaho and serves as the prime deliverer of employment and training services in five of the six areas of the state.

Purpose

The purpose of this project is to coordinate and facilitate the effective delivery of workplace literacy programs to Idaho's business and industry. The project will improve the productivity of the workplace by meeting the following objectives:
• Provide workplace literacy program designed to update and upgrade basic literacy and occupational skills of employed adults.
• Provide programs to meet the needs of adults with limited English language proficiency in conjunction with business and industry.
• Establish a business and industry identification and referral network.

Ancillary services include GED on TV and child care reimbursement for employed adults who participate in workplace literacy programs during non-working hours. A formative evaluation will be done by Northwest Regional Education Lab of Portland, Oregon.

Staff development includes training sessions for the workplace literacy coordinators to conduct literacy audits to assess skills required on the job and skill levels of employees performing those jobs. If it is determined that employees do not have the necessary skill levels to successfully perform their jobs, the workplace literacy coordinator will assist in designing and implementing customized curriculum to meet the identified need(s).

Workplace literacy programs will be delivered by the postsecondary vocational educational schools through a subproposal application process. The delivery of these programs will improve the productivity of employees by increasing their specific job literacy skills.
OVERVIEW:

Technology is changing the Idaho economy, displacing workers in some occupations and creating jobs in others. Along with this change, Idaho must cope with both a declining youth population and an increasing number of older workers, women, and minorities in the workforce. These two situations have stimulated an increased need for education in the workplace. According to the Governor's special task force report, Idaho Workforce 2000, approximately 25% of Idaho's adult workforce will need major retraining for future jobs. This need for training will be compounded by the issue raised by Xerox's CEO, David Kearns, "Future jobs will be restructured about every seven years and work and learning will be inseparable."

Changing demands of the workplace have focused a need for worker training not only on technical skills but also on expanded literacy skills. These expanded skills may be referred to as workplace literacy and may include what employers have identified as basic to the workplace: learning to learn; reading, writing, computation; listening and oral communication; creative thinking/problem solving; self-esteem/motivation; interpersonal/negotiation/teamwork; and organizational effectiveness/leadership (Workplace Basics: The Skills Employers Want, 1989).
PURPOSE:

Because the educational and training challenges for Idaho's business and industry are multi-faceted, they cannot be met by a single entity. For this reason, the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy was formed with representation from education (CAVES), industry (IAPIC), and labor (IDOE).

The purpose of the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy is to coordinate the effective delivery of basic literacy and occupational skills training necessary for the changing demands of the workplace. The Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy is furthering that purpose by coordinating efforts to increase public awareness of the need for workplace literacy and to provide workplace literacy programs designed to meet those needs.

Workplace literacy programs focus on the specific needs of workers to perform their jobs and are viewed as a way to serve otherwise unserved areas. Vocational education has traditionally served businesses' needs for technical training. Adult Basic Education (ABE), with its limited funding, has traditionally served the adult communities' needs for basic reading, math, and GED preparation. Workplace literacy programs are designed to fill the gap between the general educational focus of ABE and the specific skill training focus of vocational education. These programs focus on needs of workers whose education preparation has been below the baccalaureate level. The connection of these two service areas through WPL provides a transitional program for employed workers. Workplace literacy concentrates on the workers...
developing the ability to **use** computation, communication and other basic skills **in the context of** their particular duties in the workplace.

Workplace literacy programs will improve the productivity and efficiency of employees, and will provide them the opportunity to increase their literacy skills to a level that will allow them to retain and advance in their jobs in this time of economic and technological change.

**WORKPLACE LITERACY DEFINITION:**

There appears to be no consistency in workplace literacy definitions used nationally, or among educators of the various disciplines. It is therefore appropriate to offer a composite explanation of workplace literacy as it relates to Idaho's workplace literacy program.

From the procedures manual: "Workplace Literacy: the basic skills needed to perform work successfully are commonly referred to as job-related or workplace literacy skills and generally include: mathematics, reading, writing, speaking, listening and the ability to apply these skills in problem-solving. Workplace literacy differs from general literacy in both content and purpose as it addresses specific needs of workers on the job. For this reason, workplace literacy cannot be defined in static terms as it is constantly changing to meet rapid changes in the workplace."
From the informational brochure: Workplace literacy is "training to improve the ability to use computation and communication skills in the context of the workplace."

In development of the grant, writers envisioned workplace literacy as meeting an unserved area between generic basic skills and technical skills. Workplace literacy provides a transition between the two service areas by offering literacy training that is customized to be job specific. Computer usage is an example. Workplace literacy may include basic computer introductory skills needed to familiarize a student with the computer as a workplace communication tool. Specific computer applications are considered job specific training.

ASSESSMENT:

Workplace literacy coordinators, accompanied by short-term skills coordinators and Job Service staff, conduct job analyses and employee assessments to determine skills required on-the-job and the skill levels of employees performing those jobs. The results of these assessments are used for program planning and curriculum development.

As a result of these assessments, the project staff will compile information on student progress in one or more of the following areas: reading and math skill level needed for job performance; current reading and math skill levels of employees;
employees' ability to use printed material on the job; pre- and post-test results of participating employees; and demographic information on participants including age, sex, ethnic background, education level, and length of employment.

EVALUATION:

The Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy has contracted with the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, Oregon, to conduct an external formative evaluation of the project. In addition, an on-going internal evaluation is being conducted. The internal evaluation will include evaluation of employer satisfaction, participant satisfaction, and individual program success.

Employer satisfaction will be measured by an exit interview and a six-month follow up questionnaire. Participant satisfaction will be assessed through the use of written student evaluations. Each individual program will be evaluated using pre- and post-test data along with the results of the employer and participant evaluations.
PROJECT OVERVIEW
The Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy project was first implemented through participation in the National Audio conference presented by the National Academy for Vocational Education and cosponsored by the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education held in November 1988. Following the audioconference, a three-day workshop was conducted in December for the new workplace literacy coordinators, the postsecondary short-term training coordinators, and selected program coordinators for the Department of Employment.

Dr. Tom Sticht, Director, Applied Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences, presented the philosophy and overall project design to the participants. State Division of Vocational Education and State Department of Education staff provided the workshop participants with ways to make business contact, develop subproposals and budgets, and how to determine business/industry contributions. (See Staff Training section for agenda.) There were over 130 individuals that participated in the workshop.

The actual completion of the subproposals with business/industry was slower than anticipated, hence the first funded subproposal was not started until March 1990. In discussing the reason for the slow start-up it was determined that making contacts with the right person at the business took longer than expected. Also, once the subproposal was developed it seemed that the length of time for the formal technical review and final approval by the steering committee was too long. From initial contact to actual funding usually averaged four - six weeks. This tended to discourage all parties involved in the subproposal. This procedure was reviewed several times, but the only change possible was to encourage quicker turn around time for the technical committee and use of fax and telephone follow-up for steering committee approval. Over 600 companies were contacted during the project period, with 33 subproposals developed, 31 funded, and over 900 participants served. It was determined that with the level of participation from business\industry being so high, the cost of the projects was running lower than anticipated (see subproposal chart in Actual Accomplishments section).

The effectiveness of the GED tapes played over public television was very difficult to measure, as only 25 individuals were verified to be participants as a direct result of the airings. However, the ABE centers and the libraries were able to offer the tapes and the computer program to supplement the tapes. This was an added plus to individuals wanting GED assistance.

The child care component did not develop as expected, most clients found that the training could be completed without having to use child care services, or that it could be done under their existing contract with the child care facility. Most companies did not seem interested in the child care component.

Programs with ESL participants were developed around safety and job description curriculum. Efforts were made to do instruction at the work station as well as in the classroom. The supervisor or company tutor worked with the instructor to help present one-on-one instruction. The participants were encouraged to discuss the training in group activities in the classroom. Many participants expressed interest in continuing their language skill training and several companies are working with the institutions to provide additional training.
PROJECT SUMMARY AND OVERVIEW

Estimated cost per participant = $487.00
Cost per participant = $306.06
PROJECT OBJECTIVES
The Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy identified the following objectives:

1. Increase the availability of basic literacy services and activities.
   a. Provide GED preparatory courses through the statewide Public Broadcast System for adults who are unable to attend regular programs.
   b. Provide basic literacy skills, high school diploma or equivalency instruction for dislocated workers at sites or locations that are not on campus.

2. Establish an identification and referral network.
   a. Establish an identification and referral network of social service agencies, employment and training agencies, community based organizations, and JTPA service providers. The statewide network will identify adults who are in need of basic literacy services and refer them to the appropriate ABE learning center or outreach program for services.
   b. Establish a business and industry identification and referral network to educate business and industry employers and employees on the importance of workplace literacy and to identify those businesses who are in need of workplace literacy services.

3. Provide programs to meet the needs of adults with limited English language proficiency in conjunction with business and industry.

4. Provide workplace literacy programs designed to update and upgrade basic literacy and occupational skills of employed adults in accordance with changes in workplace requirements, technology, products or services; and to increase productivity in the workplace.
ACTUAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS
1. Compare actual accomplishments to the objectives contained in the approved application.

The Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy identified and accomplished the following objectives:

a. Provide GED preparatory courses through the statewide Public Broadcast System for adults who are unable to attend regular programs.

The Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy contracted with the statewide Public Broadcasting System for a 43 part GED tape series to provide GED preparatory courses for adults unable to attend regular GED classes. The series began in January 1989. A tape ran every Saturday at 4:00 p.m. and was repeated every Wednesday at 3:00 p.m. These broadcasts were off-aired and tapes were available for use at the ABE centers. There were over 100 inquiries from adults regarding GED courses as a result of these broadcasts.

There was also a computer component available in the ABE centers at the postsecondary schools and to other institutions for use by participants in their efforts to complete the GED. Non-federal in-kind match in the amount of $1,959 was generated by the airing of the GED series on public television.

b. Provide basic literacy skills, high school diploma or equivalency instruction for dislocated workers at sites or locations that are not on campus.

The Kraft Company in Pocatello, Idaho relocated their entire plant to California. Workers had a choice of moving to the new location or staying in Pocatello and finding a new job.

As part of a rapid response effort a survey was sent to all workers to determine their needs including any interested in pursuing a GED. Response to the questionnaire indicated that 38 persons were interested in pursuing a GED at the Kraft plant. A follow-up letter and additional questionnaire was sent to these individuals to determine the best times available for all to meet. Ten responses were received back from this inquiry. As a result of evaluation and testing of these individuals, two dislocated workers were enrolled in GED classes.

2. Establish an identification and referral network.

a. Establish an identification and referral network of social service agencies, employment and training agencies, community based organizations, and JTPA service providers. The statewide network will identify adults who are in need of basic literacy services and refer them to the appropriate ABE learning center or outreach program for services.
As part of the initial three day workshop, workplace literacy coordinators, selected job service personnel, and private industry council members were given instructions on methods to develop a viable network that would be put into place in each region of the state. The regional networks would be linked with the statewide network through the various members and would identify adults needing basic literacy services.

The workplace coordinators located at each of the postsecondary vocational-technical schools in Idaho made monthly contacts with area job service offices, private industry councils, short-term training coordinators, local workplace literacy advisory councils, Adult Basic Education Centers and various other agencies. This statewide network worked together in sharing possible referrals, identifying potential workplace literacy clients, contacting clients, determining types of services most appropriate for clients, (job service, adult education, ESL, JTPA, workplace literacy, etc), and performing job analysis and assessments for clients identified for workplace literacy funding. This network offered valuable assistance and support to the workplace literacy project.

b. Establish a business and industry identification and referral network to educate business and industry employers and employees on the importance of workplace literacy and to identify those businesses who are in need of workplace literacy services.

Over 600 business and industry contacts were made by the workplace literacy coordinators located at each of the six vocational-technical schools in Idaho. These contacts resulted in 31 subproposals being funded and over 50 workplace literacy partnerships being signed. These partnerships provided training to a total of 953 participants. Several companies have continued the workplace literacy effort and are using the partnership format to provide curriculum, resources, and instructional support without the financial support from the grant. For further information regarding types of training provided, companies served and numbers served, refer to the subproposal chart that has been provided.

3. Provide programs to meet the needs of adults with limited English language proficiency in conjunction with business and industry.

A total of eight workplace literacy projects served the needs of 137 participants identified as limited English language proficiency. These projects included language skill training in product quality assurance standards, safety requirements and production quotas.
4. Provide workplace literacy programs designed to update and upgrade basic literacy and occupational skills of employed adults in accordance with changes in workplace requirements, technology, products or services; and to increase productivity in the workplace.

The majority of the projects were developed to update and upgrade basic literacy and occupational skills of employed adults. Curriculums were developed using company manuals and production schedules as companies made changes in the workplace usually due to technology improvements or product innovations. See subproposal chart for project details.
## Workplace Literacy Subproposals Funded October, 1988 - March 1990

### State Division of Vocational Education

**Dates of Grant**

**Actual** | **Anticipated** | **Estimated** | **Actual**
--- | --- | --- | ---
Funded October, 1988 - March 1990 |  |  |  

### Project Numbers & Names of Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number &amp; Name of Project</th>
<th>Dates of Training</th>
<th>Grant Award</th>
<th>Actual Expenditures</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Match Match</th>
<th>SERVED</th>
<th>SERVED</th>
<th>Purpose of Training/Assessment Tool/Results of Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-07 BSU--Nampa Wastewater</td>
<td>3/1-5/10/89</td>
<td>1,352.00</td>
<td>1,284.25</td>
<td>3,705.00</td>
<td>1,362.14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide writing and math skills update for treatment plant workers. TABE was the instrument used for assessment. As a result of this training participants were able to communicate written information in a more thorough and concise manner, their basic math skills update reduced errors and helped them to problem solve more effectively. Students also increased their confidence in job performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-08 BSU--Simplot Food Division</td>
<td>4/5-6/2/89</td>
<td>2,198.00</td>
<td>2,010.48</td>
<td>1,390.00</td>
<td>1,026.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Job related reading improvement classes for production line workers. Chart reading is vital in many areas of plant operation and quality control at this company. The Test of Adult Basic Education was the assessment tool used. The participants were given the TABE Locator in order to discern each student's appropriate reading level however the students were unable to complete the Locator section of the test. The curriculum addressed vowels and consonants, word blends, reading aloud in small groups, dictionary drills, and the reading of job related safety materials. As a result of this training participants are now able to read charts, chemical labels, warning labels and safety procedures. An example of benefits of this training: one man learned to read sentences and a complete story. Prior to training he could read only isolated words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-09 BSU--Glenns Ferry Police Dept</td>
<td>4/13-6/15/89</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>675.23</td>
<td>645.00</td>
<td>655.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing skills class for officers to improve job performance. TABE was the assessment instrument used. Curriculum addressed writing mechanics, paragraphing, report writing and proofreading. Students actively participated and attended classes regularly. As a result of this training officers reports are more complete and understandable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-10 CSI--Simplot Food Company</td>
<td>4/4-7/20/89</td>
<td>5,494.00</td>
<td>4,849.32</td>
<td>3,187.00</td>
<td>3,187.00</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>Job skills enhancement classes focusing on math and reading skills for plant production workers. Assessment tool used was WRAT. Pretest indicated 85% of group scored below 9th grade level. As a result of training 95% of post-test group scored at or above 9th grade level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-11 CSI--Boise Cascade Corrugated</td>
<td>4/4-7/20/89</td>
<td>3,045.00</td>
<td>1,909.87</td>
<td>3,679.00</td>
<td>3,679.00</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>Math skill update for plant workers. Project designed to provide needed remediation in basic math skills needed by employees learning a more technical form of quality assurance procedure. WRAT was the assessment tool used. Overall results on the math post-test gave 65 of the total 100 incorrect responses registering in problems related to fractions, decimals, and percentages. It was concluded that further needs existed in the areas of math. Additional classes were provided as indicated on WPL-89-38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-13 ISU--Pocatello Fire Dept.</td>
<td>3/21-6/30/89</td>
<td>1,324.00</td>
<td>1,059.91</td>
<td>1,824.00</td>
<td>380.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Job related training on computers to enable employees to produce pre-fire plans, training records, reports, and other aspects of job requiring use of computers. Pretraining indicated 80% of participants knew less than 20% of the computer terms given in the pretest. 50% could not turn on the computer and begin a program. At the end of training 100% could turn on their computers and get a program up and running. 100% were also able to define the computer terms in context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT NUMBER & NAME OF PROJECT

WPL-89-14 LCSC--Potlatch Corp.

WPL-89-16 ISU--Simplot Food Div.

WPL-89-17 EITC--Good Samaritan Center


WPL-89-20 NIC--Bonner Cnty School Dist.

WPL-89-21 CSI--Boise Cascade Sign Language

DATES OF TRAINING | GRANT AWARD | ACTUAL EXPENDITURES | ANTICIPATED MATCH | ACTUAL MATCH | ESTIMATED # SERVED | ACTUAL # SERVED | PURPOSE OF TRAINING/ASSESSMENT TOOL/RESULTS OF TRAINING
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
4/4-12/1/89 | 5,235.00 | 5,017.83 | 2,000.00 | 2,000.00 | 14 | 30 | Design and implement a new model of training of millwright apprentices to include mechanical as well as reading skills and comprehension. As a result of project, more than 30 apprentices were identified as being in need of enriched curriculum in order to achieve success in their craft training. Project has proven successful in preparing apprentices with basic skills necessary to enter regular apprentice program. This program has the earnest support of company and employees. It is anticipated that similar workplace literacy follow-up activities will be ongoing at Potlatch Corporation plants.

3/6-6/2/89 | 2,935.00 | 1,995.19 | 3,077.00 | 2,414.77 | 14 | 22 | Job specific reading, writing and math skills updates for statistical process control workers. Major goal of project was to help participants in preparing and passing the Resource Improvement Program. As a result of training 12 out of 22 participants passed the RIP test.

5/8-7/14/89 | 1,695.13 | -0- | 1,198.75 | 1,199.11 | 31 | 7 | Job specific updates in math and reading for workers in areas of dietary, aids, LPNs, RNs, laundry, maintenance and housekeeping. TABE was the assessment tool used. Training resulted in an average increase of 2.0 grade levels.

6/1-7/27/89 | 1,118.00 | 642.05 | 1,780.00 | 1,060.00 | 18 | 18 | Writing skills class to improve productivity. Employee interview and TABE were the assessment tools used. Curriculum addressed paragraph development, letter and memo taking techniques, cause and effect in writing documentation, punctuation and writing practice using job-related skills. This class enabled students to upgrade their writing techniques which is vital to their Job when charting patients.

6/12-11/27/89 | 252.32 | 260.53 | 864.00 | 372.42 | 15 | 9 | Writing skills class for officers to improve job performance. CLOZE and staff interviews were the assessment tools used. Project was designed to enhance staff's ability to use and understand computerized climate control system. Individuals involved are now capable of manipulating system and have a thorough understanding of the basic operations.

5/31-8/2/89 | 1,210.00 | 1,210.00 | 780.00 | 780.00 | 8 | 8 | High noise levels create need for communication in American and English pidgin sign language. A hearing impaired employee provided tutorial assistance to other hearing workers and as a result the hearing impaired person became better integrated into the workplace. The Boise Cascade Education Coordinator felt the sign language class produced excellent results in the areas of enhanced self-esteem, increased understanding and better cooperation among employees. In order for sign language to become a viable means of visual communication for the workplace, however, most employees indicated a desire for additional training. This resulted in Boise Cascade's financial support for a five-week extension to the project. Friendships and competencies developed through the grant. For the first time in twelve years of employment, the hearing impaired employee attended the annual Christmas party.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER &amp; NAME OF PROJECT</th>
<th>DATES OF TRAINING</th>
<th>GRANT AWARD</th>
<th>ACTUAL EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>ANTICIPATED MATCH</th>
<th>ACTUAL MATCH</th>
<th>ESTIMATED # SERVED</th>
<th>ACTUAL # SERVED</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF TRAINING/ASSESSMENT TOOL/RESULTS OF TRAINING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-22 BSU--Simplot</td>
<td>8/14-11/17/89</td>
<td>8,130.00</td>
<td>5,607.76</td>
<td>2,291.00</td>
<td>1,360.00</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Job related reading improvement classes. Assessment tool used was &quot;Specific Skill Series Reading Placement Test.&quot; Curriculum addressed reading to draw conclusions, find facts, get the main idea, and draw inference. Vocabulary, word attack skills and word recognition also were included. Students improved their reading ability and were able to read materials posted on the bulletin board at the worksite. Students were pleased with their progress and felt more confident on the job and more included in the company. The company's support of the program is evidenced in the fact that two additional programs were held.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-23 BSU--Payette Lakes Care Center</td>
<td>8/17-9/7/89</td>
<td>1,259.00</td>
<td>729.53</td>
<td>383.00</td>
<td>334.80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Job related study skills, test anxiety and test taking tips. Assessment tool used was employee interview. Class was designed to help nurse aides overcome fear of testing and prepare them for certification exam required to continue employment. Curriculum included specific test information and practice, study skills techniques, test taking strategies and a nurse aide practice test. Class participants indicated they learned how to study and that the class helped them relieve the fear of taking exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-24 EITC--Westinghouse</td>
<td>10/89-1/90</td>
<td>3,373.00</td>
<td>3,143.23</td>
<td>32,000.80</td>
<td>22,178.67</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Gammer skill upgrade. Performance data and observation were techniques used to identify skill deficiencies. As a result of training entire class average rose from pretest average of 39.95% to a post-test average of 68.10%. After reviewing the class evaluations, the company offered this course again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-25 EITC--Law Enforcement</td>
<td>9/25-11/28/89</td>
<td>682.30</td>
<td>504.52</td>
<td>12,578.70</td>
<td>4,225.20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Instruction in work-related Spanish phrases for police and correction officers. Forty students enrolled in class. However, due to job responsibilities, attendance was irregular for many participants. These classes were videotaped for later viewing for those who could not attend classes. Eight students took the final exam. This class was a success for those who regularly attended classes as indicated by test results and by the student evaluations. The pre-test class average was 58.95%, the average score on the final test was 88.75%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-26 ISU--Simplot (Aberdeen)</td>
<td>July-Aug1989</td>
<td>3,306.20</td>
<td>1,865.28</td>
<td>3,755.00</td>
<td>3,196.25</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Job related computer literacy training--company is completely computerizing operation. Very few employees had even a rudimentary knowledge of computers. A comprehensive pretest was designed with 50 basic questions dealing with basic computer terminology and with hardware and software applications. Average pretest score was 32% correct; average post-test score was 86% correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-27 BSU--Boise Cascade Wood Prod.</td>
<td>10/17-12/21/89</td>
<td>1,289.00</td>
<td>701.44</td>
<td>671.58</td>
<td>415.99</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Job related basic math and reporting writing. The writing and math portions of the Basic Education Skills Check was used as an assessment tool. Curriculum addressed report writing skills and basic math skills. The math class was designed to upgrade employee skills in math measurements, fractions and decimals. Employees were enthusiastic and felt classes were very beneficial in helping them upgrade necessary skills in writing more precise, complete reports and updating their math skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT NUMBER &amp; NAME OF PROJECT</td>
<td>DATES OF TRAINING</td>
<td>GRANT AWARD</td>
<td>ACTUAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>ANTICIPATED MATCH</td>
<td>ACTUAL MATCH</td>
<td>ESTIMATED # SERVED</td>
<td>ACTUAL # SERVED</td>
<td>PURPOSE OF TRAINING/ASSESSMENT TOOL/RESULTS OF TRAINING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-28 EITC-East Idaho Reg. Med. Cntr.</td>
<td>9/25 - 12/8/89</td>
<td>1,056.00</td>
<td>969.97</td>
<td>7,875.00</td>
<td>5,407.98</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Descriptive writing classes for nurses. Assessment was done by interviewing two head nurses. They reviewed patient charts and assessments and found a definite lack in descriptive evaluations and incomplete charting and assessments. Classes included medical terminology, documentation, case studies for review and critique, policies and procedures, creating quality care plan, medical records, and charting medical history. Students increased personal skills in documentation techniques as a result of this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-29 BSU--McCall General Hospital</td>
<td>10/18 - 12/20/89</td>
<td>2,415.00</td>
<td>1,300.23</td>
<td>2,392.00</td>
<td>1,981.70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Job related writing skills upgrade. Director of nursing emphasized that good writing skills are vital in nurses' work performance. Writing portions of Basic Education Skills Check were used as assessment tools. Curriculum addressed writing mechanics, paragraphing, uses of topic sentences, report writing techniques and editing. The instructor indicated this training was successful in reaching intended objectives, this was also evidenced by participants enthusiastic responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-30 LCSC--NezPerce Tribe</td>
<td>11/89-3/90</td>
<td>15,471.72</td>
<td>14,353.53</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
<td>8,550.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Job specific computer literacy training. A total of 123 students were served under this grant. Training brought students' computer operation knowledge to a level that resulted in computer usage on the job. By the end of training participants were comfortable in basic computer operations, competent in basic computer terminology and could successfully operate the basic programs utilized by the Nez Perce Tribe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-31 ISU--American Potato</td>
<td>8/89 - 10/89</td>
<td>1,037.00</td>
<td>312.38</td>
<td>1,037.00</td>
<td>312.38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Job specific reading skills. Many company employees come from Mexico, Laos, and Vietnam and have difficulty communicating orally with fellow workers and supervisors and in reading memos, safety signs, time sheets and safety manuals. Of the 24 tested on the IRCA Test of Basic English Competency, 10 scored at preliterate and beginning ESL level, 10 at the intermediate level, and three were at the ESL advanced level. Two were at GED level. The teacher indicated that the 12 participants who attended class regularly made significant gains in better communication. Eight of these participants have exhibited an observable change in skill level on the job. Erratic class attendance was due to the beginning of the potato harvest season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-32 EITC--EG&amp;G Maintenance</td>
<td>11/89 - 2/90</td>
<td>6,065.50</td>
<td>4,891.12</td>
<td>69,858.70</td>
<td>56,366.36</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>TABE and MOS were assessment tools used. Students increased their grade equivalency scores on the TABE by an average of 2.9 grade levels. Fourteen students participated in the addendum instructional period. Overall net gain was a +7.2 equivalent grade-levels for the instructional period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-33 NIC--Elk Mountain Farms</td>
<td>11/6 - 12/20/89</td>
<td>744.00</td>
<td>312.31</td>
<td>5,555.00</td>
<td>1,795.20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Job specific bilingual communications. Assessment team interviewed supervisors at facility. Company employs 200 Hispanic workers each year at harvest time. In order to communicate successfully with the workers the supervisors completed classes in bilingual communication. Curriculum included a list of agricultural vocabulary essential to hops cultivation, numbers, direction, measurement, time, days and distance. Eleven supervisors participated in this training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT NUMBER &amp; NAME OF PROJECT</td>
<td>DATES OF TRAINING</td>
<td>GRANT AMOUNT</td>
<td>ACTUAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>ANTICIPATED MATCH</td>
<td>ACTUAL MATCH</td>
<td>ESTIMATED # SERVED</td>
<td>ACTUAL # SERVED</td>
<td>PURPOSE OF TRAINING/ASSESSMENT TOOL/RESULTS OF TRAINING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-34 NIC--Boundary Cnty Law Enforcement</td>
<td>10-24 - 11/21/89</td>
<td>1,160.00</td>
<td>432.14</td>
<td>8,314.80</td>
<td>2,320.86</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Job specific bilingual communications. Classes were attended by 22 law enforcement officials. Initial assessment revealed that the majority of contacts with Hispanic population concerned traffic violations. Curriculum included guidance in pronunciation, time, and language used in a variety of law enforcement circumstances. This project enabled officers to communicate bilingually when asking for driver's licenses, registrations, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-35 BSU--Western Trailers</td>
<td>12/24/89 - 1/6/90</td>
<td>2,215.00</td>
<td>323.18</td>
<td>440.00</td>
<td>518.55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Job specific math and geometry upgrade. No pretesting was done at the request of management. Curriculum included fractions, decimals, and basic geometry designed around work related materials, especially the tape measure. The men attended class regularly and expressed appreciation for the opportunity upgrade their skills and to attend class on their work site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-36 CSI--Universal Foods</td>
<td>12/89-4/90</td>
<td>19,050.00</td>
<td>19,050.00</td>
<td>6,949.00</td>
<td>6,949.00</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Job skills enhancement classes in math and English as a Second Language. Project was developed to meet company needs of a team-oriented quality assurance program. Steps in observation, interviewing and assessment led to recommendations for training in English as a Second Language and basic mathematics. Enrollment was 58 ESL and 20 math. Approximately 108 hours of computer literacy instruction were given to employees at all shifts in conjunction with ESL classes. Consensus of the company and individual participants reflected they were happy with scheduling, class content, and instruction. Recommendations were made that ways be found to continue the program following grant closure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-37 LCSC--American Red Cross</td>
<td>10/18/89 - 1/31/90</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>1,155.89</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Job related computer literacy. The Red Cross local office obtained computers and the staff and volunteers could not operate them. By the end of training participants were comfortable in operating an Apple IIe, competent in basic computer terminology, had some knowledge of the operating system and could successfully operate the basic programs utilized by the local Red Cross office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-38 CSI--Boise Cascade Corrugated Container Division</td>
<td>11/27/89 - 3/26/99</td>
<td>1,189.40</td>
<td>788.44</td>
<td>3,084.00</td>
<td>3,084.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Additional job related math skill update for company workers. This project was an addition to a previous WPL math program. Grade level comparisons using the WRAT test for pre/post tests resulted in an increase of 79% at the 9th grade level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-39 BSU--McCall Police Department</td>
<td>2/4 - 3/17/89</td>
<td>374.00</td>
<td>325.65</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Work related writing skills. Job analyses of officers confirmed good writing skills are essential in a police officers job performance. The Adult Learning Center Skills Check was assessment tool used. Project design consisted of report writing instruction. Curriculum included interviewing techniques, editing officer reports, paragraphing, grammar usage and sequencing facts. The employees reported the class to be extremely useful. Learned writing skills were immediately put to use. The chief recognized a great improvement in the writing skills of his officers as he reviewed their reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS

| $103,155.42 | $82,398.61 | $13,288.13 | 142,325.20 | 1,191 | 953 |

Workplace literacy projects WPL-89-12 and WPL-89-15 were unable to operate and the money was deobligated.

BSU = Boise State University; CSI = College of Southern Idaho; EITC = Eastern Idaho Technical College; ISU = Idaho State University; LCSC = Lewis-Clark State College; NIC = North Idaho College
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-07</td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>126.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee salaries</td>
<td>1,236.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,362.14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-08</td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>306.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registration fee</td>
<td>170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Paid by company)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee assessments</td>
<td>550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,026.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-09</td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee salaries</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registration fee</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Paid by company)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$655.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-10</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>2,595.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment lease</td>
<td>192.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,187.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-11</td>
<td>Instructor salary</td>
<td>672.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fringe</td>
<td>148.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>2,667.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment lease</td>
<td>192.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,679.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-13</td>
<td>Registration fee</td>
<td>380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Paid by company)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>300.90</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-14</td>
<td>Instructional supplies</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-16</td>
<td>Equipment lease</td>
<td>416.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>1,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>686.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>187.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,414.77</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-17</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>40.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-17</td>
<td>Set-up time</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-17</td>
<td>Employee salary</td>
<td>1,098.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-17</td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-17</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,199.11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-18</td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-18</td>
<td>Registration fees</td>
<td>180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-18</td>
<td>(Paid by company)</td>
<td>180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-18</td>
<td>Employee salaries</td>
<td>700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-18</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,060.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-19</td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-19</td>
<td>Registration fees</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-19</td>
<td>(Paid by company)</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-19</td>
<td>Employee salaries</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-19</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>780.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-20</td>
<td>Employee salaries</td>
<td>372.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-21</td>
<td>Instructor salary</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-21</td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>2,826.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-21</td>
<td>Equipment lease</td>
<td>1,032.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-21</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-21</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,102.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-22</td>
<td>Registration fees</td>
<td>1,088.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-22</td>
<td>(Paid by company)</td>
<td>1,088.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-22</td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>272.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-22</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,360.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-23</td>
<td>Employee salaries</td>
<td>174.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-23</td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-23</td>
<td>Registration fees</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-23</td>
<td>(Paid by company)</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-23</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>334.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-24</td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>623.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-24</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>2,494.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-24</td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-24</td>
<td>Employee salaries</td>
<td>18,800.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-24</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,178.67</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-25</td>
<td>Employee salaries</td>
<td>4,045.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-25</td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-25</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>29.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-25</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,225.20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-26</td>
<td>Equipment lease</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>656.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor salary</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,196.25</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| WPL-89-27 | Facility lease | 276.96 |
| Registration fee | 110.00 |
| (Paid by employer) |
| Supplies | 29.03 |
| **Total** | **$415.99** |

| WPL-89-28 | Employee salaries | 5,039.48 |
| Facility lease | 90.00 |
| Supplies | 278.50 |
| **Total** | **$5,407.98** |

| WPL-89-29 | Supplies | 11.70 |
| Facility lease | 160.00 |
| Employee salaries | 1,650.00 |
| Registration fees | 160.00 |
| (Paid by company) |
| **Total** | **$1,981.70** |

| WPL-89-30 | Facility lease | 8,100.00 |
| Registration fee | 450.00 |
| **Total** | **$8,550.00** |

| WPL-89-31 | Instructor salary | 289.20 |
| Fringe | 23.18 |
| **Total** | **$312.38** |

| WPL-89-32 | Employee salaries | 35,134.50 |
| Facility lease | 200.00 |
| Instructor salary | 12,705.00 |
| Fringe | 1,270.50 |
| Travel | 1,670.22 |
| Supplies | 49.70 |
| Instructional materials | 5,336.09 |
| **Total** | **$56,366.36** |

| WPL-89-33 | Employee salaries | 1,795.20 |

| WPL-89-34 | Employee salaries | 2,320.38 |

<p>| WPL-89-35 | Facility lease | 320.00 |
| Registration fees | 190.00 |
| (Paid by employer) |
| Supplies | 8.55 |
| <strong>Total</strong> | <strong>$518.55</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subproposal</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-36</td>
<td>Instructor salary and fringe</td>
<td>2,560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>1,606.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment lease</td>
<td>1,406.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>1,377.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,949.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-37</td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment lease</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-38</td>
<td>Instructor salary</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fringe</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility lease</td>
<td>2,464.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,084.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPL-89-39</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registration fees</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Paid by employer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$210.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SUBPROPOSAL MATCH**

$142,325.20
No quantitative numbers to be served or target dates were contained in the approved application. The objectives of each individual subproposal were successful in upgrading the needs and skills of the participants involved. In many cases the actual numbers of participants served were lower than the anticipated numbers. This was due in some cases to classes being held during the work day. Employees were sometimes pulled out of the classes by the press of duties. For further information regarding numbers served, types of training, companies involved, and results of training see subproposal chart that has been provided in this report.

The one component of the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy grant that did not operate as was originally identified was the child care component. Only two claims for child care were submitted for reimbursement. The training classes were often held during the work day or right before or right after work. Since most child care is provided on a daily and not hourly basis, it was not necessary for most of the participants to pay additional funds for child care.
COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE STATE OF IDAHO
DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
AND
CHILD CARE CONNECTIONS

This Cooperative Agreement is made and entered into between the State of Idaho, Division of Vocational Education, hereinafter referred to as The Division, and the Child Care Connections, hereinafter referred to as CCC.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

This Cooperative Agreement is made for the purpose of administering the child care reimbursement funds of the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project.

RECITAL

Whereas, the provision of the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project is desirable by both The Division and CCC; and

Whereas, this is an allowable activity under the duties and obligations of The Division; and

Whereas, CCC has the experience and expertise in distributing the funds and providing child care referral assistance to parents; and

Whereas, The Division has WPL funds designated to provide for child care costs for those individuals receiving training outside their normal work hours; and

Whereas, The Division must allocate, monitor and disburse these funds to be used for the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project; and

Whereas, having a written agreement which provides the extent of each parties' obligations will facilitate their cooperation in accomplishing the purpose and objectives of this Agreement.

Now, therefore in consideration of the benefits to be derived by each party:
AGREEMENT

In agreement it is hereby agreed as follows:

I. The cooperative project to be accomplished under this Agreement is the offering of the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project which allows for the payment of child care costs for those individuals participating in training outside their normal work hours.

II. Terms of the Agreement. The Cooperative Agreement shall be effective from January 1, 1989 through December 31, 1989 or until such time as the allocated funds in the amount of $29,200.00 has been expended, which ever comes first.

III. This Agreement may be modified at any time by mutual written consent.

IV. Nothing in the Agreement shall obligate The Division to make payments to CCC using state funds. In the event funds are reduced, terminated or otherwise rendered inadequate to cover one hundred percent of the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project-related costs providing child care reimbursement, all obligations under this Agreement between The Division and CCC shall be reduced accordingly or terminated. All payments are contingent upon The Division's receipt of funds from the Federal Government.

V. Mutual Cooperation. Each party agrees to cooperate with the other to accomplish the purpose and objectives of the Cooperative Agreement and fulfilling its obligations as herein provided.

VI. Specific obligations of the Parties:

A. Division's Obligation: The Division shall reimburse CCC for actual reimbursements made to participants (up to $26,864.00) plus an eight percent (8%) administrative fee (up to $2,336.00) not to exceed a combined total of $29,200.00. Reimbursements to CCC to be made monthly by The Division upon receipt of summary billing and supporting documents.
The Division shall provide information needed by CCC to perform its duties.

B. CCC's Obligations: CCC agrees to provide child care referral assistance to parents who are program participants residing in Ada or Canyon counties. The services will include, but are not limited to, telephone counseling, referral information on child care providers, consumer tips and a mailing "How to Choose Child Care Checklist".

CCC agrees to provide an orientation session for Idaho Workplace Literacy Coordinators on how the WPL Child Care Assistance Program operates. CCC's "How to Choose Child Care Checklist" will be distributed to WPL Coordinators.

CCC agrees to make biweekly reimbursement payments to participants. Child care usage and participants' attendance will be verified with a biweekly attendance report. Reimbursement shall be limited to $1.50 per hour per child while participant attends class during non-working hours.

CCC shall require participants of the WPL Program to submit completed child care receipts, which will be signed by CCC before reimbursement will be made by The Division.

VII. Repayment. CCC agrees to repay funds distributed under this Agreement which are found not to be in accordance with the terms of this Agreement. If CCC refuses to repay such funds, The Division agrees to offset the amount against any other funds to which CCC is or may become entitled under this Agreement.

VIII. Confidentiality of Records. It is expressly acknowledged and agreed that the parties shall observe all confidentiality requirements of Idaho Code and State, Federal and Agency regulations pertaining to any records or information regarding a participant of the Idaho Workplace Literacy Program under this Agreement.
IX. This Agreement may be terminated by the mutual, written consent of both parties. Upon termination, CCC shall be reimbursed for any outstanding expenditures of participants plus the eight percent administrative fee upon submission of a summary invoice within sixty (60) days of the date of the termination.

Dr. Trudy Anderson, Administrator
Idaho Division of Vocational Education

Date

Sharon A. Bigley
Child Care Connections

Date
Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy
Steering Committee Membership

Consortium of Area Vocational Education Schools
Dr. Mel Streeter, Dean
School of Vocational-Technical Education
Lewis-Clark State College
8th Avenue & 6th Street
Lewiston, ID 83501
Phone: (208) 799-2225

Idaho Association of Private Industry Councils*
Dr. Jerry Beck, Director, Continuing Education
College of Southern Idaho
P.O. Box 1238
Twin Falls, ID 83303-1238
Phone: (208) 733-9554

Department of Employment
Jane Daly, Administrator
Employment Services and Training Division
317 Main
Boise, ID 83735
Phone: (208) 334-6131

Adult Basic Education
Richard Sparks, ABE Program Director
School of Vocational-Technical Education
Idaho State University
Phone: (208) 236-2468

State Division of Vocational Education
Dr. Trudy Anderson, State Administrator
State Division of Vocational Education
650 W. State, Room 324
Boise, ID 83720
Phone: (208) 334-3216

Governor's Office
Alice Koskela, Special Assistant to
Governor Cecil D. Andrus
State Capitol, 2nd Floor, West Wing
Boise, ID 83720
Phone: (208) 334-2100

*After January 1, 1990, representative from IAPIC will be:
Representative Judith Danielson

Work Address
Idaho State Legislature
State Capitol Building
Boise, ID 83720
Phone: (208) 334-2000

Home Address
P.O. Box 724
Council, ID 83612
Phone: (208) 253-4850
WORKPLACE LITERACY
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

LBJ Building--650 West State
Bureau of Disaster Services Conference Room
Boise, Idaho

FINA\'L AGENDA

Monday, January 29, 1990
8:30 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

Welcome
  Introductions
  Minutes

Project Update

Updates and Summations

Topics for Discussion
  Policy Implications of WPL Programs
    State Level
    Institution Level
  Processes/Procedures to Expedite
    Effective Programs
  Private Sector Needs, Constraints,
    Perception of WPL Programs
  Alternatives for Continuation of WPL Project
    if Federal Funds are not Available

Evaluation

Dr. Trudy Anderson
Dick Winn
WPL Coordinators

Dr. Tom Owens
# WPL Agenda

and

Twin Falls Visitation Schedule

## January 29, 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>WPL Steering Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Boise Cascade Container Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Cecil Ward--LBJ Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## January 30, 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Leave Red Lion Downtowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 - 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Meet with Dr. Orval Bradley and Marilyn Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Dr. Neil Cross, Marilyn Mecham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Lunch with Universal Foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Meet with Mr. Walt Stowman Mr. Dave Hess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>ESL Class - Universal Foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Math Class - Universal Foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Wrap-up with Universal Foods (if necessary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Wrap-up with College of Southern Idaho (if necessary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Arrive Red Lion Downtowner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORKPLACE LITERACY STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
January 29, 1990
LBJ Building--Disaster Services Conference Room
Boise, Idaho

WPL Steering Committee Members Present
Dr. Trudy Anderson--State Div. Voc. Ed.
Richard Sparks--ABE Director, ISU
Jane Daly--Dept Employment
George Dignan--Assn. Private Ind. Councils
(Substitute for Judith Danielson)

WPL Coordinators Present
Dean Hoch--ISU
Marti Felicione--EITC
Allison Gilmore--NIC
Cheryl Engle--BSU
Marilyn Sloan--BSU
Jim Lydon--LCSC

Others Present
Diane Redding--Dept Employment
(Substitute for Cheryl Brush)
Tom Owens--Northwest Regional Education Laboratory
Shirley Spencer--Dept Education
Dick Winn--State Division of Vocational Education
Nancy Woodruff--State Division of Vocational Education

Meeting convened at approximately 8:45 a.m. Dr. Anderson asked steering committee to review minutes of last meeting and ask if there were any comments and/or discussion of the minutes. Motion was made to approve minutes, motion was seconded and approved.

Project Update
Authorization has been granted to extend WPL project through March 1990. Idaho was one of 20 states that requested an extension. Rationale for extension was basically the same for all requests. More time was needed to introduce concept of workplace literacy to companies. Application for new grant has been made. We have not heard yet if we have been successful in obtaining new grant.

Dick Winn asked WPL coordinators to go back to their institution's accounting people and make sure they have identified all matching activities on WPL projects on an on-going basis. This match has to be reported to the federal government at the end of the project. If match can't be verified, we may have to pay back the dollars.

Questions/Concerns
Dr. Anderson asked if there were any questions or concerns concerning WPL.

Dean Hoch asked if coordinators should quit writing projects since there is only $3,000 left in WPL budget for subproposals. Dick Winn indicated that the deans/directors at each of the postsecondary vocational-technical institutions were given carryover dollars which could be used for additional WPL projects. This money can also be used for other purposes. It was suggested that coordinators talk with dean/director at their institution to discuss this further.
Application for New WPL Grant

Richard Sparks commented that there seemed to be less dialogue with federal government regarding application for the new WPL grant. Richard asked if state office felt there was any hope of getting the new grant.

Dick Winn indicated that some of the reasons for the delay in granting new WPL projects were:

- US Dept of Education had to hire new readers to read proposals, for some reason the first group of readers did not work out.
- Most all projects funded the first time resubmitted applications for continuation. Feds waited until the end of December so they could review final reports of WPL projects that ended in December.

We should know by mid February if we were successful in getting refunded.

Dr. Anderson commented that some of the competition is going to be stiff and we need to give consideration to "what if" if we are not refunded.

Coordinator Reports

Jim Lydon--LCSC
Nez Perce Indian Tribe--When project is completed we will have run 90 individuals through computer literacy class. They are requesting an addendum to run another project as soon as we can solidify funding.

Omark Blount--Interested in computer training.

Law Enforcement in Lewiston would like some Spanish classes.

Marilyn Sloan and Cheryl Engle--BSU
Emphasis has been on outlying areas. Have had about 9 or 10 projects. McCall has been very enthusiastic in regard to WPL projects. Classes have been small but attendance has been great.

Simplot has been a good corporation to work with.

Overall BSU has served close to 200 employees.

Marti Felicione--EITC
Many of projects have come to an end. Did some one-on-one company projects and some cooperative projects between agencies. EG&G and Westinghouse both have addendums to original projects. Federal agency now investigating law suit at EG&G. EG&G employees are very appreciative of classes and feel instruction has helped them in their jobs.

Dean Hoch--ISU
We have similar situation at FMC. Management wanted everyone tested and the union did not agree. The project has been stopped. FMC has been hit with a lot of environmental problems and right now are fighting for survival. They also have new drug test training program. WPL training is not high on list of priorities for now. Dean brought a request for an addendum to the Simplot Computer Literacy training. This project has gone extremely well.
Allison Gilmore--NIC

Extended bi-lingual communication classes at Elk Mountain Farms and the Police Department. WPL project did a lot for establishing good public relations for NIC in Boundary County. Allison indicated she and Bernie Knapp talked to Coeur d'Alene Indian Tribe in DeSmet about possibility of supplementing programs they already have, using whatever funding becomes available.

Feedback

Dr. Anderson asked for comments regarding ABEs role in the WPL project. Richard Sparks commented that the advertising is wonderful. Some people may be reluctant to admit to employer they don't have GED, but will enroll at ABE Center to get training needed to secure their job.

Dr. Anderson asked how successful the WPL project has been in terms of input from local advisory committees, job service, and private industry. Cheryl Engle commented that the whole health care problem in connection with certification came out at an advisory committee meeting. She felt it was important to have a large enough advisory committee, and hopes the local advisory committee effort continues.

Policy Implications of WPL Programs

Dr. Anderson pointed out there were four main players involved in the WPL project: Department of Employment, Private Industry Councils, vocational-technical system, Adult Basic Education (not including CAVES and the State Division of Vocational Education together as one). She suggested that a policy might be very appropriate at the state level and maybe even agreed upon by all those entities.

Jane Daly indicated she was very supportive of keeping the steering committee composition. She said it has helped her at Department of Employment, and doesn't want it to dissipate. Shirley Spencer commented if WPL is not refunded that we need to be open to new options of addressing workplace literacy. The need for a state group exists. George Dignan agreed it would be good at a local level to talk about delivery.

Dr. Anderson said she would be willing to write a letter to the Secretary of the Department of Education and the Secretary of the Department of Labor and other entities.

Processes/Procedures to Expedite Effective Programs

New proposal was designed to eliminate unnecessary paperwork regarding approval of WPL proposals. If the WPL application is approved, $7,500 will be available at each postsecondary school for funding proposals. The coordinators will still need to submit to the steering committee and technical review committee objectives of proposal, methods of carrying out proposal, and expected results of proposal. If the proposal is over $7,500, coordinators would submit project for review to the steering committee as was done in the past. After $7,500 is depleted, coordinators must submit request for another $7,500 to steering committee.
Private Sector Needs, Constraints, Perception of WPL Programs

Coordinators felt companies know what their training needs are. Companies have problem with the term "workplace literacy". Coordinators have called it "job related basic skills enhancement," "workplace learning," "training," and "productivity improvement activities" so companies are more receptive to the idea of WPL.

Assessment is a concern of coordinators. Dr. Anderson commented that nobody has an answer on this. TABE and CASAS are the two tools used primarily, looks like CASAS will be the tool used in the future. Coordinators indicated that testing is threatening to companies as well as employees, but coordinators felt testing is necessary to measure progress.

Alternatives for Continuation

Dr. Anderson pointed out that Dick Winn mentioned earlier in the meeting that some funds were available as an institution option. These are one-time funds -- carryover from last year -- that need to be spent this year. That is one potential for continuation for the current year. The real issue is on-going money. She indicated there is a person in the State Division that reads the Federal Register. There appears to be labor money available. Jane Daly recommended that a statewide committee could pursue funding avenues.

Dr. Anderson asked the group if they felt private industry would be willing to support workplace literacy. Response was that companies would be willing to support workplace literacy, but not the coordinators salary. There was discussion on whether or not fees should be charged for company workers to attend WPL training.

Evaluation

Tom Owens, Northwest Regional Education Laboratory is responsible for the evaluation of the WPL project. Tom handed out two evaluation questionnaires. One form is to be filled out by employers whose company received a WPL grant. The other questionnaire is to be filled out by the WPL Coordinators. He will be visiting several WPL projects while he is in Idaho, and will talk with supervisors and training coordinators at these projects.

There was discussion on how to market WPL training classes so people will attend training. This seems to be one of the hardest aspects in delivery of WPL projects. Interest is usually high when classes are advertised but often times the projected number of students do not attend training.

Tom asked the WPL Coordinators if companies recognize participants after they have received training. The response was that many companies have a reception for these employees and give them certificates of completion. In most instances however monetary gain has not been a result of taking training.

Dr. Anderson requested that Tom interview Jerry Beck, a former member of the WPL Steering Committee, while he is conducting WPL interviews in the Twin Falls area.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 1:00 p.m.
Workplace Literacy Steering Committee  
Shilo Inn - Idaho Falls  
September 11, 1989

Present: Jerry Beck, Ann Stephens, Dick Winn  
Jane Daly, Trudy Anderson, Judy Burns  
Mel Streeter, Gordon Jones, Cheryl Scroggins  
Marti Felicione, Jim Lydon

Project Update

Dick Winn provided a list of WPL projects to date. When the grant was first submitted, it was speculated that projects would run approximately $3,000 to $4,000 each. Total expenditure to date is $41,000. The matching funds are around $69,000 if all the match identified is received. There is $70,000 remaining. Match in the amount of $119,000 will be required if all funds are distributed.

The U. S. Department of Education has been contacted to request a ninety day extension on the current grant.

Marti Felicione, Workplace Literacy Coordinator from EITC feels that the first year has been basically a developmental year. The length of time between the initial contact with an employer and the actual inception of a project is too long. It has been a minimum of at least two months. She feels there is a lot of potential, but most of the first year has been spent in educating prospective clients about the project. Currently projects seem to be taking less time, as business and industry become more aware of the Workplace Literacy Project.

Marti Felicione requested permission to write a project for EG&G of Idaho and bypass the forms due to the confidentiality of the information.

A motion was made and carried to accept the project from Marti Felicione without going through the outlined procedure.

