A workplace literacy partnership program model was demonstrated at four Chrysler plants in Indiana. Objectives were to improve workers' individual skills, enhance personal productivity, and increase work force job security and plant competitiveness. During the 3-month start-up phase, project staff worked with management and labor representatives to increase program support, involved United Auto Workers (UAW) officials directly in training programs by assigning them as staff, enrolled 70 workers, involved managers and UAW members in curriculum and evaluation design activities, identified 41 specific job-related or new technology skill areas, and customized the training curriculum by incorporating examples from workers' job tasks in training materials. The project recruited and enrolled 553 participants. Workers received individual counseling during the development of their individual development plans (IDP) and were provided with skill assessment services. The project provided job-related basic workplace skills training and additional components on an open-entry/open-exit basis: workplace communications, problem solving, decision making, basic skills improvement, and General Educational Development. (Twelve data charts are provided. Attachments include a list of tasks identified, summary of student assessment of instruction, program evaluation interview schedule and responses, sample IDP, and external evaluation report that concludes the project exceeded goals.) (YLB)
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I. Compare actual accomplishments to the objectives contained in the approved application.

"The four Chrysler plants have witnessed significant changes in production methods and manufacturing equipment, requiring workers to make much greater use of literacy skills. New Castle Machining and Forge and the Indianapolis Foundry have implemented (1987) a Modern Operating Agreement (MOA) which is an organizational method of production and operation requiring workers to use highly developed communication, problem solving and decision making skills. During this conversion from traditional manufacturing to present-day techniques, it had become increasingly obvious that a large percentage of the employees in these plants were functionally illiterate. Many needed to upgrade rusty skills or to develop new interpersonal and communication skills."

All of the plants involved in the Workplace Literacy Demonstration Project participate in UAW-Chrysler’s Production Quality Improvement Program (PQIP). Each plant has voluntary PQIP teams of workers among their departments, and the teams work to identify departmental problems and to develop solutions that will improve production quality, reduce waste, and/or increase operational efficiency.

The project objectives were designed to demonstrate a successful Workplace Literacy Partnership Program model for improving the individual skills of workers, enhancing personal productivity, and increasing job security of the workforce and the competitiveness of the four Chrysler plants in Indiana. The model has successfully demonstrated:

- recruitment and enrollment of workers, voluntarily, who have inadequate basic skills and have not participated in training;
- job-related workplace literacy training that is directly related to the workers’ current job skills and chances for advancement, and that has prepared them for new technology and operating methodologies; and,
- encouragement for workers to continue training to increase the competitiveness of UAW workers and Chrysler Motors.

All employees, both management and labor, were included in the plant population targeted for participation in the project. Approximately 7,100 hourly and 280 salaried employees constituted the base population. The four plants are located in three communities approximately fifty miles apart, with the exception of Kokomo, Indiana. Kokomo has two plants situated on adjacent land and connected for ease of transporting materials. The Indianapolis Foundry and the New Castle Machining and Forge are stand-alone operations. By comparison, the largest plant is the Kokomo Transmission plant with 59.9 percent of the target population; New Castle Machining and Forge has 15.1 percent, Indianapolis Foundry has 13.0 percent, and Kokomo Casting has 12.0 percent. The project was designed in two phases: a three-month start-up phase and a fifteen-month instructional phase, extended an additional three months. Each phase had distinctive goals and objectives.
Goal One: To establish a workplace literacy program that attracts workers who have been hesitant to participate in training by removing any barriers or stigmas they may have experienced that prohibited them from participating in skill improvement classes.

Objective One

To increase the support of Chrysler Management for the program by briefing all levels of management and supervisors about the program.

Accomplishment

The partnership team developed strategies to initiate the program into each plant. Assigned Regional Training Center Staff members held meetings with the plant managers and staff to present the program design and to elicit support and ideas on communicating the program with the employees. These meetings brought the most effective communication tools and media to the immediate disposal of the site Instructional Specialist and the Education Training Coordinator. Additional management meetings were subsequently held with direct suppliers of communications at each plant, such as in-house television communicators and publications personnel.

The project’s name was discussed at length. The UAW - Chrysler Region 3 Training Center Staff recommended that the word "Literacy" not be used. They indicated that experience, over the years, produces negative interest in any efforts that use “literacy.” The project was called the "Workplace Learning Partnership," which denotes the three-way partnership of the UAW-Chrysler Region 3 Training Center, the four Chrysler plants and Indiana Vocational Technical College. In addition, as contacts were made with prospective participants, the name was explained in further detail, often successfully enrolling the worker.

Initial response to the project and instructional staff was optimistic and encouraging from plant managers and supervisors. Their synergy brought ideas and tested communication vehicles that effectively communicated the design of the program to as many employees as possible.

Objective Two

To increase program support from all elected and appointed labor representatives in each plant by briefing them about the program.

Accomplishment

Working with former elected union presidents, who now are Education Training Coordinators at the UAW-Chrysler Region 3 Training Center, project staff held initial meetings first with local union leaders at each plant. The positive response to the project by these leaders opened many doors and helpful avenues of communication for project staff members. Presentations at union membership meetings were effective for informing the membership of the program and encouraging
individual support and participation. Union officials continued to be a participatory resource of assistance and motivation throughout the start-up and instructional phases of the project.

OBJECTIVE THREE

To develop a marketing strategy and materials that reflect the joint support of Labor and Management for the program.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

Joint meetings were held with local union and plant management representatives and regional training center coordinators to develop market strategies for each plant. Brochures and posters of varying types were designed and placed around the plants and at union and management meetings by the Instructional Specialists and the Region 3 Education Training Coordinators. No marketing decision on any strategy was initiated or conducted without the consensus of each plant’s labor and management personnel and the assigned member of the UAW-Chrysler Region 3 Training Center staff.

OBJECTIVE FOUR

To increase the direct involvement of the UAW in training programs by assigning three UAW-Chrysler officials from the Regional Training Center as staff to the project throughout its duration.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

The UAW-Chrysler Region 3 Training Center assigned two staff members, Mr. Roy Gammon to the Kokomo Plants and Mr. Noel Blevins to the New Castle Machining and Forge plant; Center Co-Administrator Mr. Mark Black was assigned to the Indianapolis Foundry and Mr. Sonny Green as an assistant for any recruitment needs at any plant. This team was responsible for introducing the instructional staff to the plant’s workforce. They scheduled meetings with key management and union personnel and personally contacted and recruited workers into the project. The Region 3 Training Center Staff’s time was calculated as in-kind contributions of the project.

OBJECTIVE FIVE

To recruit and enroll no less than 50 workers in the project.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

By August 1, 1990, at the end of the three-month start-up phase, seventy workers were enrolled into the project. Instruction began on August 1, 1990.

OBJECTIVE SIX

To maintain the support of the Local Joint Training Committee (LJTC) at each plant by involving each Committee in at least two planning meetings.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

Each site’s training committee was informed about the project during the start-up phase. These local training committees coordinated and provided office and instructional space at the New Castle Machining and Forge and at the Indianapolis Foundry, on-site within the plants, and at the UAW-Chrysler Kokomo Joint Training Center. Additional furnishings and supplies were provided by the committees throughout the project. Training committees also provided assistance in recruiting participants through the plants’ Education Training Counselors and local publications and training schedules. Local Education Training Counselors provided invaluable assistance to the instructional staff with start-up efforts through their contacts, advice, and expertise.
GOAL TWO: To establish a workplace literacy program that prepares workers for making the best use of new technology and new operating methods in order to increase job security, likelihood of advancement and to maintain viability in the contemporary workplace.

