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(ABSTRACT)

In 1978, Suffolk Public Schools and Planters Peanuts entered into an agreement to provide an on-site basic skills instruction program for the Planters' employees called Planters Employee Training (PET). The purpose of this study was to evaluate PET in two areas: (1) worth; the value the employees, management, union, and school system, placed on the program, and (2) merit; the extent to which PET met established standards for workplace adult basic education programs.

This study evaluated PET using a naturalistic methodology that involved the collection and analysis of qualitative data from three sources: (1) document review; (2) interviews with employee/students, employee/non-students, former student/employees, PET administrative and instructional staff, union representation, industry management, first line supervisors in the industry, and school system administrative staff including the superintendent; and (3) observations.

The conclusions of this study included a positive worth response by all stakeholder groups with the most dramatic response from the first line supervisors who reported improved employee/student job performance and,
more importantly to them, improved attitude toward work as a result of participation in PET.

The conclusions regarding merit data included the need for attention to a number of management issues regarding the acquisition of data and involvement of stakeholder groups as assets to planning an instructional program that is responsive to the needs of the employees and the industry. Recommendations include (1) the development of a Policy Committee composed of the key union, management, and school division personnel to focus PET's efforts, and (2) the utilization of the existing advisory committee to assist the PET administrator in planning a responsive instructional program and to involve the union in supporting PET's activities.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In the face of foreign imports and in search of higher productivity, the nation's industries are increasingly turning to high technology to return them to a competitive position. The workplace seems inundated with microchips, robotics, and electronics. Though the auto and steel industries have received the headlines, technology is invading even the historically conservative, labor intensive industries of the South. For example, Burlington Industries, one of the South's major textile industries, has recently spent twenty-five million dollars to automate its Asheville, North Carolina plant. The effect on the nature of work has been, and will continue to be, significant. As an example, James Morrissey of the American Textile Institute explains that, "instead of loom fixers, we'll have highly trained technicians; instead of millwrights, we'll have more people working computers" (Karmin, 1984, p. 39).

The semi-skilled jobs, the most numerous jobs in southern industry, are being replaced by technology. A reported two million "manufacturing jobs were wiped out in the 1980-82 period" (Karmin, 1984, p. 38) due to technological intervention. Howard Samuel of the AFL-CIO says "our fear is that factory jobs will disappear, and we'll end up with only engineers and floor sweepers" (Karmin, 1984, p. 38).

Pope's warning, "a little learning is a dangerous thing," takes on a new meaning in a technological workplace. Those workers who have little formal
education, but have been able to move into well paying assembly line or semi-skilled jobs, are faced with unpleasant options in the face of technological intervention. The less attractive option is to regress to a lower-level job for much less pay. The more attractive option is to enter a training program to prepare for a job that is supportive of the new technology. A little education is thus a dangerous thing; for Tenopyr (1984) reported that to qualify for retraining, the worker must be able to read, write, and do mathematics at least at a functional level.

According to a 1980 study to determine the functional level of adults, Wellborn (1982) reported that over half of the adult population in American was reported to be "just getting by, at best" in performing the competencies necessary to function in this society.

"The most formidable challenge will be to train people to work in the information society. Jobs will become available, but who will possess the high-tech skills to fill them? Not today's graduates who cannot manage simple arithmetic or write basic English. And certainly not the unskilled, unemployed dropouts who cannot even find work in the old sunset industries." (John Naisbitt, 1982, p. 250)

The technical job requirements for the future are constantly changing according to Tenopyr (1984). Thus, management needs an employee educated in the basics: reading, writing and mathematics. McCord (1984) reports that the employer can, and prefers to, add the necessary technical training to match the job requirements. Thus, there exists a need for educational programs that can prepare today's semi-skilled worker for the jobs of the future.
Adult Basic Education

Undereducated workers must look to educational programs that offer them an opportunity to improve their academic skills in order to compete in the job market. One such opportunity is Adult Basic Education (ABE). ABE offers basic academic education for adults who are functioning below the high school completion level. Classes are free to the students and instructional materials are provided at no cost to the student. Students may enter at any time during the school year, and instruction is individualized to meet student needs.

An ABE delivery system has been developed in Virginia to improve accessibility to undereducated workers by providing instruction in an industry for the employees in that industry. The pilot project of this delivery system is located in the city of Suffolk, Virginia. Planters Employee Training (PET) is an industry-based ABE program in Planters Peanuts, a division of R. J. Reynolds Brands, Inc., in Suffolk, Virginia.

PET began in 1978 as an outgrowth of a labor contract negotiation that required the development of a training program to provide for employee advancement in the organization. As a consequence, a management team was assembled to establish an apprenticeship training program. These classes would greatly enhance employees' upward mobility into higher skilled jobs. U. S. Department of Labor consultants, Virginia Apprenticeship representatives of the Department of Education, Suffolk Public Schools' Vocational Education Director, and an industry management team met to review instructional materials and plan the implementation of
apprenticeship training. However, Planters's Manager of Personnel Services called attention to the fact that most employees had not completed high school and were reading well below the ninth grade level, a level required to comprehend the apprenticeship training materials.

The resulting exploration for technical assistance to alleviate employees educational level deficit lead to consideration of the Adult Basic Education program. As a result, a cooperative agreement that described the cooperating parties' roles and responsibilities was developed by Planters and Suffolk Public Schools. In the agreement, Planters agreed to provide classroom space and assist with recruitment and other support services such as communication costs. Suffolk Public Schools agreed to secure federal ABE funds administered through the Virginia Department of Education to employ staff, purchase instructional materials, and provide program supervision by the school system's ABE Supervisor.