Application for New Grant

There needs to be revision of the process for applying to start a project. Forms need to be revised to facilitate the time required to obtain project approval.

GED Tapes - Coordinators did not feel they could confirm the validity of the tapes because they do not have adequate information. They do not know whether the tapes helped to bring more participants into ABE centers and could not provide information as to the use in libraries. The coordinators did feel that the tapes were effectively utilized at the schools and work sites.

It was suggested that if the tapes are used in the future a system should be developed to measure their usefulness.

Trudy Anderson suggested that the partnership reapply for a grant to include the child care, but not make it a line item so there is more flexibility.
There needs to be a more efficient way to distribute the funds and hold postsecondary schools accountable for the goals of the project. The suggestion was made that the Steering Committee set standards and goals and pass that criteria down to the local level. Local level could apply for blocks of money based on production criteria and make quarterly or bi-quarterly reports to the state office. More time should be allotted for coordinators to work on the projects.

A motion was made and carried to include the items of discussion into the grant process.

The next meeting of the Steering Committee will be scheduled for the second week in November.
WORKPLACE LITERACY
STEERING COMMITTEE
MEETING
JULY 24, 1989
RED LION/RIVERSIDE/CLEARWATER ROOM

AGENDA

Welcome
Introductions
Minutes

Evaluation

Dr. Trudy Anderson

Project Update,
Financial Report
Workplace Literacy Coordinators

Dr. Tom Owens
Linda Dutton

Future Meeting Dates

Other
WORKPLACE LITERACY
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
Monday, July 24, 1989

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT
Trudy Anderson
Richard Sparks
Mal Streeter
Cheryl Brush (attending for Jane Daly)
Jerry Beck
Teresa Sandmann

OTHERS PRESENT
Dick Winn
Linda Dutton
Shirley Spencer
Bernie Knapp
Bill Robertson
Ken Erickson
Dr. Tom Owens
Nancy Woodruff

WPL COORDINATORS PRESENT
Marilyn Sloane
Allison Gilmore
Cheryl Engle
Brent Studer (is now a Business & Industry representative)

The meeting convened at 8:30 a.m. in the Clearwater Room of the Red Lion/Riverside with Trudy Anderson presiding.

Trudy Anderson invited the Steering Committee members as well as the Coordinators to stay and attend the 1989 Vocational Educator’s Summer Conference and banquet.

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the May 22, 1989 meeting.

Marilyn Sloane commented that on the first page under St. Alphonsus Regional Medical Center “contingent upon having the WPL-43 signed by the cooperating agency”--there was not a cooperating agency.

Dick Winn and Linda Dutton explained that the required signatures were on the WPL-55. When the 43 was first designed that cooperating agency signature line was not for the business. That was a misunderstanding. That line is to be used if two or more agencies are cooperating together on a grant. The 55 is for business’s signature.

The motion to approve the minutes was moved and seconded.

Project Update

CSI

CSI has one project pending; no child care claims have been filed; hard to monitor usage of GED tapes at ABE Center, Boise Cascade and Simplot.

Trudy indicated that Jerry Garber would like to keep these tapes running as an available resource. Need a way to get information on how often these tapes are being used to justify keeping as a resource.
ISU

Has five projects pending.

EITC

Has projects pending at the hospital, EGG, Westinghouse and the police force; one child care claim has been submitted.

Boise State University

Two projects pending

Simplot--This is a continuation of previous WPL project.

Payette Lakes Care Center--Many of nurses-aides are having test anxiety in relation to OBRA test. This proposal, if approved, will help them learn how to study for this test. Trudy suggested that Dick Winn and Sandy Davis discuss this proposal and see if something similar could be done in other areas of the state.

Two child care claims have been submitted. It was pointed out that reasons for lack of child care claims could be:

- Training attended mostly by male employees
- Training held during work hours
- Child care paid for by the day, if training is only a few hours no additional payment to child care provider would be necessary

There was discussion regarding whether or not grant participants are aware of child care provisions and what the feelings of CEOs and managers are regarding child care.

Dick Winn suggested that Steering Committee might want Tom Owens to work on child care issue. He talked with Nancy Brooks in Washington DC. She indicated other states are also having trouble getting child care component off the ground.

North Idaho College

As soon as amnesty ESL program is finished, there is a real need for Spanish instruction for basic communication--this could be an ongoing program each year.

Trudy Anderson pointed out that Workforce 2000 has some very interesting data in it regarding the Hispanic population. It is the fastest growing population in the state. Odds are 50/50 they will graduate from high school. Bilingual communication could be a real WPL issue.

Trudy indicated that copies of Workforce 2000 would be mailed to everyone attending meeting.

Lewis Clark State College

No projects at this time. WPL local steering committee member from O MARK is attending summer conference.
Size of Projects

There was discussion as to size of projects—most of them are for a small amount of money. Coordinators felt WPL is a new concept and a hard program to get started. If this program continues on it would be easier to fund bigger projects now that they have an idea of what to expect.

There were inquiries made regarding continuation of WPL project.

Policy Document

A draft WPL policy document was passed out to members attending meeting. This document was reviewed. There were questions regarding level of training—below baccalaureate level. There were also questions regarding assessment. Trudy Anderson asked that everyone review this document and phone in changes to her. A finalized version will be sent out after suggestions for revisions are received. This document will give the WPL Coordinators more direction in writing grants.

Tom Owens--NWREL

Tom Owens of the Northwest Regional Education Laboratory is responsible for the WPL project evaluation. He reported that other statewide WPL grant recipients have also found that:

- 90-day start-up period stretched longer than the 90-days anticipated;
- most of training does not take place in college setting;
- they are under time constraints to meet quotas as well as deliver the program.
- lack of action regarding child care provision.

He passed out an interim report and indicated he would be visiting some local WPL projects while in Boise for Summer Conference.

There was discussion regarding pressure from middle management to meet work quotas and still let workers attend training. What is first priority—work quota or training.

Meeting Dates

The next steering committee meeting will be held in conjunction with the Idaho Job Training Council meeting in Idaho Falls. The meeting is scheduled for September 11. Members will be contacted with information for specific time and place of meeting. Future meeting dates will be decided at that meeting.

It was suggested that the Workplace Literacy Coordinators attend the WPL steering committee meeting in Idaho Falls as well as the first portion of the Idaho Job Training Council meeting. They would have to coordinate their travel with other people in their area attending the IJTC meeting, since they do not have specific travel money earmarked in their budget for this meeting.

The motion was made and approved to adjourn.
WORKPLACE LITERACY
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
9:00 a.m.
May 22, 1989
Voc. Ed. Conference Room

AGENDA

Welcome

Project Update

Project Approval (new proposals)

Welcome

Project Update

Project Approval (new proposals)

Linda Dutton

Dick Winn

NIC - 3 submitted - returned for negotiation

LCSC -

BSU - St. Alphonsus Regional Medical Center
Payette Police Department

'CSI - Boise Cascade Corrugated Container

ISU -

EIVTS -

Meeting Dates
WORKPLACE LITERACY
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
May 22, 1989

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Trudy Anderson
Richard Sparks
Mel Streeter
Jane Daly
Jerry Beck
Karma Metzler • (attending for Alice Koskela)

OTHERS PRESENT

Ann Stephens
Dick Winn
Shirley Spencer
Linda Dutton

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

Alice Koskela

The meeting convened at 9:00 a.m. in the State Division of Vocational Education Conference Room with Trudy Anderson presiding.

A motion was made and carried to approve the minutes of the March 27, 1989 meeting.

Project Update

A list of the current Workplace Literacy Grants indicating amounts funded was provided to committee members. The information requested at the last meeting regarding male/female participants follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIVTS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Workplace Literacy Coordinators have been advised to contact their local Job Service office regarding the use of the GED tapes by dislocated workers.

Project Approval

BSU - Payette Police Department

The motion was made and carried to approve the proposal for $1,210.

BSU - St. Alphonsus Regional Medical Center

The motion was made and carried to approve the proposal for $1,118 contingent upon having the WPL-43 signed by the cooperating agency.

CSI - Boise Cascade Corrugated Container
The motion was made and seconded to approve the Boise Cascade Corrugated Container proposal. The motion was defeated by voice vote.

It was the consensus of the committee that the project could not appropriately be classified as a workplace literacy activity. The project will not be reconsidered unless it falls under a clarified definition of workplace literacy.

Document of Policy for Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy

Additional clarity will be added to the basic explanation of workplace literacy as it relates to the limitation of resources through Adult Basic Education, inadequacy of funds in the Vocational Education area, the mission of "filling the gap", and assessment. It will be refined with definitions and specific language as stated in the proposal for the grant. A draft of the Document of Policy will be provided to the committee and the coordinators before it is finalized.

Update on Grants

Computerized Auto Body has been cancelled due to time constraints and inadequacy of the software.

Del Monte project at EIVTS has not started due to the company being sold.

ISU - Pocatello Fire Department is complete.

Meeting Dates

The next meeting is scheduled for July 24.

Projects received in the interim will be approved by contacting each committee member individually by phone.

Tom Owen from NWREL is tentatively planning to attend the July 24 meeting.

Other:

Regulations for the Workplace Literacy Program as published in the Federal Register of April 12, 1989 were reviewed.

Jane Daly proposed that 432.2 (a) (2) be amended to read state employment service agency rather than employment and training agency.

Steve Readet of NWREL will be holding two seminars in Oregon in July and September. The July conference will be presented by Tom Sticht and the September conference will focus on human resource personnel from industry. Some employers in Idaho may be invited.

Jerry Garber, PBS has requested information as to the utilization of the GED tapes. Shirley Spencer will contact the ABE Directors and provide this information at the next meeting. Mr. Garber is interested in readvertising and promoting the use of the GED tapes.
Reapplication

A motion was made and carried that the current partnership reapply for a second year and include Adult Basic Education as a partner.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.
WORKPLACE LITERACY
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

9:00 a.m.
March 27, 1989
Voc. Ed. Conference Room

AGENDA

Welcome.

Project Update
Linda Dutton

Project Approval
Dick Winn

LCSC - Potlatch

BSU - Simplot Food
Glenns Ferry Police Department

CSI - Boise Cascade
Simplot

ISU - Pocatello Fire Department
Simplot (revised)

EIVTS - Del Monte Foods

Financial Report
Linda Dutton

Regional Networks

Meeting Dates

Other:
COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Trudy Anderson, Chairperson
Richard Sparks
Mel Streeter
Jane Daly

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

Alice Koskela
Jerry Beck

OTHERS PRESENT

Ann Stephens
Dick Winn
Shirley Spencer
Linda Dutton

The meeting convened at 9:00 a.m. in the State Division of Vocational Education Conference Room with Trudy Anderson, Project Director presiding.

The minutes of the January 30, 1989 meeting were approved with the exception of the reference to the $5.00 per participant charge at BSU. This should be corrected to read $8.00 registration and delete the $90 administrative cost.

A motion was made and carried to approve the minutes with the noted correction.

Project Update

Linda Dutton provided an update on present activity.

All coordinators were contacted to receive input about their perception of the progress of the programs and the establishment of the committees at the local level. Information was provided on pending proposals and business contact from each area. They were also requested to provide information about the cooperative link with Job Service and Workplace Literacy Coordinators.

BSU - One program is in operation which is going very well. They have not had requests for child care. Job Service participation is excellent. The local committee has been established and one meeting has been held.

CSI - Local committee is in place. They have not had any request for child care to date. Job Service participation is excellent.

EIVTS - Have two additional applications pending, one with Good Samaritan Hospital and EG&G of Idaho. There has been no request for child care. Rapport with Job Service is excellent. Local committee has met a total of three times and will have another meeting in May.

ISU - Has an application pending with NonPariel Corporation. There is a possibility that Simplot will be closed for one month this summer which may present the opportunity for child care. The local committee is in the planning stage.
LCSC - Has an application pending with Nez Perce. There has been no request for child care. The local committee is in place and meets on an as needed basis.

NIC - Have proposals pending with Bonner County School District, AID, and Wallace Inn. A Literacy Council is in place locally and is working with the coordinator.

All coordinators feel the analysis and assessment process is too time consuming.

Project Approval

LCSC

Enriched Apprenticeship Training (Potlatch Corporation)

The motion was made and carried to approve the Potlatch Corporation proposal for $5,235.

Computerized Auto Body Management (5 Employers)

The vote of the group approved the Computerized Auto Body Management proposal for $750.00.

BSU

Simplot Food Division

The motion was made and carried to approve the Simplot proposal for $2,398.00.

Glenns Ferry Police Department

The motion was made and carried to approve the Glenns Ferry Police Department proposal for $800.00.

CSI

Simplot Food - Heyburn

Boise Cascade Corrugated Container

The motion was made and carried to approve the project contingent upon the staff reviewing the supply budget with the potential of reducing it if appropriate. Clarification is required as to whether the texts will remain in the school or be given to the student.
ISU

Pocatello Fire Department Computer Training

The motion was made and carried to approve the proposal for $1,324.00.

EIVTS

Del Monte - Communication and Computation Upgrade

The motion was made and carried to approve the proposal for $1,752.94.

Financial Report

$120,800 was set aside from the grant for programs. With projects approved to date a total of $25,814 has been spent leaving a balance $94,986. Committed match at this time is $32,437, which is $76,500 short of total required match.

Regional Networking

Trudy Anderson suggested using the local steering committee to establish region-wide networks by using a forum to bring in other providers. The forum would result in the development of local plans to be exchanged from region to region. The grant requires establishment of regional networks. This idea and others will be discussed further at the next meeting.

Meeting Date

The next meeting will be scheduled for the second or third week in May.

Projects will be distributed and approved by telephone if necessary prior to the next meeting.

Other:

Richard Sparks has a $40,000 match in computer equipment donated by Apple to be utilized in the workplace literacy setting. These will be established in mobile units to be utilized at various sites.
WORKPLACE LITERACY
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

January 30, 1989
9:00 - 11:00 a.m.
Voc. Ed. Conference Room

AGENDA

Welcome

Progress Report--activities in each region
Linda Dutton

Amended Forms & Procedures
Child Care Provisions
Ann Stephens
Others
Linda Dutton

Project Applications - Requests for Approval
Boise State University

Other:

Adjourn WPL Steering Committee Meeting

Adult Basic Education
Shirley Spencer, SDE
WORKPLACE LITERACY
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
January 30, 1989

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT
Trudy Anderson, Chairperson
Jerry Beck
Richard Sparks
Alice Koskela
Mel Streeter
Jane Daly

OTHERS PRESENT
Ann Stephens
Shirley Spencer
Linda Dutton
Pat Schubert

The meeting convened at 9:10 a.m. in the State Division of Vocational Education Conference Room with Trudy Anderson, Project Director presiding.

A motion was made and carried to approve the minutes of the December 15, 1988 meeting.

Progress Report

Business and industry contact network--distributed 500 informational brochures to each school and a total of 700 to the Department of Employment. The coordinators have indicated that the brochures have gone to individual businesses, Chamber of Commerce, PIC, Department of Employment and some of the Social Service networking areas. The coordinators have been advised to put more specific information in their January monthly report as to the distribution.

BSU has a proposal for review at this meeting and has mailed 300 brochures with a letter of explanation. Five agencies have expressed interest.

NIC has a prospective program with Unitech and another good prospect to hopefully submit for the March meeting.

EIVTS has been working on a large project with INEL, but there is no determination as to whether the money can be used as match or whether it retains its identify as federal money. They have four others expressing interest in the project.

CSI had a prospective proposal with Ore-Ida which apparently has now been funded by Ore-Idaho.

ISU is revising a proposal with Simplot and have two additional prospects identified.

LCSC reported no prospects at this time.
Staff training to date has consisted of orientation in October, audio conference in November and the staff conference in December. There may be need to do additional staff training with the coordinators, short-term training directors and ABE director. It has been suggested that the group meet again and have a resident "expert" provide methods on business contact. There is no monetary provision in the grant to do additional staff training.

GED tapes started running on January 14. PSA's were sent to all the media within the state.

Amended Forms & Procedures

Form WPL-27A,-27B, and -55 have been revised by deleting some of the repetitive information.

The 27A is the Individualized Development Plan which the instructor would go over with the employee prior to class beginning. Employee would retain a copy of this form.

The 27B would serve as reporting mechanism at the end of the project. This form would be filed only at the school.

The -55 has been shortened by eliminating the questionable statements.

It was suggested that the word testing be replaced with the term assessment. It was also recommended that this form be personalized to each employer situation by utilizing automated equipment at the local level.

The revised WPLP forms were reviewed. Child Care Connections feels they need to have a receipt from the participant before they can release the check. Child Care Connections will develop the form. The checks will be issued twice a month. The statement "I verify that there is no other adult in the home that can provide child care during this training time." was questioned with regard to discrimination. Ann Stephens will check on this. Maximum rate is $1.50/hr. Revise to read, "I understand that the maximum that can be paid for the care of my child is $1.50/hr." This should only be addressed once on the form.

Attendance report is for Coordinator and CCC. The participant will provide a receipt to CCC for payment. There is no involvement with IRS as long as the appropriate accountability is in place to the project.

It was moved and seconded that the forms be accepted with the suggested revisions.

Project Applications

A project from BSU has been submitted for the Wasterwater Treatment Plant in Nampa. The technical review process indicated that they cannot include indirect cost. This will be deleted from the proposal and it will be
recommended for approval. It is also recommended that it is a reasonable request to include a $5.00 per participant charge that would help to defray the cost of the paperwork through the institution. This could be considered Administrative Cost for a total of $90.

It was moved and carried that the Proposal from BSU be accepted with the deletion of the Indirect Cost in the amount of $100 and placing this under Administrative Cost at the rate of $90.

Other:

The Committee feels that they should assume the role of fostering the continuance of training after the project has completed their obligation by promoting it through public awareness.

A copy of BSU's approved proposal should be forwarded to the Coordinators for use as prototype in their development.

Public awareness- DOE was to be the key contact as the grant is written. Jane Daly reported a concern that the DOE was not being involved with initial business contacts nor with the job analysis and followup.

DOE sees their role as employer relations entity...offered in the partnership to be public relations arm. Saw coordinator coming to Job Service for information as to which employers may need help. DOE should have ongoing information on the progress of the program. Resolve through local steering committee.

The WPL Steering Committee will work to resolve the issue of coordination between Job Service and the WPL Coordinator.

DOE would like feedback from Linda Dutton as to what issues are developing in the field.

Projects will be forwarded as they are recommended by the technical review committee. Conference calling will be utilized if necessary to make final approval.

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.
AGENDA

Formative Evaluation Process
Dr. Tom Owens, NWREL

Project Child Care Provisions
Child Care Connections representatives
Ann Stephens, SDVE

Approval of Applications
Committee

Establishment of Steering Committee
Trudy Anderson
Meeting Dates

Other:
COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT
Trudy Anderson, Chairperson
Jerry Beck
Richard Sparks
Alice Koskela
Darrell Lewis (for Mel Streeter)

Absent: Jane Daly

OTHERS PRESENT
Tom Owens, NWREL
Ann Stephens
Pat Schubert

The meeting convened at 9:15 a.m. in the Opal Room of the Red Lion Riverside with Trudy Anderson, Project Director presiding.

Alice Koskela, Dr. Tom Owens and Darrell Lewis were introduced.

A motion was made and carried to approve the minutes of the November 10, 1988 meeting.

Formative Evaluation Process

Dr. Owens summarized the meeting he had with Nancy E. Smith, U. S. Department of Education, Workplace Literacy Project Director in Washington, D.C. Ms. Smith is new to the area of workplace literacy and continues to execute other assignments in addition to this project. Dr. Owens was interested in determining what her perception of the evaluation would look like---what she would be interested in and what type of information the Department is looking for. She indicated that she felt the evaluation should be providing technical assistance to the program. She is looking for something more than an end-of-year project report that would come in as a final document. The interest is mainly in the success of the project and characteristics that lead to successful partnerships with industry and education.

Seattle King PIC has also been funded for a workplace literacy project and Dr. Owens will try to find out what this project involves and the monitoring approach it will assume.

Ms. Smith referred Dr. Owens to Bill Delaney in the Department of Labor as a person knowledgeable about the workplace literacy project. Dr. Owens distributed summaries of his notes from the two conferences in D.C. and a project description. The first phase is to develop an instrument to be utilized to give a general picture of the level of workplace literacy of the group involved. A multiple matrix sample process which gives individuals
tested approximately 500 items is being used. From this sampling of each person they will put together a composite picture of the total group. The second phase of the project which assembles individually reliable measures of literacy will not occur for approximately one year.

Dr. Owens contacted Jewels Goodason from Educational Testing Service and will find out from him what type of assessment instruments may be available at the present time. Currently there is a background survey available in terms of type of information they are collecting on adults in the workplace for JTPA clients.

Dr. Owens feels it is necessary that the project continue to be in contact with the Department of Labor and keep them informed of the progress as they have a strong interest in workplace literacy.

Based on the discussion of the meeting, reading the proposal and the material presented at the conference, Dr. Owens will develop a design to identify what the steps will be for the evaluation during the year. It will focus largely on gathering information that would be useful for program improvement in contrast to information that would be usable only by external people, that might be looking only at outcomes. The evaluation will look both at needs the program is serving, and processes that are being used to summarize documentation that is being done by workplace literacy coordinators. The first purpose would be the improvement and modification of the project as it takes place, based upon information from the first few months for refinement and reshaping the project. The second purpose would be to adequately document what effect takes place so that other states that are interested in a state approach to workplace literacy might access the information. A third use of the information would be if you are in a position after the federal funding to want to continue receiving funds from private industry and other sources, clear documentation of what took place, what problems were encountered and what was accomplished would enhance the opportunity to secure additional funding from other sources.

Dr. Owens proposed that NWREL work with the workplace literacy coordinators to identify a total of about 200 employees that are receiving training that he would collect more intensive information from as to the reasons they took the training, the type of help they received, and documentation of what was provided. Dr. Owens would also like to survey by telephone the coordinators to get their assessment of the processes that are being utilized and the impact that they are seeing, particularly since the impact might be very different from one company to another. A semi annual status report will be available that summarizes the monthly reports as submitted by the coordinators. This type of collection of information can present more of a profile of the project as a total. In addition to the final evaluation there will also be an executive summary.

Dr. Owens plans to meet at least twice during the year with the Steering Committee to determine what the committee feels are some of the important issues, or items that he should be alert to during the course of the evaluation.
Dr. Owens requested that the committee elaborate on what they would like to see learned as a result of the year's experience.

1. Determine how effective the child care component is in recruiting and maintaining participants.

2. Documentation of augmentation by industry of the actual partnership participation. Types of long-term investment by industry. Define what advantages were in dollars provided by industry as opposed to dollars provided by education. Clarification of term partnership.

3. What is most effective contact point with employers (level of management).

Trudy Anderson distributed copies of the Objectives for Workplace Literacy Conference and the Objectives for Workplace Literacy Staff Training.

**Project Child Care Provisions**

Child Care Connections will provide services in three areas. Resource and referral, networking, and making vendor payments to child care providers.

Drafts of instruments to be utilized for the child care were distributed for review and comment.

Concern was expressed as to the complexity of the is perhaps intimidating the participant. This may be resolved through the coordinator working with the participant. The question arose as to the level of literacy of the people the project would be dealing with relative to completing the form.

Richard Sparks suggested that the project check with Head Start to see how they operated their child care support.

Ann Stephens will work with Child Care Connections to revise the process for child care payment. Alternatives will be explored for providing payment directly to the recipient rather than to the child care provider. In either event, Child Care Connections would handle the reimbursements for child care.

**Approval of Applications**

The Committee agreed at the November 10 meeting to review applications during this meeting if it was necessary to get the project running the first part of January.

A project from J. R. Simplot - Food Service Division in Aberdeen is submitted by Idaho State University.

The recommendation of the technical review committee is that the project be approved contingent upon several items. There needs to be a narrative within the budget which explains what the purchases would be rather than just budget figures. There needs to be clarification of the participant assessment.
The current skill levels and the levels the participants are to obtain through the training should be included as well as documentation as to whether they attained the level.

Trudy moved that the Committee approve the proposal contingent upon the suggested revisions. The vote was unanimous that it be accepted under these conditions and that it be mailed out to the members of the Steering Committee once the revisions have been made.

The form WPL-27A, WPL-27B, WPL-55 and Format for Workplace Literacy Job Analysis and Employee Assessment were distributed. These documents will be discussed with the coordinators at the December 16 meeting.

Meeting Dates

The January 26 date needs to be changed to January 30. The July date will be changed to July 24 to coincide with Summer Conference. All other dates were agreed upon as proposed.

The possibility of meeting at some of the sites was discussed. The chairperson said she would leave this up to the coordinators to determine if this is feasible.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.
AGENDA

9:00 a.m. Approval of Minutes
Update of Project
Staff Training
December Conference
Formative Evaluation

Finalization of Informational Brochure
Distribution List

Other:
Adjourn

10:15 a.m. Introduction to Workplace Literacy Coordinators

10:30 a.m. Audio Conference
WORKPLACE LITERACY
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
November 10, 1988

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Trudy Anderson, Chairperson
Jane Daly
Jerry Beck
Richard Sparks
Mel Streeter

OTHERS PRESENT

Don Eshelby
Pat Schubert

Absent: Alice Koskela

Trudy Anderson convened the meeting at 10:15 a.m.

A motion was made and carried to approve the minutes of the
October 7, 1988 meeting.

UPDATE OF PROJECT

The Local Partnership for Workplace Literacy and Idaho
Partnership for Workplace Literacy charts were discussed. Don
Eshelby will be responsible for revision of the charts at the
state level to reflect all necessary information for those
involved. The acronyms will be spelled out and Local Committee
representation will be defined.

The brochure for the December conference was provided to the
members of the committee. 5,000 copies were printed. Brochures
will be disseminated through a mass mailing. Suggested
recipients are as follows:

Private Industry Council 200
Southwest Idaho Private Industry Council 400
Department of Employment 600
(SJTCC, JSEC, COGS)
Postsecondary Vo-Tech Schools 140 (20-30 ea.)
Teacher Education 20
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory 10
Health and Welfare 150
Treasurer Valley Community College 10
Office of the Governor 20
Department of Commerce 25
State Board of Education 10
Department of Education 10
State Library (to be determined)
State Council on Vocational Education 15
Idaho Association of Commerce & Industry (to be determined)
American Society for Training and Development
(distribute through Shirley Silver)

WPL Coordinators 100 ea.
A tentative rooming list for December conference was discussed.

This list will include the Job Service, WPL Coordinator, and Postsecondary Short-Term Training personnel.

Names for the Department of Employment participants were provided to Linda Dutton.

**FORMATIVE EVALUATION**

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory has agreed to do the evaluation. Tom Owens will be in Washington, D.C. the end of November and will be meeting with federal people to clarify the evaluation criteria.

**INFORMATIONAL BROCHURE**

10,000 to 15,000 copies to be printed. A separate mailer will provide questions discussed at the October 7 meeting. The committee concluded that a name should be provided for the contact at the vocational school. These names will be added to the brochure when it is printed.

Other:

Jane Daly requested that all coordination with the Department of Employment regarding the Workplace Literacy Project go through her office.

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m.
AGENDA

Approval/Modification of Guidelines

Project Up-date
   Schedule of Staff Training and Conference
   Child Care Provision
   Airing of KET/GED Tapes
   Formative Evaluation

Steering Committee Discussion Topics
   Definition/Discussion of Terms (as they apply to the grant)
   Model of Relationships
   ABE - Short-term Skills Training - DOE Staff

Identification/Referral Network
   PIC Role
   DOE Role/JSEC
   Use of Information Brochure and/or Survey

Instrument
   Training Overview
      Audits
      Curriculum Development and Delivery
      Identification/Referral

Proposal Overview
   Procedures for Submitting
   Expectations

Other:
WORKPLACE LITERACY
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
October 7, 1988

MINUTES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Trudy Anderson, Chairperson
Jane Daly
Jerry Beck
Bill Tennant (attending for Mel Streeter)
Richard Sparks

OTHERS PRESENT

Orval Bradley
Larry Lannigan
Josie Chancey
Linda Dutton
Shirley Spencer
Dick Winn
Pat Schubert

Absent: Alice Koskela

Trudy Anderson opened the meeting at 8:30 a.m.

The first topic of discussion was the guidelines and by-laws. During the last meeting of the committee it was agreed upon by the group that operational procedures and clarification of membership was necessary.

MEMBERSHIP

Responsibility of committee members is to guide and direct the Project and be involved in decision making. Members of the committee are those individuals identified in the proposal as representing each of the partners.

The provision relating to alternates was discussed. Jerry Beck moved that members not attending three consecutive meetings of the committee without a designated alternate that their representative group be contacted for a reappointment. The motion was seconded and carried.

Orval Bradley requested clarification on the six members of the Committee. The Chair responded with the following information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane Daly</td>
<td>Department of Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Sparks</td>
<td>Adult Basic Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Beck</td>
<td>Private Industry Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mel Streeter</td>
<td>CAVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trudy Anderson</td>
<td>State Division of Vocational Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Koskela</td>
<td>Office of the Governor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OFFICERS AND THEIR DUTIES

Jane Daly moved for a wording change of Item 7 under Officers and Their Duties to read "coordination and the disseminate information and related materials." This would delete the term proposal. The motion was seconded and carried.

MEETINGS

Meetings will be held in October, November and December and in alternate months for the remaining 12 months of the Project.

AGENDA ITEMS

Two working days notice is required to agenda an item. The chairperson recommended consideration of acting upon items brought to the meetings. As currently stated it does not allow the Chair to act upon items without prior notice and they would be deferred to the next meeting. The group agreed to act upon appropriate items that had not been agendaeed.

QUORUM

No questions, comments or suggestions.

RULES

Robert's Rules of Order will be adhered to during all meetings of the Committee.

AMENDMENTS

Changes, additions, deletions to guideline can be made as long as the Committee has written notice in advance.

SUGGESTED DATES

Meeting dates of Committee are November 10 and December 14. These dates will be in conjunction with other activities involving WPL coordinators, DOE representatives and Postsecondary Short-Term coordinators. The Committee will be involved in this activity as well as making provision for time to take action on items requiring their attention.

The November 10 meeting includes the audio conference on workplace literacy from Ohio State University scheduled from 11:00 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. Meeting start times will be scheduled at 8:30 a.m. Don Eshelby will make arrangements for the audio conference and participants will be notified of time and location. The audio conference will be taped for use at the local level. Additional books will be purchased from Ohio State for regional dissemination with the tapes.
PROJECT UPDATE

All concerns identified in the telephone conference of September 8 with the U.S. Department of Education were addressed in the information forwarded to Jane Thompson on September 27, 1988. All budget reductions are reflected in the correspondence. Major changes consisted of the requirement of an outside evaluator and cost for a representative to attend project directors meeting in Washington, D.C. Neither of these requirements were stated in the RFP. The $10,808 for the Kentucky tapes includes broadcast rights for one year, unlimited off-air recording rights and computer component. Unlimited copies of the computer component are granted. Tapes will be aired through PBS at BSU on Saturday afternoon and possibly on Wednesdays. Sufficient tapes will be provided to each institution for downloading of entire set of tapes for utilization as appropriate. Material can be duplicated from 3/4" to 1" to broadcast tapes on statewide basis...can be downloaded but cannot be copied once they have been downloaded. Steering Committee should determine who should be contacted regarding the airing of this information who are not a part of the project, i.e. Idaho Migrant Council.

The Chair requested that Richard Sparks serve as a Sub-chair in coordination with Shirley Spencer and Don Eshelby to develop the strategy for publicizing and organizing the delivery of the GED materials. Information is to be provided public libraries, public broadcasting stations regarding appropriate phone number. Coordination should also be established with State Department of Education. A form needs to be designed to verify the air time utilized for documentation of the match. The Department of Employment has a form which could be utilized for in-kind match. Work of this sub-committee is to be completed and presented at the November 10 meeting.

CHILD CARE PROVISION

Child Care Connections of Boise will be the referral group for the grant. 13,432 hours of care is available. The employee will complete application form to be signed for verification by the employer and the coordinator. Relatives will not be paid for child care. If center is licenced they can continue care even though it is a relative. Provision for child care in rural areas will be dealt with on an individual, as required basis.

STAFF TRAINING AND CONFERENCE

Issues to be addressed will be child care component, what is the grant, how does it work, what does it mean? Coordinators are the fulcrum for connection to Adult Basic Education, Postsecondary Short-Term Coordinator and Job Service personnel. A list of names and locations will be provided to coordinators to contact. Training is scheduled from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at
the Red Lion Riverside, Emerald Room on October 13, 1988.

The December 14-16 meeting will be a statewide kickoff and orientation to workplace literacy. The meeting on the 14th will be open to all employers and interested individuals. A brochure will be mailed out prior to the meeting. Room rate is $54 for those outside the working group. The Governor has been invited to address the group. Dr. Tom Sticht will be the presenter for the three days of the conference. The first day is a conference and the remaining two days are considered training sessions. The schedule is 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. The first three hours of the conference will be Dr. Tom Sticht and information about workplace literacy, the importance of the process and the outcomes of workplace literacy. There will be a registration fee of $20 (includes lunch) for those not directly associated with the project. A luncheon speaker will address the child care issue.

The panel will be comprised of approximately five people to react to the content of the three-hour presentation of Dr. Sticht. Following the panel Dr. Sticht will provide a summary as a reaction to the panel discussion.

Don requested help from those present in identifying the people to whom the brochure should be mailed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Tom Sticht - Concept of WPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Hosted Luncheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Overview of Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Reactor Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Sticht Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Room rate for project people only will be $40 per night without tax. A rooming list and information for the brochure is due by November 1 to Don Eshelby.

Suggestions for panel members:
- Jim Hawkins - DOC
- Julie Kilgrow - DOE
- Omak Personnel Mgr.
- Kay Lamberson - HP
- Employer from Eastern Idaho

Dr. Sticht should be apprised of the parameters related to the composition of the audience and limitations of the project within Idaho.

AUDIT

Larry Lannigan distributed copies of the descriptions of Idaho Postsecondary Short-term Vocational Training. The most significant ones are: Industry Specific Upgrade Training, Entry/Reentry Training and Industry Specific Upgrade Training. The Project needs to be delivered in conjunction with ABE and
Specific Skill Training in an effort to bridge the two. Project should be delivering something that fits needs of business and industry. A change in the method of dealing with employers is required. Employer/employee should not be aware of when workplace literacy leaves off and technical training begins.

EVALUATION

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory has been contacted regarding the formative evaluation. Guidelines for evaluation will not be received until after the Washington, D.C. conference. NWREL will be flexible on cost factor. Dr. Larry McClure, Director of the Education and Work Program has referred the responsibility of the evaluation to Dr. Tom Owens.

DEFINITION/DISCUSSION OF TERMS

Copies of proposed definitions were provided by Linda Dutton. Linda suggested that perhaps the group would want to look at other terms to utilize in place of both audit and workplace literacy in view of the earlier discussion of the negative connotation of these terms. The group felt it was premature to establish guidelines at this point until there was an opportunity to see what employers actually require. Assessment will be a job analysis, not a task analysis or operational analysis.

Currently there is not a better definition for workplace literacy; the definition should evolve out of the operation of the project.

Shirley and Dick are planning some cooperative travel and visitations to schools in each area to bring together the local team and talk through the project.

There will be additional work done prior to November 10 to develop the terminology to appropriately identify the "audit".

IDENTIFICATION/REFERRAL NETWORK

A blanket mailing of a brochure should be made to identified employers. Identification of the employers may possibly come from IACI, JSEC and other employer bases. PIC may also provide information as to who might benefit from the project.

PIC's will play a vital role when the time arrives to make the contact with employers. They can "open doors" and help you get to the appropriate personnel. PIC partners should not be requested to identify employers.

The brochure should be simple and include a card to return requesting additional information as well as a phone number. The word literacy should not appear on the brochure.
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY

Once materials workers are to use are identified they should be incorporated into the curriculum. Curriculum building will be addressed by Dr. Sticht. Use materials from job and simulate materials from the job. The job description of the coordinator should be changed to reflect the coordination and adaptation of curriculum to meet workplace needs rather than actual development of curriculum.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.
WORKPLACE LITERACY
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
September 12, 1988

- Introductions
- Project Overview
- Role of Steering Committee
- U.S. Department of Education Conference Call
  - review of budget
- Steering Committee Discussion Topics
  - provision of child care
  - use of formative evaluation
  - broadcast of GED preparation
  - development of staff training program/s, procedural guidelines, and literacy audit
  - appointment of a technical committee/s
  - establishment of an identification/referral network
  - development of a dissemination of information plan to pertinent agencies and organizations
    - need for an informational brochure
    - terminology - "literacy" may not be a desirable term for use with some employers
- Other
- Adjourn
DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES
Dissemination activities included the distribution of over 4,500 workplace literacy brochures throughout the state of Idaho. Copies were sent to business and industry, social service agencies, postsecondary schools, private industry councils, job service offices, and other interested agencies/organizations. Workplace literacy presentations were made to the Idaho state Council on Vocational Education, Idaho Association of Private Industry Councils, and State Job Training Council. Presentations were also made at the American Vocational Association Conference, Orlando, Florida, as well as a local community college in Orlando, and to participants at the Inland Northwest workforce conference in Spokane, Washington.

Copies of this final report and project evaluation are also being disseminated to Mr. William Daniels, Director, Northwest Curriculum Coordination Center Network in Lacey, Washington, and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career and Vocational Education. An original and two copies will be disseminated to Catherine DeLuca, Chief, Section D, Grants Division, US Dept. of Education, and a courtesy copy to Nancy Smith Brooks, US Dept. of Education. Copies will also be sent to members of the steering committee of the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy and to Dr. Trudy Anderson, State Administrator of the State Division of Vocational Education.

There were no changes in key personnel for this project.
EVALUATION
Idaho Workplace Literacy Project

Final Evaluation Report

Prepared by

Thomas R. Owens
Education and Work Program
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204

March 1990
This final report summarizes: 1) the design used in evaluating the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project, 2) findings regarding the Workplace Literacy Conference, 3) staff training, 4) the Workplace Literacy coordinators' monthly reports, 5) steering committee, coordinators, and employers interviews, 6) the Employee Skills Training Survey, and concludes with some overall evaluator's reflections. Appendix A contains the tabulation of the Employee Skills Training Survey, and Appendix B summarizes an evaluation of the literacy conference and staff training workshop.

1. Evaluation Design

The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) has been contracted by the Idaho Division of Vocational Education to conduct an independent evaluation of the Project. The design consists of a statement of the proposed evaluation questions to guide the evaluation, data collection procedures, timeline, and reporting arrangements. The evaluation is being conducted to provide feedback to the staff for program improvement and to document the processes and outcomes of the project. The latter information should be of special interest to those thinking of replicating all or part of this workplace literacy project as well as to policymakers. Information from the evaluation should also be useful in obtaining funding for the continuation of the project after this year of federal funding.

Evaluation Questions

The evaluation questions were developed as a result of reviewing the project proposal, discussing the information needs with the project monitor in Washington, D.C., and discussion and feedback from the project's steering committee at their meeting in Boise in December 1988.

1. To what extent have the program objectives been met in terms of:
   a. increasing the availability of basic literacy services and activities?
   b. establishing an identification and referral network?
   c. providing programs to meet the needs of adults with limited English language proficiency?
   d. providing workplace literacy programs designed to upgrade basic literacy and occupational skills?

2. What contributed to the successes and failures of the project?

3. How important and effective was the child care component in recruiting and maintaining participants?

4. What role did business and industry play in the partnership? What types of long-term investments did they make? How large was their dollar investment?
5. What is the most effective contact point within a company's management structure in reaching employers to identify literacy needs and solutions?

6. How successful was the workplace literacy staff training?

7. How effectively has the project disseminated its practices to other interested parties?

Data Collection Procedures

The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) is using a number of strategies in evaluating the above objectives. These include: 1) a review and analysis of the monthly reports submitted by the Workplace Literacy Project (WLP) coordinators; 2) observation and participant survey of those attending the staff training in December; 3) a survey of approximately 200 people receiving workplace literacy training to upgrade literacy and occupational skills; and 4) a telephone survey of the WLP coordinators regarding assessment of the objectives identified above.

2. Workplace Literacy Conference Evaluation

The Workplace Literacy Conference was evaluated at the end of the day by 56 participants. The conference was found to be very helpful in providing participants with additional information on workplace literacy. A four point rating scale from "very helpful" to "of no value" was used for seven items. Table 1 shows the results. None of the statements were rated as "of no value" and the majority were rated as "very helpful."
TABLE 1

Workplace Literacy Conference Evaluation Ratings

Please rate the Conference on the following by circling:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Helpful</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Limited Value</th>
<th>No Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Did the Conference provide you with additional information on Workplace Literacy?</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Will the information you received help you address the Workplace Literacy concerns in your organization/agency?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the topic adequately covered by the main speaker?</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was there sufficient time for discussion and questions?</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was the Panel discussion helpful to you in addressing your concerns?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What was your overall rating of the Conference?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Would you recommend this conference to your associates?</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the open-ended section, participants were asked to identify topics for future conferences. Most of the suggestions focused on implementation issues and a desire for successful examples. A listing of specific comments made is shown here.

- How to do it. Success stories next summer. Importance to high school teachers.
- Training programs for women in workplace and wanting to enter job market.
- Who/how will pay for training?
- Please no more conferences, meetings, and surveys - lets do something.
• Immigration - what are this new group's literacy needs?

• Whose role it is to provide literacy training and why. What are the key advantages to employers?

• How to approach employee and help him recognize there is a problem? Getting parents involved.

• Implications for career planning educators in secondary schools.

• Relationship of workplace literacy to job productivity.

• Recruiting/identifying employees in need.

• From worker/labor viewpoint - who benefits and why from workplace literacy.

• Conducting needs assessment in specific skills areas.

• Come to a consensus of a short definition on what is literacy and have statistics on Idaho for this definition.

• Alternative schools for dropout pregnant teens.

• More information on establishing programs.

• Attitudes of employees, more employer input.

• What is going to be done about this issue?

• Examples of materials from other states/organizations doing workplace literacy.

• Initiatives to deal with targeted populations.

• The discrimination factor involved in testing available resources for ABE classes in rural areas - networking, money for pilot projects.

• Private sector "success" stories.

• Evaluation of efforts, Department of Education's philosophy.

• How to implement in an academic institution.

• More discussion on secondary education.

Participants were also asked for their general comments. The most frequent comments were praise for Dr. Sticht's presentation. Some people commented on the ambiguity remaining in the term "literacy."
3. Workplace Literacy Staff Training Evaluation

The staff training was evaluated by 26 participants. Participants rated 11 topics presented as excellent, good, fair, or poor. Rated the highest were the sessions on effectiveness of trainers and the session on job analysis. Rated lowest was the session on child care. In their overall rating of the training sessions, most participants rated the training as good. Table 2 contains their ratings.

TABLE 2

Workplace Literacy Staff Training Evaluation

Please rate the training in-service in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Analysis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Assessment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Reports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval Process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Tools</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative Evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching Fund Identification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Materials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Trainer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Effectiveness of Training Sessions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In open-ended questions, participants were asked to identify strengths of the training session and ways it could have been improved. Major strengths reported included the insights of Tom Sticht and the practical applications of what he said. Suggestions for improvement included clarification of purposes for the training and of roles of various agencies and persons involved. More specific training for individual provider groups was also recommended.

4. Coordinators' Reports

Narrative monthly reports were received in time for this report from coordinators at all six sites for October 1988 through November 1989. Although the reports were not structured in a uniform manner, we looked to see the
extent to which they covered evaluation issues reflected in the NWREL evaluation design. Table 3 displays the areas of focus identified in the evaluation design and the extent to which various sites addressed these issues. As can be seen in Table 3, most of the areas were covered in the coordinator's reports except the child care issue and factors considered to be contributing to the success or failure of the project.

Table 3
Contents of Workplace Literacy Coordinator's Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Idaho State University</th>
<th>Boise State University</th>
<th>N. Idaho College</th>
<th>Lewis &amp; Clark State College</th>
<th>College of Southern Idaho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Factors contributing to success or failure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Child care effects</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Business partnerships</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Managements contact points</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Staff training</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Project dissemination</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Availability of basic literacy services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Identification and referral networks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Programs for English language proficiency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Upgrading literacy and occupational skills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Listed below are some general observations about the coordinators' reports.

1. Some WLP sites were further along in implementing workplace literacy than others. Most of the classes were offered at workplace locations.

2. Child care needs seldom appeared to be an issue to the persons involved in the training. Although many businesses were asked about the need, only in a few cases was child care requested.

3. Business partnerships occurred in all six project locations. Some of the postsecondary institutions were trading teaching time for space.

4. The needs assessment part of the program was implemented. In one location, there was some resistance from the workers as to why they needed to be tested. In another case the management expressed the feeling that the given assessment was unfair.

5. The referral network is in place at all of the postsecondary institutions. Most are using the media to spread the news of WLP. All institutions are using the brochures as distribution materials, some by "blanket" distribution, others sending brochures only upon contact with a company.

6. ESL was an area of need in only several of the postsecondary institutions who have contacted businesses.

7. Because of the differences in reporting formats used by the individual coordinators in their monthly reports, the evaluator was unable to prepare a valid statistical tabulation across sites by month. However, the narrative sections of the reports were quite enlightening. Perhaps the quote from a project instructor best captures the depth of the impact the project had on some workers.

"The real success of this program lies not only with the increased test scores, but the changed attitudes and outlooks of the people. The majority of the people involved first approached this program as a way to improve their math skills in order to help their children with their math homework. They were hesitant and unsure as they approached the material. Then their attitudes about themselves and the work changed. They began to act and feel like they were important people. Many times they expressed the desire to help themselves as well as their children. To earn a G.E.D. became the goal of many, and to take some college courses was a goal of others. They felt good about themselves and their employer who had helped provide this opportunity to them."
5. Interviews with Steering Committee, Coordinators, and Employers

Steering Committee

At the January 1990 steering committee meeting, it was suggested that the NWREL evaluation might include interviews with the steering committee members as well as those already planned with the coordinators and employers. Interviews were held with three of the steering committee who could be reached by telephone. Four question areas guided the interview: 1) the perceived effectiveness of the steering committee, 2) strengths of the project, 3) weaknesses of the project, and 4) suggestions for continuation of the project after the federal grant. Shown below is a summary of responses organized around these four areas.

1. How effective do you feel the Workplace Literacy Project (WLP) Steering Committee has been?

About 7 on a 1 to 10 scale according to one committee member. It took us a long time to make decisions but they did get made. The breadth of membership was helpful. Everyone worked together. We should have had better guidelines or position descriptions for coordinators to assure that they could deal effectively with business and industry.

The committee brought together key people whose cooperation was needed. Over the first three or four meetings, there was great debate over the term "workplace literacy." Eventually, individual members started to trust each other and turf issues subsided. An advantage was that the committee was kept at a small working group size. Everybody was involved and spoke up. The committee was perceived by one member as having too heavy a Boise representation.

2. What were the major strengths of the WLP?

Child care was a strength even though seldom used. It set a precedent and showed our commitment. It removed an excuse for not participating. It wasn't used much because a lot of the WLP training was during work hours. The lack of child care never became an issue.

We need to let industry decide what "workplace literacy" means not have educators tell them. For example, they could include interpreter training at Ore-Ida. The Boise Cascade plant now has a commitment to workplace literacy training because educators didn't dictate to the company what to do.

All players worked together.

The project was timely, had good visibility, and media coverage. It raised awareness of business and industry regarding the role education needs to play in helping meet their needs. It made a difference. Postsecondary
people are now talking seriously about designing tailored programs for business.

The Idaho project attempted to look at all aspects of workplace literacy and was not confined to a single industry, as were workplace literacy projects in other states. The model developed was particularly appropriate for rural states with many small diversified companies. Also, we did company needs assessments to assure relevant training rather than trying to sell companies on a pre-established package.

The cooperate effects of the right people, including the Job Service, were important. It brought short-term trainers and ABE directors together to start working with each other for the first time. It also broadens the focus of vocational education by including workplace literacy needs.

Some companies are now saying they are willing to pay for workplace literacy training such as ESL and basic upgrading.

The steering committee agreed to continue meeting at least annually after the project terminated in order to coordinate future issues and activities.

3. What were the major weaknesses of the workplace literacy project?

Time delays in responding to the training needs of business, and inadequate training of coordinators regarding expectations for them, were mentioned as weaknesses.

It would have been good to have the coordinators meet more often with the steering committee. We needed more statewide involvement from industry, and their representation on the steering committee.

We set our operations to strictly meet federal requirements and thus created too much paperwork.

We needed a second year of funding to test out the ideas since it took longer than expected to get started. Ideally we would have had a three-year funding period with declining federal dollars in the last 18 months as companies started picking up the training costs.

4. What suggestions do you have for continuation of workplace literacy training?

Use vocational education retraining funds, ABE/GED funds, and state funds to continue workplace literacy. Business and industry are willing to add in-kind contributions. We need to be realistic that many businesses will not pay for workplace literacy. Perhaps the federal funds should be used for workplace literacy of newly hired employees.
Although the federal project has ended, the need continues. The ABE programs could use amnesty funds. We could use JTPA 8 percent money also.

We learned a lot about child care needs and ways to help arrange quality care without always using federal funds. Also, we saw the importance of child care as an incentive to some workers and learned how to find quality providers.

Coordinator Interviews

Listed below are the ten questions used to guide the group interview in January 1990 with the project coordinators and their responses. Also included are the responses from a second interview with the coordinator and college representative at the College of Southern Idaho.

1. **What have been the major tasks you have performed on the workplace literacy project?**

Contacts with business and industry, recruiting instructors, recruiting workers for classes, networking with various agencies, writing application proposals, helping in curriculum development, budgeting, initial worker assessments. Some also served as workplace literacy project instructors.

The coordinator tasks described were the same as those listed by the other coordinators.

2. **If you were to write the proposal now, are there other roles that you feel the coordinators should perform? If yes, what?**

If we knew how, we could help employers market workplace literacy to their workers and help employers with an impact evaluation. They might also help employers document their matching funds.

Not asked.

3. **What have been the major strengths of the program?**

The project is meeting critical worker needs, has good coordination statewide and within our local postsecondary institutions, gives us a good excuse to spend time with companies, is helping us identify short-term training needs, and showing companies that the postsecondary institutions are willing to customize training.

At Universal Foods, the workplace literacy testing uncovered skills of refugees not previously recognized by the company, such as art skills. Classes held at worksites have better attendance and tie in better with
the workplace than those held at the college. Some supervisors also come to classes to learn to write better. The safety director talked with the class. Another strength was the process of writing training proposals based on identified worker assessment.

The WLP produces better communications of the companies with the college and the broader community. It has helped college staff get to know more people in the companies and learn of the range of skills needed. The classes are producing optimism among workers. As one worker shared, "Everyone's going to get smarter."

4. What have been the major weaknesses of the program?

Too much paperwork, time consuming evaluation process, companies looking for a quick fix, too long a delay to begin training, confusion over the definition of "workplace literacy," unclear relationship of workplace literacy training to job effectiveness, worker fears about test taking and misuse of test information.