OBJECTIVE ONE

To increase the involvement of Managers in developing training programs by including no less than eight (8) managers or supervisors in curriculum and evaluation design activities.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

At each plant eight management personnel were selected by the UAW-Chrysler Region 3 Training Center staff member in consultation with the plant manager and union leadership to represent the plant on a Job Task Committee. Plant managers and union officers actively supported the committee, either by serving as representatives themselves or by sending a representative.

OBJECTIVE TWO

To increase the involvement of Labor in developing training programs by including no less than eight (8) UAW-Chrysler members, recognized for their expertise on the shop floor, in curriculum and evaluation and design activities.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

Each plant’s labor union officers and UAW-Chrysler Region 3 Training Center staff member selected eight union representatives to become members of a plant’s Job Task Committee. These members, along with the eight management team members, worked toward identifying basic skills among workers that were perceived as needing enhancement. The skills were discussed at length and prioritized as to their importance to the plant and immediate impact on workers’ current production and new technology needs. The Instructional Specialists were a part of the committees from the beginning, and once tasks were identified began conducting job task analyses on the highest priority items. The Job Task Committees met regularly and identified curriculum needs for a number of the skill areas.

OBJECTIVE THREE

To identify and analyze no less than 20 key Job Tasks for which the skill levels have increased as a result of technology changes; these tasks will be those perceived as problem areas to workers or by workers.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

Each plant’s Job Task Committee brainstormed basic skills areas currently viewed as problematic within identified departments. Each listing exceeded ten specific skills or areas of need (see Attachment 1). Forty-one specific job-related or new technology skill areas have been identified. Contained also on the lists are training areas and skills that were outside of the grant parameters.
OBJECTIVE FOUR

To individualize and customize the training curriculum by incorporating examples from each worker's job tasks in training materials.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

Workers desiring training on an individualized basis began with informal confidential assessments conducted by the Instructional Specialist. Often, these informal sessions resulted in identification of specific basic skill areas that the employee and Specialist then prioritized and developed into goals. Each worker's targeted Individual Development Plan (IDP) goal was then developed and designed to incorporate job-specific related materials as instructional tools and as criteria for goal accomplishment. But, in many instances, initial instruction on reviewing of basic skills used a variety of traditional instructional materials. After instruction, when a worker developed competency in the basic skills, job-related materials were incorporated to accomplish the IDP goal. (See Attachment 4.)

GOAL THREE: To establish a workplace literacy program that encourages workers to continue participating in training needed to meet competitive challenges in the world market.

OBJECTIVE ONE

To increase the information available to workers about changes in technology or operating processes by publishing articles each quarter in Local Union and Plant newsletters throughout the duration of the project.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

Plant and local union papers were used as vehicles for communicating with employees. The Instructional Specialists were invited to write articles on the progress of the project and how basic skills, workplace communications and job-specific skill training prepares workers for technology changes within the plants. Each plant willingly accepted the articles and published them periodically. Further, union officers and job task committee members volunteered their time to discuss with workers how improved basic skills instruction would enhance their jobs and prepare them for new technology. By their discussions and interaction with plant personnel, union officers and job task committee members encouraged workers to participate in the project. The UAW-Chrysler Region 3 staff members walked and talked among the employees regularly to encourage workers to participate through reviewing basic skills, looking toward technology changes and their part in an increasingly competitive global marketplace.
GOAL ONE: To recruit and enroll workers who need improvement in their basic workplace skills and to develop Individual Development Plans (IDP) for increasing their job-related skills.

OBJECTIVE ONE

To recruit and enroll no less than 200 workers in addition to the 50 workers who were enrolled in the start-up phase; no less than 82 will be from Kokomo Transmission; 30 workers will be from Kokomo Casting; 69 from New Castle Machine and Forge; and 69 from the Indianapolis Foundry.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

The project recruited and enrolled 553 participants. The eighteen-month approved project produced 535 participants. An additional three months no-cost extension brought about the additional 18 participants.

OBJECTIVE TWO

To provide Individual Counseling and prepare Initial IDP Plans for the 250 enrolled workers.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

With the exception of those workers who participated in the workplace communication classes, all individuals received individual counseling during the development of their IDP. (See Attachment 4.) Workplace communications class participants completed the IDP at the beginning of the first class session. IDP development was focused on the content of the class with skill assessment included in beginning sessions of the classes. Individuals who enrolled in individual instruction completed the IDP with either the UAW-Chrysler Region 3 counselor or instructor. Some workers completed the IDP but due to the volunteer nature of the project, didn't receive any direct instruction. Charts 1 - 12 detail by plant and project total those participants who enrolled and provide participants' demographic information.

OBJECTIVE THREE

To provide career counseling and formal skill assessment services to at least 100 of the workers enrolled in the basic skills improvement and G.E.D. components and to update their IDP to establish the sequence of skill upgrading sessions needed.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

During IDP development, participants were counseled and/or advised as to the scope of services the project was designed to provide for workers. The basic skills component offered participants review and further development of workplace "job specific" basic skills. The "job specific" skills were the target of instruction as a final goal. Often review of basic skills below the instructional level of the "job" was necessary. Instructors utilized the "Litstart" and "Literacy Volunteer's of America" assessment materials as a formal assessment. Many participants were hesitant to enter into a formal...
skills assessment, often because of negative school experiences in the past. The Instructional Specialists didn't push the "formal" assessments unless the participants indicated a willingness early on in the counseling process. During this initial process, informal assessment data was shared with the instructor which provided a starting point for instruction. As instructional sessions evolved, continual data feed-back was exchanged between participant and instructor. Instruction was competency based in the skill instruction component. The feedback loop supplied instructors continuous information for pacing instruction and scope of instruction essential for each participant. As participant association increased, additional alteration of the IDP goal became possible. Organization of instruction was developed individually for each participant to achieve his/her IDP goal. Programming of instructional sessions reflected each participant's individual learning modality.

OBJECTIVE FOUR

To refer any worker for whom the Basic Skills Improvement or G.E.D. program is not appropriate (does not match the worker's needs) to the UAW-Chrysler Education and Training Counselor for help in exploring other education and training options available through the plant, Regional Training Center, or, in the community.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

With an open/entry, open/exit participation model, a worker had access to staff to discuss individual basic skills development. The Region 3 Education and Training Counselor and the Instructional Specialist made up the local staff.

Workers whose basic skill needs or requests for training were beyond the range of the project were referred to UAW-Chrysler plant training coordinators. These in-plant coordinators assisted these participants toward acquiring the desired basic skills training at the plant's training facility or at the Local Education Agency (LEA) in the area. An example of a skill outside of the project is basic computer software literacy. These skill areas were judged beyond the limit of the WLP project goals and objectives. An undocumented number of referrals were made to each plant's training coordinator. In Kokomo, enough worker interest in computer software skills among engineering and supervisory personnel was fostered for two classes: 28 employees developed an IDP and participated. The WLP instructors coordinated the curriculum development with plant training coordinators and were successful in meeting the individual needs of the participants. Classroom instruction was first offered at the Kokomo Joint Training Center with alternating classes held at the workplace. The outside instructor circulated to the individual's work area and addressed each worker's specific problems. This model offered a highly efficient training on computer software that addressed very job specific needs. The computer training was paid for out of joint union and management funds at the Kokomo plants.

OBJECTIVE FIVE

To maintain support for the program from each LJTC by providing them with written reports each month and by meeting with them at least every other month throughout the duration of the project implementation phase.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

Instructors met with the Local Joint Training Committee (LJTC) in the plants monthly or on an invitation basis. Written reports were prepared by the instructor and the Region 3 Staff members on WLP plant activities to date. Usually, monthly reports were provided when the committees met. As the project evolved, the LJTCs regularly invited the Region 3 Staff and instructors to attend their meetings. In Kokomo, the instructional staff was included on the monthly agenda.

GOAL TWO: To provide individualized job-related basic skills instruction at convenient locations, on a flexible schedule and the supportive services necessary to assure participant success.
OBJECTIVE ONE

To provide no less that 250 workers with job-related basic workplace skills instruction and to achieve at least an 85% successful completion rate as measured by achievement of IDP goals.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

The project served 487 participants with job-related basic workplace skills related training. Of this group 79 developed a second IDP goal upon completing their first IDP. Additionally, 16 were satisfied enough to develop a third IDP, and four even developed a fourth IDP. Charts 1 and 3 indicate the number of participants who developed IDP goals during the instructional phase of the project. Instructors met with workers at convenient times, from 5:30 a.m. to 11:30 p.m. This flexibility built into the project allowed for employees to participate from all three shifts and to continue participating if the employee’s shift changed.

OBJECTIVE TWO

To serve, on an open-entry/open-exit basis, 150 workers in the Workplace Communication, Problem Solving and Decision Making component of the program.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

The Workplace Communication classes took direction from the job task committees’ listing of basic skills. The committees identified workplace communication areas that were perceived as needing improvement. The instructors were able to develop and offer “Effective Meeting Skills” and “Technical Presentation Skills” in all four plants. Additionally, “Writing Fitness” was developed to meet the needs of the Kokomo plants, late in the grant’s instructional phase. A number of workplace communication needs surfaced through the joint task committees, but such training needs were felt to duplicate existing company and union-provided training programs or were judged not to meet the criteria of the WLP program. Criteria was defined as a basic job-related skill that was not offered under current training programs. The criteria was to provide necessary skills in the workplace but not substitute “free” training. Examples of these conflicting training classes were “Listening Skills”, “Group Problem Solving”, and “Statistical Process Control.” Many of these classes were designed and incorporated into the Modern Operating Agreement plants at Indianapolis and New Castle and periodically offered to employees. The Kokomo plants were more receptive to the Workplace Communications Classes due in part to a different management model with no history of required workplace communications classes. Some employees at Kokomo previously received voluntary leadership training as a part of the Production Quality Improvement Program (PQIP). WLP offered “Effective Meeting Skills” and “Technical Presentation Skills” classes to volunteer members of PQIP teams.

OBJECTIVE THREE

To serve on an open-entry/open-exit basis, 90 workers (all sites) in the Basic Skills Improvement component of the program.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

This goal was accomplished at the half way point in the project. Chart 2 indicates the number of participants and subject areas enrolled. All instruction was ultimately directed toward the individual’s job or goal of preparing for new technology, and materials from the job were directly incorporated into instruction.

OBJECTIVE FOUR

To serve on an open-entry/open-exit basis, 10 workers in the G.E.D. component of the program.
ACCOMPLISHMENT

Seven participants enrolled in this component of the project. Those previously enrolled in G.E.D. programs chose to remain in them rather than transfer to a program offered potentially for only a limited amount of time. Chart 2 illustrates the participants' plant distribution.

OBJECTIVE FIVE

To provide bi-weekly follow-up with each participant throughout the duration of the project and to provide referral to child care or transportation assistance to those who request it.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

Participants received instruction weekly as the minimum instructional contact with the WLP instructor. Participants often requested instruction two times a week as the norm. One participant who enrolled to improve reading ability scheduled five sessions a week for up to 2.5 hours each session. This participant logged 174 activity sessions and the most contact hours of instruction in the project at 225.35 hours. If a worker missed a scheduled session the instructor would attempt to reschedule the session during the same week or double the sessions the following week. No worker indicated being unable to attend classes or sessions as a result of difficulty with child care or transportation.

GOAL THREE: To encourage workers to continue their education so they are prepared to adapt to new changes in technology or operating methods.

OBJECTIVE ONE

To update the Individual Development Plans of workers whenever an identified goal is reached as a means of rewarding the worker and encouraging him or her to continue setting and achieving additional training goals.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

As goals were accomplished, new goals were usually planned. Participants, in some cases, took group instruction and individual tutoring at the same time. This would be accounted as work toward one goal. Some participants received individual instruction toward one goal but also established a second goal in a workplace communication class. These participants would be counted as a second goal enrollment status participant. Some workers completed one goal, exited the project, then at a later date re-enrolled and established a new goal(s). These participants would be individual net participants of one, but the enrollment status would reflect the number of IDP goals established. (See Chart 2)

OBJECTIVE TWO

To sponsor one Conference on new technology and competitiveness for all program participants during the ninth month of the project.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

This goal was not accomplished by the Management Team. The goal was discussed at length, but a decision was
reached by the sixth month of the project to drop this goal. (See Phase II Operations, Goal 3, Objective 2, for details.)

OBJECTIVE THREE

To update the Individual Development Plans for 50% of the program participants who complete the basic skills instruction to encourage them to continue training through other UAW-Chrysler training programs.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

IDP goals were continually updated. As one skill area was accomplished, another goal would be developed. Some participants remained in the project for the entire 18 months. They developed up to four connective IDP goals. This included taking group instruction while also receiving individual instruction. These participants would be counted as entering the project a second time, etc.

OBJECTIVE FOUR

To track those program participants who enroll in other UAW-Chrysler sponsored training programs for one year after their participation in the project and encourage them to continue their training.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

The UAW-Chrysler Region 3 Training Center Staff will interview each participant and survey participant responses to the WLP project. The results will be compiled with recommendations for further training efforts by the Region and by local plants. The UAW-Chrysler Staff will begin their interviews on participants who exited the project earliest and end with the participants who continued to the project’s ending date.
Phase II - Operations

II. Refer to the schedule of accomplishments and their target contained in the approved application and give reasons for slippage in those cases where established objectives were not met. Include any corrective measures taken to correct slippage.

PHASE II - OPERATIONS

Project Goal 1:
To recruit and enroll workers who need improvement in their basic workplace skills and develop Individual Development Plans for increasing their job-related skills.

Objective 4:
To serve on an open/entry, open/exit basis, 10 workers in the G.E.D. component of the program.

The four sites served seven (7) individuals working toward completion of the G.E.D. These individuals were engaged in preparing for the G.E.D. testing before contacting the WLP instructor. Remedial instruction was provided to several of the workers in the area of mathematics as a supplement to the G.E.D. instruction. An undocumented number of individuals expressed an interest in starting G.E.D. instruction and often chose to contact the local UAW-Chrysler Education and Training Counselor for assistance in exploring established education providers. Some workers expressed hesitation to enroll because of the limited length of the funded project.

Project Goal 3:
To encourage workers to continue their education so they are prepared to adapt to new changes in technology or operating methods.

Objective 2:
To sponsor one Conference on new technology and competitiveness for all program participants during the ninth month of the project.

The management team began working on this objective in late Summer 1990. A number of issues surfaced in the management meetings concerning the feasibility of a conference that would bring workers from three plant sites to a central location. The distance would be over a 100-mile round trip for all but the Indianapolis Foundry. If the Region 3 Training Center was the location, many Indianapolis Foundry workers would be traveling a forty-to eighty-mile round trip.