They struggled with the issue of defining workplace literacy and coming up with better terms such as "continuing education for employees," or "employee upgrading." They also learned to drop the term "audits" and use instead "assessments" of worker skills.

5. What impact has the project had on the workers involved? What evidence do you have of this?

Improved worker attitudes and ability to read job materials, reduced errors in time sheets, some men have gotten haircuts and cleaner shaves, some workers are doing better on work-related tests, some students gave presents to their instructors, more workers are asking to take the classes, police officers who took Spanish class are practicing it with the law enforcement translator, a prosecutor who took the class now greets Hispanic defendants in Spanish, some working men are helping their wives get a GED, students asked to have the classes continue.

Increased worker self-esteem; willingness to cooperate, come to class on non-company time, tutor each other; improving equity, assessment of wider range of workers, not just those who come to class (i.e., Simplot has tested 150 workers and wants to assess 1200).

6. What impact has the project had on the companies involved? Evidence?

Companies want trainers back. All 15 students passed the nurse's aide certification. Students have learned how to take tests successfully.
Communications within the companies have increased as have the language competencies of workers. Company officials are referring workers to the college for courses. Companies are asking for more classes. Also improved safety at the companies.

7. **What impact has the project had on the postsecondary institutions involved? Evidence?**

It improved the public relations with postsecondary institutions. More people are being referred by companies to ABE, GED and short-term training.

Increased awareness of company workers' needs and more enrollments at the college.

8. **What advice would you have for other states thinking of starting a similar WLP?**

Don't use the term "workplace literacy," less paperwork. Find out what programs are already in place. Coordinators need to be willing to try new things and be creative. Don't wait 3 months to get training started but start it in 4-6 weeks. The coordinator's phone and personal contacts with employers are more effective than just mailing out flyers.

Boise-Cascade is paying for the WLP coordinator to go to their Pasco, Washington plant to help them assess workers.

9. **What is likely to continue from this project after the federal funds cease?**

Some coordinators felt a fixed percent of workplace literacy and referral training costs should go to finance the coordinator positions. Some larger companies will continue workplace literacy without federal funds.

They felt the companies would not have started WLP training without the federal funds. Simplot seems willing to pay for more workers to take the existing classes, but is less willing to pay for new course areas. (This may suggest one criterion for deciding what companies pay for and what they get through federal funds.)

10. **What is the most important thing you have learned from your experience with this project?**

Budgeting, ways to justify needs, writing persuasive business reports, greater awareness of business training needs and the important role refugees play in the workplace, awareness that many trainers are unprepared to meet entry-level worker needs.
Employer Interviews

1. **Approximately how many workers have received workplace literacy training through this project?**

   110 employees with 44 in the basic math and 20 in degree programs. 50 of 90 workers joined the Transforming American Industry class before the workplace literacy project project and 45 completed it.

   35 completed ESL.

2. **What are the major occupations of these workers?**

   Most were in manual positions up to 3 years ago but now they are in computerized rail systems.

   Operators, maintenance personnel, and some former assistant supervisors.

3. **Are there any general characteristics that describe the types of workers who sign up for these classes? If yes, what?**

   Their average age is 42 but they average 15-25 years seniority. We went from unionized to non-union a year ago. Many are hungry for education.

   The ESL class is mainly women, especially Hispanic. The math class is composed largely of middle aged women.

4. **Are there other workers at your company who could benefit?**

   Yes but about 5% actively resist anyone getting training.

   Yes, the ESL pool is at least double those now in the class and many of the 1200 workers could use more math, especially so they could handle the statistical control processing work.

5. **Why did your company decide to get involved with this project?**

   Workers were interested. He pushed the training ideas with both the workers and management. If workers are interested, it is easy to sell the idea to management.

   In teaching the "Universal Way" classes that emphasize the corporate philosophy, customer orientation, quality improvement, teamwork and communication, it became clear that many workers couldn't understand the written materials and needed help in reading. Also, some on-the-job accidents were traced to employees not being able to read labels.
6. **What was the content or focus of the training?** Approximately how many hours of training were provided? Where? By whom?

Basic math including fractions; basic English, sign language, and statistical process control (SPC).

The signing class was 16 weeks and later 22 weeks. It went 2 hours a day twice a week. He videotaped it so workers who missed a class could make it up. All their classes through workplace literacy are taught before or after work hours in the board room or lunch room.

The company hires a number of deaf people partly because there is a school for the deaf nearby. One deaf worker who had a need to communicate with a lot of other workers had communications difficulties so 30 workers agreed to learn sign language to use with him and others. The class taught functional signs and things this employee needed. The deaf worker had worked for the company for 17 years and never came to a single party. After the signing class, he came and there were 2 tables of workers who were signing with him. Classes were taught by college staff but local workers and others are used as volunteer tutors.

ESL and math. The ESL is taught in two hours twice a week and the math is also two hours twice a week for about 12 weeks. It includes fractions, decimals and algebra 1. The training is done in a conference room before or after work shifts including one ESL class from 9-11 p.m. The instructors are contracted by Southern Idaho College. The math teacher also teaches high school and college math. The ESL class stresses English related to the job, safety, etc., and is open to workers and spouses.

7. **What have been the major strengths of the project?**

Self-esteem has increased. People in their 30s-40s here never felt they had a career until now. Some workers are interested in instructional design and shipping of cutting dyes. Some took co-op ed, visited vendors, and prepared plans that the company actually used and saved transportation money. Several people have learned how to create new jobs in the company for themselves by learning to do new things that are needed. People are learning that they can do whatever they decide to.

Getting workers to work better together, employees like the classes, helps self-esteem, improves communication. It motivates some workers to complete high school, community college, or get a GED.
8. **What have been the major weaknesses of the project?**

He tried a summer workplace literacy class and found it was a bad time to offer classes. Salaried people such as supervisors and office staff have not been interested in the training. November to March are good months.

None. It is hard to get people informed about the clusters and to sign up but now word of mouth is spreading and workers are inviting their friends to come.

9. **What impact, if any, has the project had on the workers' attitudes? Job performance? Company productivity? Turnover/job retention? Customer/community relations?**

Not a long enough period to see if the training has reduced turnover yet. Now when he asks people to keep statistical records, he gets no resistance because they know how to do it. Workers are actively involved now in production reports. Workers talk about profit and loss at lunch. Relations with Ore-Ida, which is one of their customers, has improved, and workers from that company and Universal Foods are taking some of the classes at BC. About 5% of the workers here passionately resist the training. Management needs to show workers that they care about them taking training. The first 45 people to complete the workplace literacy class were given 2 shares of company stock each. The company pays 100% of some completed training.

The ESL students have asked to have the class four times a week instead of twice. Participants are talking favorably about the classes and showing better appreciation of the company. It's too soon to see other impact. It will probably have little impact on worker retention because there is already high retention since the company has good benefits and starts workers at $7.32 an hour.

10. **As you perhaps know, this project was funded by the federal government as a demonstration project. Do you feel that the type of training provided through this grant ought to be continued through company funding? Why?**

Yes. BC sees a broader scope after federal funding. He would like to see workplace English and reading as next classes. The reading would involve use of tutors.

Without workplace literacy funds, BC would probably not have started the workplace literacy training. He has talked to other BC locations about the workplace literacy training but they seem not to be interested because of the amount of time it takes to coordinate and manage the program.
He defines literacy as "anything that people need and don't have." With the tutoring he is about to start, he will open it up to spouses and dependents. He hadn't done this with the workplace literacy but felt it would have been a good idea.

Workers now speak of their jobs as careers.

If federal funds are stopped, the WLP training will probably be stopped in the short-term because the company sees it as a lower priority than other training, such as the Universal Way which is two sessions of three days each. They also need to train supervisors. The company is doing about 50 times the amount of training done two years ago. Because they pay well and have good benefits, they may decide to only hire people who have adequate reading, math, and communications skills. Now those without such skills are limited to inspecting potatoes and removing spots. They recently had 1300 applications for 200 positions.

11. **What other comments do you have about this project?**

They could see the WLP training as introductory for some people needing these skills before entering the Universal Way training. New WLP classes needed are in reading and understanding computers (which will be introduced shortly into more jobs).

### 6. Employee Skills Training Survey

The Idaho Employee Skills Training Survey was administered to 129 workers who had received workplace literacy skills in seven companies in Idaho. A tabulation of responses is contained in Appendix A. Most of the workers had jobs in production/maintenance, technical machine operators, clerical, and management. Workers averaged nine years of employment at their company. While 40 percent were in their first five years, 14 percent had over 15 years. Slightly over half of the workers are males.

Workers responded to 11 statements about their workplace literacy training on a five point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The most favorable ratings were that: the instructor was well prepared, they learned much from the course, would enjoy taking other courses in the future, and the course and materials were interesting. Over fifty percent of the workers strongly agreed with each of the above statements. The only statement disagree to by more than five percent was that the scheduled class time was appropriate. Fifty-seven percent strongly agreed and 35 percent agreed that they would recommend the course they took to workers at other companies.

Thirty-one percent of the workers indicated that child care provisions were available during their class hours but only three percent took advantage of this opportunity. Based on separate conversations with project coordinators, use of child care provisions were seldom used because workers generally continued
with their children in existing programs where they may have already been, were at home or with other relatives, or because the workers were at an age where they did not have children of an age needing child care.

Workers also responded to several open-ended questions which are reported in Appendix B.

7. Evaluator's Reflections

Perhaps one way to summarize these reflections is to group them around the seven evaluation questions listed in the evaluation design.

1. To what extent have the program objectives been met in terms of:

   a. increasing the availability of basic literacy services and activities?
   b. establishing an identification and referral network?
   c. providing programs to meet the needs of adults with limited English language proficiency?
   d. providing workplace literacy programs designed to upgrade basic literacy and occupational skills?

a. Prior to this project, there were existing Adult Basic Education classes at postsecondary institutions but no systematic approach to workplace literacy. In fact, a contribution of the project was clarification of the concept of workplace literacy and help to the business community in understanding how serious the problem is and what can be done to improve the situation. As a result of this project, workplace literacy opportunities became available in all six postsecondary regions of the state, and 885 workers participated.

b. Referral networks were developed at both the state and local community levels. Partly as a result of the state and the local steering committees education, government and training organizations became aware of each other's services and how they could support the needs of workers. Both coordinators and company human resource development staff told about learning of the resources available from each other, thus leading some companies to start coming to their local postsecondary institutions for workplace training. Also, some employers went beyond the literacy level to encourage employees to begin additional learning through postsecondary courses.

c. ESL programs were started at eight companies to assist 137 adults with limited English language proficiency. Excellent assessment of these individuals occurred to place them in appropriate programs. Those ESL students observed by the evaluators appeared highly motivated and had good attendance records.
d. Workplace literacy programs at 42 companies were conducted and involved 885 workers. The content included reading, technical writing, math, sign language, safety, statistical process control (SPC), and workplace-oriented ESL.

2. What contributed to the successes and failures of the project?

Among the factors which appear to have contributed to the success of the project are: the recognition of the critical problem of workplace literacy, good coordination at the state and local level that developed over the 12 months, improved attitudes of companies in recognizing the willingness and ability of postsecondary institutions to provide customized training, enthusiasm of some of the project coordinators and company representatives to involve workers, willingness of some companies to recognize and reward workers who took the training, increased understanding of postsecondary staff regarding conditions faced by local companies, and the availability of child care provisions even if seldom used.

Factors that have limited project success include: the delayed start-up time needed; too much paperwork for approval of some of the training projects; struggle over the concept of workplace literacy; initial turf issues between ABE coordinators, short-term worker upgrade trainers and other groups; inappropriate scheduling of some classes that resulted in lower student attendance; lack of willingness or ability of more companies to pay for continued workplace literacy training; and failure to obtain state legislation or other processes for continued funding beyond the 12 month federal project.

3. How important and effective was the child care component in recruiting and maintaining participants?

Although the statistics indicate relatively few workers chose to use the child care funds, a lot was learned about the need for various types of quality child care that will be useful in future projects. Also, one steering committee member indicated the availability of such child care funds reduced the number of excuses people could give for not taking the workplace literacy training.

4. What role did business and industry play in the partnership? What types of long-term investments did they make? How large was their dollar investment?

The role of business and industry was critical. Without them there would not have been a workplace literacy project. In addition to agreeing to offer such training at their company sites, about half allowed employees to receive the training during regular work hours. In addition to providing classroom space, some also provided supplies and equipment, such as Universal Foods that purchased computers for the courses. Coordinators'
records indicate an in-kind contribution of companies at more than $111,000. Companies, on the average, paid about half of the training costs.

5. **What is the most effective contact point within a company's management structure in reaching employers to identify literacy needs and solutions?**

The most effective contact point within a company's management structure, according to the coordinators interviewed, varied widely from company to company. It depended also on prior personal networks that may have existed. At the January 29, 1990 steering committee meeting, I raised this question with the group. It was suggested by a few that training directors were appropriate in large companies, personnel directors in middle size companies, and the president or owner in small companies.

6. **How successful was the workplace literacy staff training?**

A staff training workshop was provided in December 1988. Participants judged the training highest in the effectiveness of the trainer, and skills learned in job analysis, employee assessment, and testing tools. Rated lowest was the inservice training in child care. People commented on the ability of Dr. Sticht to communicate well and on the good mix of participants from various agencies. Suggestions for improvement were to allow more time for questions, provide more practical sessions, and add more specific training to each type of partner.

7. **How effectively has the project disseminated its practices to other interested parties?**

Within Idaho, the project has disseminated its practices to many agencies by having their involvement on local and state steering committees, thus allowing PICs and other groups to be aware of the operations. Over the 12 months, the project coordinators have been spreading the word through numerous contacts with employers in their communities, and through other staff members at the postsecondary institutions. CAVES has spread the word about the project across the postsecondary network in Idaho.

In April, Dr. Owens will be making a presentation on the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project to the Idaho State Council on Vocational Education. Presentations have already been made to the Idaho Association of Private Industry Councils and to the State Job Training Council.

Outside of Idaho, presentations were made at the American Vocational Association's December conference in Orlando, Florida, to a local community college in Orlando, and to participants at the Inland Northwest workforce conference.
Written information about the project has been provided to workplace literacy staff in other states and to workplace literacy associations in other states. The workplace curriculum materials developed are being shared through the vocational education curriculum dissemination centers. The final report will be shared nationally through the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC).
APPENDIX A

Idaho Employee Skills Training Survey
(7 Companies and 129 Workers Participated)

This survey is intended to assess the training provided to employees by the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project. The information collected will be used to improve training at other locations in Idaho. Please take a few minutes to complete the survey and return it to your course instructor. These surveys will be collected and sent to the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory for analysis and reporting as part of its evaluation of the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project.

1. What is your job title or position description? Production/maintenance 31%, technical 27%, machine operators 17%, clerical/support 13%, managers 9%, educational 3%

2. For approximately how many years have you worked for this company? Average 9 years (1-5 years 40%, 6-10 years 27%, 11-15 years 19%, 16-39 years 14%)

3. Your sex: 54 Male 46 Female

4. Please evaluate the training you have received through the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project by rating the following statements as: SA for Strongly Agree, A for Agree, U for Undecided, D for Disagree, and SD for Strongly Disagree. Circle one rating for each statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The expectations of the course were made clear to me.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The training focused on areas that are important in performing my job.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I feel I will be able to do a more effective job as a result of this training.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The course was interesting to me.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I feel that I learned much from the course.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The instructor was well prepared.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The course used a variety of teaching methods rather than just lecture.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. The course materials were useful.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. The scheduled class time was appropriate.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Please evaluate the training you have received through the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project by rating the following statements as: SA for Strongly Agree, A for Agree, U for Undecided, D for Disagree, and SD for Strongly Disagree. Circle one rating for each statement. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j. I would enjoy taking other courses in the future.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. I would recommend this course to workers at other companies.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. a. Were child care provisions available during the class hours for those taking the course?

   _31___ Yes   _69___ No

   b. If yes, did you take advantage of the child care opportunities?

   _3___ Yes   _97___ No

6. In your opinion, what were the most important things you learned from the course?

7. What do you feel were the major strengths of the course?

8. What were the major weaknesses in the course?

9. What changes would you recommend for improving this course for use in other companies?
Listed below are the responses to the open-ended questions on the worker survey. The number after some statements refers to the number of people who gave that response.

6. In your opinion, what were the most important things you learned from the course?

How to take a test and learned comprehension. (2)
To read better and learn more about the MSDS. (10)
Vocab., safety data sheets, comprehension, phonics, dictionary usage (3)
To comprehend more out of my reading and to learn more about meanings of words. (6)
Vocabulary words (2)
How to comprehend and how to pronounce words correct (5)
Take time to read the details and take in the important things. (2)
That I really can read: regain my faith in myself through the teachers way of teaching reading and vocabulary, and syn., ant., and using our dictionary. A very good instructor.
I learned some what how to comprehend.
Reading and writing
I'm reading better. (2)
I was learning speed reading and spelling. I had to quit because I got sick.
Sounding out words and reading a little faster.
Basics of reading
The importance of correct and complete documentation in the nursing profession. (11)
A good verb vocabulary - good instruments for writing care plan. How to document. (2)
How to increase my job skills.
Determination of nursing diagnosis, short term and long term goals. (2)
Better communication skills.
I feel I am able to communicate in Spanish effective enough to get the job done. (2)
I learned how to better perform my duties and also obtained a more knowledgeable attitude toward the local Hispanic community. (2)
How to explain some of the legal forms to the women I work with.
Basic Spanish phrases. (2)
Everything
Traffic stops, all areas she taught were helpful to me.
The whole class was very important and useful.
Writing techniques useful to my job as a technical writer. (2)
Be aware of audience assessment, readability, simplicity of writing style.
Correct word usage (4)
General writing
How to construct a procedure, step by step.
How to use words properly in a sentence.
Improvement of my English skills.
Possessive nouns rule, spellings. (3)
Basic grammar rules, basic technical writing rules. (6)
Punctuation, spelling, editing. (3) I needed to attend that class and practice more.
Clarified the use of commas, I will not forget possessive case.
English being my second language, I learned grammar.
The importance of good grammar in communication and how few people really know it well.

7. What do you feel were the major strengths of the course?

To improve comprehension (3)
Read and comprehension (3)
All of it (4)
Learning to read faster and to get more out of what I read. (3)
Reading more (2)
There was no pressure from anybody in the class, everybody seemed to get along.
Speed reading
Excellent teacher. (6) The instructor is probably working for peanuts. Why not give her a raise.
A very good instructor took time to explain in full detail. (4)
To learn the key words in the reading course in finding the answer to the questions. (2)
It helped me understand how to think along with reading and to remember what I had read.
The meanings of synonym and antonym.
The vocabulary, reading and MSDS sheets. (2)
The material (4)
The teacher. He put everyone at ease, worked on any level, was very positive. (2)
It was at our work location.
Test
Learned the symbols and blending and the understanding of words and what they mean.
The material and information was very pertinent and important concerning why, how and what in the subject of documentation. (3)
Enthusiasm and preparedness of instructor. (4)
Communication skills.
Location - attitude of instructor. I think that having an instructor from an extended care facility was an excellent idea.
Questions and answers - discussions able to verbalize our needs.
How it was presented, very informative.
Review
Applicable to our everyday work situation. Sharing of information from various facilities.
The course was set up around our work performance and duties. (2)
Vocabulary was excellent.
The way we all had to speak and read in Spanish.
Instructor had excellent knowledge of Spanish vocabulary. (3)
The way the teacher taught, the extra time she took with us. (3)
Instructor who was interested in the topic and had a writing/editing
background in industry. (3)
Instructors background and use of limited time.
Punctuation help
Started at ground zero (2)
The homework involving writing procedures. (2)
The teacher's presentation. (5)
Being able to determine if the sentence is correct.
To teach us how and why certain things are correct in grammar.
It pointed out from the very beginning what you were weak in and what you
were going to need to do to correct it. Learned how to use Gregg reference.
(5)
Focusing on subject and verb agreement and punctuation.
Pointing out to me how stupid I am.
Manual, teacher's knowledge of subject - teacher had good background
experiences to use in emphasis of main points.
Materials used and presentation of those materials.
Helping students be more aware of his/her spelling and writing techniques.

8. What were the major weaknesses in the course?

Need to be longer. (20)
Eye strain
Not enough time and went a little too fast. (2)
Vocabulary and learning to spell
The closed test was very frustrating. Needs to be thrown out.
The closed test is very intimidating because of time and pressure.
The reading time was too short in preparing to answer the questions, but
even at that it was for my own self esteem.
I would like to use the dictionary in the class more than the last day, but I did
learn how to use it better so I can use it in the future.
None that I saw, except it was a little hard for a couple of people because of
others making too much noise while the rest of us were working one on one
with the teacher.
I found some of the vocabulary a little difficult.
I wish we could have spent more time on each point and had more time for
discussion and input from class members.
Not enough "hands on" time in documenting narratives in writing care
plans - although instructions and suggestions for using standardized care
plans were presented.
Felt that all this works well in books and to talk about it, but in the real world
of today's nursing, time is a real factor in implementing. I would like to
see a change so that we could implement it all.
Time of day, especially if you worked day of class.
Not enough time spent on care plans.
Wish there was a "secondary" or advanced course which would follow this
one.
I didn't really feel like there were any weaknesses.
Low class attendance. (2) Not enough writing assignments. Audio visual aids (2) too short (3) Company ( ) cooperation. The company would not allow me to go to classes scheduled. The company should allow people to remain in class that they have provided for the employees. Please have a class in town for people who work in town. The instructor did not have a system to monitor completion of homework assignments. Homework is very important to this class. Not enough quizzes to assess student's progress. (2) Too much time away from job. Scheduling of the class could have been better. The Executive Guide for Grammar, was the weakest part. But still not real weak. It was OK "undecided" on the rating scale. Not enough discussion between students and instructor. Did not cover the entire scope of English. Sentence construction Teacher seemed to have trouble teaching adults - seemed to make good adjustments as class progressed. The writing style was very different from mine and I do not write sentences in this way, this makes it difficult. I would attend more courses just like this. Not enough sessions at least two more would be helpful. Length of course - lots of work for a short timeframe.

9. **What changes would you recommend for improving this course for use in other companies?**

I feel we should have some spelling, writing courses too. No changes Better vocabulary and learning how to spell better. Giving more hours for the course because I feel you could really get a lot more out of it (9) I think the entry to course should be voluntary. The closed test not be timed and made of being put under pressure. I think this course should be used not only for the slow ones, but for everyone who works for any company. To have the dictionaries at their disposal throughout the class. Go site wide, this is something I really think everybody needs. (3) More time spent on each point. More fliers and information, more work on actual care plans, instructor could do some in class on board, name tags for all plus where they work. Strongly recommend this course to hospital nurses rather than private medical offices. Was fully rounded out. Great class. Have more follow up skilled areas. Shorten length of time to allow more nurses to attend.
Retail business would use a course like this one relating to the merchandise that they sell.

A quiz during the class to monitor student progress. (2) Writing assignments to allow students to practice the principles that are taught. More technical examples in subject matter.

Company ( ) cooperation. Once you are in class make other companies keep you there until the course is complete.

More time to do homework
A longer course length and a more relaxed learning environment. Would like to go yearly.

Longer and twice a year.

Monitor homework completion. Stipulate that homework is not to be done on company time. Instruction should be 'performance based' (tailored to the end result that the company wants to see in the employees).

I think follow-up class course would increase the effectiveness of the things we learned. (2)

Make this a week course (have it all at once) instead of spreading it out over 2 months. It is too hard to get away from the work area.

Develop a class for advanced students and beginning students.

Lengthen class from 6 weeks to approximately 10.

More handouts on correct usage of grammar, other than a book.

Dispense with homework - we simply do not have time to complete it. Class time should be utilized to perform practical assignments.

Longer, but only once a week to disturb work less.

Somehow make class time involve class members in a different learning situation.

Less awkward sentences would be more practical.

Make it an 8 week course.

Possibly one day a week for 3 months or longer sessions (half day).
Workplace Literacy Conference

As one component of the NWREL evaluation of the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project (WLP), the NWREL staff worked with the Idaho Division of Vocational Education in developing and analyzing a WLP conference evaluation form. The conference was held in December, 1988 to help participants develop:

1. An understanding of workplace literacy

2. An appreciation of need for workplace literacy in relation to:
   a. state economy
   b. business/industry productivity
   c. employee development

3. Increased general awareness of workplace literacy

The conference evaluation form contained seven statements that were rated on a four point scale from very helpful to of no value. Participants were also asked to suggest topics to be addressed in future WLP conferences and to give their general comments. Table 1 shows the responses from 56 people completing the form. Rated the highest were that the topics were adequately covered by the main speaker and that the conference provided participants with additional information on workplace literacy.

**TABLE 1**

**Workplace Literacy Conference Evaluation Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Helpful</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Limited Value</th>
<th>No Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Did the conference provide you with additional information on workplace literacy?</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Will the information you received help you address the workplace literacy concerns in your organization/agency?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the topic adequately covered by the main speaker?</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was there sufficient time for discussion and questions?</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was the panel discussion helpful to you in addressing your concerns?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What was your overall rating of the conference?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Would you recommend this conference to your associates?</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A number of topics were suggested for future conferences. The most frequently given suggestions related to specifics on how to work with employers, sharing success stories, and the implications for secondary education. The complete list of suggested topics is in Appendix A.

**Staff Training**

The WLP provided a staff training workshop in December 1988. Upon completion of the training, the project staff were expected to be able to:

1. Conduct a Workplace Literacy Job Analysis and Employee Assessment
2. Establish a network of agency and industrial contacts
3. Implement child care process as needed
4. Complete project reports and data collection instruments
5. Interpret the approval process for determining eligible applications
6. Develop a process for formative evaluation for projects
7. Develop a process to identify and document matching or in-kind funding of projects
8. Determine appropriate testing or assessment tools to be used with participants

An evaluation form was used to assess training in eleven dimensions. Twenty-seven people completed the ratings. Areas where training was rated highest were: the effectiveness of the trainer, job analysis, employee assessment, and testing tools. Rated lowest was the inservice training in child care. Table 2 shows the ratings of each component.
APPENDIX B

Idaho Workplace Literacy Project

Evaluation of the Literacy Conference and Staff Training Workshop

Prepared by
Thomas R. Owens
Education and Work Program
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204

January 28, 1989
Participants were also asked to identify strengths of the training session and ways it could be improved. The most frequently mentioned strengths were, Dr. Sticht's presentation, and the good mix of people from various agencies. Suggested improvements were to allow more time for questions, provide more practical sessions, and more specific training to each type of partner, and to provide concrete tools by the end of the workshop. Specific comments are shown in Appendix B.

**TABLE 2**

**Staff Training Evaluation Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Analysis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Assessment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Reports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval Process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Tools</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative Evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching Fund Identification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Materials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Trainer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Effectiveness of Training Sessions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. What other Workplace Literacy topics should be addressed in future conferences?

- Training programs for women in work-place and wanting to enter the job market.
- Who/how will say for training?
- Please - no more conference meetings & surveys - lets do something.
- Immigration - what are this new groups literacy needs?
- Who's role is it to provide literacy training & why. What are the key advantages to employers?
- How to approach employee & help him recognize there is a problem?
- Implications for career planning educators in secondary schools.
- Relationship of EL to job productivity.
- Recruiting/identifying employees in need.
- From worker/labor viewpoint - who benefits & why from workplace literacy.
- Conducting needs assessment in specific skills areas.

- Come to a consensus of a short definition on what is literacy & have statistics on ideas for this definition.
- Alternative schools for drop out-pregnant teens.
- More information on establishing programs.
- Attitudes of employees, more employer input.
- What is going to be done about this issue.
- Examples of methods from other states - organizations doing workplace literacy.
- Initiators to deal with targeting populations.
- The discrimination factor involved in testing - available recourses for classes in rural areas - networking - $ for pilot projects.
- Private sector "success" stories.
- Evaluation of efforts. Dept. of Ed's philosophy.
- How to implement in an academic institution!

- More discussions on secondary education.
WORKPLACE LITERACY
CONFERENCE EVALUATION

9. General Comments.

This was about the best panel I have heard. Much superior to University professors.

Really enjoyed the panel discussion the most. Enjoyed Dr. Sticht's part of the program.

Great. Gary Nelson - DOE.

The "sitting time" was too long - need more frequent breaks to relieve the aching butts! Break at a maximum of 75 minutes.

Dr. Sticht was super, he relates and speaks on common terminology - it was extremely enlightening especially in comparison to other countries. The U.S. should become aware immediately or/unless this already takes place/others will own what our former country men/women tried to preserve. The education of our youth in Idaho needs to improved, the pressure from religious organizations to hold down females as not important to study fields in math, science falls back to some degree on Mormon religion - until this changes from families, teachers, business owners, etc. we can not progress in Idaho and a few states that fall on our border.

Dr. Sticht's presentation useful and entertaining - except for the gentleman from Portland many, many platitudes from panel.

Bad timing - interrupts holidays. Sticht's charts and graphs should have been handouts.

Data presented by main speaker was derived from military and inferred that similar situations existed for civilian situations. I am still not sure where the parameters defining literacy are.

DOE Representative would have been nice. Would have liked a little more on the impact the global economy and competition has had on the workplace - ie. - SPC, increased emphasis on costs, automation, competition, etc.

Good variety of agencies represented. The Conference revealed the amount of work and thought that has been given to "Workplace Literacy".

Talk. Talk Talk. It seems that it's one more horn for state to toot. Why not let the private sector have incentives to improve - not another Task (gasp) Force.

Well planned. Moved quickly and stayed on schedule while providing excellent information & expertise.

Portland & H.P. = very helpful. EG&G = limited value. Dept. of Employment & Dept. of Commerce = no value and may need to work on their workplace literacy.

Bob talked only about E.D. .

Although workplace literacy was quite thoroughly defined as well as identifying a need for corrective action, I would have liked to have had the roles of the different agencies more clearly identified.
9. General comments continued.

Temperature of room most uncomfortable in p.m. Dr. Sticht's speaking manner was enjoyable - his wrap up was great.

1. I was impressed by Trudy's speech; both content and it was 100% non-gender biased. Nice job!! 2. Dr. Sticht is great! Original. New & helpful information. Clever and entertaining.

Enjoyed the mix of the people in attendance! Thanks!

Panel perspective from private business was interesting. Bob Ford provided excellent overview of Economic Development. Ms. Kilgrow seemed to lack sincerity. Dr. Sticht was informative and entertaining. We are all aware of the problems. Where are the solutions?

May I suggest that we might have a "wellspring" of strength in people who have worked in the particular occupation returning after retirement to model skills for new personnel. Since the age "mean" is tending to be those who are older, because they are living longer. Keeping them busy is helping them be independent longer plus utilizing their experience to a good advantage.

Good conference.

Even though information was extremely good & worthwhile, I'm still at a loss as to how to reach the average H.S. grad that in reality has poor marketable skills. I'd like to see more emphasis in this area in future programs. Better suggestions to approach such individuals not eligible for sub. programs.

Still seems to be a lot of ambiguity about term literacy. Are we talking about reading, writing, math or performance discrepancies? We are all obviously using different definitions, understandings which makes meaningful discussions and planning difficult.

I think the problem of worker literacy was not well defined. Dr. Sticht's presentation had sufficient information, however, to develop a definition. Approaches to raising the level of literacy were not addressed, nor were the roles of employers, employment service, or educators in remedieng the problem. Not enough substance in the first day session related to workplace literacy enhancement. Looking forward to more substance in the next 1 1/2 days.

Very good.

Strategies for cognitive increases. Need softer seats.

Thank you.

Can't see the overhead.

Transitions to work. A more in-depth look at intergenerational literacy.
List strengths of the Training Session

Dr. Sticht - staff Josie, Larry, Don

Left me with new information of personal value that will take some time, review and consolidation to assimilate.

Tom Sticht

Brought all involved parties together for beginning of networking.

Dr. Sticht, presentation.

Software on readibility, written information. I'm glad the steering committee asked for shortened child care forms.

Dr. Sticht's humor was a real asset in addressing what could be a very dull and dry topic.

Good mix of participants from the various agencies. Dr. Sticht was a very good presenter.

Dr. Sticht "insightful"

Dr. Sticht's presentation was very good; Josie & Larry's discussion was good, although it should have been scheduled earlier.

Sticht was good. He is a professional researcher. I see this task as a monumental research undertaking with only partially trained people.

Dr. Sticht was great - he was well prepared.

Consultant.

Dr. Sticht's training manner & humor were great. It was good to see the readibility software.

Tom was interesting to listen to, he gave good overviews & sources of information. Brought up good questions. The rooms were fine, the food was OK, the staff was great.

Very good presentation for new program concept.

Information from Dr. Sticht was very informative.

Psycho-metric information from Dr. Sticht, over all view and "en specifics of the problem.

Occasional movement into the world of reality provided by Dr. Sticht
How would you improve the session?

Thanks for allowing me to be here.

Need to have clear specificiation of purpose. I was very impressed with the scope of information presented by Dr. Sticht, but I am also convinced (based on conversation with him) that he was unsure of the purpose of the workshop.

Get with the program - waste too much time! This program could have been done in less than two days. On the other hand - most information was meaningful.

Determination of precise role of Job Service. What preparation will we have to job analyses?

Specific training for each component would have enabled all agencies to understand their responsibility.

More concrete information on how to obtain childcare.

Studio visual aids. You could really see & have all the pages in Dr. Sticht's "Functional Context Education" manual.

OK as presented.

Would like more time with Dr. Sticht picking his brain, maybe have him design a model.

1. Earlier clarification of roles. 2. Examples of actual task analysis. 3. EEO and large parameters. 4. Softer chairs.

A firm statewide survey questionnaire should have come out of the sessions. In that regard it lacked some content.

Instead of keeping the group together - perhaps giving specific training to each partner instead of broad generalizations would have been more helpful. Stay with the program. Precise concrete examples. We often strayed from the topic - this made many things appear disorganized and unclear. Was this session for training or for brainstorming? Prepare - agenda & let us know ahead of time - then we could be prepared to offer more assistance.

We need more information in these areas. Child care. Matching Fund Identification and Approval Process.

Bad time of year for meeting.

No concrete tools by the end of workshop. We each have to develop our own - so sad! Needed workshop earlier - time line now for January will be hectic.

I found it a real disadvantage that most of the overheads couldn't be read. Information on child care was quite confusing. I had hoped that more specific "hot to" information would be given.
How would you improve the session? continued

Not enough time to answer questions brought up by Tom. I left with an uneasy feeling that there are many unknowns. I would have liked to have felt closer on more problems (I know this doesn't happen often).

Further sessions could be more practical. Maybe some examples of things that work.

Excuse the "This is your networking" portion!

Bigger room for 2 days with more air flow. Specifics on what Job Service does next.

Individual training for the individual provider groups in their area of responsibility.
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This interim report summarizes the design used in evaluating the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project, reports findings regarding the Workplace Literacy conference and staff training, and summarizes briefly the Workplace Literacy Coordinator's monthly reports from October 1988 through February 1989.

1. **Evaluation Design**

The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) has been contracted by the Idaho Division of Vocational Education to conduct an independent evaluation of the Project. The design consists of a statement of the proposed evaluation questions to guide the evaluation, data collection procedures, timeline, and reporting arrangements. The evaluation is being conducted to provide feedback to the staff for program improvement and to document the processes and outcomes of the project. The latter information should be of special interest to those thinking of replicating all or part of this workplace literacy project as well as to policymakers. Information from the evaluation should also be useful in obtaining funding for the continuation of the project after this year of federal funding.

**Evaluation Questions**

The evaluation questions were developed as a result of reviewing the project proposal, discussing the information needs with the project monitor in Washington, D.C., and discussion and feedback from the project's Steering Committee at their meeting in Boise in December, 1988.

1. To what extent have the program objectives been met in terms of:
   a. increasing the availability of basic literacy services and activities?
   b. establishing an identification and referral network?
   c. providing programs to meet the needs of adults with limited English language proficiency?
   d. providing workplace literacy programs designed to upgrade basic literacy and occupational skills?

2. What contributed to the successes and failures of the project?

3. How important and effective was the child care component in recruiting and maintaining participants?

4. What role did business and industry play in the partnership? What types of long-term investments did they make? How large was their dollar investment?

5. What is the most effective contact point within a company's management structure in reaching employers to identify literacy needs and solutions?

6. How successful was the workplace literacy staff training?

7. How effectively has the project disseminated its practices to other interested parties?
Data Collection Procedures

The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) is using a number of strategies in evaluating the above objectives. These include: 1) a review and analysis of the monthly reports submitted by the Workplace Literacy Project (WLP) coordinators; 2) observation and participant survey of those attending the staff training in December; 3) a survey of approximately 200 people receiving workplace literacy training to upgrade literacy and occupational skills; and 4) a telephone survey of the WLP coordinators regarding assessment of the objectives identified above.

2. Workplace Literacy Conference Evaluation

The workplace Literacy Conference was evaluated at the end of the day by 56 participants. The conference was found to be very helpful in providing participants with additional information on workplace literacy. A four point rating scale from very helpful to of no value was used for seven items. Table 1 shows the results. None of the statements were rated as of no value and the majority were rated as very helpful.

TABLE 1
WORKPLACE LITERACY
CONFERENCE EVALUATION RATINGS

Please rate the Conference on the following by circling:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Helpful</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Limited Value</th>
<th>No Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Did the Conference provide you with additional information on Workplace Literacy?</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Will the information you received help you address the Workplace Literacy concerns in your organization/agency?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the topic adequately covered by the main speaker?</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was there sufficient time for discussion and questions?</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was the Panel discussion helpful to you in addressing your concerns?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What was your overall rating of the Conference?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Would you recommend this conference to your associates?</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the open ended section, participants were asked to identify topics for future conferences. Most of the suggestions focused on implementation issues and a desire for successful examples. A listing of specific comments made is shown here.

- How to do it. Success stories next summer. Importance to high school teachers.
- Training programs for women in workplace and wanting to enter job market.
- Who/how will pay for training?
- Please no more conferences, meetings, and surveys - lets do something
- Immigration - what are this new groups literacy needs?
- Who's role it is to provid literacy training and why. What are the key advantages to employers?
- How to approach employee and help him recognize there is a problem? Getting parents involved.
- Implications for career planning educators in secondary schools.
- Relationship of workplace literacy to job productivity.
- Recruiting/identifying employees in need.
- From worker/labor viewpoint - who benefits and why from workplace literacy.
- Conducting needs assessment in specific skills areas.
- Come to a consensus of a short definition on what is literacy and have statistics on Idaho for this definition.
- Alternative schools for dropout-pregnant teens.
- More information on establishing programs.
- Attitudes of employees, more employer input.
- What is going to be done about this issue?
- Examples of materials from other states-organizations doing workplace literacy.
- Initiatives to deal with targeted populations
- The discrimination factor involved in testing-available resources for ABE classes in rural areas - networking, money for pilot projects
- Private sector "success" stories
- Evaluation of efforts, Department of Education's philosophy.
How to implement in an academic institution.

More discussion on secondary education

Participants were also asked for their general comments. The most frequent comments were praise for Dr. Sticht's presentation. Some people commented on the ambiguity remaining in the term "literacy."

3. Workplace Literacy Staff Training Evaluation

The staff training was evaluated by 26 participants. Participants rated 11 topics presented as excellent, good, fair, or poor. Rated the highest were the sessions on effectiveness of trainers and the session on job analysis. Rated lowest was the session on child care. In their overall rating of the training sessions, most participants rated the training as good. Table 2 contains their ratings.

TABLE 2

WORKPLACE LITERACY STAFF TRAINING EVALUATION

Please rate the training in-service in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Analysis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Assessment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Reports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval Process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Tools</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative Evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching Fund Identification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Materials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Trainer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Effectiveness of Training Sessions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In open-ended questions, participants were asked to identify strengths of the training session and ways it could have been improved. Major strengths reported included the insights of Tom Sticht and the practical applications of what he said. Suggestions for improvement included clarification of purposes for the training and of roles of various agencies and persons involved. More specific training for individual provider groups was also recommended.
Listed below are some general observations about the coordinator’s reports followed by a summary for each site.

**Observations on the Overall Project**

1. Some WLP sites were further along in implementing workplace literacy than others. Classes were offered at the college location as opposed to the workplace at 4 of 6 sites.

2. Child care needs seldom appeared to be an issue to the persons involved in the training. Although many businesses were asked of the need, only in two cases so far was child care requested.

3. Business partnerships appear to be underway in 4 of the 6 locations. Some of the colleges were trading teaching time for space.

4. The needs assessment part of the program is being implemented. In one location there was some resistance from the workers as to why they needed to be tested. In another case the management expressed the feeling that the given assessment was unfair.

5. The referral network is in place at all of the colleges. Most are using the media to spread the news of WLP. All colleges are using the brochures as distribution materials, some by "blanket" distribution, others sending brochures only upon contact with a company.

6. ESL was an area of need in only two of the colleges who have contacted businesses.

**Workplace Literacy Project Sites**

1. Idaho State University - Adult Success Center - School of Vocational-Technical Education

2. Boise State University - School of Vocational-Technical Education

3. North Idaho College/Region I, School of Vocational-Technical Education

4. Lewis and Clark State College/Region II - School of Vocational-Technical Education

5. College of Southern Idaho School of Vocational-Technical Education

6. Eastern Idaho Vocational-Technical School
4. Coordinator's Reports

Narrative monthly reports were received in time for this interim report from coordinators at all six sites for October 1983 through February 1989. Although the reports were not structured in a uniform manner, we looked to see the extent to which they covered evaluation issues reflected in the NWREL evaluation design. Table 3 displays the areas of focus identified in the evaluation design and the extent to which various sites addressed these issues. As can be seen in Table 3, most of the areas were covered in the coordinator's reports except the child care issue and factors considered to be contributing to the success or failure of the project.

Table 3

Contents of Workplace Literacy Coordinator's Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Idaho State</th>
<th>Boise State</th>
<th>N. Idaho</th>
<th>Lewis &amp; Clark</th>
<th>Col. of S. Idaho</th>
<th>E. Idaho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Factors contributing to success or failure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Child care effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Business partnerships</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Managements contact points</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Staff training</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Project dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Availability of basic literacy services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Identification and referral networks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Programs for English language proficiency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Upgrading literacy and occupational skills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) was contracted by the Idaho Division of Vocational Education to conduct an independent evaluation of the project. NWREL used a number of strategies in evaluating the project. These included: 1) a review and analysis of the monthly reports submitted by the Workplace Literacy Project (WLP) coordinators; 2) observation and participant survey of those attending the staff training; 3) a survey of approximately 200 employees receiving workplace literacy training to upgrade literacy and occupational skills; and 4) interviews with the WLP coordinators and steering committee members.

Listed below is a summary of the evaluation organized around the seven questions used to guide the evaluation process.

1. To what extent have the program objectives been met in terms of:

   a. increasing the availability of basic literacy services and activities?
   b. establishing an identification and referral network?
   c. providing programs to meet the needs of adults with limited English language proficiency?
   d. providing workplace literacy programs designed to upgrade basic literacy and occupational skills?

   a. Prior to this project, there were existing Adult Basic Education classes at postsecondary institutions but no systematic approach to workplace literacy. In fact, a contribution of the project was clarification of the concept of workplace literacy and help to the business community in understanding how serious the problem is and what can be done to improve the situation. As a result of this project, workplace literacy opportunities became available in all six postsecondary regions of the state, and 885 workers participated.

   b. Referral networks were developed at both the state and local community levels. Partly as a result of the state and the local steering committees education, government and training organizations became aware of each other's services and how they could support the needs of workers. Both coordinators and company human resource development staff told about learning of the resources available from each other, thus leading some companies to start coming to their local postsecondary institutions for workplace training. Also, some employers went beyond the literacy level to encourage employees to begin additional learning through postsecondary courses.

   c. English programs were started at eight companies to assist 137 adults with limited English language proficiency. Excellent assessment of these individuals occurred to place them in appropriate programs. Those ESL students observed by the evaluators appeared highly motivated and had good attendance records.
d. Workplace literacy programs at 42 companies were conducted and involved 885 workers. The content included reading, technical writing, math, sign language, safety, statistical process control (SPC), and workplace-oriented ESL.

2. What contributed to the successes and failures of the project?

Among the factors which appear to have contributed to the success of the project are: the recognition of the critical problem of workplace literacy, good coordination at the state and local level that developed over the 12 months, improved attitudes of companies in recognizing the willingness and ability of postsecondary institutions to provide customized training, enthusiasm of some of the project coordinators and company representatives to involve workers, willingness of some companies to recognize and reward workers who took the training, increased understanding of postsecondary staff regarding conditions faced by local companies, and the availability of child care provisions even if seldom used.

Factors that have limited project success include: the delayed start-up time needed; too much paperwork for approval of some of the training projects; struggle over the concept of workplace literacy; initial turf issues between ABE coordinators, short-term worker upgrade trainers and other groups; inappropriate scheduling of some classes that resulted in lower student attendance; lack of willingness or ability of more companies to pay for continued workplace literacy training; and failure to obtain state legislation or other processes for continued funding beyond the 12 month federal project.

3. How important and effective was the child care component in recruiting and maintaining participants?

Although the statistics indicate relatively few workers chose to use the child care funds, a lot was learned about the need for various types of quality child care that will be useful in future projects. Also, one steering committee member indicated the availability of such child care funds reduced the number of excuses people could give for not taking the workplace literacy training.

4. What role did business and industry play in the partnership? What types of long-term investments did they make? How large was their dollar investment?

The role of business and industry was critical. Without them there would not have been a workplace literacy project. In addition to agreeing to offer such training at their company sites, about half allowed employees to receive the training during regular work hours. In addition to providing classroom space, some also provided supplies and equipment, such as Universal Foods that purchased computers for the courses. Coordinators’ records indicate an in-kind contribution of companies at more than $111,000. Companies, on the average, paid about half of the training costs.

5. What is the most effective contact point within a company’s management structure in reaching employers to identify literacy needs and solutions?

The most effective contact point within a company’s management structure, according to the coordinators interviewed, varied widely from company to company. It depended also on prior personal networks that may have existed. At the January 29, 1990 steering committee meeting, I raised this question with the group. It was
suggested by a few that training directors were appropriate in large companies, personnel directors in middle size companies, and the president or owner in small companies.

6. How successful was the workplace literacy staff training?

A staff training workshop was provided in December 1988. Participants judged the training highest in the effectiveness of the trainer, and skills learned in job analysis, employee assessment, and testing tools. Rated lowest was the inservice training in child care. People commented on the ability of Dr. Sticht to communicate well and on the good mix of participants from various agencies. Suggestions for improvement were to allow more time for questions, provide more practical sessions, and add more specific training to each type of partner.

7. How effectively has the project disseminated its practices to other interested parties?

Within Idaho, the project has disseminated its practices to many agencies by having their involvement on local and state steering committees, thus allowing PICs and other groups to be aware of the operations. Over the 12 months, the project coordinators have been spreading the word through numerous contacts with employers in their communities, and through other staff members at the postsecondary institutions. CAVES has spread the word about the project across the postsecondary network in Idaho.

In April, Dr. Owens will be making a presentation on the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project to the Idaho State Council on Vocational Education. Presentations have already been made to the Idaho Association of Private Industry Councils and to the State Job Training Council.

Outside of Idaho, presentations were made at the American Vocational Association’s December conference in Orlando, Florida, to a local community college in Orlando, and to participants at the Inland Northwest workforce conference.
Workplace Literacy Conference

As one component of the NWREL evaluation of the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project (WLP), the NWREL staff worked with the Idaho Division of Vocational Education in developing and analyzing a WLP conference evaluation form. The conference was held in December, 1988 to help participants develop:

1. An understanding of workplace literacy

2. An appreciation of need for workplace literacy in relation to:
   a. state economy
   b. business/industry productivity
   c. employee development

3. Increased general awareness of workplace literacy

The conference evaluation form contained seven statements that were rated on a four point scale from very helpful to of no value. Participants were also asked to suggest topics to be addressed in future WLP conferences and to give their general comments. Table 1 shows the responses from 56 people completing the form. Rated the highest were that the topics were adequately covered by the main speaker and that the conference provided participants with additional information on workplace literacy.

TABLE 1
Workplace Literacy Conference Evaluation Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very Helpful</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Limited Value</th>
<th>No Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Did the conference provide you with additional information on workplace literacy?</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Will the information you received help you address the workplace literacy concerns in your organization/agency?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the topic adequately covered by the main speaker?</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was there sufficient time for discussion and questions?</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was the panel discussion helpful to you in addressing your concerns?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What was your overall rating of the conference?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Would you recommend this conference to your associates?</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A number of topics were suggested for future conferences. The most frequently given suggestions related to specifics on how to work with employers, sharing success stories, and the implications for secondary education. The complete list of suggested topics is in Appendix A.

**Staff Training**

The WLP provided a staff training workshop in December 1988. Upon completion of the training, the project staff were expected to be able to:

1. Conduct a Workplace Literacy Job Analysis and Employee Assessment
2. Establish a network of agency and industrial contacts
3. Implement child care process as needed
4. Complete project reports and data collection instruments
5. Interpret the approval process for determining eligible applications
6. Develop a process for formative evaluation for projects
7. Develop a process to identify and document matching or in-kind funding of projects
8. Determine appropriate testing or assessment tools to be used with participants

An evaluation form was used to assess training in eleven dimensions. Twenty-seven people completed the ratings. Areas where training was rated highest were: the effectiveness of the trainer, job analysis, employee assessment, and testing tools. Rated lowest was the inservice training in child care. Table 2 shows the ratings of each component.
Participants were also asked to identify strengths of the training session and ways it could be improved. The most frequently mentioned strengths were, Dr. Sticht's presentation, and the good mix of people from various agencies. Suggested improvements were to allow more time for questions, provide more practical sessions, and more specific training to each type of partner, and to provide concrete tools by the end of the workshop. Specific comments are shown in Appendix B.

**TABLE 2**

Staff Training Evaluation Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Analysis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Assessment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Reports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval Process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Tools</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative Evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching Fund Identification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Materials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Trainer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Effectiveness of Training Sessions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Idaho Employee Skills Training Survey

This survey is intended to assess the training provided to employees by the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project. The information collected will be used to improve training at other locations in Idaho. Please take a few minutes to complete the survey and return it to your course instructor. These surveys will be collected and sent to the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory for analysis and reporting as part of its evaluation of the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project.

1. What is your job title or position description? ___________________________

2. For approximately how many years have you worked for this company?
   _______ Years

3. Your sex: _____ Male     _____ Female

4. Please evaluate the training you have received through the Idaho Workplace Literacy Project by rating the following statements as: SA for Strongly Agree, A for Agree, U for Undecided, D for Disagree, and SD for Strongly Disagree. Circle one rating for each statement.

   a. The expectations of the course were made clear to me.  

   b. The training focused on areas that are important in performing my job. 

   c. I feel I will be able to do a more effective job as a result of this training. 

   d. The course was interesting to me. 

   e. I feel that I learned much from the course. 

   f. The instructor was well prepared. 

   g. The course used a variety of teaching methods rather than just lecture. 

   h. The course materials were useful. 

   i. The scheduled class time was appropriate. 

   j. I would enjoy taking other courses in the future. 

   k. I would recommend this course to workers at other companies.
5. a. Were child care provisions available during the class hours for those taking the course?
   _____ Yes  _____ No

   b. If yes, did you take advantage of the child care opportunities?  _____ Yes  _____ No

6. In your opinion, what were the most important things you learned from the course?

7. What do you feel were the major strengths of the course?

8. What were the major weaknesses in the course?

9. What changes would you recommend for improving this course for use in other companies?
FINANCIAL
FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT
(Long Form)
(Follow instructions on the back)

US Dept of Education
Div. of Financial Operations
Payments & Control Section

Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy
State Division of Vocational Education
590 West State
Boise, ID 83720

Recipient Organization Name and Complete Address, Including ZIP Code:

4. Employer Identification Number
826-000-952

Recipient Account Number or Identifying Number
WORKPLACE LITERACY
1342

Final Report:
Yes ☐ No ☐

7. Basis
Cash ☐ Accrual ☐

9. Funding/Grant Period (See instructions)
From: (Month, Day, Year) 09-20-88
To: (Month, Day, Year) 03-31-90

10. Transactions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Previous Period</th>
<th>This Period</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Total outlays</td>
<td>386,366.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Refunds, rebates, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Program income used in accordance with the deduction alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Net outlays (Line a. less the sum of lines b and c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>386,366.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recipient's share of net outlays, consisting of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third party in-kind contributions</td>
<td>142,325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal awards authorized to be used to match this award</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program income used in accordance with the matching or cost sharing alternative</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other recipient outlays not shown on lines e, f, g, h</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total recipient share of net outlays (Sum of lines e, f, g and h)</td>
<td>142,325.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net outlays (Line a. less the sum of lines b and c):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal share of net outlays (line d less line i)</td>
<td>244,041.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total unobligated obligations</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient's share of unobligated obligations</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal share of unobligated obligations</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total federal share (sum of lines j and k)</td>
<td>244,041.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total federal funds authorized for the funding period</td>
<td>292,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobligated balance of federal funds (Line j minus line k)</td>
<td>47,958.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program income, consisting of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disbursed program income shown on lines c and/or g above</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursed program income using 50% addition alternative</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisbursed program income</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total program income realized (Sum of lines q, r and s)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Indirect Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Federal Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Expense</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Remarks: Attach any explanations deemed necessary or information required by Federal sponsoring agency in compliance with governing legislation.

13. Certification: I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that this report is correct and complete and that all outlays and unobligated obligations are for the purposes set forth in the award documents.

Typed or Printed Name and Title
Daniel J. Hammel, Accountant

Signature of Authorized Certifying Official

Date Report Submitted: June 29, 1990

Telephone (Area code, number and extension)
208-334-3216

Prescribed by OMB Circulars A-102 and A-110

Standard Form 259 (REV 4-88)
STAFF TRAINING
WORKPLACE LITERACY

STAFF TRAINING
RED LION RIVERSIDE - CINNABAR ROOM
DECEMBER 15-16, 1988

THURSDAY DECEMBER 15, 1988

8:00  Workplace Literacy  Dr. Sticht
      - How to:
      Testing
      Readability
      Job Analysis
      Materials
      Methods
      Support Services

10:00  Break

10:15  Continued - How to:

12:00  Lunch - on your own

1:00  Workplace Literacy - Application
      - Team Usage  Dr. Sticht
      - Tools and Testing
      - Standardized Instruments
      - Computer Support

1:30  Formative Evaluation  Tom Owens

3:00  Break

3:15  Workplace Literacy Application - continued

5:00  Close
GENERIC SKILLS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

by Arthur De W. Smith
GENERIC DATA AND PEOPLE SKILLS QUESTIONNAIRE

OCTOBER 1973

DATE OF INTERVIEW __________________________ LOCATION OF INTERVIEW __________________________

CCDO OCCUPATION __________________________ CCDO NO. __________________________

COMPANY/ORGANIZATION __________________________

ADDRESS __________________________ PHONE NO. __________________________

PERSON INTERVIEWED __________________________ (name and title)

NOTES TO INTERVIEWER

- The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine, by questioning, the generic data and people skills which are used on the job and, of those, which ones were required on entry to the job.

- SKILLS HELD BUT NOT USED ON THE JOB ARE NOT TO BE RECORDED.

- The worker and supervisor should not be shown each other's responses.

- MAKE NO ASSUMPTIONS. SKILLS USED ON THE JOB ARE FREQUENTLY DIFFERENT FROM WHAT YOU MAY EXPECT.

- If the interviewee does not understand a question, rephrase it.

- If in doubt about a response, ask for an example or for an explanation of the skill used. Specify the exact application of the skill used where you consider it appropriate.

- For supervisor interviews, rephrase questions to identify skills used by the worker to be interviewed.

Instrument developed by:

Training Research and Development Station

Department of Manpower and Immigration

Prince Albert, Saskatchewan
GENERIC DATA & PEOPLE SKILLS QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Review notes to interviewer (front cover).
2. Explain the purpose of the interview to the respondent.
3. Remove the interviewee guide from this questionnaire and give it to the respondent to examine during the interview.
4. Reading
   a. Read all lead statements and items to the respondent unless otherwise indicated on the questionnaire.
   b. DO NOT read boxed headings as they are meant to guide the interviewer in the question content.
   c. DO NOT read items printed in block letters. These items should be presented to the respondent for examination and selection.
5. Rephrasing
   a. This questionnaire has been written for the worker in an occupational area. The same questionnaire is to be used for the worker's supervisor's interview with a minimum of modification. For example:

      the question: In which of the following ways do you use numbers in your work?

      becomes: In which of the following ways does (name of worker) use numbers in (his, her) work?

   b. If the respondent tells you to rephrase an item re-read the question first then, if necessary, rephrase the question for clarification. Be sure to maintain the content of the item.
6. Recording
   a. Rephrase column: There are two types of records to be kept in this column. The first is an indication that the item was re-read. (Mark[☑]). The second is an indication that the item was rephrased for clarification (mark [☒]).
   b. Job and Entry columns: The purpose of these columns is to separate the skills used on the job from those required on job entry. (Mark ☑ JOB or ☒ ENTRY). Be sure not to mark both columns.
   c. Demographic Information: Be sure to complete the form on the cover page of this questionnaire. In order to ensure a high degree of accuracy and consistency in the transfer of this information:
      (1) use the pens provided
      (2) print requested material on cover page.
   d. Summary of Rephrasing: For each occupation interviewed prepare a summary and description of the items rephrased on the forms provided. In order to prepare for this summary, note your rephrasing directly on this questionnaire.
For the questions

**IN YOUR WORK, DO YOU ...........?**

Please select your answer from the following:

- **NO**
- **REPHRASE**
- **YES**
- **ENTRY**

(Used on job)

(Required on job entry)
**USE OF NUMBERS**

Most employees use numbers to some degree in their work. Although some of the answers to the following may seem obvious, we would like to completely assess the use of numbers.

In which of the following ways do you use numbers in your work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whole Numbers</th>
<th>Read: 1</th>
<th>Write: 2</th>
<th>Count: 3</th>
<th>Add or Subtract: 4</th>
<th>Multiply or Divide: 5</th>
<th>Round Off: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman Numerals: (ie: I, IV, X)</td>
<td>Read: 7</td>
<td>Write: 8</td>
<td>Add or Subtract: 9</td>
<td>Multiply or Divide: 10</td>
<td>Round Off: 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fractions</td>
<td>Read: 12</td>
<td>Write: 13</td>
<td>Add or Subtract: 14</td>
<td>Multiply or Divide: 15</td>
<td>Round Off: 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decimals</td>
<td>Read: 17</td>
<td>Write: 18</td>
<td>Add or Subtract: 19</td>
<td>Multiply or Divide: 20</td>
<td>Round Off: 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Read: 22</td>
<td>Write: 23</td>
<td>Add or Subtract: 24</td>
<td>Multiply or Divide: 25</td>
<td>Round Off: 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether or not you read or write Roman numerals: (ie: I, IV, X)</td>
<td>Read: 27</td>
<td>Write: 28</td>
<td>Add or Subtract: 29</td>
<td>Multiply or Divide: 30</td>
<td>Round Off: 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether or not you read or write fractions</td>
<td>Read: 32</td>
<td>Write: 33</td>
<td>Add or Subtract: 34</td>
<td>Multiply or Divide: 35</td>
<td>Round Off: 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether or not you read or write decimals</td>
<td>Read: 37</td>
<td>Write: 38</td>
<td>Add or Subtract: 39</td>
<td>Multiply or Divide: 40</td>
<td>Round Off: 41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether or not you read or write per cent</td>
<td>Read: 42</td>
<td>Write: 43</td>
<td>Add or Subtract: 44</td>
<td>Multiply or Divide: 45</td>
<td>Round Off: 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Rephrase</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Calculate % of a number (5% of 3.00 = )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Calculate % one number is of another (75 is % of 90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Calculate a number when a % of it is known (10% of ___ = 70)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Calculate the average of a group of numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equivalents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Does your work involve the conversion of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fractions: (Example 1/4 = 25% or 1/4 = .25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decimals: (Example .5 = 1/2 or .5 = 50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages: (Example 5% = .05 or 5% = 1/20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solve Problems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 In your work do you ever have to select the math operations and, if more than one, decide the order in which they are done?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ratio and Proportion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Do you use ratio to show comparisons between two numbers? Example: gas oil mix 16:1, or compression ratio 8:1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Do you use proportion to solve problems like 4:6 = 3: ( )? For example, 4 gallons of gas requires 40 oz. of oil. How much oil would be needed for 3 gallons? 4/ = 3/ ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas, Perimeters and Volumes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Does your work involve the calculation of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Algebra</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Solve problems algebraically with one unknown:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solve this problem by first writing a word sentence showing how the facts and unknown are related, then writing an equation and then solving it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: There are 3 times as many workers on the day shift as on the night shift. The total number of workers is 30. How many are on the night shift?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Do you make use of formulas such as ( V = \frac{3M + Y}{Z} ) and have to insert the quantities for M, Y and Z and solve for V?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GENERIC SKILLS DATA & PEOPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rephrase</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Write, simplify and solve two variable algebraic problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Write, simplify and solve quadratic equations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Calculations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rephrase</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Use tables of logarithms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Calculate with a Slide Rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Perform Trigonometric Calculations (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mathematical Drawings**

Some jobs involve mathematical drawings. This may ask for simple recognition. For example, a truck driver may have to recognize road symbols and a draftsman will not only have to recognize mathematical drawings but produce them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rephrase</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>In your work do you have to make use of common objects such as circles, triangles, spheres, rectangles, squares, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Do you have to recognize common angles such as 15, 30, 45 and 90?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Do you draw, sketch, or form these figures?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Do you read scale drawings such as blueprints?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Blueprint**

![Blueprint Image]

**Scale 1:5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rephrase</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Do you draw to scale?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Do you take measurements from scale drawings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Do you have to read assembly drawings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assembly**

![Assembly Image]
**GENERIC SKILLS DATA & PEOPLE QUESTIONNAIRE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>52</strong> Do you have to read schematic drawings?</th>
<th><strong>REPRASE</strong></th>
<th><strong>JOB</strong></th>
<th><strong>ENTRY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schematic:**

![Schematic Diagram]

**Measurement**

Many employees have involvement with measurement. Stenographers may be involved with weight, when using postage meters, and carpenters with length.

In your work do you have to estimate any of the following measurements?

- **53** Time (e.g. how long it will take to do a task)
- **54** Weight (how much something probably weighs)
- **55** Distance (inches, feet, yards, miles)
- **56** Area (square feet, square yards, etc.)
- **57** Liquid Volume (quarts, gallons, etc.)
- **58** Spatial volume (cubic yards, cubic inches, etc.)

In your work do you have to actually measure:

- **59** Time
- **60** Weight
- **61** Distance
- **62** Liquid Volume

In your measurements do you read:

- **63** Scales such as postage meters, weigh scales, thermometers, etc.

**64** Do you use vernier scales such as micrometers?

In your work do you use any of the following units of measure:

- **65** Kilometre, metre, centimetre
- **66** Kilogram, gram, milligram
- **67** Kilolitre, litre, millilitre

**54**
**In your work do you make use of tables to perform the following conversions?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REPHRASE</th>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>ENTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Kilometres to miles or reverse</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Kilograms to pounds or reverse</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kilometres to miles or reverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kilograms to pounds or reverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Does your work involve the use of graphs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REPHRASE</th>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>ENTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you record information on graphs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REPHRASE</th>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>ENTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you construct (draw) graphs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REPHRASE</th>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>ENTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reading: Reading to some degree is applied in all occupations.**

In this section we are interested in, not only, what is read but why things are read.

**In your work do you read:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REPHRASE</th>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>ENTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Memos</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Forms such as work orders, job orders, vouchers, claims, purchase orders.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GENERIC SKILLS DATA & PEOPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

#### Chart: (excluding maps, lists and two column tables)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDER</th>
<th>READ HEIGHT (INCHES)</th>
<th>READ AVERAGE CHEST (INCHES)</th>
<th>READ AVERAGE WAIST (INCHES)</th>
<th>lied SEAT (INCHES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Policy manuals, regulations and instructions

In reading and listening the skills of literal, interpretive and evaluative comprehension apply. Literal comprehension would require knowing the facts; interpretive comprehension would require knowing purposes and intentions; evaluative comprehension requires the skill of using judgment.

Which of the following best describes the reading you do in your work

- **LITERAL**: Read for specific facts such written materials as telephone books, dictionaries, etc.
- **INTERPRETIVE**: Read written materials that require you to generalize, explain or make comparisons. Ex: You read a statement in your policy manual and explain the statement to others.
- **EVALUATIVE**: Judge value or usefulness of written material.

Which of the following best describes the listening you do in your work

- **LITERAL**: Listen for specific facts or directions. Ex: Your supervisor gives you a one-step oral instruction and you carry it out.
- **INTERPRETIVE**: Receive oral instructions or information that require you to understand opinions, purposes and intentions. Ex: Your supervisor gives you general instructions and you interpret exactly what is to be done.
- **EVALUATIVE**: Judge value or usefulness of oral information. Ex: A customer tells you how your products or services might be improved and you act with judgment.
**GENERIC SKILLS DATA & PEOPLE QUESTIONNAIRE**

**WRITING**

We would like to know to what extent writing is involved in various occupations. Some people may only fill in forms with words or phrases while others may compose lengthy written words.

In your work do you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REPHRASE</th>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>ENTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Write letters or notes</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Write (compose) external letters</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Write form letters</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Write single paragraph letters only</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Write (compose) internal memos or letters</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Write only short notes</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Make notes of information or directions received orally.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your work do you fill in or complete forms using:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REPHRASE</th>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>ENTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Short phrases and/or figures</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Paragraphs</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some jobs require the making of reports, sometimes reporting factually, and, sometimes, evaluating such things as work done, future markets, etc., which require inclusion of recommendations. At times, writers of these reports are given the information to write the reports while, other times, information must be researched and analyzed.

In your work do you prepare reports which require you to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REPHRASE</th>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>ENTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Show information but no suggestions or recommendations</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Include recommendations</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Decide what information you need to do the report (You receive instructions where you have to decide what information is required to do the report)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Decide how to get the information (You make up your own forms, or charts or procedures to get the information)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Analyze the information (You have to compare information against preset standards to determine which is most important and effective)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Evaluate the information (You set the standards for analysis. This may include making lists of advantages and disadvantages of different items)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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We are also concerned, about oral (word of mouth) communication required to carry out job functions.

In your work do you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REPHRASE</th>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>ENTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Talk to people by giving task directions or instructions</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Give information to others by talking to individuals</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Give information to others by talking to groups</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Use the telephone</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Report progress to persons (ie. foremen, supervisors, etc.)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Obtain information by asking questions of individuals</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Obtain information by asking questions of groups</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Talk over problems pertaining to work situations with fellow employees</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Talk to others to try to find ways and means of improving work relationships, conditions, etc.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Talk over personal matters (ie. impromptu counselling)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Talk over confidential matters</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>- with clients or customers</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>- with supervisor</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>- with management</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Carry out a “free-wheeling” conversation (to put people at ease, to occupy people’s time or to cultivate good public relations)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Ask other people for their opinion on how to perform a task (ie. foremen, supervisors, customers)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Give your opinion on how to perform a task</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>- occasionally</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>- frequently</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Rephrase</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 Give formal (prepared) talks to individuals or groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 Present factual information to an audience</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124 Deliver promotional presentations to an audience</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 - to individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 - to groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 Identify key members of the group when giving a presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 Handle open question periods after the presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In your work do you:**

129 Support your point of view, work methods or procedures            
130 - with fellow employees                                           
131 - with supervisor                                                
132 - with customers                                                 
133 Debate with others where there is some conflict or disagreement   
134 Take part in formal meetings or conferences which require you to present a point of view 
135 Take charge of a meeting or group discussion                      
136 Guide members of a meeting toward a constructive goal             

**SORTING/CLASSIFYING** This section asks about the tasks of sorting information and sorting objects by set lists or procedures. Further, we would like to know individual involvement in setting these lists and procedures.

In your work do you:

137 Sort information by a given list, e.g.,
- sort and file correspondence
- sort vouchers by types
- sort expenditures or receipts
138 Sort parts, tools, equipment or products
139 Set up lists for sorting the information or objects. E.g:
- prepare forms to record correspondence, telephone calls, or list of visitors.
- prepare sub-headings or breakdowns for expenditures or receipts.
- prepare forms to record information you believe others have a need to know.
- prepare file systems.
Some workers use what are known as diagnostic skills. They examine symptoms (or faults) to determine the problem which causes the symptom. Doctors use these skills to determine the reason for our aches and pains. Mechanics also use the skills to determine why a car won't start or doesn't run properly. We are trying to assess the use of trouble-shooting skills.

In your work:

140 Do you consider "trouble-shooting" one of your major duties

(If there is a negative answer for question 140, ignore questions 141 to 154)

Do you:

141 Ever have to list, state or think of possible reasons which might cause certain faults or symptoms

142 Use reference manuals to guide you in selecting the possible reasons

143 Ever have to establish a priority to sequence in which to check the possible reasons

144 Have to personally check to find out which of the possible reasons is the correct one

145 Use reference manuals to guide you in how to check each reason

If you have to check to find out which of several possible problems is the correct one do you do this by:

146 Asking probing questions

147 Examining by smelling, touching, looking at or tasting

148 Using tools or instruments

If you make an error in your diagnosis would it probably result in:

149 Loss of life

150 Some danger or hazard

151 Considerable loss of time

152 Some loss of time

153 Considerable financial loss

154 Some financial loss
**DISCRETION AND COMPLEXITY**

How much freedom and involvement does an employee have in deciding the means to carry out tasks and in deciding the products or services? What degree of difficulty does increased freedom bring?

In each section are three or four statements. We ask you to read each section and choose the statement in each that most nearly describes your tasks.

### Tools, Equipment, and Materials

155 Are all specified and you have no choice in what to use?

156 Some are specified. For others you use guides such as manuals, charts, etc., to help you decide.

157 You have to decide, without direction or guides, which tools, equipment or materials to use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reprase</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Procedures and Methods

158 All are specified and you have no choice in the procedures or methods used.

159 Some are specified. For others you use guides such as manuals and operating procedures, etc., to help you decide on methods and procedures.

160 You have to decide, without direction or guides, which methods and procedures to use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reprase</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task Information

161 All information needed to do your tasks is included in the assignment.

162 You have to examine trade manuals, charts, etc., to obtain some information needed to do tasks.

163 You have to recall or look up various tables (not just tables, formulas, or facts) as part of the information needed to do your tasks.

164 Your tasks require the use of creative theory beyond standard professional and trade literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reprase</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Products or services performed (tasks done at work)

165 Are completely specified and you have no choice in the results achieved.

166 You have some choice in deciding the specific product or service performed.

167 You have various options in what to do and have to investigate and evaluate each of them to decide on the specific outputs of your work.

168 There is some question on what products or services should be expected as a result of your work, and you have to control and explore many variables and formulate possible results to decide the specific outputs of your work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reprase</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Discretion between tasks (complete tasks such as fix that car, frame a wall, type this letter, do room 4, etc.)

1. **You have no choice of which task to do next.**
2. **You are given task sequences for some tasks and have a choice in sequence for others.**
3. **You are given required completion time for some tasks and have a choice in sequencing them.**
4. **Except for some priority tasks, you have nearly complete independence in sequencing your tasks.**

### Supervision

Many jobs demand skills in supervision even though the job is not classed as a supervisory position. We would like to find out the extent to which various jobs demand certain supervisory skills.

**In your work do you:**

1. **Personally orient new employees.**
2. **Show other workers how to perform tasks.**
   - By demonstration
   - By instruction
   - By having them work with others
   - Using a prepared guide or manual
   - Using your own procedures
3. **Establish what training should take place.**
4. **Assess training needs.**
5. **Personally check on tasks performed.**

**In your work do you:**

6. **Assign tasks to other workers.**
7. **Use persuasion in any way.**
8. **On other workers.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>REPHRASE</th>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>ENTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the interview do you ascertain:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 Facts or information</td>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204 Opinions or beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 Needs, interests or desires (ex. a recreation director finds out what people are interested in doing)</td>
<td></td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your work:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206 Do you talk to other people about their problems</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207 Do you have to assist others in finding solutions to their problems</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208 Do you personally deal with grievances</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209 - workers</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 - clients or customers</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211 Do you become involved with problems not related to work (i.e. personal problems, etc.)</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212 Do you have any responsibility for follow-up counselling (i.e. written reports, follow-up sessions)</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213 Do you decide when third parties should be brought into counselling (i.e. other agencies, husbands, wives or friends)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have to coordinate the resources of one or more of the following: time, work, people, location</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215 Are you responsible for any long term planning?</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216 Do you:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. set policy</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. estimate costs</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. allocate resources</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. delegate responsibility</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. prepare an activity sequence</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. adjust plans to meet changes of conditions</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REPHRASE</td>
<td>JOB</td>
<td>ENTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>- clients or customers</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Tell other workers when a task should be completed (time requirement)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Make recommendations for hiring</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Personally hire employees</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Make recommendations for dismissing employees</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Personally dismiss employees</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Refer employees to counselors, supervisors or other informed people for assistance.</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**We view interviews as a method of questioning either individuals or groups to obtain information.**

**In your work do you:**

193 Conduct interviews

194 Conduct structured interviews (where a prepared list of questions is used)

195 Conduct unstructured interviews (where only the general purposes of the interview are known and the questions are not prepared in advance)

196 Interview job applicants

197 Interview fellow workers

198 - individuals

199 - groups

200 Interview clients or customers

201 - individuals

202 - groups (more than one person)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE ADJUSTMENTS</th>
<th>REPHRASE</th>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>ENTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>222 Is it necessary in your work to adjust your role performance with various individuals and situations?</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If answer is 'yes':</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223 - with fellow employees</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224 - with supervisor</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225 - with management</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226 - with customers</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOR SUPERVISORS ONLY**

1. Is there a compulsory academic requirement for entry into this occupation?  
   Grade or Adult Equivalents:  
   (specify)  

2. Are any vocational training courses required for entry into this position?  
   (specify)  

3. Have you ever a ______________________  
   (refer to occupation being surveyed such as secretary or plumber, etc.)
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**SAMPLE PAGE OF OCCUPATIONAL COURSE SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Whole Nos: Read</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>2</td>
<td>Write</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>3</td>
<td>Count</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>4</td>
<td>Add or Subtract</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>5</td>
<td>Multiply or Divide</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>6</td>
<td>Round H/D</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>7</td>
<td>Fractions: Read</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>8</td>
<td>Write</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>9</td>
<td>Add or Subtract</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>10</td>
<td>Multiply or Divide</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>11</td>
<td>Decimals: Read</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>12</td>
<td>Write</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>13</td>
<td>Add or Subtract</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>14</td>
<td>Multiply or Divide</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>15</td>
<td>Round H/D</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>16</td>
<td>Percents: Read</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>17</td>
<td>Write</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>18</td>
<td>Calculate With</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>19</td>
<td>Equivalents: Fractions to</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></td>
<td>decimals or vice versa</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>20</td>
<td>Decimals to 1 or fractions</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>21</td>
<td>Combinations</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>22</td>
<td>Word Problems</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>23</td>
<td>Ratio</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>24</td>
<td>Proportion</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>25</td>
<td>Areas</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>26</td>
<td>Perimeters</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>27</td>
<td>Volumes</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>28</td>
<td>Algebra: Write</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>29</td>
<td>Simplify</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>30</td>
<td>Solve</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>31</td>
<td>2 Variables</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>32</td>
<td>Quadratics</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>33</td>
<td>Variations</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>34</td>
<td>Trigonometry: Logs</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>35</td>
<td>Slide Rule</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>36</td>
<td>Calculations</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>37</td>
<td>Geometry: Identify Forms</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>38</td>
<td>Sketch</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>
</tbody>
</table>

**CODES:**

A - SKILLS TAUGHT IN Course
B - SKILLS REQUIRED FOR Course ENTRY
This report describes the study of the role of reading in the Navy enlisted environment, and the development of a "general plan" for providing an integrated job skills/reading skills training system. The study of reading included (a) the construction of Navy job reading tasks, (b) a survey of the attitudes of Navy personnel on the need for reading skills and job-related reading training in relation to job performance, and (c) the feasibility of including reading and job skills training as part of the regular training day.
NAVY JOB READING TASK INTERVIEW

Introduction

The Navy is working on programs to make its printed materials easier to read and to help its people to use these materials more effectively. As part of this work, the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center in San Diego is trying to find out what kinds of reading materials people use to learn their jobs and to carry out their Navy duties. We are working for the NPRDC on this problem and to get this information we are talking with a number of people like you who are either in training for jobs or are now performing those jobs. We are studying reading requirements in several different ratings, both in school and aboard ship. The information you give us is for research purposes only and will not be given to your supervisors nor will it be entered in any of your Navy records. Now, I'd like to ask you some questions about how you do your work and about what reading you do.
**NAVY JOB READING TASK INTERVIEW**  
(Part 1)

Date: ___________________  
Interviewer: ________________

1. Ship or Station: ____________________________________________

2. Name: ____________________________________________  
   (Last)  
   (First)  
   (M.I.)

3. Present Age: ______ years  
4. Sex: Male ____  Female ____

5. S.S. Number: ________________  
6. Rate (Pay Grade): ________________

7. a) Rating: ____________________
   b) Any previous Rating: ____________________

8. Length of time in present rating: _______ years _____ months

9. Company: ________________________________________________

10. Present Assignment (Billet): ________________________________

11. Length of time in present assignment (Billet): _______ years ______ months

12. Length of time in Navy: _______ years ______ months

13. Civilian Education and Training
   a. Highest grade completed in school: ________________
   b. High school diploma ____  GED Certificate ________________
   c. Other civilian education or training (college, vocational, trade, technical, business, correspondence course):
      ________________________________________________
      ________________________________________________
      ________________________________________________
      ________________________________________________
   d. Civilian work experience related to Navy rating:
      ________________________________________________
      ________________________________________________
      ________________________________________________
      ________________________________________________
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14. Navy Education and Training

   a. Did you enter your present rating through

      Class A school ______ or on-the-job training ______ ?

   b. After you got your rating, did you attend any

      Class B schools ______? How many ______
      Class C schools ______? How many ______
      Class F schools ______? How many ______
      Rate Training Courses ______? How many ______

15. In your present Navy activities (on the job and otherwise) do you ever read any of these?

   a. Manuals . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes ____ No ____
   b. Navy Regulations . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes ____ No ____
   c. Any of these: reports, logs, memos, orders, schedules, notices, official notes, messages (teletype or TWX)... (underline any mentioned) 
      Yes ____ No ____
   d. Letters . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes ____ No ____
   e. Forms . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes ____ No ____
   f. Figures, Tables, or Charts . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes ____ No ____
   g. Directions (not in any of the above) . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes ____ No ____
   h. Signs (such as, No Smoking) . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes ____ No ____
   i. Correspondence Course Materials . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes ____ No ____
   j. Other material (specify): ________________________ Yes ____ No ____

16. On a typical work day, about how much time do you spend in reading the types of materials we just talked about? (Get answer in hours and minutes if possible.) ________________________
17. In your present Navy activities (on the job and otherwise) do you ever write any of these? (Note: By "writing" we mean prepare, compose, originate information, not just copy typing.)

a. Any of these: reports, logs, memos, orders, schedules, notices, official notes, messages (teletype or TWX) . . . . Yes ___ No ___
   (underline any mentioned)

b. Letters . . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes ___ No ___

c. Forms (fill in the form) . . . . . . . Yes ___ No ___

d. Figures, Tables, or Charts . . . . . . . Yes ___ No ___

e. Directions (not in any of the above) . . Yes ___ No ___

f. Other material (specify): ____________________________ Yes ___ No ___

18. On a typical work day, about how much time do you spend in writing that involves the types of materials we just talked about? (Get answer in hours and minutes if possible.) ________________________________________________

19. Keeping in mind the kinds of reading materials that we have mentioned, tell me about your work day yesterday (or the last working day) particularly any work in which you did some reading as part of the job. Start at the beginning of the day and go from there.

NOTE: If subject does not mention one or more of the following types of reading, probe:
Reading to do a specific job.
Reading to learn job information.
Reading for non job-related Navy activities.
19. (Continued) ... REMEMBER TO PROBE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job or Activity</th>
<th>Information Sought</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the list of job reading tasks obtained for question 19, select 2 and ask the subject to get the source materials he mentioned for each task. If in another room, go with him to see his working area.

**Working Area**

20. Density of printed material (estimated lineal feet): __________
21. Proximity of print to person's work position: ________________
I. FIRST SELECTED TASK

Reading To Do A Job ___ Reading To Learn ___

22. What was the specific job or task that you were doing?
   Operation: __________________________________________
   On What: __________________________________________
   (For Reading To Learn) Reason: _______________________

23. What was the specific information that you needed to look up in order to do that task (quote Item 22)? __________________________________________

   For Reading To Do A Job or Reading To Learn to do a job...
   Circle appropriate response code* (may be more than one).
   1. Some
   2. All
   3. Some
   4. All

24. Show me the manual that you used to get that information.

   (Record full citation.)
   Manual or Course Number ________________________________
   Title ________________________________________________
   Date of Publication ____________________________________

* 1 = Identification of steps. (Some steps or all of them.)
2 = Sequence of identified steps. (Some steps or all of them)
3 = All or most elements (procedures) for identified steps. (Some steps or all.)
4 = Point of information pertaining to an element of a step.
   (One point of information or two points.)
25. Can you show me the exact parts that you used to get the specific information that you were looking for?

(Record way in which subject locates the exact reference.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses Table of Contents</th>
<th>Uses Index</th>
<th>Leaves through material</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Page(s) ____________________________

Paragraph(s) or Section(s) ____________________________

Figures (if any) ____________________________

If both text and figures were used, indicate which information was obtained from each.

Text: ____________________________

Figures: ____________________________

27. Had you done this particular task (quote Item 22) before? Yes _ No _

If yes, How often? ____________________________

Most recent time: ____________________________

If no, Had you done specific tasks that were similar to this specific task? Yes _ No _

If yes, What kind? ____________________________
28. [Pointing to or indicating the printed citation.]
Had you ever read this specific part before?
(For example, in a school or to study for a correspondence course or for the Navy-wide exam.)
Yes ______  When: ___________________________________________  Purpose: ___________________________________________
No ______

29. [Indicating the printed material.]
How much of the rest of this material have you ever read?
Percentage: __________________
How often: __________________

30. Had you ever read anything else that told you something about this specific job or task?
Yes ______  What: ___________________________________________
No ______  Did reading that material help you read this material? ______

31. What would happen if you did not read the material correctly and thus, made a mistake in doing the job? (Response should indicate how serious such a mistake might be.) ___________________________________________

For "Reading To Learn" Situations:  Skip to question 33.
32. Would you read this printed material to do this job if you do the job again tomorrow?  
Yes ____  No ____ 

next week?  
Yes ____  No ____ 

next month?  
Yes ____  No ____ 

a year from now?  
Yes ____  No ____ 

a. If No (for tomorrow?)  
Did you learn all the information needed just by reading the material and doing the job, without doing anything special to help you remember it?  
Just by reading: Yes ____  No ____ 

If No, What did you do to help you learn it?  (Possible answers might be repeating the information, writing it down to help learn it, listing the main points, etc.)  

b. If Yes (for tomorrow?)  
If you do the job again tomorrow, will you need to look up all of the information you looked up this time, or only some of it?  
All ____  Some ____  

If Some, Which information do you remember?  

How did you learn it?  (Possible answers: just by reading it, by repeating it, etc.)  

For "Reading To Do" Situations:  Skip to question 38.
33. Why did you select that information to study and learn?

34. Was the information you were looking for:
   a. Together in one place in the material in an order and arrangement that you could study from easily/
   b. Together in one place in the material, but in a mixed-up order & you had to rearrange the information before you could study it...
   c. Scattered in more than one place in the material and you had to dig out the information you wanted and put it together for yourself.

35. Did you use any special study methods to learn this material? (Describe):

In general when you study, how often do you use any of these study methods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make an outline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underline important parts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw pictures or diagrams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look up words in dictionary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look over whole section before studying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask yourself questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to memorize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read material over again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. How long do you have to remember the information until you first use it? (For example, use it for the test or to do a job.)

37. How often do you expect to use the information that you learned?
38. Do you do any writing when you do this job?  
   Yes ___  No ___
   If Yes,
   a. Describe. ______________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________
   b. Kind: Letter ____ Log Entry ____
       Memo ____ Form ____ Other ____ (Form # ______)
   c. When you finish writing it, do you show it to anyone to check it?  
      Yes ___  No ___
      If Yes, Who? ______________________________________________________
   d. Who reads it in order to use the information?
      _________________________________________________________________
II. SECOND SELECTED TASK

Reading To Do A Job ___  Reading To Learn ___

22. What was the specific job or task that you were doing?

Operation: _____________________________

On What: ______________________________

(For Reading To Learn) Reason: ______________________________

23. What was the specific information that you needed to look up in order to do that task (quote Item 22)?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

For Reading To Do A Job or Reading To Learn to do a job . . .

Circle appropriate response code* (may be more than one).

1 Some 2 All 3 Some 4 All 4 One 2 Two

24. Show me the manual that you used to get that information.

(Record full citation.)

Manual or Course Number ____________________________

Title ____________________________________________

Date of Publication ________________________________

* 1 = Identification of steps. (Some steps or all of them.)

2 = Sequence of identified steps. (Some steps or all of them)

3 = All or most elements (procedures) for identified steps. (Some steps or all.)

4 = Point of information pertaining to an element of a step. 
   (One point of information or two points.)
25. Can you show me the exact parts that you used to get the specific information that you were looking for?

(Record way in which subject locates the exact reference.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses Table of Contents</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leafs through material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Page(s) ___________________________
Paragraph(s) or Section(s) ___________________________
Figures (if any) ___________________________

If both text and figures were used, indicate which information was obtained from each.

Text: _______________________________________
Figures: _______________________________________

27. Had you done this particular task (quote Item 22) before? Yes ___ No ___
If yes, How often? ___________________________
Most recent time: ___________________________

If no, Had you done specific tasks that were similar to this specific task? Yes ___ No ___
If yes, What kind? ___________________________
28. [Pointing to or indicating the printed citation.]

Had you ever read this specific part before?
(For example, in a school or to study for a correspondence course or for the Navy-wide exam.)

Yes ___

When:
Purpose:

No ___

29. [Indicating the printed material.]

How much of the rest of this material have you ever read?

Percentage: __________

How often: __________

30. Had you ever read anything else that told you something about this specific job or task?

Yes ___

What: __________

No ___

Did reading that material help you read this material? __________

31. What would happen if you did not read the material correctly and thus, made a mistake in doing the job? (Response should indicate how serious such a mistake might be.)

For "Reading To Learn" Situations: Skip to question 33.
32. Would you read this printed material to do this job if you do the job again tomorrow? 
   Yes ___ No ___ 
   next week? Yes ___ No ___
   next month? Yes ___ No ___
   a year from now? Yes ___ No ___

   a. If No (for tomorrow?)
   Did you learn all the information needed just by reading the material and doing the job, without doing anything special to help you remember it? Just by reading: Yes ___ No ___
   If No, What did you do to help you learn it? (Possible answers might be repeating the information, writing it down to help learn it, listing the main points, etc.)

   b. If Yes (for tomorrow?)
   If you do the job again tomorrow, will you need to look up all of the information you looked up this time, or only some of it? All ___ Some ___
   If Some, Which information do you remember? __________________________
   __________________________
   __________________________
   How did you learn it? (Possible answers: just by reading it, by repeating it, etc.) __________________________

For "Reading To Do" Situations: Skip to question 38.
33. Why did you select that information to study and learn?

______________________________________________________________________________

34. Was the information you were looking for:
   a. Together in one place in the material in an order and arrangement that you could study from easily/ __________
   b. Together in one place in the material, but in a mixed-up order & you had to rearrange the information before you could study it __________________________________________
   c. Scattered in more than one place in the material and you had to dig out the information you wanted and put it together for yourself. __________

35. Did you use any special study methods to learn this material? (Describe):

______________________________________________________________________________

In general when you study, how often do you use any of these study methods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Method</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make an outline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underline important parts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw pictures or diagrams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look up words in dictionary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look over whole section before studying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask yourself questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to memorize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read material over again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. How long do you have to remember the information until you first use it?
   (For example, use it for the test or to do a job.) _____________________________

37. How often do you expect to use the information that you learned? __________
38. Do you do any writing when you do this job?  
   If Yes, 
   a. Describe. ____________________________
   b. Kind: Letter ______ Log Entry ______
     Memo ______ Form ______ Other ______
     (Form # ______)
   c. When you finish writing it, do you show 
      it to anyone to check it?  
      If Yes, Who? ______________________________
   d. Who reads it in order to use the information?
39. Think about all the information you now have about your job that makes you different from a person of the same rate in a different rating.

How important was each of the following training experiences to you in getting the information you now have about your job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Real Importance</th>
<th>Some Importance, But Not A Lot</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. Pre-rating knowledge  
(Knew before striking for rating) |                               |               |
| b. School rating training courses  
(Class A, B, C, F) |                               |               |
| c. Self-study rating training courses |                               |               |
| d. Day-by-day job experience/OJT |                               |               |
| e. Off-duty education courses |                               |               |

(Rank within each category)

40. Still thinking about all the information that you now have about your job that makes you different from a person of the same rate in a different rating... How important are these same training experiences for passing the Navy-wide exam?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Real Importance</th>
<th>Some Importance, But Not A Lot</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. Pre-rating knowledge  
(Knew before striking for rating) |                               |               |
| b. School rating training courses  
(Class A, B, C, F) |                               |               |
| c. Self-study rating training courses |                               |               |
| d. Day-by-day job experience/OJT |                               |               |
| e. Off-duty education courses |                               |               |

(Rank within each category)
41. Still thinking about all the information that you now have about your job that makes you different from a person of the same rate in a different rating. How important are these same training experiences for doing the new job after you have been promoted?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Experience</th>
<th>No Real Importance</th>
<th>Some Importance, But Not A Lot</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Pre-rating knowledge (Knew before striking for rating)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. School rating training courses (Class A, B, C, F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Self-study rating training courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Day-by-day job experience/OJT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Off-duty education courses</td>
<td>(Rank within each category)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Navy School Training

42. Thinking about your Navy school training and all the information you are expected to learn there, how much (what percentage) of that information do you feel you:

a. Needed to pass the course?  

b. Needed to be able to do your job?  

c. Did not need for either?  

43. If you could change the Navy school training to make it more helpful to you, how would you change it?

44. In the school training, how easy was it to understand the language used in the lectures, films, and discussions?

Rating Scale: 1 2 3 4 5
Very Easy

45. a) In the school training how easy was it to read and understand the language used in the printed materials?

Rating Scale: 1 2 3 4 5
Very Easy

b) How could the printed materials in the schools be made more helpful to you?
46. Now thinking about your rate training correspondence courses and all the information you are expected to learn from them, how much (what percentage) of that information do you feel you:

   a. Needed to pass the Navy-wide exam? ________

   b. Needed to be able to do your job? ________

   c. Did not need for either? ________

47. a) How about the Rate Training Manuals themselves; how easy are they to read and understand?

   Rating Scale:  
   1 Very Hard
   2
   3
   4
   5 Very Easy

   b) How could the Rate Training Manuals be made more helpful to you?

48. How much of the information in the Rate Training Manuals do you try to learn? Describe.

49. How many hours did you spend studying your last rate training correspondence course?

   ________ hours

   Over how many weeks or months were these ( ) hours spread?

   ________ weeks

   ________ months
50. What percentage of people have real difficulty in understanding the printed materials which they have to read in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy School Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate Training Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In doing their job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. Are these reading problems caused because the materials are harder than they need to be, or because the people don't read as well as they should, or both?

Explain:

52. What are the reasons why more people don't sign up for the reading courses that are given now; either on-duty or after duty hours?
3. How much difficulty do/did you have in understanding the printed materials which you use/used in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Real Difficulty</th>
<th>Some Difficulty</th>
<th>A Lot Of Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMT?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy School Courses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate Training Courses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing your job?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. a) Thinking about yourself and your Navy assignments for the next year or two, would a job reading training program - that is, a program which trained you to better understand the Navy materials you will need to read - be of any help to you?

- **Yes**
- **No**

If No, Why not?

54. b) Would you sign up for such a job reading training program offered during:

- **On-duty hours?**
  - **Yes**
  - **No**

- **Off-duty hours?**
  - **Yes**
  - **No**

If No for either one,

What would it take to get you to sign up for it?

55. Compared to other enlisted personnel in the Navy, how well do you read?

Please mark your position on this line:

- **Below Average**
- **Average**
- **Above Average**
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APPENDIX A

JOB LITERACY SURVEY INSTRUMENT
Hello, my name is __________ and I'm working with Dr. Larry Mikulecky of Indiana University. We are looking at how much reading and writing is done on various jobs. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions on this survey. We're just trying to get a picture of the kinds of reading and writing you do.

The first series of questions deals with background in reading and writing. It describes people in a variety of situations.

For example, listen to this description:

4. "You are tired of waiting for the dentist, so you start to leaf through a magazine."

We're going to rate this statement on a scale of one to five according to whether it is very like you or very unlike you. If that description is very like you, I want you to give it a score of 5. If the description isn't like you at all, if it is very unlike you, give it a score of 1. If the description is unlike you, give it a score of 2; if it is between being unlike you and like you, give it a score of 3; if the description is like you, give it a score of 4.

So what score would you give the following description? (Reread from above.) (Repeat scores and point meanings for the first few items.)

Okay, the next item is ...

5. You walk into the office of a doctor or dentist and notice that there are magazines set out.

6. There are many things you'd rather do than read.

8. People have made jokes about your reading in unusual circumstances or situations.

8. You are at a shopping center where you've been several times. Someone comes up to you and asks you where books and magazines are sold. You are able to tell the person where to find them.
### Skill Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On job</th>
<th>On this job at entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### IN YOUR WORK, DO YOU READ:

- Notes, letters or memos?
- Forms (such as work orders, job orders, vouchers, claims, purchase orders)?
- Charts?
- Policy manuals, regulations, and instructions?

#### DO YOU USE INFORMATION FROM BOOKS SUCH AS:

- Telephone Directories?
- Catalogs?
- Dictionaries?
- Technical References?
- Company Manuals?

#### IN YOUR WORK, DO YOU WRITE:

- Notes, letters or memos?
- Forms such as work orders, job orders, vouchers, claims, purchase orders?
- Reports for superiors or others in your field?

#### IN YOUR READING AT WORK, DO YOU HAVE TO:

- Use Directions?
- Find Out Facts?
- Find Out Opinions, Purposes, or Hidden Meanings?
- Use two or more books at a time to find out information?
- Compare references from two or more books and set a value judgement on the one to use?

#### IN YOUR WRITING AT WORK, DO YOU HAVE TO:

- Report on what was accomplished?
- Generate plans for further work?
- State your opinions about some aspect of the job?
- Complete already prepared forms?
I'd like to get examples of times recently when you used printed materials in connection with carrying out some part of your job (schoolwork). Could you give me an example of material you have used within the past month? (Get name of book, manual, etc.) Could you show me the section (chapter, unit, etc.) you used the last time you used this book? (Cite specific section).

Name of Material: ___________________________ Section # ___________________________

2.4 Type: (A) Book (D) Printed flyer (up to 3 pages)
(B) Part of Book (E) 1-3 pages (not printed flyer; letters, reports, etc)
(C) Manual (F) On merchandise or product

2.5 Ask to look at book to determine display:
(A) Text (G) Other
(B) Graphic (Charts, graphs; Not direct representation)
(C) Text, graphic and/or representative (D) Numbers only (no text)

If you had to do exactly the same task tomorrow, would you have to read this material again?

(Schools) If you needed the information from this material again tomorrow, would you have to read this material again?

A. No B. Maybe C. Yes

Did you learn something from this material? (If yes, proceed with the following)

Different people have different ways of learning information. For example, some people read it over two or more times; some people ask themselves questions about the material or solve problems using the material; some people relate the information to something they already know; and some people simply concentrate, or direct their attention by such things as underlining or outlining. How do you remember information from printed material?

(USE ABOVE QUESTIONS TO CODE THE FOLLOWING)

2.7 (A) Reading to learn (C) Reading to do (with learning)
(B) Reading to do (no learning) (D) Reading to assess
Specific Strategy:

2.8 Reading to learn task (to know; never read again):
   (A) Reread/rehearse
   (B) Problem solve/question
   (C) Relate/associate
   (D) Focus attention, concentrate

2.9 Reading to do task (No learning):
   (A) Fact-finding in text
   (B) Fact-finding in charts, graphs, tables, maps
   (C) Follow directions using text
   (D) Follow directions using charts, etc.

2.10 Reading to do task (with learning):
   (A) Special learning strategy (2.8 A,B,C,D)
   (B) Repetition of reading task over days or months
   (C) Single-trial learning (i.e., read once, then application of info "fixed" it.)
   (D) Other (Specify)________

2.11 Reading to assess:
   (A) Usefulness for a particular task
   (B) Whether to read more carefully later
   (C) Whether to pass material on to someone else
   (D) Other (Specify)________

2.12. Show me the most important information in this section (chapter, unit, etc.--105 pages). (Subject can determine most important information.)

   UNCLEAR
   1  2  3  4  5
   (A)  (B)  (C)  (D)  (E)

   Interviewer clues:
   Incoherent "Not sure, can point it out, but vague out, moderately clear explanation why it is important with detail
   Response floundering" Can point it Can point it Can point it

2.13. Try to summarize in your own words the most important information in this section (unit, etc.). (Subject can put in own words most important information.)

   INCAPABLE
   1  2  3  4  5
   (A)  (B)  (C)  (D)  (E)

   Interviewer clues:
   Can't do it Literal but miss a good part of it Near literal Summarize in your own words (no own words information elaboration) and elaborate a bit
2.14 Please describe several situations in which you would use this information. (Subject can name some situations.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAGUE</th>
<th>DETAILED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (A)</td>
<td>2 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (C)</td>
<td>4 (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviewer clues:
1 situation, 1 situation, Second variation, 2 variations 3 variations
vague in detail, vague in detail, in detail

2.15 What would be the consequences if you made a mistake in reading this material?

(A) Not important to task (B) Important, but not vital (C) Vital to Completion of task

16-18 How many times a month do you use this material? (Get exact number)

________ occurrences per month.

19-21 How many minutes per day do you spend reading this or similar material?

________ minutes.

2.22 Difficulty Rating. (After each piece of job (school) material is examined, the worker (student) should mark material difficulty on this scale.)

"How difficult does this material seem to you compared to these types of reading material?" (Show the interviewee the 2nd grade and Einstein passages.)

Single-word ads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1+</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Story</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>Novels</td>
<td>Contracts,</td>
<td>Einstein</td>
<td>Income tax</td>
<td>Passage</td>
<td>Manuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Circle One:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(You can verify with, "So, you feel this material is more difficult than _______ and less difficult than _______?")
2.61 (After all three reading samples have been discussed.) How many minutes per day do you spend reading job (school) materials other than those you just mentioned?

minutes.

ALTERNATIVE SOURCES

Often people talk to others in order to get information to help do their jobs (schoolwork). This can be as simple as checking to make sure about a certain detail or as complicated as having someone explain how to do a whole job or project. Asking the date, or a job number (or assignment information), or an address are all examples of ways workers (students) get information.

3.72-73. About how many times a day do you talk to others to get information about your job (schoolwork)?

3.74-75. What percentage of the information you asked about is available in a book, manual, or other type of print?

3.70. There can be many reasons for getting information from another worker (student) instead of looking it up. Which reason most often describes why you ask other workers (students) about information instead of looking it up?

A. To be sociable; to talk to someone.
B. The reading is unclear or parts of it are too confusing.
C. It takes too long to look up the information.
D. I usually ask my boss (instructor) to be sure I've got things straight.
E. Other

3.76-77. Workers: How many years and months have you been on the present job?

Technical School Students: How long have you been in this technical school program?

Public School Student: Code in 11th grade.

Code Time in Months: 1 year: 12 4 years: 48 6 years: 72
2 years: 24 5 years: 60 8 years: 96
3 years: 48 above 8: 99

3.78-79. How long have you been on a similar job? (In months)

Demographic Data

3.40. How much schooling have you finished?

(1) Less than 8th grade
(2) 8-12 grade (not finished h.s.)
(3) High school graduate
(4) Some post high school
(5) College graduate
(6) Post-college
3.49. Sex: (A) Male (B) Female

3.50. Race: (A) White (C) Hispanic (B) Black (D) Other

3.51-55. Income $________________ (Gross annual).

Questions to determine job categorization:

1. What is your formal job title?

2. What industry do you work in? (e.g., textiles, leather manufacturing, etc.)

3. What materials, tools, machinery, etc., do you use in your job?

4. To whom in the company are you responsible (title)?

5. Do you organize a staff or crew and/or direct its activities? Yes No

6. Do you research, construct, design, develop, alterate or repair? If "Yes," circle one.

7. Do you serve a client/customer directly/indirectly? Yes No.

8. Are you affiliated with any professional or labor organizations? If "Yes," specify: ___________________________ No

2.62-63. General Cloze Score ______ 2.64-65. Job Cloze Score ______
"This lake is all treated sewer water," the old gentleman murmured in admiration. The old man sat on a bench as close to the bank as possible with his elbows resting on his knees while gazing at the rippling water. The breeze sweeping across the lake caused the sailboats to glide along with amazing speed.