A Saturday meeting was determined as the best possible to accommodate most workers enrolled and not interfere with any individualized instruction. Which Saturday was the problem. Schedules of plant shut-downs and vacations were considered. As the months passed, more plants were conducting rolling department shutdowns. These department or entire plant shut downs were from one to four weeks in length and were dictated by sales and assembly plant component needs.

The management team also groped with finding a conference agenda which would meet the needs of so many workers and provide the best attendance. No one topic was determined strong enough to draw or interest all workers. As May approached, the team attempted to connect the selection of the Chrysler-produced Stealth automobile for the Indianapolis 500-Mile Race Pace Car with a technology conference. Chrysler personnel would be at the “500” race
course during the month of May and could provide demonstrations and products that would draw workers on a weekend to Indianapolis. This idea was pursued strongly, but the scheduling of events conflicted with the “500” activities. Furthermore, no budget allocation was provided, and cost estimates to secure attendance at the “500” race track would have been prohibitive.

The one-day technology conference was dropped by the management team as a viable project objective.

III. For projects involving direct services to individuals, identify the number and characteristics of project participants who completed planned project activities, and of those who did not, and the outcomes achieved by participants who completed project activities.

a. Number and characteristics of project participants who enrolled and those receiving planned project activities.

A total of five hundred and fifty-three (553) employees from the four (4) UAW-Chrysler participating plants were enrolled into the project. Because the project followed an open-entry/open-exit enrollment plan, employees joined and left the program at different times. Their degree of participation also varied. The majority of employees received instruction weekly; but other employees varied the frequency of instruction, and one worker received instruction on a daily basis. Of the 553 employees enrolling into the project, four hundred and eighty-seven (487) received instruction. The remaining sixty-six (66) employees were counseled and referred to their respective plant’s education and training counselor or to outside education agencies such as a colleges or university. (See Chart 8)

b. Outcomes achieved by participants

Of the 487 employees receiving instruction, 454 developed a single IDP goal to completion, or were directed to other service providers at the end of the instructional phase of the project. Interest in continuing workplace literacy instruction is evidenced by 79 employees who developed a second IDP goal, 16 employees who developed a third IDP goal, and 4 employees who established a fourth IDP goal. (See Chart 3, for plant detail)
### Number of Participants

#### Distribution by Plants

**August 1990 - November 30, 1991**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>IDP's</th>
<th>Received Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Casting</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>114 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Transmission</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>114 (99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle Machining and Forge</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>148 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis Foundry</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>111 (86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>487 (88%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Number of Participants

**Distribution by Instructional Area by Plant**

**August 1990 - November 1991**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Area</th>
<th>Kokomo Trans.</th>
<th>Kokomo Casting</th>
<th>New Castle Machining &amp; Forge</th>
<th>Indianapolis Foundry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>186 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC Pre-Math</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Communication</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>185 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED Preparation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Referral</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>281 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>184</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
<td><strong>284</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>848 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22%)</td>
<td>(21%)</td>
<td>(33%)</td>
<td>(24%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Development</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kokomo Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>208</strong></td>
<td><strong>187</strong></td>
<td><strong>284</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>879 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 2**
Number of Participants

Multiple IDP Goals

August 1990 - November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
<th>Plant Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Casting</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Transmission</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle Machining and Forge</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>175 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis Foundry</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>129 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>553 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Chart 3](chart_image.png)
### Total Project Activities by Months and Total Project

**August 1990 - November 1991**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Month</th>
<th>Total Instructional Activities</th>
<th>Total Counseling/Referral Activities</th>
<th>Total for Month/Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August, 1990</td>
<td>57/58.50</td>
<td>22/17.75</td>
<td>79/76.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 1990</td>
<td>124 / 107.75</td>
<td>20 / 8.00</td>
<td>144 / 115.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 1990</td>
<td>212 / 199.50</td>
<td>10 / 5.25</td>
<td>222 / 204.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 1990</td>
<td>253 / 267.50</td>
<td>18 / 8.00</td>
<td>271 / 275.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 1990</td>
<td>221 / 250.25</td>
<td>25 / 7.80</td>
<td>246 / 258.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 1991</td>
<td>262 / 287.25</td>
<td>16 / 7.05</td>
<td>278 / 294.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 1991</td>
<td>265 / 308.35</td>
<td>20 / 9.25</td>
<td>285 / 317.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 1991</td>
<td>284 / 694.50</td>
<td>66 / 19.50</td>
<td>350 / 714.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 1991</td>
<td>184 / 208.00</td>
<td>33 / 14.50</td>
<td>217 / 222.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 1991</td>
<td>289 / 400.50</td>
<td>38 / 14.25</td>
<td>327 / 414.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1991</td>
<td>236 / 301.25</td>
<td>49 / 20.25</td>
<td>285 / 321.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July, 1991</td>
<td>293 / 363.75</td>
<td>19 / 8.00</td>
<td>313 / 372.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 1991</td>
<td>558 / 889.25</td>
<td>17 / 5.50</td>
<td>576 / 895.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 1991</td>
<td>417 / 845.75</td>
<td>9 / 2.25</td>
<td>426 / 848.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 1991</td>
<td>442 / 738.15</td>
<td>9 / 2.50</td>
<td>451 / 740.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 1991</td>
<td>341 / 506.50</td>
<td>3 / .75</td>
<td>344 / 507.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>4438 / 6426.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>374 / 150.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>4814 / 6578.35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(92%) (98%)</th>
<th>(8%) (2%)</th>
<th>(100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Average time/activity:** 1.45 hours
- **Average minutes/activity:** 1:27 min.
- **Average time/activity:** .4 hours
- **Average minutes/activity:** :24 min.
Number of Participants

Distribution by Ethnicity

August 1990 - November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Kokomo Trans.</th>
<th>Kokomo Casting</th>
<th>New Castle Machining</th>
<th>Indianapolis Foundry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afro American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>175</strong></td>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
<td><strong>553</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 5
### Number of Participants

#### Distribution by Sex

**August 1990 - November 1991**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Transmission</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Casting</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle Machining &amp; Forge</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis Foundry</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>515</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing Male and Female participation by plant]
## Number of Participants

### Distribution by Mean Age

**August 1990 - November 1991**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Kokomo Trans.</th>
<th>Kokomo Casting</th>
<th>New Castle Machining</th>
<th>Indianapolis Foundry</th>
<th>Totals/% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 24 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19/3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19/3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34/6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40 years</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>245/44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+ years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>236/43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>175</strong></td>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
<td><strong>553</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart 7

- **Indianapolis Foundry**
- **New Castle Machining**
- **Kokomo Casting**
- **Kokomo Transmission**

- 18 - 24
- 25 - 30
- 31 - 35
- 36 - 40
- 41+
Number of Participants

Distribution of Direct Instruction and Counseling Referral Services

August 1990 - November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>Direct Instruction</th>
<th>Counseling Referral Only</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Transmission</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Casting</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle Machining and Forge</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis Foundry</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Chart 8](chart.png)

- **Counseling/Referral Only**
- **Direct Instruction**
### Number of Participants

**Distribution by Years with Chrysler Corporation**

**August 1990 - November 1991**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years with Chrysler (Range)</th>
<th>Kokomo Trans.</th>
<th>Kokomo Casting &amp; Forge</th>
<th>New Castle Machining</th>
<th>Indianapolis Foundry</th>
<th>Totals/ % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>104/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25 years</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>195/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13/2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+ years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>175</strong></td>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
<td><strong>553/100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 9**

- Indianapolis Foundry
- New Castle Machining and Forge
- Kokomo Casting
- Kokomo Transmission
### Number of Participants