"We are making great ecological strides," he thought to himself. He knew well the story of this remarkable lake nestled in the foothills of Southern California. He swelled with pride to recall the wise choice the Santee citizens had made when they elected not to join the metropolitan sewage system where the waste would been been discharged into the Pacific with only inadequate primary treatment. Rather, the residents constructed their own sewage facility, reclaiming the sewer water, thus extending their own supply to provide water needs and clean recreational extras.

"This is probably the only city park in the world which is built just miles downstream from a sewer plant," the gentleman thought. He leaned forward scooping up a handful of water. "This lake is more sanitary than most mountain streams."
INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS

(Assuming the interview is already set up and the interviewer has arrived and is now face-to-face with the interviewee.)

Note: Come prepared with a complete interview folder containing the following:

(1) Instrumentation
(2) Answer Sheet
(3) "Skills Used" sheet
(4) Reading Task Sheets (3 sets)
(5) Difficulty Rating Sheet
(6) Alternative Sources Sheet
(7) General Cloze
(8) 2 numbered sheets for Job Cloze
(9) Broad-tipped black felt-tip pen (for constructing Job Cloze)

Briefly introduce yourself and explain what the interview is about. Try to set the interviewee at easy by telling him/her that the interview is confidential and that there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Our only interest is in an honest response.

The Diehl-Mikulecky Job-Liberacy Survey

The first section of the interview consists of a list of statements which the interviewee will rate on a scale of 1 to 5. (1) means that the statement is very unlike me; (2) means the statement is unlike me; (3) means the statement is neither like me nor unlike me; (4) means the statement is like me; and (5) means the statement is very like me. Give the interviewee an answer sheet and explain the scale, making sure the interviewee understands. Instruct the interviewee that as you read items, s/he is to circle the number on the scale that s/he believes to most represent his or her feelings or attitudes.

Read through the statements slowly enough so that the interviewee can respond, but keep the pace brisk. When you finish, place the completed answer sheet in the folder.

When interviewing in schools, you will possibly be giving this section of the interview to a group. The procedure is still the same. At the end of this section, however, it will be necessary to break up the group in order that the rest of the interview can be conducted one-to-one. If there are more interviewees than interviewers, one or more of the subjects will have to wait 20-30 minutes until an interview is completed. It's a good idea to ascertain who may have commitments requiring them to leave, so that they can be interviewed first.

Skills Used

After the first series of statements, the interviewee is handed the "skills Used" form and asked to fill it out according to the types of reading tasks encountered on his/her job, both at present, and when s/he first
began the present job. The interviewee is to make a check next to reading tasks s/he has and/or does use. It is possible for both columns to be either checked or blank on the same item.

**Reading Tasks**

During the next part of the interview you will be getting information from the interviewee concerning three examples of reading that are encountered on the job (in school).

Ask the interviewee (see "Reading Tasks") to show you an example of reading s/he has used within the past month. If the example is more than just a few pages, ask the interviewee to point out the specific section (i.e., chapter, unit, etc., 1-5 pages). Record the name of the material and cite the specific section in the spaces indicated on the sheet (2.4). Record the type of reading material (i.e., book, part of book, etc.) If uncertain, record "Other," cite specific example, and consult with another interviewer later to determine how it should be coded.

Ask to look at the material to determine what kind of graphic display (2.5) is used. (A) "Text" means that there are no charts, graphs, photographs, or representations of any sort. (B) "Graphic" means that the material consists entirely of charts, graphs, tables, etc. (D) "Numbers" means that other than a title at the top of the page, the display consists entirely of numbers, with no text. (D) "Representation" means that direct representations of something (i.e., blueprints, drawings, photographs, etc.) constitute the entire reading task. And finally, (C) is any combination of (A), (B), and (E)--any 2 out of three, or all three.

Next you must elicit information from the interviewee that will inform you of the purpose in reading this material. From the list of questions, choose the one or two that you feel best suits the particular situation.

The next question (2.6, "If you had to do exactly the same task tomorrow . . .") is to help you determine if learning has taken place during the reading task. However, sometimes the question seems inappropriate. If this is the case, try to develop (with the help of the subject) a hypothetical situation for which the question can be answered in a specific, rather than a general sense.

In order to verify whether or not learning took place, you ask the interviewee, "Did you learn something from this material?" If the answer is "No," you will code 2.7-B "Reading-to-do task (no learning)"; then choose the type of task in 2.9 A-D. If "Yes," proceed with the determination of the specific strategies (2.7-2.11). Please note that the introduction to this section is simply a way of eliciting information from the interviewee. The purpose is to get him/her thinking about the types of learning strategies actually employed, not to provide a list of options from which to choose. If you are asked to repeat the examples, it would be best to kindly decline and direct the interviewee's attention to his/her actual strategies used.
Item 2.7 lists the general strategy categories (i.e., Reading-to-learn, etc.), while questions 2.8-2.11 list the specific strategies within the previous categories. Item 2.8 is to be coded when the task is specifically for the purpose of learning (to know; never read again). (A) indicates that the interviewee learns the material by reading the material over and over again, in one place and time, not to be referred to afterward. (B) indicates that the interviewee learns by answering the questions at the end of a chapter; poses questions to him/herself while reading; solves problems using the information being learned, etc. For (C), the interviewee relates or associates the new information with information already known. And (D) means the interviewee finds a way to focus attention, such as underlining, taking notes, outlining, or simply concentrating as s/he reads. If more than one strategy is employed, code the strategy the interviewee uses most (or the first one cited).

Item 2.9 indicates that the reading task is specifically for the purpose of carrying out a job task, and the interviewee learns something less than half the time. This item is coded if the answer to the "Did you learn anything?" question is "No." (A) "Fact-finding in text" (as defined in 2.5) means that the interviewee looks quickly through the material to find the specific piece of information s/he is currently interested in. (B) is the same process, but using charts, etc., as also defined in 2.5. (C) and (D) are self-explanatory.

Item 2.10 is coded when the task is a Reading-to-do task, but incidental learning takes place at least half of the time. (A) indicates that a learning strategy such as those listed in 2.8 is utilized. (D) means that a repetition of the reading task over a period of time caused learning to take place, and (C) means that one reading, accompanied by an application of the information, caused the interviewee to learn it. If (D) Other, is coded, cite the specific strategy and consult with another interviewer later to determine how it is to be coded.

Item 2.11 means that the purpose of a reading task is to determine the importance or use of a piece of information--whether it is useful for a particular task, whether it might be important later and should be filed right now for future reference, or whether it should be passed on to someone else for use.

The purpose of the next 3 questions is to determine the interviewee's competency with his/her job reading material.

In item 2.12 you ask the interviewer to point out or show you (physically) what s/he considers to be the most important information in the particular section under attention, and to tell you why it is the most important. Using the interviewer clues, you will then score the subject on a scale of 1 to 5 according to his/her clarity of understanding.

In item 2.13 you ask the subject to summarize in his/her own words the most important information, and then score according to his/her ability to summarize and, perhaps, elaborate. Again, refer to the interviewer clues. It will be necessary to look at the reading material yourself to help you determine the interviewee's capability. The interviewee may repeat information here that was given in 2.12.
In item 2.14 you ask the interviewee to describe several situations in which this information would be used, and then score according to the number of situations and amount of detail. If you feel the interviewee is holding back on any of these questions, you can prod a little; use questions such as, "Can you elaborate?" or "Is there anything else?"

Item 2.15 is to determine the consequences to the interviewee in making a mistake in reading this material. (C) "Vital" can mean several things: a drastic occurrence, such as injury or death (i.e., if a backhoe operator reads the electric company's blueprint wrong and digs where the wires are buried); a great loss of money or prestige either to him/herself or the company; the interviewee's job is in jeopardy; the interviewee will be in serious trouble with the boss, etc. (B) "Important, but not vital" means that while the mistake has importance, there are enough other safeguards to ensure that vital consequences will not occur (i.e., the yard foreman at a lumberyard may make a mistake in computing a bill, but there is a great likelihood that it would be caught by the cashier, the accountant, or the customer. Even if it is not caught, the loss is not likely to be great). (A) "Not Important to Task" means that there are no consequences whatsoever.

Please note that the interviewee is not to be given the choice of A, B, or C. Simply ask question 2.15 and you determine whether or not the consequences would be vital and make the selection based on your judgment.

Item 2.16-18 is to find out the exact number of times a month the interviewee uses this particular material, or material very similar. The occurrences can be averaged out. Note that this question (and several more to follow) is coded in three separate spaces on the computer sheet.

After discussing each reading example, the interviewee is asked to rate the difficulty of that material on the "Difficulty Rating Sheet," Show the interviewee the first grade reader story and the Einstein passage and indicate that they rate 1 and 10 respectively, then ask the interviewee to rate his/her reading task according to those 2 anchor points and to the reference points on the scale (Yellow Pages, newspapers, etc.). Hand the interviewee the sheet and ask him/her to circle the appropriate number for each reading example.

In order to verify the interviewee's decision, you may ask, "So, you feel this material is more difficult than __________ and less difficult than __________?"

When all three examples have been discussed, ask question 2.61, "How many minutes per day do you spend reading job (school) materials other than those you just mentioned?" Again, the number can be averaged out.

**Alternative Sources**

The directions in the Alternative Sources section are pretty straightforward, but it may take some patience to get the information from the subject. It seems to take a great deal of thought. Item 3.72-73 can be averaged out over a 7-day week. In item 3.74-75, let the interviewee's assessment of the percentage stand. In question 3.70, however (reason for using alternative source), the interviewee is not to be given the list to make a choice. Let him/
her tell you the reasons, and you decide which choice is appropriate. If you're not sure, just keep the interviewee talking with questions like, "Is there anything else?" until you get enough information to make a decision.

Demographic and Job Information

Question 3.76-77 can be asked two different ways: for workers, it is: "How many years and months have you been on the present job?" For technical school students, the question is: "How many years and months have you been in this technical school program?" All high school students will be in the 11th grade. Note that time is coded in months.

For "Income" (3.51-55), ask if the interviewee would mind giving us his/her gross annual income. If s/he hesitates, inform him/her that it is solely for the purpose of categorization and that the information will be held in strict confidence. If s/he still refuses, it will be necessary to contact the interviewee's supervisor (either there on-site or later by phone) to determine what a representative income would be for that position.

The job information questions are to be asked of the interviewee to help determine his/her occupational definition. It may be necessary for the interviewer to make notes or elicit additional information from the subject. The more information we have about the subject's occupation, the more accurately we will be able to determine his occupational code number designation in the DOT (Dictionary of Occupational Titles).

Frequently, some of these questions will have been answered in earlier parts of the interview. If so, don't repeat the question, but be sure to code the answer--on the spot, if possible, but if not, very soon after the interview.

If you still do not have a clear understanding of the subject's job, ask him/her to discuss his/her responsibilities in more detail and make notes on the demographic data sheet.

Try to get as much information as possible, but do not spend more than a very few minutes on this section of the interview.

Cloze Tests

Next, the interviewee is handed the general cloze test to fill out. Explain the basic tactic of the cloze, that the first three sentences are left intact, then starting with the fourth sentence, every fifth word is deleted. The interviewee is to fill in the blanks with the word s/he considers most appropriate. It sometimes alleviates the tension to inform the interviewee that very few people score as much as 50%. Encourage him/her not to belabor this task.

If the interviewee has a reading example that contains a passage of at least 150 words in continuous discourse (and if there is a copying machine available, or if the material may be kept), you can prepare a job cloze while the interviewee is completing the general cloze. Choose a passage (indicating a beginning point), leave the first three sentences intact, and beginning with the fourth sentence, delete every fifth word until there are 25 deleted words. Please note that before you black out the words, it is necessary to record them on one of the two numbered sheets for the job cloze. Check the
"Key" blank on your sheet of answers. The interviewee is to be given the other sheet on which to record his/her answers.

This is the end of the interview. Thank the interviewee and go to the next interview. No more than a week should pass before the interview data is coded on the computer sheet. It should be fresh in your memory.
APPENDIX E

OBSERVATIONS FORMS
Women, Work and Literacy

A Program Model

Combining Literacy and Employment Training

On-site linkage of literacy classes to employment and training programs can be a significant factor in improving a woman's basic education skills—laying a stronger foundation for increasing her employability.

Key Program Characteristics

Programs should strive to be:

- **Comprehensive**—meeting the specific needs of low-income and single mothers.
- **Learner-centered**—recognizing each woman's own competencies, life experiences, interests and goals.
- **Flexible**—providing a variety of instructional strategies linking literacy and employment training.
- **Standards-based**—striving to meet operating guidelines for every program component.
- **Policy-linked**—incorporating advocacy activities that the program experiences to the public policy issues that will continue to shape literacy services.

Strategies for Service Delivery

**LITERACY COMPONENTS:**
- Individualized remediation plans
- Small groups
- Incremental goals
- Occupationally-related reading and math materials
- Student-created materials
- Computer familiarity

**EMPLOYABILITY COMPONENTS:**
- Job readiness
- Nontraditional skills training
- Job skills training
- Internships
- On-the-job training
- Job search
- Job placement

**LIFE SKILLS COMPONENTS:**
- Training in
  - Problem solving
  - Decision making
  - Goal setting
- Personal counseling
- Career counseling
- Support services in
  - Child care
  - Transportation
  - Emergency funds

Public Dollars for Literacy

- **The Adult Education Act:** Federal assistance for adult education and literacy is primarily authorized through this Act, which serves about 2.8 million people each year.
- **The Job Training Partnership Act:** Authorizes expenditures of funds for remedial education and basic skills training, literacy and bilingual training and attainment of certificates of high school equivalency.
- **The Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act:** Provides for an 8.5% set-aside for the Single Parent and Homemaker Program, within which funds are authorized for vocational education and training activities including basic literacy instruction.
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Resources

Association for Community-Based Education (ACBE)
1806 Vernon Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Business Council for Effective Literacy (BCEL)
1221 Avenue of the Americas
35th Floor
New York, NY 10020

Institute for Literacy Studies Lehman College
Bedford Park Blvd. West
Bronx, NY 10408

Institute for the Study of Adult Illiteracy
Pennsylvania State University
248 Calder Way, Room 307
University Park, PA 16801

Laubach Literacy Action
1320 Jamesville Avenue
P.O. Box 131
Syracuse, NY 13210

Literacy Volunteers of America, Inc. (LVA)
5795 Widewaters Parkway
Syracuse, NY 13214

National Alliance of Business (NAB)
1015 15th St., NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005

National Center for Education and Employment Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, NY

National Governors' Association (NGA)
444 North Capitol Street, NW
Suite 250
Washington, DC 20001

Project Literacy U.S. (PLUS)
Box 2
4802 Fifth Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

U.S. Department of Education Adult Literacy Initiative (ALI)
Reporter's Building, Room 510
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

U.S. Department of Education Division of Adult Education
Reporter's Building, Room 522
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

U.S. Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration
200 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20210

Literacy Publications from Wider Opportunities for Women

Wider Opportunities: Combining Literacy and Employment Training for Women (1988)
Executive Summary: Outlines barriers to and strategies for enhancing literacy skills of female single parents as identified by five case study sites. Price: $7.50
Case Studies: In-depth reports from each of four sites (New York, Chicago, Dallas, and Washington, D.C.) participating in national literacy project. Price: $5.00 each
Analysis of Eight Focus Group Sessions with Educationally Disadvantaged Women (1987); Price: $5.00

Wider Opportunities: Combining Literacy and Employment Training for Women—A Program Manual (September, 1988)
A step-by-step, "how-to" guide for employment programs to initiate a literacy component within on-going training efforts. Includes program standards, implementation strategies, sample materials, worksheets and discussion of policy issues. Price: $15.00

Report from the Rockefeller Female Single Parent Literacy Project (Available Winter, 1989); Price: TBA

Iliteracy and the Employability of Single Mothers (1986)
Presents an overview of the problem of adult illiteracy in the U.S., suggests policy solutions, and then details WOW's Single Parent Employability and Educational Development Project (SPEED), its individualized remediation program, basic skills research project and measurements of success. Price: $5.00

Order from: Wider Opportunities for Women, 1325 G Street, N.W., (Lower Level), Washington, DC 20005; Phone: (202) 638-3143.

About WOW: Wider Opportunities for Women is a 24-year-old national women's employment organization. Since 1964 it has achieved systemic change for women in economic policies, employment practices, and employment and training programs. With local training programs in Washington, D.C. and national projects across the country, WOW's goals are to achieve equal opportunity and economic independence for women.

This fact sheet was prepared with the cooperation of the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education (NCWGE).

11/15/88

The NCWW encourages broad distribution of this fact sheet. Those interested in reproducing it are simply required to inform our office.
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Workforce 2000

From now through the year 2000, two out of three new entrants to the labor force will be women.

- By 2000, it is projected that 80% of women ages 25-54 will be employed. Women will comprise more than 47% of the labor force.
- Hispanic women's participation in the labor force between now and 2000 will increase by 85%. Black women's participation will be up by 16%.
- The majority of mothers are also paid workers. In March 1988, two-thirds of all women with children under 18 were in the labor force; 53% of all women with children under age three were working. For the first time, more than half of women returned to work before their infants were one year old.

Almost all of the new jobs created between now and the year 2000 will be in the service sector rather than in manufacturing.

- Although these will demand higher skill levels than the jobs of today, most will be low wage.
- According to the U.S. Senate Budget Committee, 43% of women workers today are in jobs with below-poverty-level wages, compared to 27% of men.
- Five of the 11 occupations projected to create the largest number of new jobs over the next decade are now female-dominated occupations, with median weekly wages below poverty level. (1987 poverty level income for a family of four was $11,611 or $223 per week.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th># jobs projected to be created</th>
<th>1987 median weekly female wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail Sales</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>$192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitress</td>
<td>752,000</td>
<td>$178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>575,000</td>
<td>$183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Worker</td>
<td>449,000</td>
<td>$149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Aide</td>
<td>443,000</td>
<td>$212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The education and training women and girls receive often prepares them for a lifetime of poverty-level wages.

- Women workers, employed year-round, full-time in 1987 earned 65¢ for each dollar earned by men.
- The vocational choices of boys and girls as well as the choice of college majors by men and women indicates that occupational segregation by sex will continue well into the 21st century, with a probable continuing gap in wages.

For the first time in history, a majority of all new jobs will require higher education or training as technological change impacts the content and complexity of work.

- Only 27% of all new jobs will fall into low-skill categories.
- By the year 2000, people with less than a high school education will be able to fill only 14% of all jobs.
- At a minimum, according to employers, basic skills in written and spoken English, problem-solving, basic math, and analytical skills will be required for employees to adapt to continuing changes in employment.
- The American Society for Training and Development estimates that by 2000, 75% of all employees in the U.S. will need to be retrained. The number of companies that teach remedial basic education will have to double.

Sources:
NCWGE Issue Brief, "Women, Illiteracy and Poverty: Breaking the Cycle"
U. S. Department of Education
U.S. Department of Labor
Bureau of the Census
Hudson Institute Report, "Workforce 2000"
Children's Defense Fund
Congressional Clearinghouse on the Future
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The Problem

The U.S. Department of Education estimates that 23 million Americans over the age of 17 are functionally illiterate.

- One out of five American workers reads at no more than the eighth grade level.
- One in eight reads at the fourth grade level.
- Functional illiteracy means that these citizens cannot read or write well enough to perform the basic requirements of everyday life.

Illiteracy is increasingly linked to America's deepest problems: long term welfare dependency, poverty, teenage pregnancy, crime, and chronic unemployment.

- Children of illiterate parents are at a disadvantage and may continue a cycle of illiteracy.
- The greatest predictor of a child's future academic success is the literacy of the child's mother.
- Young women with below average skills and below poverty incomes are five and a half times more likely to become teen parents.

There is a high correlation between women's low educational attainment and high levels of poverty.

- Seventy-five percent of female heads of household with less than a high school diploma are living in poverty, compared to 34% of men in the same situation.
- Three-fifths of all adults receiving AFDC have not completed high school; the average reading level of AFDC mothers between the ages of 17 and 21 is below the sixth grade.
- Nearly 40% of female single parents have an eighth grade education or less.
- Thirty-five percent of displaced homemakers have an eighth grade education or less. Thirty-nine percent of these women fall below the poverty line.

Total costs related to our nation's illiteracy are estimated to exceed $225 billion a year.

Included are direct costs to business stemming from workers' lack of basic literacy and mathematical skills which can cause costly mistakes, lead to accidents, reduce productivity, and increase the need for supervision.

Literacy Needs for the Future Work Force

- good basic skills; reading, writing and mathematics;
- the ability to perform critical, higher order thinking;
- being able to analyze and solve problems;
- listening skills, speaking skills, and the ability to communicate decisions;
- basic technical skills with computers;
- being able to relate information to situations and understand one's role within a larger context.
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Teen Girls on TV Care About Looks and Dates, NCWW Study Finds

In August, WOW released "Growing Up In Prime Time," a National Commission on Working Women media report examining the portrayals of adolescent girls on TV. Based on a study of over 200 television programs featuring adolescent characters, the report found that:

- for teenage girls on television, the importance of good looks far overshadows ability;
- they are seen engaged almost exclusively in shopping, grooming, and dating, to the exclusion of any intellectual activities;
- they are significantly more passive than their teenage male counterparts, reacting rather than initiating the action;
- they receive less attention in plots and story lines, and
- they are disproportionately wealthy and lack economic diversity.

According to the report, the overarching theme communicated night after night to female teen viewers is that one needs no academic or intellectual preparation to become a successful, productive adult—that growing up is demanding emotionally and socially but does not require job skills or vocational planning.

Press and public response to the report has been widespread. Hundreds of newspapers featured articles about the report, and the Commission was interviewed on dozens of radio stations, as well as "Good Morning, America, "Entertainment Tonight," and "Hour Magazine." NBC News also carried the story. In addition, Sally Stransky, WOW media director, spent a week in Los Angeles briefing the producers of the shows analyzed in the report and discussing strategies for improved portrayals.

Five European Women Visit U.S. Programs
WOW Hosts German Marshall Fund Equal Opportunity Fellows

What do Ingrid Nümann-Seidewinkel, a mayor of Hamburg, West Germany; Ana Maneru, director of educational equity programs in Spain; Artha Schimmel, Equal Opportunity Officer for the Netherlands Postal and Telecommunications Services; Ulla Knapp, Equity Policy Officer for the Ministry of Economics of Northrhine-Westfalia; and Maria Pierret, Equity Policy Officer for the Ministry of Economics of Northrhine-Westfalia; and Maria Pierret, program administrator for the European Center for Training and Development in Berlin have in common?

They are German Marshall Fund Equal Opportunity Fellows for 1988. Chosen by an international selection committee staffed by WOW's Executive Director Cindy Marano, the fellows were awarded four-and-a-half week fellowships in the U.S. from September 26 to October 28. The fellows began their individual programs in Washington, D.C. with a week of orientation briefings, before traveling to three or four other U.S. cities.

As a mayor of an industrial, harbor city with high unemployment, Ingrid Nümann-Seidewinkel wanted to study equal employment policy in the public sector, as well as community development and job creation. She was hosted by the Office for Women's Rights in Seattle, the St. Paul Commission on the Economic Status of Women, the New York City Commission on the Status of Women, and the Center for Women in Government in Albany.

Ana Maneru was hosted by the Council of Chief State School Officers in Washington, D.C., the Women's Action Alliance in New York, and the Circle Project of the California State Department of Education in Sacramento. In each city she visited teacher training programs, schools, and advocacy groups working to improve equality of education for women and girls.

The program for Artha Schimmel was quite unique because she wanted to study EEO practices of public and private companies in the telecommunications industry. She visited the U.S. Postal Service, UPS, Federal Express, AT&T, MCI, and IBM among others. Her hosts included WOW, the YWCA in Memphis, the Women's Bureau regional office in Atlanta, and the Institute of Women and Work of Cornell University in New York City.

Continued on page 6
Welfare Reform Bill Becomes Law

On October 13, 1988, President Reagan signed into law a major revision of the nation’s welfare system. The bill was called “a revolution” by Senator Moynihan (D-NY) and “slavefare” by Congressman Augustus Hawkins (D-CA)—an indicator of the widespread and intense debate that the bill has generated.

The Family Support Act of 1988 replaces the WIN program and Aid to Families with Dependent Children and is expected to cost $3.6 billion over the next five years.

The bill includes rigid requirements for participation in employment, education and training programs, with a mandate that parents of children over age three (down to age one at state option) participate in these activities. The participation requirements will result in states having to serve large numbers of people with very limited funds. It also requires that one parent in a two-parent family participate in a workfare program as a condition of receiving benefits.

The new law includes transition benefits, such as child care and Medicaid, to help families make the transition from welfare to paid employment. It also strengthens child support enforcement provisions. It does not include any increase in cash welfare payments to families.

Advocates who are interested in having input into the state implementation process should watch for federal regulations, which must be issued six months after a bill is passed. A 30-day comment period is usually allowed on regulations. This will be the next opportunity to have input into the process at the federal level, before actual state implementation begins. Planning is already underway at the state level, however. Groups interested in having an impact in their states should contact their Commissions of Social Service.

An analysis of the new bill is available from Deborah Arrindell at WOW.

WOW Plans Its Future

by C. Courtney Elliott

Over the past few months I have been privileged to chair the Board committee working on WOW’s Program and Policy Agenda for 1989-1991. In planning for WOW’s future, the committee designed a two-stage process to receive significant input from all of WOW’s constituent groups. We met with WOW’s staff, with our local Industry Advisory Council, and the WOW Board. We also solicited feedback from the 400 members of the Women’s Work Force Network and the members of the multi-sector National Commission on Working Women.

During the process, the committee asked everyone two things: What do you think the political and economic climate will be in the next few years? And secondly, given that climate, what should WOW’s priorities be? Defining the climate was the first step, because the “climate issues” will shape and give boundary to what is possible and preferable.

The Program and Policy Agenda will be published by late winter, but following are some of my personal observations about what we have found so far.

First of all, it seems to me that all of WOW has approached this task with more urgency and a greater sense of its importance than we ever have before. We all agree that we are at a particularly critical juncture for women in employment and training. We foresee:

- a growing disparity in income between rich and poor in the U.S.;
- an ever-increasing need for employment and training programs for women, based on Work Force 2000 projections;
- no major new sources of public funding for women’s employment and training;
- the need for increased private resources for training future workers; and
- the need for greater collaboration between organizations which share common purposes.

Given this probable climate, I have been extremely impressed by a renewed sense of energy and commitment from the WOW family for these overarching priorities:

- continuing to concentrate our efforts on the needs of low-income women and women of color;
- creating opportunities for collaboration between WOW and other groups and among all the sectors concerned with the future of women in the work force; and
- strengthening the Women’s Work Force Network.

One of WOW’s strengths is that we represent a wide range of viewpoints on issues. What has been most striking for me during this process has been to see people with very different perspectives and levels of knowledge about issues and problems reach remarkably common conclusions. I have also seen and felt an increased spirit of cooperation among all of us. The process at WOW makes me optimistic about the future.

Equity Gains Made by Project Sites

- Two new curriculum units focusing on women in the work force, nontraditional careers and greater awareness of women's issues and job opportunities have been instituted for all tenth-grade students at Sandia High School, Albuquerque, NM.
- Area businesses are helping to develop a video bank of interviews with their employees in nontraditional jobs for presentation to eighth-grade students through Metropolitan Vocational-Technical Education Center in Little Rock, AR.
- Enrollments of female students in the technologies programs rose from 32 to 84—a 260% increase—following a series of recruitment activities in cooperation with the campus women's center, faculty in-service trainings and production of a video highlighting nontraditional opportunities at El Paso Community College, El Paso, TX.

WOW Launches National Literacy Demonstration Project

In September, WOW announced the publication of "Wider Opportunities: Combining Literacy and Employment Training for Women." This 76-page manual describes the literacy program model which was developed through an 18-month grant from the MacArthur Foundation. WOW's program model combines the experience and resources of five community-based women's employment and training organizations. The Midwest Women's Center in Chicago, Wider Opportunities for Women in Washington, D.C., Non-traditional Employment for Women (NEW) in New York City, the Mary Crowley Academy in Dallas, and Access for Women in Brooklyn cooperated to produce the program model.

The Department of Labor has now funded a national demonstration of this model in the four cities. The model project will serve 600 economically and educationally disadvantaged single mothers.

The program model has five key elements:

- It integrates literacy into an employment-oriented program. Women with limited educational skills can work toward their economic goals. They improve their basic reading, writing and math ability.
- It is standards-driven. Each element of the program has a set of general operating guidelines which specific service delivery methods should embody.
- It is flexible. For every component there are a variety of implementation strategies to meet the needs of the individual women in the program.
- It is learner-centered. Staff build on the skills and experiences of the women as they come to the program and involve them as active participants in the learning process.
- It unites program and public policy. Through advocacy activities carried out in concert with program operation, efforts are made to improve the access to and quality of services for disadvantaged women.

These are just some of the activities undertaken at the three Educational Equity Options Project sites during 1988. Funded by a grant from Levi Strauss Foundation, WOW has worked for the past 12 months with selected key leaders to bring the seven-step EEO Project process to their communities.

"Please make it clear that this is just a beginning, not an ending," said one key project leader during a roundtable meeting of leaders from the three sites. Held September 26 in El Paso, this meeting brought together the school administrators, women's advocates and sex equity coordinators who have been leading the efforts for each site.

The problem of occupational segregation within academic and vocational classes is persistent. The Educational Equity Options Project developed by WOW is a process for:

1. identifying and reducing the barriers faced by females for successful completion in nontraditional classes;
2. developing greater understanding and support among school and community persons for educational equity; and
3. training a team of school and community leaders to plan and implement local strategies to achieve sex equity.

After working with WOW for a year on the EEO Project, the three sites have begun implementing plans that will carry their sex equity efforts past the formal ending of the project. Mainstreaming such efforts is a goal of the project and at Sandia, Metro and EPCC—equity efforts are on the front burner to stay.

For more information about the Educational Equity Options Project, contact Judy A. Beck, WOW, (202) 638-3143.

To order the EEO Resource Bibliography—with over 80 listings of videos, books, posters and equity organizations—send $5 to EEOP Bibliography, WOW. (Make check payable to WOW.)
Network Members Active This Fall in Service to Women

Network Members Influence Public-Policy Makers

On a one-day trip to Chicago in July, U.S. Secretary of Labor Ann McLaughlin visited the Midwest Women's Center (MWC). McLaughlin chose MWC because of their strong record of training women in nontraditional fields. The visit coincided with her announcement of a new Task Force on Women in Nontraditional Fields. The visit gave McLaughlin an opportunity to meet with two construction women working in a nearby construction site.

"The sincere interest and expertise shown by the Secretary bodes well for all of us committed to insuring a future for women in the trades," says Susan Dunlap, MWC's executive director.

U.S. Secretary of Labor Ann McLaughlin (center, left) and Susan Dunlap of Midwest Women's Center meet with two construction women.

Network Members Create Funding Options

Women in the Building Trades (WIBT) at Roxbury College in Boston received a 12-month grant from the U.S. Department of Labor for $123,700. The group expects to get a matching grant from the state. WIBT invested three years of their time developing a model pre-apprenticeship program for women, which now also serves as a model for the state program. In addition to running their own program, WIBT does consulting for the State Department of Public Welfare.

Tradeswomen, Inc. of San Francisco sells their "Little Tradeswoman Coloring Book" for $4 plus a $1 handling fee (P.O. Box 40664, S.F., CA 94140).

The Center for New Directions in Pocatello, Idaho received funding from their local United Way Campaign to provide day care for mothers attending a vocational program or their last year of academic classes.

Network Members Develop Innovative Programs

Women receive pre-vocational training from Women Unlimited in Monmouth, Maine. The program stresses physical conditioning, personal and career development, job-related literacy and math, and trade-related technical skills training in surveying, electronics and construction.

The Women's Rights Information Center in Englewood, New Jersey held a Women's Career Expo on September 24, which included recruiting by employers and providing career advice on business ideas and on job training programs. Seminars covered the area of running your own business.

In Wilmington, Delaware the YWCA is developing a model transient housing project, designed to help women become self-sufficient.

The TEENS program (Teenagers Experiencing Educational Needs) is run by Mountain Empire Community College in Big Stone Gap, Virginia, providing 100% of wages for teenage mothers so they can develop marketable skills.

After getting the Shiloh Christian Retreat to loan them land in Pasco County, Florida, migrant farm women started their own cooperative nursery business, which is called Agricultural Women Involved in New Goals (A-WING). For more information, call the Southeast Women's Employment Coalition at (606) 276-1555.

New Ways to Work in San Francisco released their Equiflex Project Report. This report identifies flexible and non-standard work options that can improve work conditions for part-time and temporary workers, as well as for independent contractors. Call (415) 552-1000 for information.

Network Members Hold Seminars and Conferences

This fall the Center for Women in Government in Albany offered two-day seminars on Women as Managers and Women as Supervisors.

With the New York State Department of Economic Development, Everywoman Opportunity Center, Inc. of Buffalo co-sponsored a seminar for women on "Minding Your Own Profitable Business."

The Women's Economic Development Corporation in St. Paul, Minnesota is holding seminars on how to make one's own business more successful ("Snap, Crackle and Pop", "You're the Boss").

The Southeast Women's Employment Coalition of Lexington, Kentucky will focus on "Women Taking Charge: Making a Living and Making Change" at their next regional conference. It will be held on April 28-30, 1989 at Lake Junaluska, Asheville, North Carolina. For information, write SWEC Conference Committee, 140 E. Third St., Lexington, KY 40508.

The National Network of Hispanic Women will be holding a conference on "Hispana Leadership: In Step with the Future" in Los Angeles on June 22-25, 1989. Call (213) 938-617 or 459-041.

Anniversaries Celebrated

The Maine Displaced Homemakers Program and the Displaced Homemakers Multiservice Center in Hempstead, N.Y. recently celebrated their tenth anniversaries.
Region IX Meeting Held in San Francisco

The Women's Work Force Network held its annual Region IX Meeting in San Francisco on September 23. More than 30 people from California and Arizona joined WOW staff members and the Regional Leader, Robin Purdy of the Sacramento Employment and Training Agency. Robin Purdy and Karie Wyble of the Sierra College Tutoring Center organized the meeting and introduced many new program operators to the Women's Work Force.

Co-sponsored by VOICE (now the Employment Training Network of Sacramento), the regional meeting created new resource-sharing and supportive relationships between participants.

A highlight of the Region IX meeting was the presentation by Judy Beck and Sandra Porter of WOW's new literacy program guide, which serves as a model for integrating literacy education within employment and training programs for women. They stressed the importance of meeting key standards so that programs can serve single mothers in effective ways and begin to deal with intergenerational literacy.

Robin Purdy identified several changes in JTPA policy. The federal government has proposed that non-profit JTPA providers be distinguished from for-profit providers; only non-profits would have to consider revenues in excess of cost as program income. Under the Education and Training for a Competitive America Act of 1988, displaced homemakers are now defined as displaced workers and may be provided services. In addition, there will be fewer private sector members on the State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC), fewer members from state and local governments, and a stronger emphasis on participation from the general public, labor and community-based organizations.

A national assessment of JTPA is now being carried out by the Department of Labor. The assessment involves determining whom JTPA should serve, evaluating the quality of services and the management of the system, and exploring ways to integrate and coordinate systems. Cindy Marano, WOW's executive director, a member of the 30-person national evaluative team, encouraged the participants to provide her with any JTPA assessment information by the end of December. Feedback from other advocates and providers who serve women is also welcome.

At the close of the Region IX meeting, an impressive list of creative ideas on program development and public policy was prepared and submitted to WOW's Board of Directors as a contribution to the 1989-1991 agenda-formation process.

Women's Work Force Region II Annual Meeting Held

Merble Reagon and Mary Ellen Boyd, Region II co-leaders, welcomed 31 Network participants from New York and New Jersey to New York City for a day of information sharing and seminar sessions on October 26. In the morning, members provided feedback on JTPA to Cindy Marano as part of the national assessment process (described above). WOW staffer Deborah Arrindell then led the group in a critical analysis of the recently enacted welfare reform legislation.

Two concurrent sessions were conducted in the afternoon, one on WOW's literacy program model and the other on national issues for Region II and for the country. Issues raised included the crucial need for support services for women in education or training programs and the need to focus on work force-related issues for both welfare and working poor women.

The next meeting of Region II Network members will take place in January. Call Merble Reagon at (212) 964-8934 or Mary Ellen Boyd at (212) 420-0660 for further details.

JOIN THE WOMEN'S WORK FORCE NETWORK

Form a working partnership with more than 400 employment/training and educational programs and advocates for women by joining WOW's national network. Help guarantee that women receive quality job training, education and supportive services around the country and in your area. Keep ahead of the trends and influence the ability of women to shape our world.

Yes, I am ready to become a member of the Women's Work Force Network; enclosed is my membership fee of $40. I want to network with women's employment, training and education programs that provide pre-vocational, job training, counseling, job placement, job-related advocacy or other work-related services; policy and program advocates, employers, job training agencies, educational institutions, unions, funders, policy makers, and other supporters of the Women's Work Force Network.

I would like to make an additional contribution to WOW's work to ensure equality of opportunity and economic independence for women; included is my tax-deductible gift of $ __________.

Name ____________________________

Organization ____________________________

Address ____________________________

Telephone (________) ____________________________
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Equal Opportunity Fellowship
Continued from Page 1

Ulla Knapp was interested in public/private cooperation in job development and training for women as well as visiting EEO offices of various U.S. corporations. Her host organizations were the Chicago Mayor’s Commission on Women’s Affairs, Bay State Centers for Displaced Homemakers in Boston, and the Women’s Center for Education and Career Advancement in New York City.

The program for Maria Pierret gave her the opportunity to look specifically at research and evaluation methods for determining the effectiveness of training programs for women. She was hosted by New Economics for Women in Los Angeles, Non-traditional Employment for Women in New York City, Public/Private Ventures in Philadelphia, and Mathematica Policy Research Corporation in Princeton.

Fellows also observed how U.S. government systems work as well as how the American system of informal networks and coalitions impacts the political process on behalf of women. “Being in the States this fall during the pre-election period has been very interesting. Most of the people I met were more involved in the political process and more aware of events in the rest of the world than I ever expected,” said Ana Maneru from Spain.

Now in its tenth year, the Equal Opportunity Program is a valuable international exchange, particularly for women’s employment advocates. It has enabled a transfer of knowledge about U.S. equal opportunity and affirmative action policy and practice to almost every country in Europe through the experiences of former fellows.

WOW has administered the Equal Opportunity Fellowship Program since 1986 through an annual grant from the German Marshall Fund.
Celebrating Ten Years of Advocacy

by Linda Lavin
Actress/Producer

This year marks the tenth anniversary year of the first Women at Work Broadcast Awards, and it seems like a fitting time to reflect on some of the changes I have seen in the broadcast industry regarding working women.

There have been some positive changes, but there is still work to be done.

First of all, on a personal level, being a part of the Commission and the Broadcast Awards program has raised my consciousness as an actress and as a producer about the importance of portraying real-life women in real-life situations. I certainly think twice about the roles I play now and whether they are fair and true to the millions of women who struggle every day to meet the demands of work and family, often with very low wages.

One trend I have noticed in the last few years is that women's issues have come of age on television and radio. One mark of that maturity is that stations no longer feel the need to have lights flashing and horns blaring "Women's Issue! Women's Issue!" Instead we have begun to see the mainstreaming of women's issues on news and public affairs programming as well as in prime time entertainment shows.

As women's work force participation has increased, we have also seen women's characters on TV become stronger and more powerful in the last decade. We have moved from Chrissie and Janet on "Three's Company" to Jessica Fletcher on "Murder She Wrote" and from "Charlie's Angels" to "Cagney and Lacey." We now have strong women characters as lawyers and doctors on shows such as "LA Law" and "Heartbeat."

Family life in the eighties, with the juggling act that all working mothers perform every day, has also found its way into TV's scripts. TV's mothers are now career women, and though the realities of child care, school vacations or sick children are largely ignored as yet, such programs as "Kate and Allie," "Growing Pains," and this season's premiering "Roseanne" reflect the struggles many families face.

Now for the bad news: Many of the new strong women characters of the last decade such as Alexis on "Dynasty" and Pam on "Dallas" are very wealthy. If anything, television has made almost no progress in the last 10 years in the area of diversity. There are too few women who are working class or poor, and there are too few women of color on TV. I think the next step is to expand the portrayal of women to include more than an elite well-to-do.

According to the latest report from the Commission which looks at teen age girls on television, adolescent viewers are also being given an unrealistic picture of what it takes for young women to prepare for and enter the world of work. The lack of role models who are seen studying or doing homework, talking about future careers, can be outlined, and it seems like a trend that must be corrected in Hollywood.

Which brings me to a final "trend:" Women viewers have become a force for enlightened women's programming. As a producer, I know that unless studio and network executives hear from viewers to the contrary, they will assume all is well. You really can make a difference if you write and call. Among others, thousands of letters from viewers put "Cagney and Lacey" back on the air more than once when the network wanted to cancel production. So don't lose heart. You can continue to make a difference in our next 10 years!

Linda Lavin, Tony Award-winning actress and star of TV's "Alice," has been a member of the Commission since 1981.
Thanks to Our Interns!

In the spring and summer of 1988 WOW was again fortunate to have the splendid assistance of five very capable student interns. Susan Martino, a senior at the University of Connecticut at Storrs, developed a bibliography of audio-visual resources on nontraditional work for women. Robin Stroud, an Ada Comstock scholar at Smith College, researched and wrote a Commission report on nursing aids. Jennifer Watson, a graduate student at George Washington University, designed the literacy fact sheet and helped to implement press and Congressional briefings on literacy.

We were also pleased to have two women high school students who interned at WOW last summer. Sarah Novelli and Regina White contributed their skills and enthusiasm to our ongoing work.

We are now recruiting for spring, summer, and fall interns for 1989. Interested applicants should send a cover letter, writing sample, and two references to Cathy Stentzel at WOW.
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National Commission on Working Women and Women's Work Force Network of WIDER OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN
1325 G St., N.W., Lower Level
Washington, DC 20005
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Opening Comments - Don Eshelby, Director of Program Services Division of Voc-Educ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome - Alice Koskela, Special Assistant Governor's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview - Trudy Anderson, Acting Administrator, Division of Vocational Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor Comments - Ben Brown, Dept. of Labor, Seattle, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Workplace Literacy in a Functional Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Tom Sticht, Applied Behavior and Cognitive Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Workplace Perspective: continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Luncheon . . . . . . . . . . . . Hosted Child Care Services for Training Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharon Bixby, Child Care Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Workplace Literacy - The Idaho Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panel Discussion:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lloyd Hodgden - Potlatch Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kay Lamberson - Hewlett-Packard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julie Kilgrow - Department of Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Ford - Department of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gil Moncivais - E G &amp; G Idaho, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>Questions and Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Summary of Presentation and Implications for Idaho's Workforce - Dr. Tom Sticht ABC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FRIDAY DECEMBER 16, 1988

8:00 Workplace Literacy Application
   - Review and Recap Dr. Sticht

8:30 Child Care
   Ann Stephens
   Melanie Curtis-Campbell

9:00 Application Process
   - Policy Larry Lannigan
   - Form Wpl 43/55 Josie Chancey
   - Technical Review Dick Winn

10:15 Break

10:30 Networking Don Eshelby

10:00 Monthly Reports Linda Dutton
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COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
CONSORTIUM OF AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SCHOOLS
IDAHO ASSOCIATION OF PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCILS
AND
IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT

The Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy is comprised of the Consortium of Area Vocational Education Schools (CAVES), the Idaho Association of Private Industry Councils (IAPIC), and the Idaho Department of Employment (IDOE).

The purpose of this agreement is to identify the responsibilities of the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy members in each of the program objectives:

Objective I - Increase the availability of basic literacy services and activities.

The Consortium of Area Vocational Education Schools will:

a. Purchase the franchise rights to broadcast the Kentucky GED preparatory courses through the statewide Public Broadcasting System for adults who are unable to attend regular programs.

b. Facilitate the completion of the GED process for individuals who complete the GED preparatory courses through the ABE learning centers and outreach programs.

c. Coordinate with private industry councils, local job service, and joint labor management committee staff/members for the provision of basic literacy services to dislocated workers at sites or locations that are off-campus.

The Idaho Association of Private Industry Councils will:

a. Inform their JTPA service providers of the availability of the GED preparatory courses provided through the statewide Public Broadcasting System.

b. Coordinate with CAVES member schools, local job services, and joint labor management committees for the provision of basic literacy skills to dislocated workers at sites or locations that are off-campus.
The Idaho Department of Employment will:

a. Publicize the availability of GED preparatory courses provided through the Public Broadcasting System through their resource centers and other appropriate vehicles.

b. Coordinate with the CAVES members schools, private industry councils, and joint labor management committees for the provision of basic literacy skills services and activities for dislocated workers at sites or locations that are off-campus.

c. Provide labor market information which may assist in identifying occupational skill shortage areas and concentrations of job seekers, including dislocated workers who may have need of literacy training.

Objective II - Establish a network for the identification and referral of adults who are in need of basic literacy services and activities.

The Consortium of Area Vocational Education Schools will:

a. Conduct statewide training workshops to teach social service agency staff, employment and training agency staff, community base organization staff, and JTPA service provider staff how to recognize adults who may be in need of services; how to approach the adult about the apparent need for services; and where to refer them for services.

b. Publicize the dates and locations of the training workshops.

c. Identify appropriate staff to attend the training workshops; i.e., vocational counselors, etc.

The Idaho Association of Private Industry Councils will:

a. Inform JTPA service providers of the dates and locations of the training workshops and encourage them to attend.

b. Identify appropriate staff to attend training workshops.

The Idaho Department of Employment will:

a. Publicize the dates and locations of the training workshops among the local job service offices.

b. Identify appropriate staff to attend training workshops.

Objective III - Establish a network for the identification and referral of employers in need of workplace literacy programs.

The Consortium of Area Vocational Education Schools will:

a. Inform business and industry representatives on vocational advisory
committees of the workplace literacy efforts and encourage them to participate in the program.

b. Establish contact with employers through the workplace literacy coordinators and the postsecondary short-term vocational training coordinators.

c. Publicize the workplace literacy efforts through the Vocational Technical Education News and other appropriate vehicles.

The Idaho Association of Private Industry Councils will:

a. Inform the business and industry PIC members of the workplace literacy effort and encourage them to participate in the program.

b. Refer identified employers to the appropriate CAVES member school for services.

The Idaho Department of Employment will:

a. Identify potential employers through their employer network.

b. Inform Job Service Employer Committees of the services and encourage them to participate in and/or host forums on workplace literacy.

c. Publicize the workplace literacy efforts during regular employer visits, resource center materials, contact with employer committees, and other appropriate vehicles.

d. When an employer or group of employers are identified, the job service will facilitate contact with the appropriate CAVES member school to ensure appropriate coordination of literacy services within the overall employment and training strategy.

e. Job service staff will screen applicants and employers for workplace literacy needs when developing JTPA on-the-job training opportunities.
Objective IV - Develop programs to meet the needs of adult with limited English language proficiency.

The Consortium of Area Vocational Education Schools will:

a. Provide English as a Second Language (ESL) and other basic skills programs for adults with limited English language proficiency through ABE learning centers and outreach programs. These services will be provided with funds available through other federal and state sources.

b. Develop programs designed to address the needs of adults with limited English language proficiency in conjunction with employers, if the employer has identified a need in the workplace. These programs may be provided with funding through this grant.

Objective V - Develop workplace literacy programs in accordance with changes in workplace requirements, technology, products or services.

The Consortium of Area Vocational Education Schools will:

a. Conduct workplace literacy audits in conjunction with the local job service staff.

b. Develop curriculum based on the results of the workplace literacy audits. The curriculum may include a need for occupational skills upgrade classes.

c. Design the workplace literacy program in conjunction with the employer. The postsecondary short-term vocational training coordinator will coordinate the delivery of occupational skills upgrade classes as appropriate. The program delivery will be facilitated through the ABE learning centers and outreach programs.

d. Conduct program evaluation, including pre- and post-test to determine participant achievement.

e. Assign a representative to assist with on-site evaluation visits of the programs.

The Idaho Association of Private Industry Councils will:

a. Assign a representative to assist with on-site evaluation visits of the programs.
To ensure the effective utilization of resources and prevent duplication of effort and services, the Job Service and Private Industry Councils will coordinate workplace literacy efforts with services provided under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).

The Consortium of Area Vocational Education Schools will be responsible for the administration of the project as outlined in the Management Plan, and Quality of Key Personnel.

Dr. Trudy Anderson, Assistant Administrator
State Division of Vocational Education

Dr. Jerry Beck, IAPIC President

Jane Daly, Administrator, Employment Services and Training Division, Department of Employment

Dick Winn, CAVES Secretary
RESPONSIBILITIES

The member schools of the Consortium of Area Vocational Education Schools will:

a. Purchase the franchise right to broadcast the Kentucky GED preparatory courses through the statewide Public Broadcasting System for adults who are unable to attend regular programs.

b. Facilitate the completion of the GED process for individuals who complete the GED preparatory courses through the ABE learning centers and outreach programs.

c. Coordinate with private industry councils, local job service, and joint labor management committee staff/members for the provision of basic literacy services to dislocated workers at sites or locations that are off-campus.

d. Conduct statewide training workshops to teach social service agency staff, employment and training agency staff, community base organization staff, and JTPA service provider staff how to recognize adults who may be in need of services; how to approach the adult about the apparent need for services; and where to refer them for services.

e. Publicize the dates and locations of the training workshops.

f. Identify appropriate staff to attend the training workshops; ie., vocational counselors, etc.

g. Inform business and industry representatives on vocational advisory committees of the workplace literacy efforts and encourage them to participate in the program.

h. Establish contact with employers through the workplace literacy coordinators and the postsecondary short-term vocational training coordinators.

i. Publicize the workplace literacy efforts through the Vocational Technical Education News and other appropriate vehicles.

j. Provide English as a Second Language (ESL) and other basic skills programs for adults with limited English language proficiency through ABE learning centers and outreach programs. These services will be provided with funds available through other federal and state resources.

k. Develop programs designed to address the needs of adults with limited English language proficiency in conjunction with employers, if the employer has identified a need in the workplace. These programs may be provided with funding through this grant.

l. Conduct workplace literacy audits in conjunction with the local job service staff.
m. Develop curriculum based on the results of the workplace literacy audits. The curriculum may include a need for occupational skills upgrade classes.

n. Design the workplace literacy program in conjunction with the employer. The postsecondary short-term vocational training coordinator will coordinate the delivery of occupational skills upgrade classes as appropriate. The program delivery will be facilitated through the ABE learning centers and outreach programs.

o. Conduct program evaluation, including pre- and post-tests to determine participant achievement.

p. Assign a representative to assist with on-site evaluation visits of the program.
IDAHO PARTNERSHIP FOR WORKPLACE LITERACY

STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Membership

The membership of the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy (IPWL) Steering Committee shall be composed of one member from each of the following: Consortium of Area Vocational Education Schools; Idaho Association of Private Industry Councils; Department of Employment; Adult Basic Education; State Division of Vocational Education; and the Governor’s Office.

Appointing Authority

The membership of the IPWL Steering Committee shall be appointed by the agency or organization they represent.

Alternates

A member may designate a voting alternate to represent him/her at an IPWL Steering Committee meeting upon notification of the Chair.

OFFICERS AND THEIR DUTIES

The Chair of this body shall be the member appointed by the State Administrator for Vocational Education and shall serve for the duration of the project. The duties of the Chair shall be:

1. To call and preside at all meetings of IPWL.
2. To make committee assignments.
3. To appoint committee chair and members.
4. To record, publish and distribute the minutes of IPWL.
5. To supply IPWL members with information as needed to conduct IPWL business.
6. To provide professional, technical and clerical staff.
7. To coordinate the dissemination of proposals and related materials.

MEETINGS

Regular Meetings

Regular meetings of IPWL Steering Committee will be held at least once per month during the project’s start up time and at least six times during the project’s operational time. Meetings will be held at times and places determined by the members.

Special Meetings

Conference calls may be initiated by the Chair as deemed necessary.

Agenda Items
The Chair shall prepare an agenda. Any member may place an item on the agenda by notifying the Chair. Unless two working days prior notice has been given of the pending consideration of an agenda item, any members of IPWL Steering Committee may cause that item to be held over to the next regular meeting.

Open Meetings

All regular meetings of IPWL shall be open to the public, except those authorized under Idaho Law which may be held in executive session.

QUORUM

Members of IPWL Steering Committee may be represented at IPWL Steering Committee meetings by designated voting alternates upon notification to the Chair by the member.

A quorum of IPWL Steering Committee shall consist of a majority of the members.

A question shall be carried by a majority vote of quorum voting.

Each IPWL Steering Committee member is entitled to one vote.

RULES

The conduct of the meeting shall be in accordance with Robert’s Rules of Order, insofar as they do not conflict with these organizational guidelines.

AMENDMENTS

These organizational guidelines may be amended or repealed at any regular meeting of IPWL Steering Committee by a majority vote, provided that copies of such amendments shall have been submitted in writing to each member at least seven days before they are proposed.
MISSION STATEMENT

The purpose of the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy is to coordinate the effective delivery of basic literacy and occupational skills training necessary for the increasing literacy demands of the workplace.

The Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy has identified the following project objectives:

1. Increase the availability of basic literacy services and activities.
   a. Provide GED preparatory courses through the statewide Public Broadcasting System for adults who are unable to attend regular programs.
   b. Provide basic literacy skills, high school diploma and equivalency instruction for dislocated workers at sites or locations that are not on campus.

2. Establish an identification and referral network.
   a. Establish an identification and referral network of social service agencies, employment and training agencies, community based organizations, and JTPA service providers. The statewide network will identify adults who are in need of basic literacy services and refer them to the appropriate ABE learning center or outreach program for services.
   b. Establish a business and industry identification and referral network to educate business and industry employers and employees on the importance of basic skills in the workplace; identify those businesses who are in need of workplace literacy services; and refer them to the appropriate postsecondary vocational-technical school.

3. Provide programs to meet the needs of adults with limited English language proficiency in conjunction with business and industry.

4. Provide workplace literacy programs designed to update and upgrade basic literacy and occupational skills of employed adults in accordance with changes in workplace requirements,
# IDAHO PARTNERSHIP FOR WORKPLACE LITERACY

## STATE DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trudy Anderson</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>334-3213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Winn</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>334-2659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Lannigan</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td>334-3214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josie Chancey</td>
<td>Staff Training</td>
<td>334-3871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Eshelby</td>
<td>Program Assistance</td>
<td>334-2659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Dutton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shirley Spencer</th>
<th>Technical Consultant</th>
<th>334-2186</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABE Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IDAHO PARTNERSHIP FOR WORKPLACE LITERACY
SCHOOL OF VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION NETWORK

Boise State University
School of Vocational-Technical Education
1910 University Drive
Boise, ID 83725

Acting Dean: Dr. Tom Denison
385-1508

Short-Term Training Skills Coordinators:
Charles Tillman
Gary Arambarri
Bonnie Sumter
Barbara Egland

CAVES Representative: Dr. Tom Denison

ABE Director: Elaine Simmons
385-3681

Workplace Literacy Coordinators:
Marilyn Slone
Cheryl Engle
385-3681

Center for New Directions: Marie Meyer
385-3681

College of Southern Idaho
School of Vocational-Technical Education
315 Falls Avenue
Twin Falls, ID 83303

Dean: Dr. Orval Bradley
733-9554

Short-Term Training Skills Coordinators:
Dave White
Karine Siplong
Rick Parker

CAVES Chairman: Dr. Orval Bradley

ABE Director: Marilyn Mecham

Workplace Literacy Coordinator: Marilyn Stevens

Center for New Directions: Rita Larom
736-0070
Eastern Idaho Vocational-Technical School
1600 Hitt Road
Idaho Falls, ID 83404
524-3000

Director: John Christofferson
Short-Term Training Skills Coordinator: Roger Orme
CAVES Representative: Bill Robertson

Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy
School of Vocational-Technical Education Network

ABE Director: Ken Erickson
Workplace Literacy Coordinator: Marti Felicione
Center for New Directions: Yvonne Booty

Idaho State University
School of Vocational-Technical Education
Pocatello, ID 83209
236-3227

Dean: Dr. Richard Johnson
Short-Term Training Skills Coordinator: Margaret Phelph
CAVES Representative: Gordon Jones
ABE Director: Richard Sparks 236-2468
Workplace Literacy Coordinator: Dean Hoch
Center for New Directions: Laura Clemons 236-2454
Lewis-Clark State College  
School of Vocational-Technical Education  
8th Avenue and 6th Street  
Lewiston, ID 83501  
799-2225  

Dean: Dr. Mel Streeter  
Short-Term Training Skills Coordinators: Nancy Howser, Harvey Franklin, Bill Tennant  
CAVES Representative: Dr. Mel Streeter  
ABE Director: Darryl Lewis  
Workplace Literacy Coordinator: Brent Studer  
Center for New Directions: Vicki Daehling 799-2331  

North Idaho College  
School of Vocational-Technical Education  
1000 West Garden  
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814  
769-3444  

Dean: Clarence Haught  
Short-Term Training Skills Coordinator: Bernie Knapp  
CAVES Representative: Bernie Knapp  
ABE Director: Helen Branson 769-3450  
Workplace Literacy Coordinator: Allison Gilmore  
Center for New Directions: Carol Joseph 769-3445
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL OFFICE</th>
<th>MANAGER</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackfoot</td>
<td>M. Wade Virgin</td>
<td>785-2200</td>
<td>155 N. Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaine County</td>
<td>Susan Deemer</td>
<td>788-3526</td>
<td>513 N. Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 1, Hailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105 S. Third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise-East</td>
<td>Ethna Scagraglino</td>
<td>334-6200</td>
<td>8455 Emerald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise-West</td>
<td>Jim Lowery</td>
<td>334-4211</td>
<td>1069 S. Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonners Ferry</td>
<td>Karin Smith</td>
<td>267-5581</td>
<td>127 W. 5th St. N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burley-Rupert</td>
<td>Roger Poulton</td>
<td>678-5518</td>
<td>Burley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon County</td>
<td>Art Thorsted</td>
<td>459-4617</td>
<td>5909 Graye Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeur d'Alene</td>
<td>Betty Kerr</td>
<td>765-2258</td>
<td>202 Anton Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmett</td>
<td>Sharon Vawter</td>
<td>365-5316</td>
<td>2030 S. Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grangeville</td>
<td>John Purdy</td>
<td>983-0440</td>
<td>102 N. College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Falls</td>
<td>Cal Larson</td>
<td>525-7000</td>
<td>150 Shoup Ave, Suite 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellogg</td>
<td>Gary Beck</td>
<td>783-1202</td>
<td>120 W. Cameron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewiston</td>
<td>Tim Rubio</td>
<td>746-0471</td>
<td>1158 Idaho St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCall</td>
<td>Jim Thackeray</td>
<td>634-7102</td>
<td>Village Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>Ron Flathers</td>
<td>882-7571</td>
<td>221 E. 2nd St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Home</td>
<td>Marilyn Campbell</td>
<td>587-7911</td>
<td>575 N. 3rd E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orofino</td>
<td>David Washburn</td>
<td>476-5506</td>
<td>153 Johnson Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payette</td>
<td>Joe Bowman</td>
<td>642-3375</td>
<td>175 N. 16th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocatello</td>
<td>Larry Palmer</td>
<td>233-3821</td>
<td>430 N. 5th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rexburg</td>
<td>Steven J. Platts</td>
<td>356-4451</td>
<td>49 Professional Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Maries</td>
<td>Morris Bentley</td>
<td>245-2518</td>
<td>622 College Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon</td>
<td>George Galvan</td>
<td>756-2234</td>
<td>1301 Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandpoint</td>
<td>Lee Sieckmann</td>
<td>263-7544</td>
<td>1123 Lake St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Falls</td>
<td>Jim Ingalls</td>
<td>733-4880</td>
<td>260 4th Ave. N.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCILS

Mr. Scott McDonald, Planner
Southeast Idaho Private Industry Council
1070 Hiline Road, Suite 390
Pocatello, ID 83201

Ms. Candy McElfresh, Coordinator
South Central Idaho Private Industry Council
P.O. Box 1844
Twin Falls, ID 83303

Mr. George Dignan, Administrator
Southwest Idaho Private Industry Council
727C Potomac
Boise, ID 83704

Mr. Jim Flowers, Administrator
North Idaho Private Industry Council
11100 Airport Drive
Hayden Lake, ID 83835

Ms. Tina Alexanderson, Planner
Clearwater Private Industry Council
1626 6th Avenue North
Lewiston, ID 83501

Mr. Terry Butikofer, Planner
East Central Idaho Private Industry Council
P.O. Box 330
Rexburg, ID 83440
WORKPLACE LITERACY COORDINATORS

All instructional staff hired through this project will meet the Idaho Certification Standards for Professional School Personnel (academic and vocational) as applicable. Instructional staff will devote 100% of their time to the project.

The conditions of the grant stipulate that the workplace literacy coordinators will be under the direct supervision of the ABE program directors, who report to the dean/director of the postsecondary vocational-technical school. The workplace literacy coordinator will be responsible for coordinating with the private industry councils and local job service staff for the identification of business/industry in need of program services; working in conjunction with the postsecondary short-term training coordinator and job service staff to conduct workplace literacy audits and determining employee proficiency levels; developing workplace literacy curriculum; and establishing/coordinating the delivery of program services, activities and evaluations. The workplace literacy coordinator may serve as instructor to deliver workplace literacy curriculum.

The workplace literacy coordinators will be trained to conduct workplace literacy audits and to coordinate the adaptation of curriculum based on the results of those audits. The workplace literacy curriculum will be developed to improve the employee’s proficiency to an acceptable level and will:

- be organized by job tasks, not discrete basic skills;
- include problems and simulated situations that call for the use of basic skills as they will be used on the job;
- provide opportunities to link basic skills and thinking together;
- build on the employee’s knowledge of the job content;
- incorporate the use of actual job materials as instructional texts;
- when applicable, give employees the opportunity to work together and learn from each other;
- be linked to the goals of the company and the participating employees.

When necessary, the basic skills training will be coordinated with postsecondary short-term training upgrade classes (occupational skills training) and/or classes designed to improve the employee’s speaking, listening, and reasoning skills as identified in the workplace literacy audit.
DEFINITIONS

WORKPLACE LITERACY: The labor market of the future will require workers with flexible skills and a high degree of information processing capability. Such "real world" capability, to be referred to as "workplace literacy", emphasizes the tasks of "locating the correct information in complex displays of print, holding information in 'work memory' while finding additional information, transferring these fragments of information into new knowledge, and then writing or otherwise communicating the results of these complex cognitive activities."*

WORKPLACE LITERACY: The basic skills needed to perform work successfully are commonly referred to as job-related or workplace literacy skills and generally include: mathematics, reading, writing, speaking, listening and the ability to apply these skills in problem-solving. Workplace literacy differs from general literacy in both context and purpose as it addresses specific needs of workers on-the-job. For this reason, workplace literacy cannot be defined in static terms as it is constantly changing to meet rapid changes in the workplace.

For the purpose of this grant, workplace literacy may also include technical and occupational specific skills when they are coupled with basic skills in planning programs.

WORKPLACE LITERACY AUDITS: According to the Bottom Line, a literacy audit is an investigation that leads to definitions of jobs in terms of their basic skill requirements and then to an assessment of the workforce's proficiency in those skills. The tools of an audit are observation, collection and analysis of materials, interviews, and customized tests.

For the purpose of this grant, it may also include investigation and assessment of technical and occupational specific skills when indicated by employers.

*Literacy: Profiles of America's Young Adults, National Assessment of Educational Programs.
WORKPLACE LITERACY JOB ANALYSIS
AND EMPLOYEE ASSESSMENT

The purpose of a workplace literacy audit is to determine the skills gap (basic and/or technical). It is an attempt to answer the following questions:

What is the present level of the worker's skills?

What is the necessary level for satisfactory job performance or for coping with changing job demands?

What curriculum and instruction can be used to bring the skills to the identified desired level?

When a potential employer has been identified, the workplace literacy coordinator, postsecondary short-term training coordinator and job service staff will conduct a workplace literacy audit to include:

- employee interview and observation to determine the basic and/or technical skills used on the job;
- management interviews to determine their perception of the skills necessary for the jobs;
- collection of materials that are written and read on the job to determine the level of skill proficiency required;
- development of cloze tests based on the employees' job reading requirements;
- collection of a sample of any math used on the job;
- assessment of math deficiency if applicable;
- identification of any technological changes that have taken place or will take place that will affect skills levels needed by workers.
EVALUATION PLAN

The internal evaluation plan includes activities designed to measure both the quality of instruction and overall program efficiency. The evaluation of instruction will be conducted with a student survey designed to gather information on the quality of instruction such as relevance of program content, instructor effectiveness, quality of facilities, etc. Student learning will be measured through the assessment process and pre- and post-testing. Additional evaluative information will be solicited from supervisors and employers for programs conducted in the workplace for a specific employer.

Monthly reports will be obtained to reflect and evaluate:

1. The activities of the workplace literacy coordinators.
   a. Number of business/industry contacts
   b. Development of programs/curriculum
   c. Progress of programs in developmental stage

2. The efficiency of the identification and referral networks.
   a. The number of business/industry contacts
   b. The number of individuals identified as needing services
   c. The number of adults referred for services

3. The progress of programs in operation.
   a. The number of adults enrolled in the program
   b. The number of contact hours for the month
   c. The number of adults completing program objectives

The monthly progress reports will also state any problems or accomplishments during the month and additional participant and program information as required.

On-site program reviews will be conducted by members of the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy.

The external evaluation will be conducted by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL). Formal details of the formative evaluation will be available after the Washington conference which is tentatively scheduled for January, 1989.
December 8, 1988

Jane Thompson, Grants Specialist
U.S. Department of Education
Grants and Contracts Services
7th and D Streets, S.W.
Washington, DC 20202-4838

Dear Jane:

This letter is in response to our telephone conversation on September 8, 1988, regarding the workplace literacy proposal PR/Award #V198A80068 submitted by the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy. Enclosed are the original and two copies of the following:

- Revised Form #424
- Signed Partners' Agreement
- Revised Budget Narrative
- Match Budget Narrative
- Clarification of Contractual Services

The budget we discussed on the telephone has been amended to reflect the following changes:

Salaries and Wages - have been reduced by $328 from $76,028 to $75,700 for:

- 3.5 FTE Workplace Literacy Coordinators -
  7,280 hours @ $10/hour = $72,800
- Irregular help - $2,900

Staff Training Travel - has been increased by $1,831 from $9,928 to $11,759 for:

- Two trips to Boise for the Workplace Literacy Coordinators. One trip will be in early October for orientation, and the second trip will be on November 10 to attend the Ohio State University audio-conference.
- The staff training scheduled for November 10-11 has been changed to December 14-16, 1988. The State Division of Vocational Education is covering the cost to bring Tom Sticht to Boise for a one-day conference and two-day training session. This resulted in an additional day of per diem for 30 people and 24 motel rooms for an additional night.

Supplies - have been reduced by $6,039 from $9,000 to $2,961 and will be used for:

- 258 VCR tapes to off-air record the KET GED tapes for check-out use.
- Reference books to be maintained by the State Division of Vocational Education for use by the Workplace Literacy Coordinators.
- Miscellaneous supplies for the Workplace Literacy Coordinators at $183 per school for six (6) schools.
- Printing costs associated with a Workplace Literacy brochure to be used in conjunction with the Business/Industry Identification and Referral Network.

**Contractual Services** - have been increased by $4,148 from $160,450 to $164,608 for:
- The franchise agreement with Kentucky Educational Television has been increased by $358 from $10,450 to $10,808 to cover the cost of the computer component. The computer component will be duplicated for check-out use at each of the six regional ABE centers.
- Subproposals to operate Workplace Literacy Programs will remain at $120,800.
- Child care for employed adults who participate in programs during nonworking hours will remain at $29,200.
- An outside evaluator for the project has been budgeted at $3,800 but may require up to $5,000. The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, in Portland, Oregon, has been contacted and has agreed to conduct a formative evaluation of the project. We will negotiate a final cost with the NWREL once final details regarding the evaluation is received at the Washington conference. The NWREL has an exemplary track record. We are confident that the expertise of the lab’s consultants will be a positive factor in the overall success of the project.

**Other** - has been increased to $4,500 to cover:
- Postage @ $300/school X 6 schools
- Telephone @ $250/school X 6 schools
- Photocopying costs @ $100/school X 6 schools
- Ohio State Audio Conference

**Project Start-Up Costs** - have increased by $2,431 from $33,760 to $36,191 to cover the additional cost of staff training. The revised match figure is $109,632.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at (208) 334-3213. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Trudy Anderson, Ph.D.
Workplace Literacy Project Director

TA/JC/jb
Enclosures

cc: Steering Committee Members
    Dr. William Ullery
PARTNERS' AGREEMENT

As authorized representatives of our organizations, we agree to the following terms with respect to our application number V198AB0068 as a condition of receiving a grant from the Workplace Literacy Program. We:

- are willing to be partners in this project;
- will perform the activities outlined for each of us in the application;
- will be bound by the statements contained in the application.

Name: Dr. Trudy Anderson
Assistant State Administrator, State Division of Vocational Education
Title, Organization

Name: Dick Winn
Secretary, Consortium of Area Vocational Education Schools
Title, Organization

Name: Dr. Jerry Beck
President, Association of Private Industry Councils
Title, Organization

Name: Jane Daly
Administrator, Employment Services & Training Div., Dept. of Employment
Title, Organization
# BUDGET NARRATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Start-Up*</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Operation**</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Salary and Wages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 FTE Workplace Literacy Coordinators - 7,280 hours @ $10/hour</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>$72,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular Help</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fringe Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 FTE Workplace Literacy Coordinators @ 24% of $72,800</td>
<td>$4,032</td>
<td>$13,440</td>
<td>$17,472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular Help</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>$72,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required trip to Washington DC for Project Director</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$N/A</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Literacy Coordinators</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Training:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Trips to Boise for WPL Coord.</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in Boise</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification/Referral Network</td>
<td>3,198</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$14,759</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$26,759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258 VCR tapes to off-air record Kentucky Tapes for Check-out Use</td>
<td>$N/A</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Books</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Office Supplies for WPL Coordinator - $183/school X 6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$N/A</td>
<td>$2,961</td>
<td>$2,961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Contractual Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Project Start-Up*</th>
<th>Project Operation**</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Agreement to air GED preparatory tapes over the Public Broadcasting System</td>
<td>$ N/A</td>
<td>$ 10,808</td>
<td>$ 10,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subproposals to Operate Workplace Literacy Programs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>120,800</td>
<td>120,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care for employed adults who participate in programs during nonworking hours</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>29,200</td>
<td>29,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Evaluator required by Grant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care for employed adults who participate in programs during nonworking hours</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Project Start-Up*</th>
<th>Project Operation**</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postage @ $300/school X 6</td>
<td>$ N/A</td>
<td>$ 1,800</td>
<td>$ 1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone @ $250/school X 6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying Costs @ $100/school X 6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ohio State Audio Conf. 600  600

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS  $ 600 $3,900 $4,500

* Project Start-Up period is 10/1/88 through 12/31/88

** Project Operation period is 1/1/89 through 12/31/89
Travel costs include funds for 1 ABE coordinator, 1 workplace literacy coordinator, 1 vocational short-term training coordinator, and 2 Department of Employment job service office staff to attend training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Air Fare - 5 X $200</th>
<th>3 days per diem @ $15 X 5</th>
<th>2 night motel @ $40 X 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeur d'Alene</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$1,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewiston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Falls</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocatello</td>
<td>584 miles X .205*</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Falls</td>
<td>982 miles X .205**</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise Area</td>
<td>1,066 miles @ .205***</td>
<td>$219</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise Area</td>
<td>1,146 miles @ .205****</td>
<td>$237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes (1) mileage from Burley
** Includes (1) mileage from Blackfoot
*** Includes (1) mileage from Rexburg
**** Includes (1) mileage from Caldwell, Emmett, Payette, Mtn. Home, and McCall

TOTAL $6,700
TRAVEL COSTS

36 air fares @ $200 $ 7,200
62 nights motel @ $40 2,480
36,729 miles @ 20.5¢/mile 7,529
Per diem @ $15/day 4,852
Required trip to Washington, DC 1,500
Identification/Referral Network Training 3,198

$26,759
MATCH BUDGET NARRATIVE

The source of state/local matching funds in the amount of $109,632 will be provided from one or more of the following sources:

1. Employer contributions will equal 20% of the line item total for subproposals to operate workplace literacy programs. The line item total is $120,800 and an additional $30,200 will be provided by nonfederal employer contributions.

2. The education institution's overhead costs affiliated with operating the workplace literacy programs.

3. The nonfederal in-kind contributions of the Idaho Educational Public Broadcasting System to broadcast the Kentucky Educational Television GED tape series.

4. State appropriated vocational education funds provided for occupational skills upgrade classes. Funds will be provided to fund the occupational upgrade classes identified in the workplace literacy audits and included in the workplace literacy curriculum.
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES

Franchise Agreement to air GED preparatory tapes over the Public Broadcasting System

The cost to purchase statewide broadcast rights to the Kentucky Educational Television (KET) General Educational Development (GED) services for the period of 1/1/89 through 12/31/89 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Broadcast Rights</td>
<td>$7,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping Costs</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Component</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction Costs (Idaho PBS)</td>
<td>2,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,808</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Idaho Public Broadcasting System will air each of the 43 tapes on Saturday or Sunday afternoon, with a possible repeat during the week. Included in the broadcast rights are unlimited off-air record rights. Funds have been included to cover the cost of 43 VCR tapes per school to off-air record the GED series. Other public schools and libraries will be notified of the off-air recording rights and how to coordinate the GED completion process with the ABE centers.

The cost to broadcast the GED series will be used to meet the matching requirement.

Subproposals to Operate Workplace Literacy Programs

It is anticipated that approximately forty (40) programs will be operated at average cost of $3,000 per program serving twenty-five (25) adults. Overall, the employer contribution will be twenty-percent (20%) of the line item total of $120,800.

Child Care for employed adults who participate in programs during nonworking hours

Child care will be provided by licensed child care providers to employed adults who participate in programs during nonworking hours. A contract will be entered into with Child Care Connections (a private nonprofit organization) to coordinate the identification of child care providers; maintain records of adults who receive child care assistance, and voucher of payments to child care providers.

Child care provided by relatives will not be reimbursed through this grant.

An application form will be used for each adult who requires child care assistance and must be signed by the participant, employer, and school representative. Time sheets submitted to Child Care Connections for reimbursement must also be signed by the participant, the child care provider, and a school official to document the hours of instruction.
The cost breakdown for the child care is as follows:

- Child Care Connections - 8% Administrative Fee $2,336
- 13,432 hours of child care @ $2/hour $26,864
- Total $29,200

EVALUATION

The evaluation of the project has been budgeted at $3,800 but may require up to $5,000. The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, in Portland, Oregon, has been contacted and has agreed to function as the outside evaluator and will conduct a formative evaluation of the project. We will negotiate a final cost with the NWREL once final details regarding the evaluation is received at the Washington conference. The NWREL has an exemplary track record. We are confident that the expertise of the lab’s consultants will be a positive factor in the overall success of the project.
WORKPLACE LITERACY PROJECT SUBMISSION/APPROVAL PROCESS

1. ANY OF THE FOLLOWING MAY INITIATE CONTACT WITH THE BUSINESS/SITES:
   a. WORKPLACE LITERACY COORDINATOR (WPLC)
   b. ADULT BASIC EDUCATION COORDINATOR (ABEC)
   c. POSTSECONDARY SHORT TERM TRAINING COORDINATOR (PSSTC)
   d. JOB SERVICE COORDINATOR (JSC)

2. WORKPLACE LITERACY COORDINATOR IS CONTACTED

3. WORKPLACE LITERACY COORDINATOR CONTACTS BUSINESS TO MEET WITH REPRESENTATIVES TO DETERMINE TIMELINES AND NEEDS

4. WPLC COORDINATES WITH JSC AND PSSTC TO CONDUCT THE AUDIT

5. WPLC COORDINATES CURRICULUM ACTIVITY WITH APPROPRIATE STAFF

6. WPLC DEVELOPS COURSE OF STUDY FOR TRAINING

7. WPLC COMPLETES WPS #43 INCLUDING APPROPRIATE ATTACHMENTS AND SIGNATURES

8. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL TO DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

9. REVIEW PROCESS INITIATED

TECHNICAL REVIEW .... FINANCIAL
    .... ATTACHMENTS
    .... SIGNATURES
    .... ADULT BASIC EDUCATION
    .... PROGRAM SUPERVISORS
    .... DIVISION WPL STAFF
10A. PROJECT APPROVAL - PHASE ONE - PROJECT DIRECTOR STATE STAFF

10B. PROJECT DENIAL - STATE STAFF
- LACK OF APPROPRIATE ELEMENTS
- INAPPROPRIATENESS OF TOPIC
- MISSING SIGNATURES
- MISSING OR INADEQUATE MATCHING FUNDS

11. PROJECT APPROVAL - PHASE TWO - SUBMISSION TO STEERING COMMITTEE

12. STEERING COMMITTEE REVIEW AND APPROVAL

13. RECOMMENDED PROJECTS SUBMITTED TO STATE ADMINISTRATOR FOR FUNDING AND SIGNATURE

14. PROJECT ACTIVITY INITIATED AT LOCAL LEVEL

15. QUARTERLY OR TIMELY REPORTS SUBMITTED TO DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION COORDINATOR
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING
CAVES Form No. WPL-43

This form is to be used for all programs funded with workplace literacy funds including basic literacy services (including services to dislocated workers) and workplace literacy programs, and must include:

**Basic Literacy Services**
- Statement of Need
- Course Outline
- Budget Narrative
- Description of how the program will be coordinated with other programs (if applicable)
- WPL-55

**Workplace Literacy Programs**
- Statement of Need (including letter/s of support from the business)
- Results of the workplace literacy audit
- Outline of the workplace literacy curriculum
- Budget narrative (including contributions from business)
- Description of how the program will be coordinated with other programs (if applicable)
- WPL-55

Instructions for completing the form:
1. Name of member school responsible for the program.
2. Name of business the training is being conducted with (if applicable).
4. Proposed starting and ending dates.
5. Day(s) of the week and time(s) of the day class will be held.
6. Total hours of instruction.
7. Name of instructor. Teacher certification (Voc. Ed. No. 7) must be completed and submitted with this form if the teacher is not certified. (Teachers need only be certifiable, not certified.)
8. Initial number of students to start the program. Estimated total number of students to be served during the program.
9. Show the total workplace literacy funds requested and the total amount of matching (other) funds to be provided in each category. Administrative funds are not allowable with workplace literacy funds, but may be used to meet the matching requirement.

Equipment may be leased but not purchased with workplace literacy funds.
A budget narrative detailing workplace literacy funds and the source of matching funds must be attached.

MATCHING FUNDS for workplace literacy programs may include cash or in-kind non-federal contributions. Matching funds shall reflect only those costs or portion of costs directly applicable to those students enrolled in the workplace literacy project.

**Cash Contributions** are any non-federal cash used for the operation of a workplace literacy program.

**In-Kind Contributions** are non-cash non-federal contributions provided by the member school or third parties. Resources for in-kind contributions are:

**Space.** Space may be provided to the workplace literacy programs at no cost or at a reduced rate. In the former case, the entire cost of the space (at fair rental rate) may be claimed as in-kind; in the latter case, the difference between the normal cost and the reduced rate may be claimed.

**Utilities and Maintenance.** Public utilities, janitorial services and other costs that are not normally absorbed by the provider of the space in the fair rental rate may be claimed as in-kind.

**Equipment and Supplies.** In-kind contributions may be claimed for the value of equipment or supplies donated (or loaned) for workplace literacy activities, including equipment, machinery, training supplies, etc.

The cost of equipment purchased for a specific workplace literacy program with matching funds may be used with the following conditions:

- The total cost may be used for a one-time match; or
- The amount of depreciation may be used over a period of years if the total cost of the equipment was not used at the time of purchase; and
- If students other than those enrolled in the workplace literacy program utilize the equipment, the prorated portion shall not be used for match.

**Volunteer Services.** Unpaid services provided to a recipient by individuals shall be valued at rates consistent with those ordinarily paid for similar work in the recipients organization. If the recipient does not have employees performing similar work, the rates shall be consistent with those ordinarily paid by other employers for similar work in the same labor market. In either case, a reasonable amount for fringe benefits may be included in the valuation.
Employees of Other Organizations. When an employer other than a recipient or cost-type contractor furnishes free of charge the services of an employee in the employee's normal line of work, the services shall be valued at the employee's regular rate of pay exclusive of the employer's fringe benefits and overhead costs. If the services are in a different line of work, the paragraph pertaining to volunteer services shall apply.

Release Time for Employees Attending Workplace Literacy Programs. When an employer allows an employee to attend workplace literacy programs during regular work hours and continues to pay the employee's salary, the matching funds shall be calculated at the employee's regular rate of pay exclusive of the employer's fringe benefits and overhead costs. Match may only be calculated for those hours that the employee is attending class.
The following agreement is designed to describe the contractual arrangements between the Vocational-Technical School and the Business/Industrial sector in relation to the training program developed to provide Workplace Literacy skills to the employees of the Business/Industrial entity. This agreement will describe the conditions under which both parties will agree to operate during the time line established for the training.

Name of Business/Industry

Contact Person

Authorized Signature

Name of Vocational-Technical School

Workplace Literacy Coordinator

Authorized Signature

Time line for the project

Begin

End

(Name of School)

agrees to provide the following services:

1. Individual employee assessment as needed.

2. Training sessions designed to provide job related literacy skills as identified in the assessment.

3. Develop a schedule for services to be provided.

4. Provide progress reports on WPL project.

5. Provide technical assistance to employer with regard to transitional needs of the employees after training.

6. Other

(Name of Employer)

agrees to:

1. Identify a contact person to serve as the liaison for the project.

2. Provide in-kind matching funds for services provided under the Workplace Literacy training consisting of:
3. Provide adequate conditions for employees to participate in the project to include:
   a. release time needed for assessment;
   b. confidentiality of all records associated with the training and assessment;
   c. ensure all records remain the property of the school.

4. Cooperate to provide the necessary facilities for training and/or individual assessment.

5. As required by the grant, provide six month follow-up data on employees trained under the project to include:
   a. retention history of employees;
   b. promotional history of employees;
   c. skill improvement levels of employees;
   d. salary history of employees.

6. Provide all information as needed by the Workplace Coordinator for preparing reports.

7. Ensure that no discrimination on the basis of sex, race, age or other barrier will occur.

8. Assist the Workplace Coordinator and other project staff in developing the training objectives for employees.

9. Provide all necessary company documents, communication items, training manuals, and job related material as identified by project staff to be used as training material.

10. Other
Application for Approval of Workplace Literacy Training

1. Member School __________________________ City ____________, Idaho
2. Business __________________________ City ____________, Idaho
3. Program Title ____________________________________________________________
4. Proposed starting date ____________ Ending no later than ____________
5. Class meets on M, T, W, Th, F, S, from ____________ to ____________ Clock Time
6. Hours of Instruction ________________
7. Name of Instructor ___________________________ (Submit Vo-Ed Form No. 7)
8. Initial Enrollment ____________ Estimated Total Enrollment ____________
9. Program Costs

   | MATCHING/  | OTHER FUNDS |
   | WPL FUNDS  |            |
   | N/A        |            |
   |            |            |
   |            |            |
   |            |            |
   |            |            |
   |            |            |
   |            |            |
   |            |            |
   |            |            |
   |            |            |
   |            |            |
   | i. GRAND TOTAL |


I understand that the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy and the State Division of Vocational Education have no obligation to fund this proposal until an approved copy has been returned. I certify that funds requested in this proposal will be used to supplement and supplant funds otherwise available for the services proposed. I further certify that I am authorized to enter the organization specified above to the terms of this agreement and any other documents affixed or referred to in this agreement.

Signed ___________________________ Date ________________

CAVES Representative

Signed ___________________________ Date ________________

Authorized School Official

Signed ___________________________ Date ________________

Cooperating Agency/Organization

Signed ___________________________ Date ________________

Project Director

State Division of Vocational Education to complete the following:

One copy approved by the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy and the State Division of Vocational Education will constitute an agreement for financial or other assistance as not below.

Remarks ____________________________________________

__________________________________________________

__________________________________________________

Signed ___________________________ Date ________________

Project # __________
Section 74.21 Length of Retention Period

(a) except as provided in paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section, records shall be retained for 3-years from the starting date specified in section 74.22

(b) if any litigation, claim, negotiation, audit or other action involving the records has been started before the expiration date of the 3-year period, the records shall be retained until the completion of all issues which arise from it, or until the end of the regular 3-year period, whichever is later.

(c) in order to avoid duplicate recordkeeping, awarding parties may make special arrangements with recipients to retain any records which are continuously needed for joint use. The awarding party will request transfer of records to its custody when it determines that the records possess long-term retention value. When the records are transferred to or maintained by the awarding party, the 3-year retention requirement is not applicable to the recipient.

Section 75.734 Record Retention Period

Unless a longer period is required under 34 CFR Part 74, a grantee shall retain records for five years after the completion of the activity for which it uses grant funds.

Section 74.22 Starting Date of Retention Period

(a) General. (1) Where ED grant support is continued or renewed at annual or other intervals, the retention period for the records of each funding period starts on the day the grantee submits to ED its single or last expenditure report for that period. However, if ED grant support is continued or renewed quarterly, the retention period starts on the day the grantee submits to ED its expenditure report for the last quarter of the Federal fiscal year. In all other cases, the retention period starts on the day the report would have been due. "Expenditure Report" is defined in section 74.3.

(2) Exceptions to this paragraph are continued in paragraphs (b) through (d) of this section.

(b) Equipment records. The retention period for the equipment records required by section 74.140(a) starts from the date of the equipment's disposition (Section 74.139) or replacement (Section 74.135) or transfer at the discretion of the awarding party.

(c) Records for income transactions after grant or subgrant support.

(1) In some cases an ED requirement concerning the disposition of program incomes, as defined in Subpart F of this part, will be satisfied by applying the income to costs incurred after expiration or termination of grant or subgrant support for the activity giving rise to income. In such a case, the retention period for the records pertaining to the costs starts from the end of the recipient's fiscal year for which the costs are incurred.
(2) In some cases, there may be an ED requirement concerning the disposition of copyright royalties or other program income which is earned after expiration or termination of grant of subgrant support. Where there is such a requirement, the retention period for the records pertaining to the earning of the income starts from the end of the recipients fiscal year in which the income is earned.

(d) Indirect cost rate proposals, cost allocation plans, etc.

(1) Applicability. This paragraph applies to the following types of documents and their supporting records: (i) indirect rate cost rate computations or proposals; (ii) cost allocation plans under appendix C to this part; and (iii) any similar accounting computations of the rate at which a particular group of costs is chargeable (such as computer usage chargeback rates or composite fringe benefit rates.)

(2) If submitted for negotiation. If the proposal, plan, or other computation is required to be submitted to the Federal Government (or to the grantee) to form the basis for negotiation of the rate, then the 3-year retention period for its supporting records starts from the date of submission.

(3) If not submitted for negotiation. If the proposal, plan, or other computation is not required to be submitted to the Federal Government (or to the grantee) for negotiation purposes, then the 3-year retention period for the proposal, plan, or other computation and its supporting records starts from the end of the fiscal year (or other accounting period) covered by the proposal, plan, or other computation.

Section 74.23 Substitution of Microfilm. Copies made by microfilming, photocopying, or similar methods may be substituted for the original records.
Section 74.41 Meaning of Program Income.

(a) Except as explained in paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section, program income means gross income earned by a recipient from activities part or all of the cost of which is either borne as a direct cost by a grant or counted as a direct cost towards meeting a cost sharing or matching requirement of a grant. It includes, but is not limited to such income in the form of fees for services performed during the grant or subgrant period, proceeds from sale of tangible personal or real property, usage or rental fees, and patent or copyright royalties. If income meets this definition, it shall be considered program income regardless of the method used to calculate the amount paid to the recipient—whether, for example, by a cost-reimbursement method of payment or fixed price arrangement. Nor will the fact that the income is earned by the recipient from a Federal procurement contract or from a procurement contract under a Federal grant awarded to another party affect the income’s classification as a program income.

(b) For research grants that are subject to an institutional cost-sharing agreement, income shall be considered program income only if it is earned from an activity part or all of the cost of which is borne as a direct cost by the Federal grant funds. An institutional cost sharing agreement is one entered into between ED and a grantee covering all of ED’s research projects grants to the grantee in the aggregate.

(c) The following shall not be considered program income:

(1) Revenues raised by a government recipient under its governing powers, such as taxes, special assessments, levies, and fines. (However, the receipt and expenditure of such revenues shall be recorded as part of grant or subgrant project transactions when such revenues are specifically earmarked for the project in accordance with the terms of the grant or subgrant.)

(2) Tuition and related fees received by an institution of higher education for a regularly offered course taught by an employee performing under a grant or subgrant.
Subpart G - Cost Sharing or Matching

Section 74.51 Definitions

For purposes of this subpart:

"Cost sharing or matching" means the value of third-party in-kind contributions and that portion of the costs of a grant-supported project or program not borne by the Federal government.

"Equipment" has the same meaning given to that term in Section 74.132, except that instead of ‘acquisition cost,’ the words market value at the time of donation" shall be substituted.

"Supplies" means all tangible personal property other than "equipment" as defined in this section.

"Third-party in-kind contributions" means property or services which benefit a grant-supported project or program and which are contributed by non-federal third parties without charge to the grantee, the subgrantee, or a cost-type contractor under the grant or subgrant.

Section 74.52 Basic Rule: Costs and Contributions Acceptable.

With the qualifications and exceptions listed in Section 74.53, a cost-sharing or matching requirement may be satisfied by either or both of the following:

(a) Allowable costs incurred by the grantee, the subgrantee, or a cost-type contractor under the grant or subgrant. This includes allowable costs borne by non-Federal grants or by other cash donations from non-Federal third parties.

(b) The value of third-party in-kind contributions applicable to the period to which the cost-sharing or matching requirement applies.

Section 74.53 Qualifications and Exceptions.

(a) Costs Borne by Other Federal Grants.

(1) Except as provided by Federal statute, a cost-sharing or matching requirement may not be met by costs borne by another Federal grant. This prohibition does not apply to costs borne by general program income earned from a contract awarded under another Federal grant.

(2) For purposes of this part, general program revenue sharing funds under 31 U.S.C. 1221 are not considered a Federal grant. Therefore, in the absence of any provision of Federal statute to the contrary, allowable costs borne by these funds may count towards satisfying a cost-sharing or matching requirement.

(b) Costs or contributions counted towards other federal cost-sharing
requirements. Neither costs nor the values of third-party in-kind contributions may count towards satisfying a cost-sharing or matching requirement of an ED grant if they have been or will be counted towards satisfying a cost-sharing or matching requirement of another Federal grant, a Federal procurement contract, or any other award of Federal funds.

(c) Costs financed by general program income. Costs financed by general program income, as defined in Section 74.42 shall not count towards satisfying a cost-sharing or matching requirement of the ED grant supporting the activity giving rise to the income unless the terms of the grant expressly permit the income to be used for cost sharing or matching. (This is the alternative use of general program income described in Section 74.42(d).)

(d) Records, costs and third-party in-kind contributions counting towards satisfying a cost-sharing or matching requirement must be verifiable from the records of recipients or cost-type contractors. These records must show how the value placed on third-party in-kind contributions was arrived at. To the extent feasible, volunteer services shall be supported by the same methods that the organization uses to support the allocability of its regular personnel costs.

(e) Special standards for third-party in-kind contributions.

(1) Third-party in-kind contributions shall count towards satisfying a cost-sharing or matching requirement only where, if the party receiving the contributions were to pay for them, the payments would be allowable costs.

(2) A third-party in-kind contribution shall not count as direct cost-sharing or matching where, if the party receiving the contribution were to pay for it, the payment would be an indirect cost. Cost-sharing or matching credit for such contributions shall be given only if the recipient or contractor has established along with its regular cost rate, a special rate for allocating to individual projects or programs the value of the contributions.

(3) The values placed on third-party in-kind contributions for cost-sharing or matching purposes shall conform to the rules in the succeeding sections of this subpart. If a third-party in-kind contribution is of a type not treated in those sections, the value placed upon it shall be fair and reasonable.

Section 74.54 Valuation of Donated Services.

(a) Volunteer services. Unpaid services provided to a recipient by individuals shall be valued at rates consistent with those ordinarily paid for similar work in the recipients organization. If the recipient does not have employees performing similar work, the rates shall be consistent with those ordinarily paid by other employers for similar work in the same labor market. In either case, a reasonable amount for fringe benefits may be included in the valuation.

(b) Employees of other organizations. When an employer other than a recipient or cost-type contractor furnishes free of charge the services of an
employee in the employee's normal line of work, the services shall be valued at the employee's regular rate of pay exclusive of the employer's fringe benefits and overhead costs. If the services are in a different line of work, paragraph (a) of this section shall apply.

Section 74.55 Valuation of donated supplies and loaned equipment and space.

(a) If a third party donates supplies, the contribution shall be valued at the market value of the supplies at the time for donation.

(b) If a third party donates the use of equipment or space in a building but retains title, the contribution shall be valued at the fair rental rate of the equipment or space.

Definitions:

"Equipment" means tangible personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of $300 or more per unit except that organizations subject to the Cost Accounting Standards Board (CASB) regulations may use the CASB standard of $500 or more per unit and useful life of two years. An organization may use its own definition of equipment: Provided, That such definition would at least include all tangible personal property as defined herein.

"Personal property" means property of any kind except real property. It may be tangible-having physical existence, or intangible, such as patents, inventions, and copyrights.

"Real property" means land, including land improvements, structures and appurtenances thereto, but excluding movable machinery and equipment.

"Replacement equipment" means property acquired to take the place of other equipment. To qualify as replacement equipment, it must serve the same function as the equipment replaced and must be of the same nature or character, although not necessarily the same model, grade, or quality.
COST ALLOWABILITY

1. Factors affecting allowability of costs. To be allowable under a grant program, costs must meet the following general criteria:

   a. Be necessary and reasonable for proper and efficient administration of the grant program, be allocable thereto under these principles and, except as specifically provided herein, not be general expense required to carry out the overall responsibilities of state or local governments.

   b. Be authorized or not prohibited under state or local laws or regulations.

   c. Conform to any limitations or exclusions set forth in these principles, Federal laws, or other governing limitations as to types or amounts of cost items.

   d. Be consistent with policies, regulations, and procedures that apply uniformly to both federally assisted and other activities of the unit of government of which the grantee is a part.

   e. Be accorded consistent treatment through application of generally accepted accounting principles to the circumstances.
Section 75.562 Indirect cost rates for educational training projects.

(a) The Secretary may approve an indirect cost rate for an educational training project at the lesser of-

(1) The actual indirect cost rate of the grantee; or

(2) Eight percent of the total direct costs of the project.

(b) This section does not apply to-

(1) A State (as defined in 34 CFR 74.3); or

(2) A local government (as defined in 34 CFR 74.3).
Section 75.580 Coordination with other activities.

(a) A grantee shall, to the extent feasible, coordinate its project with other activities that are in the same geographic area served by the project and that serve similar purposes and target groups.

(b) A grantee whose project includes activities to improve the basic skills of children, youth, or adults, shall, to the extent possible, coordinate its project with other basic skills activities that are in the same geographic area served by the project.

(c) For the purposes of this section, "basic skills" means reading, mathematics, and effective communication, both written and oral.

(d) The grantee shall continue its coordination during the project period.

Section 75.581 Methods of Coordination.

Depending on the objectives and requirements of its project, a grantee shall use one or more of the following methods of coordination:

(a) Planning the project with organizations and individuals who have similar objectives or concerns.

(b) Sharing information, facilities, staff, services, or other resources.

(c) Engaging in joint activities such as instruction, needs assessment, evaluation, monitoring, and technical assistance and staff training.

(d) Using the grant funds so as not to duplicate or counteract the effects of funds made available under other programs.

(e) Using the grant funds to increase the impact of funds made available under other programs.
Section 75.590 Evaluation by the grantee.

A grantee shall evaluate at least annually-

(a) The grantee's progress in achieving the objectives in its approved application;

(b) The effectiveness of the project in meeting the purposes of the program; and

(c) The effect of the project on persons served by the project, including:

(1) Any persons who are members of groups that have been traditionally underrepresented, such as--

   (i) Members of racial or ethnic minority groups;
   (ii) Women;
   (iii) Handicapped persons; and
   (iv) The elderly; and

(2) If the program statute requires that private school students be provided an opportunity to participate, the students who are enrolled in private schools.
Section 74.61(h) Audit

(1) General.

(i) This paragraph applies to each recipient that is not subject to the audit requirements in Appendix G to this part.

(ii) Public hospitals and public colleges and universities are subject to this paragraph if excluded under paragraph 4 of Appendix G of this part.

(iii) A financial and compliance audit shall be made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, including the standards of the U.S. General Accounting Office's publication "Standards for Audit of Governmental Organizations, Programs, Activities, and Functions." The auditors engaged by a recipient shall meet the criteria for qualifications and independence in that publication.

(2) Purpose and Scope. The purpose of these audits shall be to determine the effectiveness of the financial management systems and internal procedures established by the recipient to meet the terms of its grant or subgrants. The recipient's auditors need not examine every grant or subgrant awarded to the recipient. Rather, audits generally should be made on an organization-wide basis to test the fiscal integrity of financial transactions and compliance with the terms of awards. These tests would include an appropriate sampling of Federal grants and subgrants.

(3) Frequency. These audits shall be conducted on a continuing basis or at scheduled intervals, usually once a year, but at least every two years. The frequency shall depend on the nature, size and complexity of the recipient's grant- or subgrant-supported activities.

(4) Relation to Federal audit. These audits may affect the frequency and scope of the Federal audit. However, nothing in this section is intended to limit the right of the Federal Government to conduct an audit of grant- or subgrant-supported activity.

(5) Audit resolution. The recipient shall follow a systematic method to assure timely and appropriate resolution of audit findings and recommendations.

(6) Copies of audit reports. A copy of each audit report and a description of its resolution, shall be furnished to ED.
CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

Part C - Adult Training, Retraining, and Employment Development

Findings and Purpose

Sec. 321. (a) The Congress finds that--

(1) technological change, international competition, and the demographics of the Nation's workforce have resulted in increases in the numbers of adult workers who are unemployed, who have been dislocated, or who require training, retraining, and upgrading of skills,

(2) many women entering and reentering the paid labor market are disproportionately employed in low-wage occupations and require additional training,

(3) many adults cannot gain access to or benefit fully from vocational education due to limited English language proficiency, and

(4) these needs can be met by vocational education programs that are responsive to the needs of individuals and the demands of the labor market.

(b) It is the purpose of this part (1) to provide financial assistance to the States to enable them to expand and improve vocational education programs designed to meet urgent needs for training, retraining, and employment development of adults who have completed or left high school and are preparing to enter or have entered the labor market, in order to equip adults with the competencies and skills required for productive employment, and (2) to ensure that such programs are relevant to the labor market needs and accessible to all segments of the population, including women, minorities, the handicapped, individuals with limited English language proficiency, workers fifty-five and older, and the economically disadvantaged.

Authorization of Grants and Uses of Funds

Sec. 322 (a) From the portion of the allotment of each State under Section 101 available for this part, the Secretary shall make grants to the States for programs, services, and activities authorized by this part.

(b) (1) Grants to States under this part may be used, in accordance with State plans, for--

(a) vocational education programs, services, activities, and employment development authorized by title II which are designed to meet the needs of--

(i) individuals who have graduated from or left high school and who need additional vocational education for entry into the labor force;
(ii) unemployed adults who require training to obtain employment or increase their employability;

(iii) employed individuals who require retraining to retain their jobs, or who need training to upgrade their skills to qualify for higher paid or more dependable employment;

(iv) displaced homemakers and single heads of households who are entering or reentering the labor force;

(v) employers who require assistance in training individuals for new employment opportunities or in retraining employees in new skills required by changes in technology, products or processes; and

(vi) workers fifty-five and older;

(B) short-term programs job retraining designed to upgrade or update skills in accordance with changed work requirements;

(C) education and training programs designed cooperatively with employers, such as--

(i) institutional and worksite programs, including apprenticeship training programs (or combinations of such programs) especially tailored to the needs of an industry or group of industries for skilled workers, technicians, managers, or to assist their existing work force to adjust to changes in technology or work requirements; and

(ii) quick-start, customized training for workers in new and expanding industries, or for workers for placement in jobs that are difficult to fill because of a shortage of workers with the requisite skills.