**Distribution of Participants by Head of Household by Plant**

**August 1990 - November 1991**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Single Head Female/Male</th>
<th>No. of Single Head</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10/7</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casting</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3/9</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indy Foundry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar Chart](https://chart-image-url.com)

- **Indianapolis Foundry**: 125
- **Machining and Forge**: 154
- **Kokomo Casting**: 103
- **Kokomo Transmission**: 117

**Chart 10**

- Single Male
- Single Female
- Head

**No. of Single Head**

**25**
### Number of Participants

#### Distribution of Marital Status by Plant

**August 1990 - November 1991**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Widow</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indy Foundry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagram:**

- Indianapolis Foundry: 105, 22, 0, 0
- New Castle Machining and Forge: 105, 13, 0, 0
- Kokomo Casting: 95, 11, 0, 0
- Kokomo Transmission: 105, 11, 0, 0

**Chart 11**
### Number of Participants

**Participant Recruitment Methods by Plants**

August 1990 - November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kokomo Transmission</th>
<th>Kokomo Casting</th>
<th>New Castle Machining and Forge</th>
<th>Indianapolis Foundry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WLP Staff Member</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin Announcement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Newsletter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Officer Referral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Referral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC Plant Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee's Supervisor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Other Contacts</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage**

1. WLP Staff Member .................................................. 39%
2. Brochure .................................................................. <1%
3. Bulletin Board Announcement ...................................... 4%
4. Plant Newsletter ..................................................... <1%
5. Friend .................................................................... 5%
6. Union Officer Referral ............................................. 1%
7. Management Referral ............................................... 18%
8. ETC Plant Education Training Coordinator Referral ...... 5%
9. Employee's Supervisor .............................................. 2%
10. Through Plant meetings, other contacts, etc. .......... 26%

**Chart 12**
IV. Report on any dissemination activities.

The following items were disseminated to the United States Department of Education; the UAW/Chrysler National Training Center; the UAW-Chrysler Region 3 Training Center; the four partner Chrysler plants within UAW region 3; the Indiana Vocational Technical College; the Indiana Office of Workforce Development; the ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career and Vocational Education, Division of Adult Education and Literacy’s Clearinghouse on Adult Education and Literacy; and the Curriculum Coordination Center Network:

- Project Final Performance Report
- Project Final External Evaluation Report

In addition, the project information was shared, throughout the project, with the following organizations through individual and group meetings with representatives:

- UAW-Chrysler National Training Center, Detroit, via Teleconference
- UAW-Chrysler Region 3 Training Center, Indianapolis
- Indiana Vocational Technical College, Central Office, Indianapolis
- Regional campus administrators of Indiana Vocational Technical College
- Indiana Office of Workforce Development, Indianapolis
- Acme Steel Co., Riverdale, Illinois
- Sinclair Community College, Dayton, Ohio
- South Suburban College, South Holland, Illinois
- Indianapolis Network for Employment and Training (iNET)
- Learning Disability Task Force of the Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition
- Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition
- Chrysler Region 3 administrators at the four plants involved

Formal Presentations about the project were conducted at the following meetings:

- Northern Indiana Power Service Company (NIPSCO), Public Forum, South Bend, Indiana, Fall 1991
- Workforce Literacy Exchange (Sponsored by Indiana Office of Workforce Development), Indianapolis, October 1991
- 13th Annual Adult Education Administrator’s Conference, (Indiana Department of Education, Division of Adult Education), Indianapolis
- Indiana Association for Developmental Education (INADE), French Lick, Indiana, Annual Meeting, October 1990 and 1991
  - Howard County Literacy Coalition, Meeting
  - Henry County Reading County, Meeting, Fall 1990 and 1991
  - UAW Local 550, Indianapolis, Membership Meeting
  - UAW Local 371, New Castle, Membership Meeting
  - UAW Local 1302, Kokomo, Membership Meeting
  - UAW Local 685, Kokomo, Membership Meeting
  - UAW Local 1166, Kokomo, Membership Meeting
  - Alpha Zeta Chapter of Kappa, Kappa, Kappa, Statewide Philanthropic Organization, Meeting
  - New Castle Noon Optimists Club, Meeting, Summer 1991

Information about the project was also published and distributed through project newsletters; plant newspapers; project brochures; project posters; local union newspapers; the INADE newsletter; The Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition statewide newsletter; The Literacy Letter, Summer 1991, a part of the Governor’s Literacy Action Program; in-plant videos; and local public newspapers within the three communities where plants are located.
V. Report on any evaluation activities.

The evaluation procedures for the project were designed to provide information to the project management team, the college, and the instructional staff. The evaluation activities and data collection procedures conducted by project staff were as follows:

1. Recorded descriptive participant information (demographic data) about the participants at the time of enrollment using a modified version of the UAW/Chrysler Individual Development Plan (IDP) (See Attachment 2).

2. Selected appropriate pre-testing materials for use with individual participants. Some participants desired formal assessment. The TABE, LitStart, Literacy Volunteers of America or specific publishers' textbook pre-assessments were administered. For other participants, where resistance to assessment was observed and deemed by Instructional Specialists as interfering with the teacher/student relationship, pre-assessment became informal in nature. In almost all cases pre-and post-assessments were used after a trust relationship developed. Informal pre-assessment information was as simple as the answering of yes/no questions by the Instructional Specialists. As instruction continued, periodic assessment was inevitably requested by participants.

3. Monitored participants' progress regularly. For the individual basic skills component of the project, participants' progress was monitored by the Instructional Specialists through individual confidential record folders. These were taken home by the Instructional Specialists or placed under locked security. Pre-assessment for participants in the workplace communication classes was informal in nature and utilized an instrument developed for that specific class. The pre-assessment was administered prior to instruction during the first class session with post-assessment during the last class session.

4. Maintained individual records of activities. A computer management system was developed to record the frequency of instruction; the date of instruction; the specific subject goal area; the amount of time allotted for delivering instruction; the type of instruction, that is, whether the instruction was designated as group, individual, or computer-assisted; and the number of IDP goals set and attained.

5. Collected evaluation questionnaires from participants upon completion of an IDP goal. When the predetermined IDP goal was achieved or the employee decided to exit the program, an interview was conducted using an evaluation questionnaire. Employees who attended the workplace communication classes completed a similar questionnaire which was developed for use with groups. Each form asked the same essential questions (See Attachments 3-4).

6. Analyzed data and prepared quarterly reports.

7. Met with external evaluator on a regular basis. The external evaluator collaborated during the start-up phase in the development of the evaluation questionnaires. The evaluator was contacted periodically throughout the implementation phase and was kept informed through progress reports.

8. Questionnaires and testimonials from employees provided anecdotal records as events occurred. Exit interviews, or interviews conducted when participants completed IDP goals, provided individual opinions concerning the project's worth.