(D) building more effective linkages between vocational education programs and private sector employers (through a variety of programs including programs where secondary school students are employed on a part-time basis as registered apprentices with transition to full-time apprentices upon graduation), and between eligible recipients of assistance under this Act and economic development agencies and other public and private agencies providing job training and employment services, in order to more effectively reach out to and serve individuals described in subparagraph (A;)

(E) cooperative education programs with public and private sector employers and economic development agencies, including seminars in institutional or worksite setting, designed to improve management and increase productivity;

(F) entrepreneurship training programs which assist individuals in the establishment, management, and operation of small business enterprises;
(G) recruitment, job search assistance, counseling, remedial services, and information and outreach programs designed to encourage and assist males and females to take advantage of vocational education programs and services, with particular attention to reaching women, older workers, individuals with limited English language proficiency, the handicapped, and the disadvantaged;

(H) curriculum development, acquisition of instructional equipment and materials, personnel training, pilot projects, and related and additional services and activities required to effectively carry out the purposes of this part;

(I) the costs of serving adults in other vocational education programs, including paying the costs of instruction of the costs of keeping school facilities open longer; and

(J) related instruction for apprentices in apprenticeship training programs.
INDIVIDUALIZED DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Name

Soc Sec #

Phone Contact

Home Address

State

Zip Code

Employer:

Address:

Job Title:

Skills/
Interests:

Learning
Objectives:

Career
Objectives:

Development
Plan:

Employee Signature ___________________________ Date __________

Program Representative Signature ___________________________ Date __________

Distribution: Employee
Instructor
WPL File
INDIVIDUALIZED DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Employee: ___________________________ Soc. Sec. #: ________________

Last  First  MI

Employee’s Home Address: ___________________________ Date of Birth: __________ Phone: __________

Supervisor: ___________________________ Phone: __________

Racial Ethnic Designation Code

1. White not of hispanic origin
2. Black not hispanic origin
3. American Indian or native Alaskan
4. Asian or Pacific Islander
5. Hispanic
6. Non-resident alien

Highest level of education completed: ___________________________ Date __________________

Name of location of school: ___________________________

PROGRAM COMPLETION INFORMATION

Date of Enrollment: ________________ Date of Withdrawal __________________

Withdrawal Reason: ___________________________

Date of Completion: ________________ Total Class Hours: __________________

WORK HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of Employment</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Employer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN ASSESSMENT SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKILLS CHECK</th>
<th>PRE-TEST</th>
<th>POST-TEST</th>
<th>GAIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MATH**

- Addition/Subtraction
- Solving story problems
- Multiplication of whole numbers
- Division of whole numbers
- Fractions
- Decimal fractions
- Changing percents, fractions, decimals
- Ratio/proportions
- Geometry
- Algebra
- Other

**ENGLISH**

- Spelling
- Subject/Verb Agreement
- Capitalization
- Punctuation
- Pronoun Usage
- Logic/Organization
- Verb Tenses
- Legibility
- Job-related Vocabulary
- Other

**SUBJECT**


**DATE**


**Distribution:** WPL file  
Instructor file
NAME: 

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER: 

MAILING ADDRESS: 

PHONE NUMBER: 

NAME OF CHILD CARE GIVER: 

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER: 

ADDRESS: 

PHONE NUMBER: 

COST OF CHILD CARE PER HOUR: 

NUMBER OF CHILDREN NEEDING CARE: 

AGES OF CHILDREN: 

I verify that there is no other adult in the home that can provide child care during this training time.

Name ___________________________ Date ______________

Rate for Child Care Assistance is $1.50 per child per hour

The Reimbursement for this project will be $________ per hour based on _______ children needing child care assistance.

This child care assistance is limited to $________. Funds have been allocated by the Work Place Literacy Project for this fiscal year. In the event that funds are no longer available, this contract is null and void.

Work Place Literacy Coordinator ___________________________ Date ______________
**BI-WEEKLY ATTENDANCE REPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Name</th>
<th>Day of Mo.</th>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>BCM</th>
<th>CCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total instructional hours to be reimbursed

This is a document of financial record.

Form Distribution:
1 copy remains with school
1 copy to WPL Coordinator
1 copy to Child Care Connections
P.O. Box 6756
1303 Fort Street
Boise, ID 83707

(Instructor Signature) (Date)

-Please follow directions on reverse side-

(Worplace Literacy Coordinator) (Date)
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INSTRUCTIONS

1. Fill in the name of School, Company and City.

2. Fill in the five-digit Project Number and period this report covers.

3. List students alphabetically, last name first. It is helpful to include the student's social security number also.

4. Use the following code in marking attendance:

   E - Student enters  
   2, 4, etc. - Number of hours present  
   - - Show absence with a dash  
   W - Withdrawal  
   R - Reinstatement

5. "BCH" means "beginning cumulative hours", the total hours which the student has attended previous to this reporting period.

6. "CCH" means "closing cumulative hours", the total hours attended, including the period covered by this report.

7. Total hours for which the instructor is to be paid must be clearly indicated in the CCH column. This is a document of financial record.

8. Mail this report after the last session of the reporting period to the WPL Coordinator, and Child Care Connections, P.O. Box 6756, 1303 Fort Street, Boise, ID 83707.
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The U.S. Department of Education has awarded a $292,000 grant to the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy. Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy members include the Consortium of Post-secondary Vocational-Technical Schools, Idaho Association of Private Industry Councils and the Idaho Department of Employment.

Rapid technological changes in many businesses and industries have left many employees with obsolete skills and knowledge. The grant will provide workplace literacy programs designed to update and upgrade basic literacy and occupational skills of employed adults in accordance with changes in workplace requirements, technology, products or services, and to increase productivity in the workplace.

Workplace Literacy Coordinators will be housed at the Adult Basic Education centers in each of the postsecondary vocational-technical schools. The coordinators will work with Department of Employment Job Service staff to determine the skills and knowledge needed for various jobs. Curriculum will be developed and organized by job tasks, include problems and situations that call for the use of basic and occupational skills as will be used on the job, and be linked to the goals of the business and participating employees.

The grant will also provide GED preparatory courses through the Idaho Public Broadcasting Systems for adults who are unable to attend regular GED programs. Completion of the GED process will be coordinated through the Adult Basic Education Centers.
Child care services for employed adults who attend workplace literacy programs during nonworking hours may be provided through this grant. The child care provision of this grant is unique to the state.

The program services will begin January 1, 1980.
SCHEDULING:

Work site visits should be scheduled two to three weeks in advance. The logical contact person is the personnel director or training supervisor. Explain specifically what your visit will entail. Provide details of what will be required of the company.

COMPONENTS OF SITE VISIT:

- **Interview with managerial staff**
  In order to gain a broad perspective of the company's goals and needs, start at the top of the organizational structure and work down. Identify management's perception of company's needs. Document management's perception of future changes in the business.

- **Site tour**
  Your site tour should involve an awareness of any safety or security features which might affect your presence at the work site. Also, you can use the tour to observe work settings, employees, and any evidence of literacy requirements; i.e., signs, bulletins, notices, etc.

- **Interview with direct supervisors**
  Ask the supervisors for job descriptions and obtain their perceptions of literacy needs. Document the results of this interview for later comparison with employees' descriptions of job duties and skills required. You may also want to ask supervisors to participate in employee selection process.

- **Select employees to interview and observe**
  This selection process will depend on the identified needs of the employer.

- **Interview selected employees**
  See next section for details.

- **Observe selected employees**
  See next section for details.

- **Gather and photocopy literacy material**
EMPLOYEE INTERVIEW, OBSERVATION, AND JOB ANALYSIS

ESTABLISH RAPPORT

Introduce yourself and explain the purpose of the analysis and assessment. Be aware of employee's anxiety and try to allay any fears. The following are examples of approaches you might use:

I'm interested in any reading, writing, or math you do in your job. When I say 'reading', I'm not just talking about books. I'm interested in the forms you read or fill out when you do your job. Blueprints, graphs, charts, or work manuals are also examples of the kinds of things I'll be asking you about during the interview. What I learn from you today will be used to make training materials for others who need to learn to do a job similar to yours.

What kinds of things do you read or write as you do your job? (If you begin the interview with the question, "What kinds of materials do you read in your job?" you are likely to hear, "I don't read much on my job.")

Hello, my name is __________ and I am with ________ adult learning center. I am working on a Workplace Literacy project to determine how much reading, writing, and math is done on different jobs. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions. I'm just trying to get a picture of the kinds of reading, writing, and math you do.

OBSERVING WORKERS

OPTIONS

Option 1 allows you to observe the worker perform the task and then move to a quiet area to ask him or her questions. If the job site is hazardous or noisy, and the job task has a small number of reading materials involved and is relatively simple, then Option 1 may be the best method. Have the worker bring all the forms, manuals, measurement tools, and any other materials he or she uses to perform the task. After asking the worker questions in a quiet area, return to the workplace and watch as the worker performs the task a second time. Use the second observation to clarify your understanding of the task.

Option 2 follows the same steps as Option 1, but the analyst spends less time observing and more time interviewing the worker about the task. For a complex task that involves several printed materials and is also performed in a noisy or hazardous work area, Option 2 is a better choice than Option 1. For tasks which integrate several printed materials, the extra time spent talking with a worker is often needed.

Option 3 is the optimum situation for conducting the Literacy Task Analysis. When the work area is quiet and safe, you can ask questions during the job performance and you will achieve better results. The worker can explain each step of the procedure as he or she is performing it. You will have the opportunity to immediately ask questions about any steps that are unclear. There is less chance of misunderstanding when you can simultaneously observe the worker perform and question him or her about the task.*
Ideally, you can question, interview, and gather materials as you observe.

Observe the employees to determine the basic skills they must use in order to perform their jobs effectively.

- Watch the employees throughout a workday to be sure all tasks are observed.
- Record each time the worker reads, writes, or does an arithmetic calculation.
- Note the setting in which these basic skills activities take place.
- Note the materials used by the employee to perform the tasks involving basic skills activities.
- Determine the purpose of those tasks.

**Questions to include:**

If I were a new employee, how would you break me in? (Get a step by step explanation - this is a good example of thinking skills.) (See page 15, bottom line.)

How comfortable or uncomfortable are you with what you read on the job?

Do you tend to avoid reading job materials when you can get the information a different way?

Do you tend to avoid writing something if you can just tell someone the same thing?

How comfortable or uncomfortable are you with what you have to write on the job?

As a reader, do you consider yourself to be: (1) below average; (2) average; (3) above average.

How important is reading to your job?

What are the main types of reading that you do? (specify in notes)

During a usual day, how much time do you spend reading for your job?
### Job Reading and Writing Check List (record yes or no answers).

**In your work, do you read**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Notes, letters or memos?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Forms (such as work orders, vouchers, claims, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Charts/graphs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Policy manuals, regulations, and instructions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you use information from books such as**

| 1. Telephone directories | Yes | No |
| 2. Catalogs? | | |
| 3. Dictionaries? | | |
| 4. Technical references? | | |
| 5. Company manuals? | | |

**In your work, do you write**

| 1. Notes, letters, memos? | Yes | No |
| 2. Forms . . . ? | | |
| 3. Reports for superiors or others in your field? | | |

**In your reading at work, do you have to**

| 1. Use directions? | Yes | No |
| 2. Find our facts? | | |
| 3. Find out opinions, purposes or hidden meanings? | | |
| 4. Use two or more books at a time to find out information? | | |
| 5. Compare references from two or more books and set a value judgement on the one to use? | | |

**In your writing at work, do you have to**

| 1. Report on what was accomplished? | Yes | No |
| 2. Generate plans for further work? | | |
| 3. State your opinions about some aspects of the job? | | |
| 4. Complete already prepared forms? | | |
I would like to get examples of times during the last month or so when you used printed material in connection with carrying out some part of your job. Could you give me the exact name of this material(s)?

NAME OF MATERIAL(s) ________________________________

(Code)

A. Total book
B. Part of book (text)
C. Part of book (charts, tables, diagrams, map)
D. Single to triple sheet text
E. Single to triple sheet graphics

How did you use that material in getting the information you needed?

Why did you choose to read that particular material?

Did you learn something from this material? How did you learn the material? (Use the information from the above question to code the following:)

READING TO LEARN

A. Reread/rehearse
B. Problem solve/question
C. Relate/associate
D. Focus attention

READING TO DO (no learning)

E. Fact-finding in text
F. Fact-finding in charts, graphs, tables, maps
G. Following directions using text
H. Following directions using charts, etc.

READING TO DO WITH LEARNING

I. Special learning strategy (explain)

READING TO ASSESS

J. Usefulness for a particular task
K. Whether to read more carefully later
L. Whether to pass material on to someone else
M. Other (specify)

If you had to do the same work/task tomorrow, would you have to read this material again?

How important to the completion of the job was reading this material?

How often do you do this kind of reading?
Now I'd like to get some examples of writing you have to do. Could you give me some instances when you had to write something on your job in the last month or so?

What exactly did the writing task involve?

**TYPE OF TASK**

A. Fill out form  
B. Write letter, memo  
C. Write report or articles for others  
D. Note work accomplished  
E. Other (specify)

What would be the consequences if you made a mistake writing this material?  
How often do you do this type of writing?  
Ask whatever other questions necessary to clarify your analysis of the job.

**GATHER MATERIALS**

Be sure that you have discussed this beforehand with management. You will need permission to copy work related materials.

Collect all materials that are written and read on the job to determine the degree of skill proficiency an employee must have to do the job well. **

- Include memoranda, telephone messages, manuals, bills of sale, and forms such as inventory lists, balance sheets, and requisition slips.
- Examine the materials to determine reading levels, necessary vocabulary, and style.
- Analyze the content of these materials to determine their function and importance to the employees' jobs.

**JOB RELATED LITERACY MATERIALS CHECK LIST**

*Task Oriented Reading*

reference manuals  
measurements tools  
blueprints  
work orders, forms  
computer printouts  
diagrams & flowcharts  
job aids  
graphs, scales, charts, tables  
procedural guides  
first aid instructions  
metric conversion charts  
product labels
Perform readability test of job materials and assessment of math skills required.

FORCAST Formula*

1. Count number of one syllable words in 150 word sample
2. #1 divided by 10
3. #2 subtracted from 20

It is recommended that you sample from the beginning, middle, and end of the book or manual. You should then average the three to determine the readability of the total document.

Sample passage #1
Sample passage #2
Sample passage #3
Reading level (average)

FOG Characteristics and Formula*

- Uses the average sentence length plus the number of three or more syllable words in a 100-word passage
- Tends to run a little higher than other formulas
- How to calculate:
  1. Select at least three passages from the material.
  2. Count 100 words for each passage. (Count contractions and hyphenated words as one word. Count numbers and letters as one word.)
  3. Count the number of sentences.
  4. Calculate the average sentence length by dividing 100 by the number of sentences.
5. Count the number of words that have three or more syllables. (Do not count capitalized words, combinations of short easy words [bookkeeper], or verb forms made into three syllables by adding -ing or -ed).

6. Add the two factors of average sentence length and number of three syllable words.

7. Multiply the total obtained in (6) by 0.4. This is the approximate grade level.

EMPLOYEE ASSESSMENT


Combine the information gathered from observing the employees, collecting the materials they use, and the interviews. Then, write up a description of each of the audited jobs in terms of the reading, writing, and computation skills needed to perform them.

CLOZE PROCEDURE

Using materials that you have gathered on the job, delete every fifth word. Leave the first sentence intact and complete the sentence that contains the last deletion. Replace every deletion with the same length blank (number the blanks if you plan to administer the test to more than one person). Select the appropriate number of deletions for your purpose, realizing the fewer the deletions the more one has to question the validity of the results.

Direct the test takers to fill in one word for each blank (spelling does not count).

- Administration

A list of deleted words is not provided. No aid can be given during the test. Test takers should not be told to read through the passage first.

- Scoring:

Mark each exact replacement with a "+" disregarding the spelling. Count the number of exact replacements and determine the percentage based on the total number of deletions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 - 100%</td>
<td>Independent Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59%</td>
<td>Independent/Instructional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 55%</td>
<td>Instructional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39%</td>
<td>Instructional/Frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 34%</td>
<td>Frustration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research has demonstrated the Cloze percentages between 40-60 are equivalent to the percentages of 75-90 on a multiple choice test of the same selection.

Be cautious, the percentage on one test is not as valid as the comparison among several selections.

**DOCUMENTATION**

The importance of asking clear questions, clarifying answers, and writing everything down as soon as possible cannot be over stressed.*

Take thorough notes during the entire process. You will need three copies of all job-related material you gather. One should be retained in a file for curriculum building, one will be used for a cloze test, the remaining one will be used as a key for the cloze test.

**DOCUMENTING THE RESULTS OF LITERACY TASK ANALYSIS***

To avoid forgetting important information, begin organizing and documenting the results of your job analysis as soon as possible after you have completed the interviews and observation. Use your notes to begin to isolate each task that you discussed with the worker. To help organize the information, form two columns on a sheet of paper. In the left column, write a brief description of the steps of the task. Next, in the right column, list the related literacy elements contained in the steps you have written in the left column.

* From *How to Gather and Develop Job Specific Literacy Materials for Basic Skills Instruction*. (1988)

** From *The Bottom Line: Basic Skills in the Workplace*. (1988)

*** From *Job Literacy Survey* by Diehland Mikulecky.
TEACHER COMPETENCIES: STAFFING NEEDS IN WORKPLACE LITERACY PROGRAMS

Elaine Shelton

COMPETENCY 1: To identify, build on, and emphasize the connection between what is to be learned and the kinds of tasks the employee performs on the job

- Adults learn much more quickly and easily if they can see the immediate application of what they are learning.
- The incorporation of real job tasks and materials into worksite literacy instruction is critical to the efficacy of the program.
- Data suggest that 100 hours of engaged time are needed on average to make one year's gain in reading grade level. A focus on the actual literacy requirements of a job can cut the 100-hour average by as much as two-thirds.
- "Skills taught in traditional or generic basic skills classes appear to have little direct transfer to the performance of job-specific basic skills tasks."
- There is no substitute for realia like company newsletters, in-house memos, benefit statements, company manuals and charts, etc.
- This does not preclude the effective use of teacher-made and commercial materials, although the latter may need to be adapted to job-related situations.

COMPETENCY 2: To demonstrate an understanding of the company for which the student employees work and a good knowledge of the specific job(s) these employees have

- The kinds of reading, writing, and analytical tasks workers are expected to perform are often different from those taught in schools or in general adult literacy program.
- Instructors must understand for what specific purposes the employee needs to be able to read, write, and compute in order to be an effective worker.

COMPETENCY 3: To be a generalist rather than a specialist

- Employers often expand the definition of basic skills to include listening, interpersonal relations, and decision-making.
- A generalist may have an easier time integrating the teaching of reading, writing, speaking, listening, computation, decision-making, and interpersonal relations with each other.

COMPETENCY 4: To possess good listening skills

- Much can be learned about a student's skill levels and needs by "simply" listening to them. The discrepancies between what skills are present and usable and at what level and what is lacking can become the basis for meaningful, practical instruction.
COMPETENCY 5: To possess the ability to interpret diagnostic information gained through both informal assessment and formal evaluation

- This may necessitate the instructor performing a "literacy audit."
- "It is best to measure the success of your program by the employee's ability to apply what he or she has learned to the requirements of the job actually performed.
- Some assessment should deal with covert indices of success like increased self-esteem, confidence, punctuality, decreased absenteeism, and improved interpersonal relations, etc.
- This ability to interpret the needs of students should extend to the ability to recognize learning disabilities and to be familiar enough with community resources to refer the student to other sources for help.

COMPETENCY 6: To understand the need for thorough, accurate documentation of skills, goals, and progress

COMPETENCY 7: To be open-minded and non-judgmental

- Don't assume presence or absence of a skill.
- Respect diversity rather than fearing or mistrusting it.

COMPETENCY 8: To demonstrate an understanding of the importance of and ability to individualize (personalize) instruction

- Tailor or customize the instructional program to best fit the strengths and weaknesses, needs, and goals of the individual student/employee.
- Personalize both materials and instructional methods.

COMPETENCY 9: To demonstrate adaptability and flexibility

- Enough adaptability and flexibility to be comfortable with jointly determining program content with the student and employer is an important instructor competency.
- Should be willing and able to change instructional materials and/or methods if evaluation data support a need for adjustment.

COMPETENCY 10: To demonstrate SENSITIVITY

- Need to be sensitive to the often fragile ego and low self-esteem of a person with low literacy skills.
- Treat the student with respect and dignity.
- Be sensitive to group dynamics and how they can affect behavior.
- Sensitivity should extend to competence in being a good observer.
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT OUTLINE

A. Recruitment and registration
   1. Meeting with management (including line supervisors)
   2. Meeting with human resource personnel
   3. Announcement to employees of program availability
   4. Employee registration

B. Plan of operation
   1. Location of classroom(s)
   2. Days and hours of operation
   3. Program dates

C. Pretesting

D. Attendance regulations and completions
   1. Attendance regulations
   2. Completions

E. Format and curriculum
   1. Instructional format
   2. Instructional materials
   3. Staff
      a. Numbers
      b. Hiring
      c. Qualifications

F. Evaluation
   1. Evaluation of program
      a. Process evaluation
      b. Product evaluation
      c. Using the results
   2. Evaluation of participant
      a. Formal evaluation
      b. Informal evaluation

G. Six month follow-up
   1. Statement of Assurance for business to sign
ADULT EDUCATION STRATEGIES FOR WORKPLACE LITERACY

It has been recognized that the art of teaching adults presumes a particular set of criteria that differs in many respects from K-12 instruction. The following topics are especially relevant to workplace literacy teaching strategies!

Climate Setting--Setting the climate for adult learning is a critical first step. It is helpful to keep in mind that many of these worker/students have had negative school experiences in the past. Others may have had no structured learning experiences for many years. Both of these patterns may create anxiety and fear of failure in the employee/student.

The instructor can help allay these fears by an open, friendly and respectful manner. An informal class setting using tables rather than desks promotes group learning and a feeling of equality.

Sensitivity--It is important that the instructor be sensitive to individual personalities, needs, goals, and learning styles. The workplace literacy instructor should develop a good working knowledge of adult teaching strategies in order to better match teaching strategies; i.e., dialogue; lecture; simulation; modeling; group discussion; experiential learning with learning styles.

Facilitator/Empowerment--Although there may be times when the instructor may need to assume the role of teacher, it is generally agreed that an instructor of adults should function as a facilitator of learning. This approach furthers the atmosphere of mutual respect and emphasizes the student's responsibility for his/her learning.

Information Processing System--According to the conclusions reached by Sticht and Mikulecky (1984), an adult basic skills program should operate with "an understanding of the person as an information processing system that develops new capabilities over time using prior knowledge and skills as the means for acquiring new knowledge and skills" (page 31). It is for this reason that the authors claim the best results are reached when basic skill instruction is integrated with technical training using job-specific materials.

Learning Networks--Employees constantly draw upon each other's knowledge and expertise to solve problems. These useful networks should be utilized whenever possible in structured learning experiences in the workplace. (Sticht and Mikulecky, 1988)

Program Development--Sticht and Mikulecky (1984) suggest the following four principles:

1. Maintaining an orientation to the mission of the business or industry involved.
2. Using a functional context (job-specific) approach to instruction.
3. Arranging for experiential learning when possible.
4. Using a competency-based, mastery learning instructional approach where possible. (page 32)

APPENDIX A
PRESENTATION PACKET
IDAHO PARTNERSHIP FOR WORKPLACE LITERACY

Steering Committee

Division of Vocational Education

IAPIC  CAVES  DOE

EIVTS  ISU  CSI  BSU  LCSC  NIC

Legal Recipient – CAVES
Administrative Entity – Vocational Education
Governing Body – Literacy Partnership
Policy/Procedure and Funding Recommendation – Steering Committee
PROPOSAL PROCEDURES

WORKPLACE LITERACY PROJECT
SUBMISSION/APPROVAL PROCESS

WORKPLACE LITERACY COORDINATORS (WPLC) COORDINATES WITH JOB SERVICE STAFF AND POSTSECONDARY SHORT-TERM SKILLS COORDINATOR TO CONDUCT THE JOB ANALYSIS.

JOB ANALYSIS AND EMPLOYEE ASSESSMENT IS CONDUCTED.

WPLC COORDINATES PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT WITH APPROPRIATE STAFF.

WPLC DEVELOPS COURSE OF STUDY FOR TRAINING

WPLC COMPLETES WPL #43 INCLUDING APPROPRIATE ATTACHMENTS AND SIGNATURES

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL TO DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

REVIEW PROCESS INITIATED
TECHNICAL REVIEW

FINANCIAL ATTACHMENTS
SIGNATURES
ADULT BASIC EDUCATION
PROGRAM SUPERVISORS
DIVISION WPL STAFF
PROJECT APPROVAL - PHASE ONE - PROJECT DIRECTOR STATE STAFF

PROJECT DENIAL - STATE STAFF
- LACK OF APPROPRIATE ELEMENTS
- INAPPROPRIATENESS OF TOPIC
- MISSING SIGNATURES
- MISSING OR INADEQUATE MATCHING FUNDS

PROJECT APPROVAL - PHASE TWO - SUBMISSION TO STEERING COMMITTEE

STEERING COMMITTEE REVIEW AND APPROVAL

RECOMMENDED PROJECTS SUBMITTED TO STATE ADMINISTRATOR FOR FUNDING AND SIGNATURE

QUARTERLY OR TIMELY REPORTS SUBMITTED TO DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION COORDINATOR
THE CHANGING WORKFORCE

. THE DECLINE IN POPULATION GROWTH WILL MEAN AN OLDER WORKFORCE, WITH THE AVERAGE AGE OF WORKERS INCREASING FROM 36 TO 39 BY THE YEAR 2000.


. 80 PERCENT OF NEW ENTRANTS INTO THE WORKFORCE WILL BE WOMEN, MINORITIES, AND IMMIGRANTS.
THESE CHANGES MEAN THAT:

. AN OLDER, LESS ADAPTABLE WORKFORCE WILL FACE A JOB MARKET THAT REQUIRES INCREASINGLY FLEXIBLE SKILLS, WITH MANY WORKERS CHANGING JOBS FIVE OR SIX TIMES DURING THEIR WORKLIVES.

. TRADITIONALLY LESS SKILLED GROUPS AND UNDERUTILIZED POPULATION GROUPS (WOMEN, MINORITIES, AND IMMIGRANTS) WILL BE NEEDED TO FILL AVAILABLE JOBS.

. AS A CONSEQUENCE OF SMALLER GROWTH IN THE LABOR FORCE AND A DIMINISHING POOL OF QUALIFIED WORKERS, EMPLOYERS MAY FACE SERIOUS SKILL SHORTAGES NOT EXPERIENCED SINCE WORLD WAR II.
DEFINITIONS - TERMS

CUSTOMIZED TRAINING AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS NOW INCLUDE WORKPLACE LITERACY.

WHAT IS WORKPLACE LITERACY?

WORKPLACE LITERACY DIFFERS FROM GENERAL LITERACY IN BOTH CONTEXT AND PURPOSE AS IT FOCUSES ON THE SPECIFIC NEEDS OF WORKERS TO PERFORM THEIR JOBS.

WHAT CAN A CUSTOMIZED TRAINING AND EDUCATION PROGRAM INCLUDE?

*TRAINING FOR TECHNOLOGY

VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL TRAINING TO IMPROVE THE MAINTENANCE, ADVANCEMENT, OR PRODUCTIVITY OF EMPLOYEES IMPACTED BY TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE.

*BASIC SKILLS

BASIC EDUCATION IN READING, WRITING, AND COMPUTATION.

*WORKPLACE LITERACY

TRAINING TO IMPROVE THE ABILITY TO USE COMPUTATION AND COMMUNICATION SKILLS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WORKPLACE.
IDENTIFICATION/REFERRAL NETWORK
(SOCIAL SERVICE)

IDENTIFICATION AND REFERRAL OF INDIVIDUALS
IN NEED OF BASIC LITERACY SERVICES.

THE IDAHO PARTNERSHIP FOR WORKPLACE
LITERACY WILL HOLD TRAINING SESSIONS
ACROSS THE STATE TO TRAIN JOB SERVICE
STAFF, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND WELFARE
DISTRICT OFFICE, STATE, COMMUNITY BASED
ORGANIZATION STAFF, IDAHO OFFICE ON AGING
STAFF, POSTSECONDARY COUNSELORS, JTPA
SERVICE PROVIDER STAFF, AND PRIVATE
INDUSTRY COUNCIL STAFF ON HOW TO IDENTIFY
ADULTS WHO MAY BE IN NEED OF BASIC
LITERACY SKILLS SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES;
HOW TO APPROACH THE INDIVIDUAL ABOUT THE
APPARENT LACK OF BASIC SKILLS; AND HOW AND
WHERE TO REFER THEM FOR SERVICES.
IDENTIFICATION/REFERRAL NETWORK

(BUSINESS/INDUSTRY)

The Idaho Partnership of Workplace Literacy will establish an identification and referral network to educate business and industry employers and employees on the importance of workplace literacy and to identify those businesses who are in need of workplace literacy services. The identified businesses will be referred to the appropriate vocational-technical school.
WORKPLACE ESL

TO MEET THE LITERACY NEEDS OF ADULTS WITH LIMITED ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY MAY BE OFFERED THROUGH THIS GRANT IF THEY ARE IN CONJUNCTION WITH AN EMPLOYER OR GROUP OF EMPLOYERS AND ARE CONDUCTED AT THE WORKSITE.
CHILD CARE

CHILD CARE FOR EMPLOYED ADULTS WHO PARTICIPATE IN PROGRAMS DURING NONWORKING HOURS.

CHILD CARE WILL BE PROVIDED BY LICENSED CHILD CARE PROVIDERS TO EMPLOYED ADULTS WHO PARTICIPATE IN PROGRAMS DURING NONWORKING HOURS. CHILD CARE CONNECTIONS (A PRIVATE, NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION) WILL COORDINATE THE IDENTIFICATION OF CHILD CARE PROVIDERS, MAINTAIN RECORDS OF ADULTS WHO RECEIVE CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE, AND VOUCHER OF PAYMENTS TO CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.

AN APPLICATION FORM WILL BE USED FOR EACH ADULT WHO REQUIRES CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE AND MUST BE SIGNED BY THE PARTICIPANT, EMPLOYER, AND SCHOOL REPRESENTATIVE. TIME SHEETS SUBMITTED TO CHILD CARE CONNECTIONS FOR REIMBURSEMENT MUST ALSO BE SIGNED BY THE PARTICIPANT, THE CHILD CARE PROVIDER, AND A SCHOOL OFFICIAL TO DOCUMENT THE HOURS OF INSTRUCTION.
DISLOCATED WORKERS

SERVICES DESIGNED TO PROVIDE BASIC SKILLS, HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA OR EQUVALENCY INSTRUCTION, AND ACTIVITIES FOR DISLOCATED WORKERS WILL BE HELD AT SITES OR LOCATIONS THAT ARE OFF-CAMPUS. THE DELIVERY OF THIS INSTRUCTION WILL BE COORDINATED WITH THE APPROPRIATE JOBS SERVICE OFFICE AND PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCIL. THESE SERVICES MAY BE PROVIDED WITH OTHER FUNDS OR THROUGH THIS PROJECT.

GED PREPARATION MAY BE PROVIDED THROUGH THE USE OF THE KET/GED TAPES AT OFF-CAMPUS SITES.
GED PREPARATORY COURSES FOR ADULTS WHO ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND REGULAR PROGRAMS WILL BE BROADCAST THROUGH THE STATEWIDE PUBLIC BROADCASTING SYSTEM. PARTICIPANTS WILL BE INSTRUCTED AS TO THE NEAREST ABE LEARNING CENTER FOR COMPLETING THE GED PROCESS.

UTILIZATION OF KET/GED:

PARTICIPANTS MAY VIEW ORIGINAL BROADCAST TO COMPLETE PREPARATORY COURSEWORK.

TAPES WILL BE OFF-AIR RECORDED AND MADE AVAILABLE FOR PARTICIPANT USE AT THE ABE LEARNING CENTERS AND OTHER OUT-REACH SITES.

A COMPUTER COMPONENT WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR USE AT THE ABE LEARNING CENTERS AND MAY BE UTILIZED AT OFF-CAMPUS SITES DEPENDING ON THE AVAILABILITY OF A COMPATIBLE COMPUTER.
PROGRAM EVALUATION

To measure results of the workplace literacy program, staff should:

1. Construct and administer job-specific pre- and post-tests based on the results of a literacy or similar job task analysis technique.

2. Talk to the employees and their supervisors to find out what they believe to be the ongoing and final results of the training.

3. Look for signs of changes in the employees' self-confidence in class & on the job. Note positive changes in work habits such as improved attendance, punctuality, & teamwork skills.

4. Supervisors should monitor classes to make sure that instruction is on track with the learning goals of the employees & the overall goals of the company.
THE NORTHWEST REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY, IN PORTLAND, OREGON, HAS BEEN CONTACTED AND HAS AGREED TO FUNCTION AS THE OUTSIDE EVALUATOR AND WILL CONDUCT A FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT.

EACH SCHOOL WILL PROVIDE REPORTS AND CONDUCT EVALUATIONS THAT INCLUDE STUDENT ASSESSMENTS FOR THEIR PROGRAMS.
OCCUPATIONAL SKILL & KNOWLEDGE LEVELS

Professional  Technician  Vocational

Know

Do
CURRENT SERVICES TO EMPLOYED ADULTS

- Adult Basic Education
- Short-Term Vocational Training
SERVICES TO EMPLOYED ADULTS WITH WORKPLACE LITERACY GRANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult Basic Education</th>
<th>Workplace Literacy</th>
<th>Short-Term Vocational Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL SETTING

1. Clarify and define the specific workplace need that will be addressed by raising the basic skill levels of employees.

2. Identify the workers in need of basic skills development.

3. Specify the projected results for the company and the employees.
TO HELP SET THE GOALS FOR EFFECTIVE CUSTOMIZED TRAINING AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS, ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

1. What company goals or performance standards are not now being met?

2. Are there projected changes in the business or business environment that will add new goals or modify current performance standards?

3. What are the skills needed to perform effectively in particular jobs or job families now and over the next 5 years?

4. Do employees or groups of employees lack these minimal skills?

5. If a basic skills training program is set up, what results are expected?

6. What evidence would indicate that these results had been achieved?
BUILDING THE CURRICULUM

A good curriculum for developing workplace literacy skills should be designed to include the tasks & materials that fit the specific job contexts of the workers.

***

1. Is organized by job tasks, not by discrete basic skills.

2. Includes problems & simulated situations that call for the use of basic skills as they will be used on the job.

3. Provides opportunities to link basic skills and thinking together.

4. Builds on the employees' knowledge of the job content.

5. Uses actual job materials as instructional texts.

6. Gives employees the opportunity to work together & learn from each other.

7. Is linked to the goals of the company and participating employees.
JOB ANALYSIS AND EMPLOYEE ASSESSMENT

THE TOOLS OF A JOB ANALYSIS AND EMPLOYEE ASSESSMENT ARE:

- Observation
- Collection and Analysis of Materials
- Interviews
- Customized Tests
COMPARING NEW LABOR MARKET ENTRANTS TO THE CURRENT WORKFORCE REVEALS SOME STRIKING DIFFERENCES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LABOR FORCE 1985</th>
<th>NET NEW WORKERS 1985-2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>115,461,000</td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE WHITE MEN</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE WHITE WOMEN</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE NON-WHITE MEN</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE NON-WHITE WOMEN</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMIGRANT WOMEN</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINDINGS

1. THE ECONOMY AND THE WORKPLACE ARE CHANGING RAPIDLY, AND THE PACE OF CHANGE IS ACCELERATING.

2. THE JOBS THEMSELVES ARE CHANGING IN CONTENT AND SKILL REQUIREMENTS, REGARDLESS OF TYPE OR SIZE OF BUSINESS.

3. THE "BASIC SKILLS GAP" BETWEEN WHAT BUSINESS NEEDS AND THE QUALIFICATIONS OF THE ENTRY LEVEL WORKERS AVAILABLE TO BUSINESS IS WIDENING.

4. EMPLOYERS ARE PRACTICALLY UNANIMOUS IN THEIR CONCERN THAT COMPETENCIES OF ENTRY LEVEL WORKERS ARE DEFICIENT. THESE INCLUDE THE BASIC SKILLS OF READING, WRITING, MATHEMATICS AND COMMUNICATION. DEFICIENCIES WERE ALSO FOUND IN SUCH ABILITIES AS PROBLEM SOLVING, TEAMWORK, INITIATIVE, AND ADAPTABILITY.
5. THESE SKILLS DEFICIENCIES IN THE WORKPLACE ARE COSTING AMERICAN BUSINESS MONETARILY, THROUGH WASTE, LOST PRODUCTIVITY, INCREASED REMEDIATION COSTS, REDUCED PRODUCT QUALITY, AND ULTIMATELY A LOSS IN COMPETITIVENESS.

6. EDUCATORS AGREE WITH BUSINESS ABOUT THE OVERALL GOALS OF EDUCATION, AND ABOUT THE SKILLS NEEDED IN THE WORKPLACE. HOWEVER, THE MAJORITY OF EDUCATORS MAINTAIN THAT THEIR GRADUATES ARE WELL PREPARED FOR ENTRY LEVEL POSITIONS, AND ONLY A FEW EDUCATORS ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE GAPS AREA AS SEVERE AS BUSINESS INDICATES.

7. EDUCATORS MAY NOT BE TRANSLATING THEIR UNDERSTANDING OF BUSINESS’ NEEDS INTO WHAT HAPPENS IN THE CLASSROOM.

8. BUSINESS MUST DO A BETTER JOB OF ANTICIPATING FUTURE WORKFORCE NEEDS, AND COMMUNICATING THESE NEEDS TO EDUCATORS, TO PARENTS, TO STUDENTS, AND TO OTHER COMMUNITY RESOURCES THAT CAN HELP ADDRESS THESE NEEDS.
9. BOTH BUSINESS AND EDUCATION STRESS THE NEED TO DEVELOP MECHANISMS TO REDUCE THE ISOLATION OF THEIR WORLDS IN ORDER TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' PREPARATION FOR THE WORKPLACE AND FOR RESPONSIBLE ADULTHOOD.

10. WHILE EDUCATION REFORM EFFORTS HAVE BROUGHT UNDENIABLE PROGRESS, MANY EXPERTS CONCLUDE THAT THE NON-COLLEGE BOUND AND DROPOUTS HAVE BEEN LEAST AFFECTED.

11. AGGRESSIVE ACTION MAY BE NEEDED BY BUSINESS AND EDUCATION TO LEARN FROM EACH OTHER AND TO CHANGE THE WAY EDUCATION IS PROVIDED TO ENSURE A QUALITY WORKFORCE AND A PRODUCTIVE NATION.
SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The findings and conclusions presented in this report provide a challenge not only for business and education, but for government and all sectors at the national, state and local levels.
CONCLUSIONS

IN ORDER TO CLOSE THE SKILLS GAP, WE NEED TO:

1. IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION

2. MOBILIZE BUSINESSES TO ASSIST SCHOOLS

3. MOBILIZE THE COMMUNITY
THE CHANGING ECONOMY

THE CHANGING WORKPLACE

THE JOBS THEMSELVES ARE CHANGING IN CONTENT AND SKILL REQUIREMENTS, REGARDLESS OF TYPE OR SIZE OF BUSINESS.

THE LARGE MAJORITY OF EMPLOYERS CONSULTED CONTEND THAT THE COMPLEX AND CHANGING MARKETPLACE WILL CONTINUALLY HEIGHTEN THE NEED FOR A MORE HIGHLY QUALIFIED ENTRY LEVEL LABOR FORCE.
SUMMARY: BUSINESS' WORKPLACE NEEDS

IN SUMMARY, BUSINESSES CONSISTENTLY NOTED THAT ENTRY LEVEL WORKERS AND APPLICANTS DID NOT HAVE THE SKILLS TO:

- READ AND COMPREHEND POLICY AND INSTRUCTION MANUALS AS WELL AS TECHNICAL MATERIAL.

- WRITE SENTENCES WITH CORRECT SENTENCE FORM, SPELLING, PUNCTUATION, AND OTHER MATTERS OF MECHANICS.

- PERCEIVE ERRORS AND REWRITE.

- SPEAK AND EXPLAIN IDEAS CLEARLY.

- ANSWER AND ASK QUESTIONS AND FOLLOW VERBAL DIRECTIONS.

- ADD, SUBTRACT, MULTIPLY AND DIVIDE.

- WORK WITH FRACTIONS AND DECIMALS.
EMPLOYERS ALSO IDENTIFIED DEFICIENCIES IN THESE MORE TECHNICAL SKILLS:

- MEASURE AND COMPREHEND SPATIAL RELATIONSHIPS, AND USE METRIC MEASUREMENTS.
- TYPE WITH ACCURACY AND SPEED.
- WORK ACCURATELY WITH COMPUTERS AND COMPUTERIZED PROGRAMS.

FINALLY, EMPLOYERS NOTED THAT THEY NEEDED—but were frequently unable to recruit—employees with positive attitudes and the ability to:

- LEARN, BE FLEXIBLE, AND RESPOND TO CHANGE QUICKLY.
- DEAL WITH COMPLEXITY, THAT IS, LEARN AND PERFORM MULTIPLE TASKS AND ANALYZE AND DEAL WITH A WIDE VARIETY OF OPTIONS.
- IDENTIFY PROBLEMS, PERCEIVE ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES, AND SELECT THE BEST APPROACH.
- OPERATE INDEPENDENTLY AFTER A BRIEF BUT INTENSIVE ORIENTATION PERIOD OR AFTER AN INITIAL TRAINING PERIOD.
. Work cooperatively with people of different personalities, race, sex, across different authority levels and organizational divisions.

. Be punctual and dependable as well as show pride and enthusiasm in performing well.
THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE GROWING SKILLS GAP

THESE SKILLS DEFICIENCIES IN THE WORKFORCE ARE COSTING AMERICAN BUSINESS MONETARILY, THROUGH WASTE, LOST PRODUCTIVITY, INCREASED REMEDIATION COSTS, REDUCED PRODUCT QUALITY, AND ULTIMATELY A LOSS IN COMPETITIVENESS.
WORKPLACE LITERACY COMPONENT

(4) Programs designed to upgrade and update basic and occupational skills for adult workers in accordance with changes in workplace requirements, technological change, products or services, will be offered in conjunction with an employer or group of employers. Course content will be determined by the workplace literacy audit and will contain basic literacy services and occupational specific skills training as appropriate. The programs may be offered at the business site or a mutually agreed upon site.

Subproposals to Operate Workplace Literacy Programs

It is anticipated that approximately forty (40) programs will be operated at an average cost of $3,000 per program serving twenty-five (25) adults. Overall, the employer contribution will be twenty percent (20%) of the line item total of $120,800.
GED

FRANCHISE AGREEMENT TO AIR GED PREPARATORY TAPES OVER THE PUBLIC BROADCASTING SYSTEM

The Idaho Public Broadcasting System will air each of the 43 tapes. Included in the broadcast rights are unlimited off-air record rights. Funds have been included to cover the cost of 43 VCR tapes per school to off-air record the GED series. Other public schools and libraries will be notified of the off-air recording rights and how to coordinate the GED completion process with the ABE centers.
HOW IS A CUSTOMIZED TRAINING AND EDUCATION PROGRAM DEVELOPED?

ANY OF THE FOLLOWING MAY INITIATE CONTACT WITH THE BUSINESS/SITES:

A. WORKPLACE LITERACY COORDINATOR (WPLC)
B. ADULT BASIC EDUCATION COORDINATOR (ABEC)
C. POSTSECONDARY SHORT-TERM TRAINING COORDINATOR (PSSTC)
D. JOB SERVICE COORDINATOR (JSC)

WORKPLACE LITERACY COORDINATOR IS CONTACTED

* INITIAL FACT-FINDING INTERVIEW WITH MANAGEMENT.

* JOB ANALYSIS - PERFORMED BY TRAINED STAFF TO DETERMINE SKILL LEVELS NECESSARY FOR SATISFACTORY JOB PERFORMANCE.
* EMPLOYEE ASSESSMENT - PERFORMED BY TRAINED STAFF TO DETERMINE PRESENT SKILL LEVELS OF EMPLOYEES.

* PROGRAM DESIGN - CURRICULUM IS CUSTOMIZED TO BRIDGE GAPS BETWEEN WORKERS' CURRENT AND DESIRED SKILL LEVELS.

* PROGRAM DELIVERY - PROGRAMS MAY BE DELIVERED ON-SITE BY QUALIFIED INSTRUCTORS FROM THE BUSINESS OR THE VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL.
CUSTOMIZED EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM COMPONENTS

WORKPLACE LITERACY

BASIC SKILLS

SHORT-TERM SKILLS TRAINING
PROGRAM DESIGN
OPTION I

WORKPLACE LITERACY

BASIC SKILLS

SHORT-TERM SKILLS TRAINING

*MAY INCLUDE CHILD CARE COMPONENT
PROGRAM DESIGN
OPTION II

WORKPLACE LITERACY

SHORT-TERM SKILLS TRAINING

* MAY INCLUDE CHILD CARE COMPONENT
PROGRAM DESIGN
OPTION III

WORKPLACE LITERACY

BASIC SKILLS

*MAY INCLUDE CHILD CARE COMPONENT
PROGRAM DESIGN
OPTION IV

BASIC SKILLS

SHORT-TERM SKILLS TRAINING

* DOES NOT INCLUDE CHILD CARE COMPONENT
PROGRAM DESIGN
OPTION V

WORKPLACE LITERACY

*MAY INCLUDE CHILD CARE COMPONENT
PROGRAM DESIGN
OPTION VI

SHORT-TERM SKILLS TRAINING

*DOES NOT INCLUDE CHILD CARE COMPONENT
PROGRAM DESIGN
OPTION VII

BASIC SKILLS

*DOES NOT INCLUDE CHILD CARE COMPONENT
ECONOMIC/PRODUCTIVITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Training projects that are developed to respond to the changing needs of business and industry through:

CUSTOMIZED TRAINING

Postsecondary vocational training designed to prepare individuals for employment in specific occupational areas in new or expanding industry and/or for workers for placement in jobs that are difficult to fill because of a shortage of workers with requisite skills. These programs are operated with a commitment from an employer or a group of employers to employ individuals upon successful completion of training.

Customized Training is appropriate for:

1. A newly formed Idaho company; or
2. a business which is relocating to the state of Idaho; or
3. a business defined as expanding due to:
   a. expansion which will result in a substantial increase in the labor market for which there is an inadequate trained workforce; and/or
   b. expansion of products (value added) which results in the need for training in new occupational skill areas.

INDUSTRY SPECIFIC UPGRADE TRAINING

Postsecondary vocational training designed to improve the efficiency of employed individuals through supplemental instruction. These programs are operated in conjunction with an employer or group of employers and are usually offered at a site provided by the employer(s).

Industry Specific Upgrade Training is appropriate when:

1. The training has been developed in conjunction with the employer(s); and
2. is designed to improve the efficiency of present employees; and
3. has a letter(s) of endorsement or request from the employer(s).
Apprenticeship projects - Postsecondary vocational programs designed to provide classroom and/or laboratory instruction in conjunction with employer based training to registered apprentices. These programs are conducted or sponsored by an employer, a group of employers, or a joint apprenticeship training committee representing both labor and management.

FIRE SERVICE TRAINING

Postsecondary vocational training designed to provide instruction for fire personnel. Instruction ranges from basic fire fighting techniques to management theory.
RETRAINING, EMPLOYMENT ENTRY/REENTRY PROJECTS

Training projects that are developed to respond to the changing needs of Idaho's workforce through:

ENTRY/REENTRY TRAINING

Postsecondary vocational training designed to provide individuals with the minimum skills necessary to enter or reenter the labor force. This training is usually developed for target populations and does not follow the traditional program design.

Entry/Reentry Training is:

1. Short-term (usually 500 hours or less); and
2. provides specific occupational skills training; and
3. is coupled with JTPA funds; or
4. serves target populations including, but not limited to:
   a. Displaced homemakers
   b. Single parents
   c. Older workers
   d. Welfare recipients
   e. Out-of-school youth

RETRAINING

Postsecondary vocational training designed to provide training to individuals who have been laid off due to a plant closure or other reduction in employment due to technological change.

Retraining projects are:

1. Short-term (usually 500 hours or less); and
2. provides training to dislocated and/or displaced workers; and
3. provides training in new and/or expanded occupational skill areas.

PREAPPRENTICESHIP

Postsecondary vocational training designed to enhance an individual's potential to enter an approved apprenticeship program. The projects are limited to out-of-school youth (16 years of age or older) and adults.
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS AND
AGRIBUSINESS MANAGEMENT TRAINING

Postsecondary vocational instruction designed to provide business personnel or potential business personnel and farmers with the skills and knowledge essential for the efficient operation and/or establishment of a small business.

Appropriate Instructional Areas include, but are not limited to:

1. Small business/agribusiness management
2. Entrepreneurship instruction
3. Employee awareness
4. Supervisory training
5. Marketing techniques

Entrepreneurship Training is offered where there is sufficient capacity to provide additional independent business instruction for the successful development and operation of a small business.

UPGRADING

Postsecondary vocational training designed for persons already in the workforce who are in need of supplemental instruction to maintain and/or advance in their current employment, and for persons desiring to pursue a new occupation.
PROPOSAL PROCEDURES

WORKPLACE LITERACY PROJECT
SUBMISSION/APPROVAL PROCESS

WORKPLACE LITERACY COORDINATORS (WPLC) COORDINATES WITH JOB SERVICE STAFF AND POSTSECONDARY SHORT-TERM SKILLS COORDINATOR TO CONDUCT THE JOB ANALYSIS.

JOB ANALYSIS AND EMPLOYEE ASSESSMENT IS CONDUCTED.

WPLC COORDINATES PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT WITH APPROPRIATE STAFF.

WPLC DEVELOPS COURSE OF STUDY FOR TRAINING

WPLC COMPLETES WPL #43 INCLUDING APPROPRIATE ATTACHMENTS AND SIGNATURES

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL TO DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

REVIEW PROCESS INITIATED
TECHNICAL REVIEW

FINANCIAL
ATTACHMENTS
SIGNATURES
ADULT BASIC EDUCATION
PROGRAM SUPERVISORS
DIVISION WPL STAFF
PROJECT APPROVAL - PHASE ONE - PROJECT DIRECTOR STATE STAFF

PROJECT DENIAL - STATE STAFF

- LACK OF APPROPRIATE ELEMENTS
- INAPPROPRIATENESS OF TOPIC
- MISSING SIGNATURES
- MISSING OR INADEQUATE MATCHING FUNDS

PROJECT APPROVAL - PHASE TWO - SUBMISSION TO STEERING COMMITTEE

STEERING COMMITTEE REVIEW AND APPROVAL

RECOMMENDED PROJECTS SUBMITTED TO STATE ADMINISTRATOR FOR FUNDING AND SIGNATURE

QUARTERLY OR TIMELY REPORTS SUBMITTED TO DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION COORDINATOR
Workplace Literacy:
Designing Effective Local Partnerships Involving Business and Education

11:00-1:30 PM MDT
Thursday • November 10, 1988 • 1:00-3:30 p.m. EST

The National Center for Vocational Education
National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University

Co-sponsored by
American Association for Adult and Continuing Education
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Workplace literacy challenges firms

By Janie Pewitt
The Idaho Statesman

Not many years ago, two of the chief criteria for getting a job on a production line at Hewlett-Packard Co. were manual dexterity and the ability to get along with people.

Not anymore.

"People work from written procedures and have to use the computer or a terminal of some sort," said Kay Lamberson, personnel officer at H-P.

Lamberson, other employers and government officials met Wednesday in Boise at a conference on workplace literacy, an issue that has emerged in an age of rapid technological advance. Employers are being confronted with employees who haven't caught up.

Workplace literacy often shows up in "company towns" where generations of families work in the company sawmill or mine, said Thomas Sticht, San Diego, Calif., workplace literacy specialist.