VI. Report on any changes in key personnel.

There were two personnel changes as two Instructional Specialists departed the project during the fifteenth and sixteenth months. The Indianapolis Foundry instructor departed six weeks prior to the agreed-upon end of the instructional funding period (November 1991), and one of the two Kokomo Instructional Specialists departed two weeks prior to the end of the instructional funding period. Both Instructional Specialists accepted permanent positions within the college. Both have been readily available for evaluation purposes.
Attachment 1

JOB TASKS COMMITTEES
41 Tasks Identified

Indianapolis Foundry: (Prioritized list)

Reading - Vocabulary (Scrap Sheets)
Oral Communication Skills
Math - General competency upward
Writing - reports, supervisors, forms (health, personnel)
Written Communications
Algebra - skilled trades, SPC
Effective Meetings
Computer Literacy - terms, acronyms
Office Skills - file system (records), organization, typing
Blueprint Reading - Sketching, perspective drawings, reading prints, terminology
Shop Math - theory (skilled trades)
Tool Recognition - numeration, math skills
Fork Lift Training - completing certified training, understanding test materials
Inductor Analysis - furnace, reading gauges, charting data, completing reports

Kokomo Transmission Plant:

Gage reading - Mathematics involved, Decimals
Math/Spatial concepts for pre-apprentices
Skilled Trades Preparation - Math
Print Reading - Mathematics, terminology
Computer Numerical Control terminology, mathematics, acronyms
Supervisory Training—listening skills, communication skills
Group Problem Solving
SPC Mathematics, integer number system, charting, terminology
Presenting reports to groups
Writing more effectively
Improving team meetings

Kokomo Casting:

Basic Skills: Reading, Math, and Writing
Statistical Process Control: review of decimals, plotting, filling out forms, +/- numbers, graph reading, communicating info.
Identifying defects in parts: communicating what a defect is.
Technical Training: What basic skills training will best prepare employees for technical training.
Plant Glossary of terms
Effective Meeting
Technical Presentation Skills

New Castle Machining and Forge:

Basic Skills Development: employees entering the skilled trades apprenticeship program Basic skills preapprenticeship upgrading as well as support and reinforcement during instruction periods

Statistical Process Control Basic: Basic math reinforcement and integer number system reinforcement, basic calculator use, charting, terminology

(FMEA) Failure Modes and Effective Analysis: Basic problem solving as it relates to new technology

Decimal Numeration skills: in all areas of the plant

Computer Literacy Skills, especially keyboard literacy and communication skills, reading the keyboard

Communication skills, oral communication for launch teams, problem solvers, and team members

(MOA) Modern Operating Agreement problem solving skills Possibly a general forum approach with specific skills developed later
### Attachment 2/ SUMMARY OF STUDENT ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTION

Instructions: Circle the appropriate letter for each of the descriptions, please respond to the following statements.

#### Descriptions:
- **A** - You STRONGLY AGREE with the statement.
- **B** - You AGREE more than you disagree with the statement.
- **C** - You DON'T KNOW or the statement is NOT APPLICABLE to the subject or the instructor or you are simply not able to give a response.
- **D** - You DISAGREE with the statement more than you agree.
- **E** - You STRONGLY DISAGREE with the statement.

#### 1. The instructor was prepared for the session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. The instructor established clear goals and objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. The materials for learning were well organized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4. Instructions were clear, reasonable, and carefully given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. The instructor was understanding of the student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. The subject was presented in an understandable manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 8. The instructor made the subject interesting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. I would rate the sessions as "excellent."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. I can apply/use what I've learned to or at my job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. I can apply/use what I've learned outside of my workplace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. I feel better about myself because of this class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The class has enabled me to be a more productive worker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. I am more comfortable with change(s) at my workplace due to the class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. My attitude toward work has improved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. I am more comfortable with changing technology due to this class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. This class has impacted my learning outside of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. The project has effected my future educational endeavors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. I am a better "team member" due to my involvement with the project and its instructor(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 3/ PROGRAM EVALUATION INTERVIEW

Participant's Name: ____________________________________________

Exit Date or Last Date of Instruction: ______________________________

Area(s) of Instruction: __________________________________________

1. How did you hear about the WLP Project?
   See Chart #12

2. What goal(s) did you want to achieve through the WLP Project?

3. How well do you feel you have met your goal(s)?

4. Can you give me some examples of what you learned while in the project?

5. What can you do now that you couldn't do before you came to WLP?

6. How valuable do you feel the project was for you?

7. What did you especially like about the project?
8. What did you especially like about the instructors?

9. How can we improve our project?

10. Who else do you think would find the WLP Project valuable?

11. What new goals would you like to set?

12. How can the WLP Project staff help you to meet these goals?

Please feel free to use the back of this page if you need more space.

Student's Signature: ____________________________ Date: ______________________

Staff Signature: ____________________________ Date: ______________________
Attachment 4/ Program Evaluation Interview

Question Two: What goal(s) did you want to achieve through the WLP Project?

Re-learn basic math and complete algebra class.

To be able to speak better publicly and to sell others on my ideas.

Learn how to spell.

Math improvement.

To increase knowledge in Geometry and Trigonometry.

Perform my work faster.

I wanted to enjoy leisure reading.

My time is very limited.

Upgrade my math skills.

Advancement in math skills.

To do math without a calculator.

Learn more than what I already knowed[sic]. Refresh my mind: reading, math, spelling, etc. everything I can get cause[sic] I lost on a lot in high school.

I wished to upgrade my skills in communications.

To refresh my mine[sic] an to see if I still remember some of my math.

[ALL ARE QUOTATIONS DIRECTLY FROM THE INTERVIEW FORM]
Program Evaluation Interview

Question Three: How well do you feel you have met your goal(s)?

Very Well.

I didn’t finish high school. What I had forgotten from high school & missed out on, WLP has help [sic] me much.

Very well.

My spelling is much better.

Very satisfactory.

Very well in the short time we worked together.

My time for now was too constricted.

Very well.

Very Good.

I feel that I exceeded my original goal, and set new ones.

I would rate it as a B.

Pretty close to 100%.

I am very pleased with my progress to date. I feel very full fill [sic] after seeing the grades I am making.

[ALL ARE QUOTATIONS DIRECTLY FROM THE INTERVIEW FORM]
Program Evaluation Interview

Question Four: Can you give me some examples of what you learned while in the project:

How to work with fractions, decimals, percentages and other problems related to math and algebra.

All rules have exceptions.

How to convey my ideas orally, and preparation is a very important part of an oral presentation.

That you're never too old to learn. Knowing how to work fractions. Having self confidence [sic] in myself.

Yes, especially in the areas of punctuation and grammar.

Notice words, can read better, to sound out words. Helped me write numbers I notice in my checking account, read more and buy more newspapers. Helped me all the way around, I'm just getting started.

Decimals, dividing, rounding numbers. High level of math. Functions of micrometers, Sai/calii,[sic] fractions, decimals. The technique of speed reading so I could teach myself in my pare time. Some fundamentals of geometry.

A better understanding of propositions and how important the pathog. (sic) and thermo is.

See no 3 and 4.

I learned basic fractions and decimals - change fractions to equilavent decimals and percentages.

[ALL ARE QUOTATIONS DIRECTLY FROM THE INTERVIEW FORM]
Program Evaluation Interview

Question Five: What can you do now that you couldn't do before you came to WLP?

I can add and subtract fractions and decimals - change fractions to equivalent decimals and percentages.

Multiply fractions, divide fractions.

Figure triangles with fewer mistakes.

Better use of the calculator.

I can read and enjoy a novel in much shorter time. I read an entire magazine and newspaper in an hour, Wall Street Journal and Inventor Daily - not light reading.

Add, subtract, multiply, dividing, fractions, decimals.

Advanced math. Rounding numbers and not to clear on decimals.

All of #4.

Communicate more effectively.

Round off numbers, do fractions, sit down at home an study math more.

Speak publicly without nervousness.

All types of math, from basic skills to Algebra, math was always my weakest subject.

I have a better concept of words.

[ALL ARE QUOTATIONS DIRECTLY FROM THE INTERVIEW FORM]
Program Evaluation Interview

Question Six: How valuable do you feel the project was for you?

Very worthwhile

Very valuable - without it I could not have completed the Algebra class I enrolled in, I needed Basic Math and WLP was right there at the plant and made it possible for me to learn at hours I was free.

Very much so. It helped me attain two very important goals.

It has had a very positive effect on my life at home an at work an it gives one self esteem.

Very valuable

Very valuable

Very valuable

Very important

Very valuable, before I took this class I avoided reading novels because I felt I did not have enough time. Sunday afternoon I read a biography of Catherine the Great, from beginning to end. This was not a novel, but it was a pleasant experience to read it quickly and understand it.

It would be very valuable if I had more time in the classroom.

Very helpful.

It’s been valuable for me. I may never use fractions in my work but it makes me feel better because I can do them.

Although I do not use math (fractions - decimals) everyday, I do use them more frequently than I used to and I am more comfortable when I do, also, I do not need a calculator any more for basic math, so, it has been a very valuable asset to me on my job.

[ALL ARE QUOTATIONS DIRECTLY FROM THE INTERVIEW FORM]
Program Evaluation Interview

Question Seven: What did you especially like about the project?

It's a good private comfortable atmosphere, working with the instructor one on one versus classroom, I wasn't embarrassed by my lack of knowledge as I would have been in a classroom setting.

One on one.

The one on one learning process and having the instructor at the plant which is close.

It helped me gain self confidence and be a better public speaker.

Learning in math that I didn't understand or I didn't learn when I was in school.

Class size. Barbara tailored it to fit our needs. I liked the personal attention. One on one privacy. It was easily accessed. You could take homework with you. One on one. The personal instruction.

[ALL ARE QUOTATIONS DIRECTLY FROM THE INTERVIEW FORM]
Program Evaluation Interview

Question Eight: What did you especially like about the instructor?

Very knowledgeable, plus knew who to ask to get more information on the latest information.

Done real good, explained a lot of different things I learned a lot in reading.

She (Barbara) will take the time and make sure you understand what needs to be done.

Friendly, and make me feel at ease. Sincere, understanding.

My instructor, Barbara, is exceptional. She is caring, knowledgeable, works beyond expectations and is very charming.

(All) He understood my needs and could meet the same. He was willing to work where I needed help. It takes patience to teach me, I don't catch on quick.

I like the way she had my class work ready, the homework she gave me to do when I didn't understand she would help me to understand until I did.

I liked the way she worked one on one, and concentrated on your weak points.

Instructor went of way to help me in any problem that came up, has been very helpful and done great job.

Her patience.

They were knowledgeable and capable of getting me to understand what I needed to know, especially Barbara Hulse, she is an excellent and capable instructor.

[ALL ARE QUOTATIONS DIRECTLY FROM THE INTERVIEW FORM]
Program Evaluation Interview

Question Nine: How can we improve our project?

Just keep it coming - I need more

Extend the classes

I like it the way it is - if anything I would like to see it expanded into even more educational areas.

I didn’t know about other areas but, the program helped me tremendously.

By keeping the program going to help other people that would like to have help just like myself.

 Longer time from [sic].

Have some hours on company time. With CNC coming, all toolmakers need similar training.

More hands-on work related skills.

The project works fine for me now, I hope it continues.

Advertise a little more.

Seems good as it is.

More funding.

[ALL ARE QUOTATIONS DIRECTLY FROM THE INTERVIEW FORM]
Program Evaluation Interview

Question Nine: How can we improve our project?

Just keep it coming - I need more

Extend the classes

I like it the way it is - if anything I would like to see it expanded into even more educational areas.

I didn’t know about other areas but, the program helped me tremendously.

By keeping the program going to help other people that would like to have help just like myself.

Longer time from [sic].

Have some hours on company time. With CNC coming, all toolmakers need similar training.

More hands-on work related skills.

The project works fine for me now, I hope it continues.

Advertise a little more.

Seems good as it is.

More funding.

[ALL ARE QUOTATIONS DIRECTLY FROM THE INTERVIEW FORM]
Program Evaluation Interview

Question Ten: Who else do you think would find the WLP Project valuable?

Everyone in the plant. Lots of people.

Anyone who wants to learn.

Anyone wanting to increase education.

Upgrade the employees who work for me and with me.

Edna Adkins (works days), I believe she is in the job bank. Dale Winchester, Heat treat on second shift. Charles Nicholson, Pyrometer tech, second shift would like advanced math in the winter session. He has other classes to attend for the Millwright upgrade this summer.

Anyone in the skilled trade.

A lots of people like myself who didn’t finish school, or wants to learn more.

Anyone wanting to expand their education, it is great to have educational help right there at the plant.

Other plant employees if they would just try it.

ALL ARE QUOTATIONS DIRECTLY FROM THE INTERVIEW FORM]
Program Evaluation Interview

Question Eleven: What new goals would you like to set?

Metric math.

Higher education.

To be able to communicate with people, more confidence.

To be able to do a lot of things myself.

Touch more people.

Spelling

By having great teachers like the one I've got that cares an to take time to show you how to work out problems.

In other areas. Reading (speed reading) skills. Continue classes.

[ALL ARE QUOTATIONS DIRECTLY FROM THE INTERVIEW FORM]
Program Evaluation Interview

Question Twelve: How can WLP Project staff help you to meet these goals?

Be kept on the job.

By renewing the program (continuation). Note: I have to many irons in the fire to continue any summertime classes, would affect winter scheduling.

The same way it has helped in math with one on one learning and being right there, located locally. In two months it has been almost one year with my schooling at one hour a week at 5:30 a.m. until 6:30 a.m. before work time. I have never miss one class, if I didn't think it was helping me I would sleep for an extra hour and a half. If I can learn, I am going to keep on learning. Thanks to Barbara Hulse for helping me learn.

More training. By being here. Video is good addition, interesting.

Extend the program.

By continuing to provide instructor and access to educational materials.

[ALL ARE QUOTATIONS DIRECTLY FROM THE INTERVIEW FORM]
INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (IDP)

Confidential/Non-Confidential

IDP Date:

Last Name: ____________________________ First Name: ____________________________

Entry Date: ______________________ Exit Date: ___________ Shift: __First __Second __Third

Department Phone No. ____________________________ Department No. ____________________________

Home Address: ____________________________ City: ____________________________ Zip: ____________________________

Home Phone No. ____________________________ Enrollment Status: ____________________________

Recruited by: ____________________________ Age: ________ Sex: ________ Race: ____________________________

Marital Status: __________ Single Head of Household? __Y __N Years with Chrysler: __________

Staff Member: ____________________________

JOB OR TRAINING GOAL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
### BASIC NEEDS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

### PERSONAL ISSUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

### GENERAL COMMENTS:

__________________________  __________________
Worker Signature            Date

__________________________  __________________
Staff Member Signature       Date
External Evaluation

External Evaluation Report
Workplace Learning Partnership (WLP) Project
Indiana Vocational Technical College,
UAW and Chrysler Corporation

This external evaluation report is submitted in accordance with the U. S. Department of Education project specifications and an evaluation contract. The external evaluation report may at times express duplicate as well as divergent information contained in the project evaluation report. The external evaluation report focused on a more generalized perception of the project.

Activities included in the report
Meeting with the Project Director and Project Manager
Planning of the evaluation activities
Site visits of the WLP sites
  Interviews with Chrysler Management
  Interviews with UAW Leadership
  Interviews with Project participants
  Interviews with Project staff and instructors
Examination of project documentation and reports
Review of project data
Review of dissemination planning

Meetings with Project Director and Project Manager
The WLP external evaluation comprised activities spread across the term of the grant. The initial meetings with the Project Director and Project Manager focused on designing evaluation procedures and methods for data collection. The ability to track progress of individual participants and their assessment of instruction was central in this review. Input was provided into the design of a WLP Program Evaluation Interview Form, and the WLP Summary of Student Assessment of Instruction Form. Periodic meetings with project management were both consultative and evaluative. Review of procedures and forms for compiling data and records were the focus of early external evaluation efforts. Site visits were conducted toward the end of the WLP project to evaluate the extent the WLP project fulfilled goals and objectives proposed.