Mining and mill jobs now require higher skills because equipment is becoming more sophisticated, Sticht said. Problems with literacy frequently show up when a person changes jobs and is handed a thick training manual.

"They discover the work requires more reading, writing and arithmetic skills," Sticht said. "Evidence shows that people that have higher reading ability can perform tasks better."

In 1965, one in five people age 21 to 26 read below the eighth-grade level. But Sticht points out that in some cases, an employee has trouble not because he is a poor reader, but because the training manual is written poorly.

Lloyd Hogden, manager of the Potlatch Corp.'s consumer products division in Lewiston, said Potlatch realized it had to find solutions to the workplace literacy problem when it upgraded one of its plants by adding computerized machinery.

"We knew we had journeymen who didn't know their jobs like they needed to," Hogden said. "The new mill allowed us to use new technology to get these folks with it again."

Training was provided. Manuals were switched to make the instructions more understandable. Workers had the chance to practice on mock panels.

"In that particular function, I saw some really healthy strides in improving the literacy of our employees," Hogden said.

In some cases, employers have managed to do their jobs without some of the skills that are now being required. Some companies are offering educational assistance so employees can increase their reading and math levels.

Bob Ford, who works in the Division of Economic Development for the Idaho Department of Commerce, said a literate work force is necessary if Idaho is to compete with other states for new industry.

Further growth in Idaho could be limited by the quality and quantity of its labor force.

DEFINITION

Workplace literacy: The need for people to be able to read, write, compute and solve problems in the workplace.

— Thomas Sticht, president of The ABC's, Applied Behavioral & Cognitive Sciences Inc.

BUSINESS SURVEY

Oisten Services, a temporary help agency, recently conducted a survey of secretaries and executives about communications in the business world and found:

- 21 percent of male executives over 40 don't have a dictionary or other reference book in their offices.
- Young executives think writing is much more important to success than their older colleagues do.
- Three out of four executives proofread all business letters their secretaries type.
- "Accommodate" is the most frequently misspelled word, followed by "effect," "affect" and "commitment."
- Nearly one-third of the U.S. executives surveyed would not consider a job applicant whose resume contained a typographical error.
- Only 13 percent of male executives over the age of 40 compose letters on a word processor, although 29 percent under 40 use the equipment.
Locally- State

Council hears about job training

By JEANETTE HARP
Staff writer

KELLOGG — Made-to-order job training programs are available to Silver Valley businesses.

Allison Gilmore, coordinator for the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy, told members of the Silver Valley Literacy Council that programs can be tailored to fit many needs and training can be done at the work place.

"The Silver Valley is a good place to come," Gilmore said during a luncheon meeting at the Silver Spoon restaurant last week in Kellogg. "People here are upbeat about getting their feet back on the ground."

Employers interested in taking advantage of the service can fulfill a 20 percent financial commitment by providing supplies, Gilmore said, telling of the flexibility allowed.

North Idaho College is one of six schools in Idaho to be included in the workplace literacy program that is using a portion of $9 million appropriated by Congress, Gilmore said. The structured program in Idaho involves vocational education, Job Service and the Private Industry Council.

Gilmore said she is currently seeking input concerning needs, as well as information about programs are available for dealing with problems in order to avoid duplication.

She said workplace literacy deals with more than the reading and writing skills generally identified with general literacy.

Citing an example of how the program is implemented, Gilmore said employees at the new Wallace Inn can be trained for jobs ranging from from hi-tech positions to proper methods of making beds.

Elsewhere in this area, people who will be working in a new Boeing plant will be trained in what Gilmore describes as a pilot program.

Gilmore invites contacts with business people and potential employees. She can be reached by calling 1-769-3450 or through contacts with NIC's Vocational-Technical School.
Declare war on workplace illiteracy

"Workplace literacy" is a phrase we'll be hearing frequently in the future, and with good reason. To quote from a funding proposal to the U.S. Department of Education by the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy, "The labor market of the future will require workers with flexible skills and a high degree of information-processing capability."

Knowing how to read and write well enough to understand the language and commands of the omnipresent computers won't be enough, according to the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy. Workers also will need skills and knowledge to solve problems, make decisions and communicate effectively via written reports.

The workplace of the future in Idaho — and not too distant future at that — will be modeled on operations like the almost entirely computerized processing plants which use computers instead of human hands to sort potatoes for quality. Personal computers are standard equipment in offices across the state, and even skilled employees need additional training to use the new technology.

Now then, consider that 50,000 adult Idahoans are functioning below 4th grade level and another 120,000 haven't finished high school. The figures are from the University of Idaho report on illiteracy in Idaho, compiled in January 1985.

A policy team on workplace literacy — whose members include the state's coordinator of adult basic education, the state's employment director, and Mike Mitchell, chief of staff to Gov. Cecil Andrus — has declared that 40 percent of the state's adult population may be in trouble in one or more basic skills. That means they have trouble reading, writing and computing. That means the state's economy is headed for big trouble unless the problem of workplace literacy is addressed head-on.

It won't be easy. According to the state's Workforce 2000 Taskforce (yet another group inventing illiteracy in Idaho), CEOs and upper management of Idaho businesses don't know, or won't acknowledge, that a literacy problem may exist among their workers. If they asked the line supervisors, they'd be more likely to find out the truth.

One of the objectives of the Idaho Partnership, which includes the state's vocational schools, employment service and private industry councils, is to educate business and industry on the importance of workplace literacy. When they identify an Idaho business that could use some literacy services, project staff will work with the company to develop the kind of basic skills training needed by its employees.

One of my friends says most businesses aren't about to admit they have employees who lack basic skills. If a business admits deficiencies among its workforce, he says, how can the business continue to advertise quality products and maintain its competitive position in the marketplace? On the other hand, it seems to me that hiding their collective heads in the sand is sure to bring grief to business owners and CEOs who must depend on a skilled workforce.

Every time I reflect on our growing national problem of illiteracy, I am reminded of the well-educated Japanese. Forbidden by World War II treaties to spend major monies on military goods, they invested instead in the education of their people. They are among the most literate people in the world and enjoy a powerful and rich economy.

Until our country makes education a national priority, we'll continue to play catch-up with workplace literacy and dropout programs as we move toward the 21st century. We may not be forced by a war treaty to budget major monies for education, but surely our instincts for survival should propel our national and state leaders to action.

Maria Salazar is a freelance writer who lives in Emmett.
The Vocational School at Lewis-Clark State College has an exciting new program called Workplace Literacy. Rapid technological changes in business and industry find employees with out-dated skills and knowledge; the new Workplace Literacy program has been designed to provide training to assist these employees in keeping pace by updating their computation and communication skills, as well as critical thinking and problem-solving skills. In so doing, the Workplace Literacy program bridges the gap between traditional literacy programs and the basic skill needs of business and industry.

Workplace Literacy differs from general literacy in both context and purpose as it focuses on the specific needs of workers to perform their jobs while using job specific materials. In addition to updating basic skills, this training will enhance worker maintenance, advancement potential, and productivity impacted by technological change in the context of the workplace.

Because Idaho is a rural state, many adults are unable to attend regularly scheduled Adult Basic Education (ABE) programs. In order to make the General Education Development programs more accessible to this segment of Idaho's population, Idaho Public Broadcasting (PBS), through funding from Workplace Literacy, will broadcast the GED tapes statewide. A telephone number and computer component will be available to assist students using the PBS programs, and information about the nearest ABE learning center for GED completion will also be broadcast.

The Workplace Literacy Program is a partnership of the Idaho Association of Private Industry Councils (IAPIC), the Consortium of Area Vocational Education Schools (CAVES), and the Idaho Department of Employment. The purpose of this partnership is to coordinate effective delivery of workplace literacy and occupational skills necessary for workers to succeed. This state agency partnership was an important factor in Idaho's WPL grant application attracting the attention of the federal granting agency, the Department of Education, who ultimately awarded the grant to Idaho.

Brent Studer, Workplace Literacy Coordinator at Lewis-Clark State College, would be pleased to answer any questions you may have about this exciting new program. Contact him at 799-2238.

Vocational Education:

Building tomorrow's leaders

Vocational Education Week: Feb. 13-17
Illiteracy in the workplace: a staggering business loss

By Tondee Perry
Workplace illiteracy.

No these are not sayings on personalized licensed plates. Workplace literacy is a problem that is hitting corporate America in the pocketbook. Estimates of what illiteracy costs business and the United States in terms of lost wages, profits, productivity and taxes are in the $200 to $225 billion range.

Workplace literacy doesn't translate directly to mean dumb, stupid or people who can't spell the words workplace literacy. We are all illiterate in some area such as computers, cars, or figuring simple interest on a car loan.

With the national report released by the Department of Education in the early 1980s titled A Nation at Risk and subsequent studies, plus the emphasis President and Mrs. Bush has placed on the literacy issue—the problem cannot be swept under the table.

Two Idahoans returned last week from National Conference '89 on Workplace Literacy which stressed the theme "Basics and Beyond." This was the first national conference on workplace literacy.

Dick Winn, director of short term training at the State Division of Vocational Education, and Shirley Spencer, coordinator of Adult Education for the Idaho Department of Education, attended the conference in Rochester, N. Y. and came away with the feeling that everybody needs to work together to solve this problem.

The United States is losing its competitive edge in the workplace, one explanation says, because its work force is not as skilled as other advanced world economies.

This is where the fingers start going in eight directions. The blame can be put on the home, schools, government, higher education, and immigrants. The national conference, Winn said, helped put a stop to the pointing and a start to evaluating and fixing.

"No one group can do it all. It's everyone's problem—business, unions, education, government. We can't leave it up to one group and point the fingers. We need to do more cooperative partnerships like we've put together here in Idaho," Winn said.

In the past the "Three R's"—reading, writing and 'rithmetic were enough. Now businesses need people who are trained in advanced math, reading instructions, communicating in writing and speech, problem solving, critical thinking and decision making.

See LITERACY. Page 12A

According to the definition of the Steering Committee for the Workplace Literacy Project in the state of Idaho, literacy is defined as: the basic skills needed to perform work successfully and are commonly referred to as "job related." These skills include: mathematics, reading, writing, speaking and listening and the ability to apply these skills in problem solving. The key to workplace literacy is that the training takes place on site using curriculum developed in the context of the job.

"We don't deal in illiteracy but in literacy. Whatever level the individuals are at we want to raise that level to meet the needs of an entry level job or growth within the company," Winn said.

A grant from the U.S. Department of Education was awarded to the Idaho Consortium of Vocational Technical Education Schools. Winn explained this grant had helped form an Idaho partnership for workplace literacy with a wide variety of organizations and agencies in Idaho.

Under this program, local workplace literacy coordinators contacted businesses and industry in their region to assist in determining what skills were needed to help the business upgrade its operations. They then developed courses and curriculums to teach it.

An example of where employees would need to go through special programs, Winn said, is in the area of manufacturing. Many companies are initiating a statistical process control to reduce rejections to zero. In the past the employee only had to throw out the bad products. Now they are being asked to graph the information and analyze it and in order to reach the goal.

Winn said that 28 Idaho businesses were assisted. He said some of the businesses helped were Boise Cascade Corrugated Container, Pilotus Corp., St. Alphonse Regional Medical Center, Payette Lakes Care Center and Westinghouse.

"The needs of the individual businesses are each different so the responsibility of the workplace customized training programs is to develop a program that meets the needs of those employees within those organizations," Winn said.

He said the immediate response from businesses has been wonderful—they want more of it! Winn said. He is applying for another grant to keep the Workplace Literacy program going.

Businesses can do their part to train the employees they now have as well as future ones by assisting in the educational system. Boise Cascade volunteers are finishing up a project at Whiting Elementary School where they set up 11 reading centers to encourage more reading.

"Literacy is so important in life," said Deryl Kinch, chairman. We are pleased we could provide this assistance. Our efforts only scratch the surface as we hope to do more in the future as well," said Deryl Kinch, chairman.
Adults can earn GED through PBS-TV classes

Adults who haven't finished high school can get a General Equivalency Diploma by watching classes on television.

Classes air on PBS stations at 4 p.m. Saturdays and are repeated at 3 p.m. Wednesdays. The first class aired Jan. 14 and will repeat on Wednesday.

To find out how to get your GED by TV, call the Adult Learning Center at the vocational-technical school in your area. The number at BSU is 385-3661.
Bluestein to show slides of desert

Cartographer Sheldon Bluestein will show a slide program, "Exploring Idaho's High Desert," at 7:30 p.m. Tuesday at Idaho Tab & Game headquarters, 600 S. Walnut St. The program is free.

The Boise Public Library is making it easier to study for the General Educational Development test. Library patrons can check out half-hour videotapes to study for the G.E.D.

Each tape is equivalent to a half-hour class. Subjects include reading, writing, science, mathematics and social science.

A Kentucky G.E.D. program is running on public television and the library plans to tape the series. Anyone with a valid Boise Public Library card can check out tapes overnight.
Workplace literacy!
What's that?

A new program will begin in January through a U.S. Department of Education grant to the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy. The partnership includes the Job Service offices in Idaho, the Idaho Association of Private Industry Councils, and the six area vocational technical schools. Within the project, funding is available for offering job skill enhancement classes to employees of businesses and industries.

In this age of rapidly expanding technology, the marketplace requires increasingly higher levels of "workplace literacy"—computation and communication skills, as well as critical thinking and problem-solving skills. The Adult Learning Center is prepared to offer classes in reading, mathematics, English, and English as a second language that will address these needs as they directly affect an organization and its employees.

The Adult Learning Center will individualize the workplace literacy (skills enhancement) classes using job-related language and materials. The special dimensions of this program include child care provisions, on-site classes, and time frames structured to meet employees' specific schedules.

For further information call 385-1622 and ask for Marilyn Slone or Cheryl Engel, or call your local Job Service office.

The Idaho Business
Review, Inc. 2-6-89
WORKPLACE LITERACY

The gap between the skills needed for jobs and the skills that workers bring to jobs has been growing. Many workers find it difficult to follow complicated instructions or to adapt to new technology. To assist businesses in training their work forces to meet these challenges, the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy has developed a job training program, which can be tailored to the specific needs of each business. The partnership includes a consortium of area vocational education schools, the Idaho Department of Employment, and Idaho Association of Private Industry Councils. North Idaho College offers the program to Panhandle businesses, governmental agencies, or non-profit agencies.

In designing a program, the Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy first determines exactly what skills employees need to meet management's goals. Then, it determines what skills employees presently have. Next, it designs a program to fill the gap between the skills the employer needs and its employees have. Finally, it arranges for the programs to be delivered on-site by qualified instructors from the business or from North Idaho College. Unlike general literacy courses, the program focuses on the specific skills needed by workers to perform jobs and are custom-made for each employer. To learn more about the program, call Allison Gilmore at 769-3450 or call North Idaho College's Vocational
Program brings training to workplace

By SUZANNE RICHARDS
Staff writer

COEUR D'ALENE — The gap between the skills needed for jobs and the skills workers bring to jobs has been growing.

As a result, many workers find it difficult to follow complicated instructions, or adapt to new technology, Kathryn Tacke said.

"Tacke, a Job Service Labor Market Analyst, said something is being done to correct the problem.

To assist businesses in training their workforces to meet these challenges, the Idaho Partnership determines the skills necessary to meet management's goals, defines the gap between these employees and custom designs programs, said Dick Winn, training director for the State Office of Vocational Education.

"The programs are then designed to address this gap," Winn said in 1989.

Bonner County school district maintenance staff workers are learning computer skills necessary to operate new heating systems. "This is the kind of gap that can develop overnight when new technology arrives on the scene," Winn said.

At Potlatch Corp. in Lewiston, educators are working with the union to qualify workers for apprenticeship training, which today requires a certain amount of math and related skills. "Business and education working together can fill these gaps to the benefit of both the workers and the workplace," Winn said.

NORTH IDAHO NEWS NETWORK Sunday, May 27, 1989
Workplace literacy programs reported on rise

By DAVE FIELDS
Post-Register and wire

More companies are taking workplace literacy seriously, holding training sessions to help employees read, write and to remain current on changing job requirements.

Good Samaritan Nursing Center is one local business that intends to provide math and reading classes for its employees, said Marti Felicione, Eastern Idaho Vocational-Technical School workplace literacy coordinator.

The program will be provided in cooperation with EIVTS. The school is offering workplace literacy consulting and testing services to local businesses and government agencies with funding from a federal grant.

"There's a definite loss to the future that illiteracy brings," Mrs. Felicione said.

From 20 million to 27 million Americans adult lacks basic reading, writing and mathematics skills, she said.

The result is a growing burden on the country's social security system, a decreasing economic competitive edge over other nations and dimming hopes for the United States' future, she said.

Illiteracy may not be as prevalent in the Pacific Northwest as it is in other parts of the country, but the problem is still substantial, with 7 percent of the adult population functionally illiterate and 26 percent lacking high school degrees.

Good Samaritan will begin holding math and reading classes this fall, spokeswoman Ana Wierzba said. The training is being set up after recent math and reading examinations found some employees lacking in these skills, she said.

The exams were given to determine employees' abilities, she said.

"The idea is to help them learn to read in a non-threatening way, knowing their jobs are not on the line in any way with workplace literacy," she said.

EIVTS is assisting with six other area businesses to help them start similar programs, Mrs. Felicione said.

A 1988 survey of 2,000 corporations by the Center for Public Resources found that 75 percent of respondents had started remedial training programs for their employees. But estimates are that corporate training efforts are only meeting about 5 percent of the need, Mrs. Felicione said.

The exam results in selected vocational-education schools in year-long programs.

Idaho was the only state to receive funding for a statewide program. The state received $120,000, all of which has been distributed to the state's vocational-technical centers.

Wilson to be sentenced

in St. Anthony on Friday

Thursday, June 1, 1989

The city has disputed that, as well as his contention that the pumice and its placement met city specifications.

The city contends DECO breached its contract in several ways, including failure to properly backfill and compact trenches after replacing water lines, failure to maintain public and private access to the area during construction, and failure to properly apply the sealant at oil and rock chips.

Chad Stanger, city public works director, testified early in the trial that he saw portions of a trench on Almeda Avenue open for about two weeks, while the contract required that no trench be open for more than 48 hours. That open trench blocked driveways and prevented all vehicle traffic, he said.

The contract allowed 60 working days for the project, with a completion due of July 26, 1985. Two changes during construction moved that to Aug. 8 of that year, Stanger said.

In August of 1985 the city began charging DECO liquidated damages of $200 per day on the project, eventually retaining $14,000 on the job. The city also claims it was entitled to another

Finnish envoy visits Gem State

the pumice. That caused the pumice to break down and caused the surface to slump, he said.

In August of 1985 the city began charging DECO liquidated damages of $200 per day on the project, eventually retaining $14,000 on the job. The city also claims it was entitled to another
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EIVTS program aims to cut illiteracy on the job

By DAVE FIELDS
Eastern Idaho Vocational-Technical School officials are trying to decrease workplace illiteracy by offering businesses special instruction for employees.

The authors of a recent University of Idaho study estimate that 7 percent of Idahoans over age 16 are illiterate. An American Library Association study says as many as 60 million adults nationwide may be functionally illiterate — unable to perform daily tasks such as reading a job application, balancing a checkbook or understanding a technical manual.

Illiteracy diminishes worker productivity and can cause on-the-job accidents and equipment breakdowns, said Marti Felicione, EIVTS workplace literacy coordinator.

Beginning in January, EIVTS will offer workplace literacy training.

Funded with a federal grant, the program will run through 1989.

The program will cover basic adult education, technology changes, computing and communication, and English as a second language.

"It really will save the company money," Mrs. Felicione said.

The program is a cooperative effort among EIVTS, Job Service and the Private Industry Council.

"Employees will learn to read what they actually have to read on the job," she said.

Companies that could have a strong interest in the program include food processing, lumber, and mining, and service industries such as hotels and nursing homes, she said.

Many food processing companies need English instruction for their Spanish-speaking migrant workers, she said.

Managers of participating businesses will meet with Mrs. Felicione and a Job Service official to determine company needs. Companies may request that their employees be tested to gauge their skill levels.

"The results are very confidential, that we get," Mrs. Felicione said.

A literacy program will be designed to bridge gaps between employees' skill levels and job requirements. Instruction may occur either on the job or at EIVTS.

"The skill level needed in jobs is getting higher and higher, and if people want to remain employed, they need to increase their skills," she said.

Employees may also receive General Educational Development certificate instruction.

Length of training will depend on company needs. Mrs. Felicione said she has found through her work as a GED instructor that most workers can only absorb 10-15 hours of instruction each day after work.

No businesses have enrolled in the program, said Mrs. Felicione, who began promoting it in November. The training will be conducted by an EIVTS instructor or by someone provided by the company.

"The skill level needed in jobs is getting higher and higher, and if people want to remain employed, they need to increase their skills," she said.

Employees may also receive General Educational Development certificate instruction.

"The results are very confidential, that we get," Mrs. Felicione said.

A literacy program will be designed to bridge gaps between employees' skill levels and job requirements. Instruction may occur either on the job or at EIVTS.

"The skill level needed in jobs is getting higher and higher, and if people want to remain employed, they need to increase their skills," she said.

Employees may also receive General Educational Development certificate instruction.

"The results are very confidential, that we get," Mrs. Felicione said.

A literacy program will be designed to bridge gaps between employees' skill levels and job requirements. Instruction may occur either on the job or at EIVTS.

"The skill level needed in jobs is getting higher and higher, and if people want to remain employed, they need to increase their skills," she said.

Employees may also receive General Educational Development certificate instruction.

"The results are very confidential, that we get," Mrs. Felicione said.

A literacy program will be designed to bridge gaps between employees' skill levels and job requirements. Instruction may occur either on the job or at EIVTS.

"The skill level needed in jobs is getting higher and higher, and if people want to remain employed, they need to increase their skills," she said.

Employees may also receive General Educational Development certificate instruction.

"The results are very confidential, that we get," Mrs. Felicione said.

A literacy program will be designed to bridge gaps between employees' skill levels and job requirements. Instruction may occur either on the job or at EIVTS.

"The skill level needed in jobs is getting higher and higher, and if people want to remain employed, they need to increase their skills," she said.

Employees may also receive General Educational Development certificate instruction.

"The results are very confidential, that we get," Mrs. Felicione said.

A literacy program will be designed to bridge gaps between employees' skill levels and job requirements. Instruction may occur either on the job or at EIVTS.

"The skill level needed in jobs is getting higher and higher, and if people want to remain employed, they need to increase their skills," she said.

Employees may also receive General Educational Development certificate instruction.

"The results are very confidential, that we get," Mrs. Felicione said.

A literacy program will be designed to bridge gaps between employees' skill levels and job requirements. Instruction may occur either on the job or at EIVTS.

"The skill level needed in jobs is getting higher and higher, and if people want to remain employed, they need to increase their skills," she said.
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New training service helps Idaho workers keep up with change

By Cynthia Teggart

COUR D'ALENE — North Idaho workers, like workers all over the nation, need help keeping pace with technical demands, Allison Gilmore says.

Gilmore plans to provide that help by taking training courses into job sites in the five northern counties. "It used to be people could make a decent living at an ordinary job with a fourth- or eighth-grade education," she said. "Now, no one accepts that. Now the most basic jobs are computerized."

Gilmore is the project manager of a new Workplace Literacy program offered through the Idaho Department of Education. The program channels federal funds to projects that promise to upgrade the skills of a large number of workers.

While many small projects throughout the nation received federal funds, only Idaho received $384,000 for a statewide project, Gilmore said.

The state's Consortium of Area Vocational Education Schools, Private Industry Council and Job Service division of the Department of Employment banded together to apply for the money. They submitted a cooperative project that would benefit the entire state, she said.

"A real lack of skilled workers is a big problem to the economy and to employers," she said. "And many employers don't have the resources to meet the training demands. Things have gotten very complicated."

This year, the consortium established workplace literacy coordinators at North Idaho College, Lewis Clark State College, Boise State University, Eastern Idaho Technical School, Idaho State University and the College of Southern Idaho.

The goal of the program is to raise the level of productivity throughout the state and provide workers with skills they need to retain or be qualified for jobs, Gilmore said.

"The definition of literacy is different now," said Lee Fields, manager of the Job Service office in Coeur d'Alene. "Not anymore. A lot of people need help."

"It's difficult to get people without skills to admit they need help. They're afraid it will endanger their job," she said. "If I could wish for anything, it'd be a wand that would do away with the stigma of retraining."
You may have thought that Job Service was defined only in terms of a labor exchange, but as it becomes increasingly apparent that America needs better prepared workers, Job Service is also working to meet that need.

In a cooperative linkage with area vocational schools and with the business community, Job Service operates programs funded through the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) which provides training opportunities to the unskilled or semi-skilled.

The JTPA program uses federal dollars to enroll eligible students into vocational school programs and also to subsidize employers who hire eligible workers and train them on the job.

Through JTPA, hundreds have received classroom training to help them compete in the labor market. Training has ranged from remedial course work to obtain a High School Equivalency Diploma all the way to such things as completing a full-time program in electronics.

Training on the job has mirrored the diversity of jobs found in the community, from custodial work to manufacturing technology.

Part of the JTPA Program is targeted exclusively to high school youth who have little or no work experience. Employers who commit to hiring upon completion of training can have a youth work in a part-time “try-out” arrangement for up to 250 hours, with the wage paid by the program.

Job Service is working with Eastern Idaho Vocational Technical School (EIVTS) to decrease illiteracy in the workplace. This program is called Workplace Literacy and will address needs in basic adult education, technology changes, and English as a second language. Representatives from Job Service and EIVTS will work with company officials to determine their needs. EIVTS will then design a literacy program to bridge gaps between employees’ skill levels and job requirements. Training may take place on the job or at EIVTS. This project is funded through a federal grant.

The State Division of Vocational Education has received 8% funds from the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and from the Carl Perkins Act. These funds are being used to develop a pilot project known as the Teen Parent Program. School District 91 and EIVTS, along with Job Service, are assisting pregnant teenagers and/or teen parents to stay in school and obtain their high school diploma.

Participants receive classes directed towards pre-natal health and parenting skills, along with regular core class requirements. Day Care is provided for these students free of charge. Job Service provides employment and vocational counseling. All participants are provided with labor market orientation, job finding skills, interviewing techniques, and application and resume completion.

Job Service develops work sites for those participating who need to work because of financial need. They are placed in an employment setting directed towards their career goals. JTPA pays the wage during the training period for these individuals.

If you would like to know more about the services that are available to you, contact your local Job Service office:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Falls</td>
<td>525-7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocatello</td>
<td>333-3821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfoot</td>
<td>785-2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon</td>
<td>756-2234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rexburg</td>
<td>356-4451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Studer hired to head literacy program

Brent W. Studer recently joined Lewis Clark State College School of Vocational Technical Education as the Workplace Literacy Coordinator and Business and Industry Assistant Training Coordinator.

Brent holds a Bachelor's Degree in Management Technology from Lewis Clark State College as well as having received training in Heavy Equipment Repair from Spokane Community College.

Brent, his wife Verna, and their two sons Ben and Tim, who are originally from Bonners Ferry and Lewiston have recently moved back to Lewiston from Yakima, Wash. Brent and his family are glad to be back in the valley.

Brent was most recently a supervisor at S.S. Steiner, Inc., a hop pelleting plant in Yakima. His other management experiences include shop foreman for a farm equipment dealership and assistant manager for a hop farm in North Idaho. Brent also worked as a mechanic and machinist welder in the logging and farming industries.
Workplace Literacy Programs Available in Eastern Idaho

by Mani Felicione, Eastern Idaho Vo-Tech
and Dean Hoch, Idaho State University

Workforce Trends by the year 2000

- Jobs will require more sophisticated skills.
- Most jobs will require some education beyond high school.
- Fewer jobs will be in a low skill category.
- Technology will have changed the content of most existing jobs.
- Competitiveness in a global market will be essential.

A workplace literacy program will begin January 1, 1989 throughout the state of Idaho. This exciting, first-of-its-kind, federally funded project provides employees with customized instruction they need to use computation and communication skills in the context of the workplace.

Workplace literacy is a partnership between education, industry and labor and is a result of the state’s commitment to helping its citizens lead productive and independent lives by acquiring skills necessary for successful competition in the job market.

Any business (service or product), governmental or private agency in the state of Idaho may take advantage of this service which includes (1) an on-site analysis of the employer’s needs as to their employees’ skills, (2) assessing current employee skill levels, and (3) providing a course of study to school personnel.

The workplace literacy program may provide instruction at the actual job site using materials that are used on the job. Instructional areas include reading proficiency, communication skills (written and oral), problem solving or reasoning skills, and upgrading technical skills needed for the workplace. Child care is also available by licensed child care providers for employees who take classes during non-working hours.

The benefits to the employer from this project are enormous: increased job proficiency, increased productivity, increased quality of product, reduced on-the-job accidents, and reduced absenteeism. In addition, promotability and mobility are increased in current employees — providing employers with a ready workforce to meet the needs of a changing marketplace.

Workplace Literacy is a joint endeavor of the Private Industry Council, Job Service and the Vocational Schools throughout the state of Idaho. If you are interested in learning more about this project or participating in the program, please call Mani Felicione at Eastern Idaho Vocational-Technical School (524-3000); or Dean Hoch at Idaho State University (236-4092).

Mani Felicione and Dean Hoch are the Workplace Literacy Coordinators for Region 6 and 5 and will be traveling throughout these regions with Job Service representatives to meet with employers and answer any questions about the Workplace Literacy Program. The Workplace Literacy Coordinators have been trained to make on-site job analysis and employee assessments to provide a maximum benefit to the employer. Early entry into the Workplace Literacy Program is encouraged because there is a set budget statewide.
Early in her career, patrol officer Zuella Nelson pulled a young Hispanic woman over on a traffic violation. The woman spoke no English, and Nelson said she didn’t understand any Spanish.

“We were totally unable to communicate,” Nelson said. “Our attempts were useless.” Although the woman indicated a willingness to cooperate, many attempts to communicate failed, Nelson said, and she let the woman go.

“It was extremely frustrating,” Nelson said. She decided at that point it was necessary for her to learn at least some key Spanish phrases, she said.

Daniel Rodriguez, Idaho Falls area manager for the Idaho Migrant Council, estimates the Hispanic population in the southeastern portion of the state numbers around 10,000, or about 10 percent of the population. Rodriguez said communication problems for Spanish-speaking Hispanics are more likely since the federal amnesty program. He said he often hears of problems.

“If a Hispanic who doesn’t know the (English) language is confronted with a police officer, he or she tends to clam up. They are scared and intimidated,” Rodriguez said. He said he is all for Spanish lessons. Only four of 66 Idaho Falls police officers claim fluency in Spanish. But since November, up to 30 city and county law enforcement officers have been taking Spanish classes at Eastern Idaho Technical College in a program especially tailored for police. The classes, financed by a federal grant, end in March.

Mary Ann Moberly established and teaches the course. She learned the language in Costa Rica 25 years ago, where she lived for six years after marrying a native of that country. The way she learned Spanish is now the way she teaches it — by ear.

“My students come out of the class in 10 weeks speaking an acceptable level of Spanish to communicate,” she said, though she acknowledges the Spanish they speak may not be grammatically perfect.

The course involves 30 hours of classroom work, four hours a week for eight weeks. Others who have taken the class are emergency medical technicians and Motor Vehicle Department employees.

“The community is fortunate law enforcement officers care enough to learn the language,” she said. Twenty years ago, she said, she was unable to inspire any interest.

“I didn’t realize how much I didn’t know — both about the language and the culture,” said Nelson, 31, who has been with the Idaho Falls police force for seven years.

For example, she has learned it is considered inappropriate to approach a female member of a Hispanic family for questioning before speaking to the men, who are considered the authority figures.

She said she learned key phrases, such as how to request a driver’s license, car registration and proof of insurance. She said she also knows enough to understand simple replies. But she said she would like to learn more.

Police work is not the only place where Spanish is being heard more often. In Magistrate Court, defendants hear taped information in both English and Spanish. Both Magistrate and 7th District courts in Bonneville County have a court-appointed interpreter on retainer.

Adalina Chambers interprets for defendants in both courts, District Court Clerk Sandy Grover said.

See SPANISH, Page B-2
I was born into a world of sound. I was a child of Tennessee, where my parents were born. As a child, I was always interested in the sounds of the world around me. I could hear everything, from the chirping of birds to the distant sound of cars on the road. I was always curious about the world and everything in it.

My family was different from most people. We were deaf. I was born into a world of sound, but I could not hear it. I was born into a world of silence, and I had to learn how to live in it.

I was always fascinated by sound. I would listen to the sounds of the world and try to figure out where they were coming from. I would close my eyes and try to imagine what the sounds looked like. I was always curious about the world and everything in it.

I was always interested in the sounds of the world around me. I would listen to the sounds of the world and try to figure out where they were coming from. I would close my eyes and try to imagine what the sounds looked like. I was always curious about the world and everything in it.

I was always interested in the sounds of the world around me. I would listen to the sounds of the world and try to figure out where they were coming from. I would close my eyes and try to imagine what the sounds looked like. I was always curious about the world and everything in it.
Far too many scam school operators are exploiting America's neediest kids and their dreams for a new start in life. They promise education and jobs but rip students off, leaving them deep in debt—with taxpayers picking up the tab.

Scandal in Our Trade Schools

By Trevor Armbister

In Chicago, in 1987, an unemployed mother named Maria T. Ramos signed up for a business course at the Illinois School of Commerce. According to a complaint brought by the State of Illinois against the school, the man who recruited her promised to repay her government-guaranteed student loan if she could not pay it and to find her a high paying part-time job immediately. Once she started class, however, she found that the school did not provide such jobs. Angry, she tried to withdraw. For two days of instruction, she still owes approximately $1300.

• According to sworn statements, teachers at the Robert Fiance Institute in Miami noted the names of students who were not in class and marked attendance records accordingly. When they saw those records again, the "absents" had been whited out, enabling the school to receive federal funds that are tied to class attendance.

• New Jersey requires a high-school diploma or General Educational Development (GED) certificate for a cosmetologist's license. No such credential is required of the thousands of aspiring beauticians who borrow millions to attend classes at beauty schools in that state. "Those who finish can't be licensed unless they get a GED, and few do," says Lutz Berkner, an official of the New Jersey Department of Higher Education. "The
schools say students can get jobs in beauty shops doing wash and prep. You don't need to go to school and get $2500 in debt to do that."

They call themselves schools, learning centers and colleges. They promise career training. But too many of America's 5000 accredited profit-making trade, business and beauty schools do not deliver the education they promise. Too many of the two million students enrolled in these "proprietary" schools are dropping out and defaulting on their loans, leaving taxpayers a bill that will exceed $500 million this year.

"At an increasing number of these schools," says Van Phillips, the U.S. Department of Education's chief investigator in Atlanta, "the fraud is out of control." The worst of the proprietary schools regularly entice disadvantaged kids to sign up for courses they can't possibly complete, offer courses that don't lead to jobs, and alter grades, attendance records and loan applications to bring in federal aid. Former Secretary of Education William J. Bennett describes the owners of such schools as "sharks, destroyers of the American dream."

Many proprietary schools, it is important to note, deliver on their promises. In Cleveland, for example, the Ohio Auto/Diesel Technical Institute graduates 650 students a year. The school's federal-loan default rate is under five percent, and employers flock there to hire mechanics who know their stuff. In California, 97 percent of the eligible graduates from the Fashion Institute of Design and Merchandising go on to full-time positions, often in high-paying jobs. In Pennsylvania the Gordon Phillips Schools train beauticians who, two years after graduation, can earn between $25,000 and $50,000 a year. Unfortunately, the reputation of good proprietary schools has been soiled by a growing band of fast-buck artists.

Until 1976, proprietary-school students could not receive government-guaranteed bank loans or Pell Grants (stipends for needy students) unless they had graduated from high school or possessed a GED. Then Congress let schools admit anyone who had an "ability to benefit." Who would make that determination? None other than the schools themselves.

Enrollments soared. So did outlays from the U.S. Treasury. In 1976 Pell Grants to students at proprietary schools totaled $82 million. By 1987 they had climbed to $890 million. Guaranteed Student Loans—an estimated $436 million in 1979–80—have exploded to $2.4 billion today. And since 1981 the default costs have skyrocketed by more than 600 percent.

Tuition costs are pegged to the amount of federal aid available; the schools depend on Washington for as much as 98 percent of their revenue. The temptation to cash in on this federal-aid bonanza has led to widespread abuses. Here are the most common:

Shameful recruiting practices. In order to qualify for federal funds, a proprietary school must be recognized by an accrediting body such as the Association of Independent Colleges and Schools (AICS). Accrediting groups have ethical recruitment standards, but some "problem" schools pay them no heed.

In Miami last year, 21-year-old Carlson Wilson was approached by a recruiter from the Robert Fiance Institute who offered him $5 for signing some papers at a branch office—in effect enrolling him in the school. To Wilson, a tenth-grade dropout, it seemed like a good deal, and the moment he signed, he received his $5. Then came the bad news: notices from a loan service in Denver that he owed $4055 on his "student loan."

"He didn't go to school," his mother told the Miami Herald. "Not one hour."

Fraudulent admissions policies. "Every day I meet ex-offenders who are enrolled in courses where they can't possibly succeed because their basic skills are so low," says Lynne Ornsrein, executive director of New York City's Fortune Society, a private group that helps former prisoners adjust to civilian life. "We tested a woman in an executive-secretary program. She had a first-grade reading level."

The U.S. General Accounting Office found that 732 of the 1165 trade schools it studied for program year 1980–81 admitted students "who did not meet" the Department of Education's minimum requirements. Seventy-four percent of these students dropped out.

At the Memphis (Tenn.) School of Commerce, according to a 1988 Department of Education Inspector General report, "testing was manipulated to enroll students of questionable ability to complete the training paid for by federal funds. In 63 of the 86 instances where students were enrolled but had failed the entrance test, incorrect answers were counted as correct."

Financial-aid flimflam. Once students sign up, school officials usually take care of the financial-aid paper work. In Boston in 1986–87, seven former Wilfred Academy admissions counselors pleaded guilty to charges that they aided students in making "fraudulent statements" on applications for student aid. In Phoenix, teachers alleged that students at Arizona Career College (now bankrupt) were given grades and credits for courses they had never taken so that the school could rake in additional federal dollars.

But few schools can match the tactics of the four Robert Fiance Institutes in Florida, whose top executives—New York City businessmen Rocco Ferrara and Robert E. Porges—viewed student-aid programs as a license to steal. In fiscal year 1988 they received approximately $50 million in grants and loans from the government.
could not type. School officials
explained that Porges had told her,
"If you see that one student is a little
smarter than the others, forget
about the loan application. Sign it
for him after he leaves."

Churning students out the door.
Last spring Vietnam vet Tommy L.
Wells enrolled in a word-process-
ing course at a proprietary school in
Ohio. Unemployed, with a wife
and two daughters, he wanted des-
perately to get off welfare. But he
couldn't type. School officials
promised to teach him.

Within weeks he received $4600
in grants and loans and signed over
the checks to the school. Suddenly
the atmosphere changed. As Wells
explained: "When I asked for help,
they refused to give it. They used
racial remarks to try to make me
walk out of class. They said they
would flunk me no matter how
difficult I tried."

"A school can earn more money
by emptying seats quickly," ex-
plains Leonard Bozza, a former
official of the New York State De-
partment of Education. In some
states, tuition-refund laws encour-
age this behavior. In Illinois a
school can keep 70 percent of the
tuition after a student has com-
pleted 25 percent of the course:

Poor-quality instruction. At too
many proprietary schools, teachers
know little about the subjects they
are supposed to discuss. Course cur-
ricula don't exist; neither do books
and other vital materials. Testifying
before the New York State Con-
sumer Protection Board, the leader of
one Hispanic group addressed the
problem bluntly: "Some of the
teachers we have found in these
schools cannot read themselves."

Low job-placement rates. Accord-
ing to the 1988 Department of Ed-
ucation Inspector General report,
Memphis School of Commerce of-
ficials boasted that they placed 90
percent of their graduates. The cor-
correct figure was closer to 13 percent.

Of some 700 students enrolled in a
computer-programming course at
Adelphi Institute (no connection
with Adelphi University) in Brook-
lyn, N.Y., only 11 found jobs that
bore any relation to the training
they'd received.

At the federal level no one was
more forceful than Secretary Ben-
nett in calling attention to the prob-
lem schools. But Congress and
powerful lobbyists opposed him at
every turn.

Superior Training Services of
Indianapolis specializes in truck-
driver training courses. Its chair-
man, Gary L. Eyler, kept a
$6-million jet—dubbed the Senate
Shuttle in the Indianapolis Star—
which he frequently used to ferry
politicians where they wanted to
go. Among his passengers: Senators
Robert Dole (R., Kan.), Paul Simon
(D., Ill.), Alan Cranston (D., Calif.),
Dan Quayle (R., Ind.) and Edward M.
Kennedy (D., Mass.).

In April 1987 Eyler flew in
Kennedy, chairman of the Senate
Committee on Labor and Human
Resources, for a $1000-a-plate Ken-
nedy fund-raiser. Soon after, Eyler
had a problem. The State Student
Aid Assistance Commission of In-
diana was refusing to guarantee
loans for the home-study portion of
Superior's courses. It didn't think
the law, which had been supported
by the Senate committee, required
it to do so. This meant that two-
thirds of the school's tuition costs
would not be guaranteed.

In Washington, D.C., lobbyist
Robert Herbolsheimer recounted the
predicament to committee staffers
and asked for a "clarification" of the
law, explaining that programs at
Superior and at other members of
the National Home Study Council
(of which Eyler was a director)
would be in jeopardy unless action
was taken. On August 14, five Sena-
tors, including Kennedy and Quayle,
sent a letter to Bennett informing
him that for loan guarantors to
discriminate against schools with
on- and off-campus instruction "is
inconsistent with Congressional in-
tent." Reluctantly, Bennett agreed
and so informed the appropriate
agencies. (In September 1988 the
U.S. Department of Justice sued
Superior for $366 million, charging
fraudulent admissions procedures,
among other violations. The com-
pany denied the charges.)

Lobbying can work wonders,
but the worst proprietary schools
also benefit from Department of
Education inaction. In 1981 it con-
ducted 1058 "program reviews"
and assessed fines and liabilities of
$16.4 million. By 1987, those totals
had plummeted to $72 and $2 mil-
lion, respectively.

One reason is that Education is
understaffed. Its regional office in
New York City has only three
employees to monitor 860 schools.
Seattle's regional office has four
reviewers to cover four states.

The record of many state agen-
cies is not significantly better. No
state provides enough resources. In
Arizona the State Board for Pri-
vate Postsecondary Education, which
is funded by the schools, has no paid
investigators on staff. In Florida the
State Board of Independent Postsec-
yondary Vocational, Technical,
Trade and Business Schools has a
staff of four to check 389 schools.

With loan defaults for proprie-
tary schools projected to reach
$1 billion for 1993, and with new
students being victimized every
day, the time for reform is long
past. Last spring Secretary Bennett
urged Congress to repeal the "abili-
ty to benefit" provision and require
all students to possess high-school
diplomas or GEDs before obtaining
federal aid. He proposed rules that
would tighten up refund policies
and allow the Department of Edu-
cation, beginning in 1991, to limit,
suspend or terminate any institu-
tion with a default rate above 20
percent from participating in federal financial-aid programs.

Congress has yet to take final action to resolve these problems.

Madelin Polanco, a 17-year-old mother of two, was studying computer programming at Adelphi Institute. She broke into tears the day she arrived at school to find the doors padlocked because Adelphi had declared bankruptcy. She doesn't know how she's going to pay the $3000 she owes. "I feel ripped off," she says. "The government knows about thousands of people like me, and yet it's still allowing the schools to take our money."

Concludes Phoenix attorney Jerry Davich, who has represented scores of victims of scam trade schools, "It isn't just a matter of fraud. It's inhumanity. Somebody, somewhere, ought to have a sense of shame."

**Time Warp**

I was sitting for a long time in the doctor's crowded waiting room, thumbing through a bunch of magazines at least two years old. A patient who was about to leave looked around the room at the rest of us and said, "Believe it or not, those magazines were up to date when I first came in."

—Contributed by Frances J. Eberhard

After waiting over three frustrating hours at the airport for the arrival of a plane that had been delayed in takeoff, a man approached the boarding desk and asked for an arrival-time update. He was concerned because he was meeting his nephew and this was the boy's first flight. "How old is the boy?" the airline representative asked solicitously.

"He was six when he left," the man replied sharply.

—Contributed by Thomas J. Doran

**Truth to Tell**

There's nothing like having the electricity go out to put the good old days in proper perspective.

—JoAnn Thomas in Door County, Wis. Advocate, quoted by Debbie Adams in Milwaukee Journal

Just when you get to the point where menu prices don't matter—calories do.

—Changing Times, The Kiplinger Magazine

If you were around the last time short skirts were popular, you shouldn't be wearing them this time.

—Gigi Mahon in New York
The Literacy Gap

To close it—and to open the eyes of millions of workers—U.S. companies are spending hundreds of millions every year as educators of last resort.

Anyone who has hired new employees or tried to retrain veteran ones is painfully aware of the problem. As much as a quarter of the American labor force—anywhere from 20 million to 27 million adults—lacks the basic reading, writing and math skills necessary to perform in today's increasingly complex job market. One out of 4 teenagers drops out of high school, and of those who graduate, 1 out of 4 has the equivalent of an eighth-grade education. How will they write, or even read, complicated production memos for robotized assembly lines? How will they be able to fill backlogged service orders? Already the skills deficit has cost businesses and taxpayers $20 billion in lost wages, profits and productivity. For the first time in American history, employers face a proficiency gap in the work force so great that it threatens the well-being of hundreds of US. companies.

More and more American corporations have responded to the literacy crisis by adding school bells to their time clocks. In the past decade, the price tag for remedial employee training in the three Rs has reached $300 million a year. More than half of FORTUNE 500 companies have become educators of last resort.

Taking up where school systems leave off, companies have traveled two different paths in the quest for improved literacy. Smaller firms have tended to rely on local educational resources, such as community colleges and volunteer tutors, to set up programs that will help their workers bridge the skills gap. Getting employees to stick with classes can be difficult, however, since the sessions are frequently held away from the workplace after hours. Larger companies, which command the resources to hold classes in-house, have sweetened the deal by offering workers time off during the workday to attend. Success in both cases depends on how strongly individual companies support their programs—and how effectively they defuse workers' fears about getting fired for owning up to subpar literacy.

The problem is not just large numbers of people who are insufficiently educated. Never before have the majority of American jobs placed so many demands on employees. To compete effectively, the average American worker today must employ skills at a ninth-to-twelfth-grade level, in contrast to the typical fourth-grade standard during World War II. "It's not that people are becoming less literate," points out Irwin Kirsch, a senior research psychologist working for the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, N.J. "It's that we keep raising the standards."

In the past, an expanding labor pool allowed business to satisfy its growing demands for skilled workers by skimming off the top. But since the baby boom ended in the mid-1960s, the number of 16- to 24-year-olds in the work force has dropped from 22.4 million in 1979 to 20.2 million last year. Most of the growth will be among minorities—the very groups that have been served least well by public school systems. Over the next decade, blacks, Hispanics and Asians...
who may speak English poorly, will make up more than half of all entry-level employees.

U.S. automakers are leading the search for skilled, literate workers. GM devotes more than 15% of the $170 million it spends yearly on job training to remedial education. In an attempt to match the quality of many foreign manufacturers, Detroit's Big Three carmakers joined the United Auto Workers in 1982 to create a comprehensive education and training program. At Ford Motor Co. alone, more than 8,500 of 106,000 blue-collar workers have since enrolled in basic-skills classes at the company's 50 learning centers in plants nationwide. Says Ford chairman Donald E. Petersen: "The prospect of having to teach its new workers basic English literacy, Conrad, who received a high school diploma this past summer, is concerned about the increasing demands of automation at the plant. Says she: "If you don't have the basic training, some of it can be hard to keep up with."

Some unions have been in the education business for decades. In New York City, locals of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees started teaching basic skills to their members in the late 1960s, when a group of nurses' aides without high school degrees asked for help. Today approximately 15% of its 20,000 member-students enroll in fundamental literacy and math courses each year. "The problem was always there," says Katherine Schrier, director of the union's Education Trust Fund. "Business is just now waking up to it."

The shock has been particularly strong in the service industries. At American Express, which expects to fill 75,000 entry-level positions in the next five years, profits depend on good customer relations. Says Amex President Lou Gerstner, whose company spends $10 million annually to teach its new workers basic English and social skills: "I lie awake at night wondering where I'm going to find well-qualified employees for the future." Even the art of cooking requires more of workers than ever before. Last year Domino's Pizza of Ann Arbor, Mich., discovered that its fledging bakers had trouble understanding its dough-making manuals. Now it spends $50,000 on a reading program, heavily seasoned with lessons on cuisine chemistry.

Since 3 out of every 5 new jobs in the economy are created by companies with fewer than 500 employees, small businesses suffer as severely as their corporate brethren. Bill Gregory, who owns Gregory Forest Products Sawmill in Gendalde, Ore. (pop. 870), did not know he had a problem on his hands until one of his 400 employees noticed that a forklift operator took forever to count loads of lumber. A bit of digging disclosed that about 10% of the mill's workers needed to develop proficiency in math and English. So, at a cost of $15,000, Gregory asked the nearby Umpqua Community College to provide instruction. Says he: "We're spending millions of dollars to modernize the mill. It just didn't make sense to pay for that without providing training for basic skills as well."

Reading, writing and arithmetic, however, are just the beginning. Today's jobs also require greater judgment on the part of workers. Clerks at Hartford's Travelers insurance company no longer just type endless claim forms and pass them along for approval by someone else. Instead they are expected to settle a growing number of minor claims on the spot with a few deft punches of the computer keyboard. Now says Bob Fenn, director of training at Travelers: "Entry-level clerks have to be capable of using information and making decisions."

O n-the-job education has allowed some companies to tap the current wave of immigration—the largest since World War II—for skilled workers. Blue-collar employees at the Orange County, Calif., division of Unisys, for example, speak everything from Korean to Japanese to Spanish. Their productivity improved significantly. Unisys managers say, when the company began offering ten-week courses in reading, writing and speaking English. Classes, which number 15 students at most, meet in the company cafeteria, whose wraparound picture windows look out on the Santa Ana Mountains. "Before I took the class I couldn't stand up and talk in our Thursday staff meetings," says Elvia Adame, 31, who came from the Southern California city eight years ago. "Now I participate in all the meetings."

Of course, better-skilled workers do not guarantee profits. Economic policy, trade agreements, technology, labor costs all play a role. But progress still depends on people who can communicate effectively, calculate accurately and act conclusively. "You can make the exchange rate anything you want," says American Express's Gerstner. "If you don't have the human capital to equal or exceed your competitors, you will fall behind."

The report cards are out, and businesses are going to great lengths to make the grade.

—By Christine German.
Reported by Mike Carroll/New York and D. Blake Hallinan/San Francisco