Information from the Site Visits
External evaluation site visits were conducted at each of the WLP locations. In-depth interviews were conducted to determine the extent the WLP project was successful in meeting goals and objectives. Informal and formal interviews were conducted with participants and other personnel from both the UAW and Chrysler management. It is noteworthy that only two less-than-positive comments were stated from all the interviews. One comment centered on over-spending on education by the government; the other comment suggested WLP was a “triplication” of effort being conducted by others. This latter statement was refuted by both union and other management leaders. The need for WLP was reported to be crucial, considering the literacy rate documented at the site.

One particular strength of the program, as viewed by UAW officials and by the participants, was the extent the WLP adapted to the particular physical and work climate of each site. Although the sites were all Chrysler plants, the type of manufacturing process varied considerably from site to site. The “easy” path to incorporate WLP would have been to
impose an identical system and set of procedures on each site. Instead, the project management carefully tailored the procedures to fit the requirements and unique features of each site.

**Summary of Major Findings**

One of the primary findings reported by many of the participants was the importance of the "one-on-one" instruction. The individualized help was considered crucial in creating successful learning experiences. The nature of adult learners, and especially in their initial experiences with learning, is usually very private. The UAW/Chrysler participants indicated they were apprehensive about their initial contacts about WLP. The one-on-one learning opportunity, however, is considered an important variable in the early efforts to sign-up participants.

The support of the Union and Management Leadership was found to be another crucial variable. The extent to which this leadership support was present from both the company and union and the extent to which that support was publicized were directly related to project success. This finding was evident at each site. The site where less participation from these parties was evident produced generally less activity than at other sites, even though each site exceeded projected numbers of learners to be served.

**Avoidance of the word “literacy”**

A pronounced theme which participants repeatedly mentioned was that they were neither treated nor referred to as being “illiterate”. This was an initial perception that many participants had as personal “baggage” from years of being non-readers. Instructional Specialists at each site were very successful in portraying the WLP effort as another job-related training effort. This message was circulated through the informal networks in the workplace and contributed to increased participation. Ironically, a number of participants began revealing on their own that they had begun to learn to read and write through the WLP program. Many helped convince other co-workers to participate in WLP learning activities.

One important and substantial theme expressed at all sites was the personal empowerment many participants felt they had gained. The WLP, through the Instructional Specialists, was proving to be a substantial force in the everyday life of the participants. The personal stories expressing how participants felt about themselves and how their families were supporting their efforts were numerous and powerful. This anecdotal data was associated with the praise expressed about the integrity and dedication of the Instructional Specialists. Participants were inspired because the Instructional Specialists provided help at any time of the day, on all shifts. The sense of personal empowerment from new basic skills seemed to affect the general workplace attitude of many participants. At each site Chrysler managers and employees themselves reported having an improved attitude toward work. Many indicated they were going to “upgrade” their jobs because they now felt more capable and confident.

**Development of Instructional System**

One of the strengths observed in the WLP program was the system developed to maximize the talents of instructional personnel. This was accomplished by developing on the strengths of the instructors and coordinators through project-wide meetings. It was found that the Instructional Specialists were used initially to provide in-service in their particular strength area to other instructors. For example, the person with advanced math skills led the effort in content development and provided assistance to the others in the area of math. The same situation occurred in reading and writing skills.

Outside of the content areas, the individual with extensive union leadership experience led the “induction” effort on how to make entry into the workplace. A major factor in the success of the WLP project can be contributed to the effort expended by the WLP personnel to become accepted by employees. This strategy was formulated in the beginning of the project to eliminate the perception that the WLP was being “forced” on the workforce. Being “accepted” by the workforce was a primary goal of the project and enabled the project to be “grounded” within the infrastructure of each plant site. The extent to which this acceptance occurred determined the success of the entire project. Observations from the site visitations lead to the conclusion that the project personnel were able to exceed project goals because of efforts to build worker ownership of the project.

**Impact on the Organization**

A site interview with a Chrysler manager revealed that the WLP project may be tied directly to increasing the volume of business produced by the plant. This plant was being reviewed by other manufacturing companies to determine if the Chrysler personnel and procedures were of the quality needed to produce non-Chrysler parts. During the visitation, specific questions were asked to identify the extent that basic skills development was being conducted by Chrysler. The
improvement in worker skills and literacy through WLP was noted by a manager as being particularly impressive to the visiting companies.

**Project Management and Operation**

A component of external evaluation included observing the project management and operation planning throughout the project. The formative evaluation included reviewing project management and operation planning while elements of the plans were being formulated and refined. One of the more productive management processes enabled each site to operate with some degree of latitude to accommodate site-specific conditions and needs. Site-based personnel were required to complete on-going reports and data tabulation to ensure larger project goals were preeminent. The amount of time spent at the three sites by project management contributed to the parsimony of project goals.

Another strength contributed to project management was the focused attention given to documentation and data collection. This documentation detailed the amount of time site personnel spent on activities such as instruction and recruitment. The reporting system reinforced project management’s ability to monitor each site’s progress and to keep the total effort focused on target.

**Unanticipated Anecdotal Findings**

One pronounced finding from site interviews with Chrysler employees is the extraordinary praise directed at the instructional personnel at each site. The theme of the message concerning instructors was beyond the appreciation directed at help in learning basic literacy skills. Many participants were almost missionary in their adulation about how their lives were significantly changed by participating in the WLP. Stories of personal empowerment and heightened self-concept were repeatedly told at each site. In each case the credit was attributed to the project instructors and their dedication to helping each voluntary participant.

Overtures from participants and staff alike indicated a strong desire, need for and willingness to continue the project beyond the ending date. In early Fall 1991 union and management efforts to continue the project materialized at the sites as the ending date approached. Earliest objectives committed efforts toward continuing instructors for twelve months. But, during the last quarter of 1991 the National Training Center initiated deep, sweeping constraints on voluntary training activities at all Chrysler plants as slumping auto sales and worsening economic conditions forced financial restrictions within the corporation. Efforts to continue funding the project’s instructors appeared hopeless. During this same time period, however, workers from the New Castle Machining and Forge petitioned the plant’s employees in an effort to assess interest and the felt need to continue the plant’s instructor. Funding approval to continue employing the New Castle instructor, for an additional three months on a part-time basis, is pending approval from the UAW-Chrysler National Training Center in Detroit.

During the life of the WLP project, the State of Indiana has been formulating plans to address the critical needs of a literate and skilled workforce. Economic development is tied to the capabilities of the workforce. The WLP project serves as a significant demonstration in how such development in the workplace can be accomplished. The WLP effort serves as a model for corporations in the state and for other Ivy Tech regions who show a willingness to continue making business conditions better.

It is recommended that the project management actively publish the processes and accomplishments of the WLP project. The information included in the project management evaluation should be central in the information dissemination.

**Conclusion**

The conclusion from the external evaluation is that the WLP project exceeded goals specified in the proposal. The number of participants served significantly exceeded the target goal at each site. The project helped build unity between company management and union efforts to improve the skills of employees. The success of the WLP project should stimulate internal funding by Chrysler and the UAW to continue the efforts started.