The final agreement signed in the spring of 1978 created the Planters Employee Training (PET) Program. PET was organized with five staff members: a Coordinator/Teacher, two instructors, and two aides who were employees (one the Chief Steward of the Union; the other a Union Board Member). A maximum of forty students would be served. Students could attend class prior to or immediately following their work shift. Because the shifts changed at 3:00 p.m., the PET center would open from 12:30 p.m. until 5:30 p.m. This schedule allowed first shift workers to attend after getting off work at 3:00 p.m. and second shift workers to attend prior to going to work. If a student attended four hours per week, he or she would
receive regular salary for two hours. However, students could attend more
than four hours per week if they chose. The PET center was open Monday
through Thursday on a nine month schedule from September through May.

Students were screened and selected for participation based on
seniority in the union. Employees with higher seniority were given first
choice to participate.

To accommodate the PET operation, the company bore the expense of
enclosing one end of an exceptionally large cafeteria in the main plant
creating one large classroom that could be divided into three sections. The
PET Learning Center, as it was named, was wall papered and fitted with
new furnishings and instructional equipment at company expense.

The Setting

Two cooperating parties have been involved in the development and
maintenance of the Planters Employee Training (PET) Program: Planters
Peanuts and Suffolk Public Schools. In addition, the Adult Education Service
of the Virginia Department of Education provided technical assistance and
financial support. These entities and their resulting interrelationship
provided the setting for this study.

Planters Peanuts, a division of R. J. Reynolds Brands, Inc., is a major
employer in southside Virginia and northeast North Carolina. The
independent, locally owned company was purchased by Standard Brands, Inc.
in 1979 prior to becoming affiliated with Nabisco in 1983 and R. J.
Reynolds in 1986.
Planters employs approximately 930 persons of which some 200 are white collar and 730 are blue collar. The potential PET students come from the blue collar manufacturing segment of the work force. Table 1 depicts selected employee characteristics in 1985. Not included are employee educational levels. Those data were unavailable.

The rank and file employees were represented by the Distributive Workers' of America until the early 1980's when affiliation was changed to the United Auto Workers. According to personnel department staff, all manufacturing employees were union members. The average years of seniority was 22.4 years. One hundred ninety five employees (26.6%) had more than thirty (30) years of employment. The average age of the blue collar employees was forty seven (47).

Two types of training were provided for the blue collar employees. Job specific training was done on the job by the first line supervisor. Safety and specialized training was provided by the Training Division headed by the Manager of Training.

Suffolk Public Schools, the second party in this cooperative effort, has offered adult education programs since the early 1970's. These adult education programs were directed by the Director of Vocational and Adult Education and the ABE portion was supervised by a part-time ABE supervisor who has additional duties in the school system. The community-based ABE program consisted of four evening classes held in one high school two nights a week. Ninety percent of the ABE funding for the evening
Table 1
Selected Characteristics of Blue Collar Manufacturing Employees at Planters in 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>00.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-35</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-55</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-65</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>734</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>734</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>06.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>00.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>734</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YEARS OF SERVICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>04.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>01.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>734</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
program was provided by a grant administered through the Virginia Department of Education, Adult Education Service.

To initiate the PET Program, Suffolk Public Schools applied for and received a planning grant from the Adult Education Service under Section 306 of the Adult Education Act PL 91-230 and amendments. For the two subsequent years (1979-1980), the Suffolk school system applied for and was awarded demonstration grants from the state under Section 310 of the Adult Education Act. That section of the Act provided funds for special experimental, demonstration, and teacher training projects. These federal funds provided ninety percent of the budget for PET and Planters provided the remaining ten percent.

Beginning the third year of operation (1981), funds for PET were included in the regular operating budget (formerly covering only the evening program in the high school) of the Suffolk ABE program. The proportion of Federal funds for PET steadily declined due to increased demands for ABE services across the Commonwealth coupled with a stagnant or decreasing allocation of Federal funds nationwide. By fiscal year 1983, PET's budget was composed of thirty percent Federal funds and seventy percent Planters' funds.

The Virginia Department of Education provided major funding and technical assistance to PET in order that PET would serve as a demonstration model to be replicated across the Commonwealth. The PET program promised many advantages over community-based programs. First, the in-house delivery overcame many scheduling and class location problems
faced in evening programming. Secondly, the financial commitment by the industry expanded the limited funds available for ABE. Thirdly, the setting provided a variety of instructional and curriculum resources that could capture the student's interest and enhance learning. Lastly, and most importantly, the program served a target population that would experience employment instability without educational services.

Beginning in 1979, the Virginia Department of Education, through its Adult Education Service, encouraged other cooperative arrangements between local school divisions' ABE programs and local industries. Those efforts generated questions from potential adopters regarding the PET's effectiveness in accomplishing its original objective, the efficiency of the PET delivery system, and PET's impact on the industry. However, no formal evaluation of PET had been conducted to answer those basic questions. The significance of the questions was heightened in view of the changes that have occurred at Planters Peanuts since 1978. Those changes included a change in company ownership from Standard Brands to Nabisco, Inc. to R. J. Reynolds, a change in the entire management team, a change in union affiliation from Distributive Workers of America to United Auto Workers, a complete turnover in PET instructional and administrative staff, a replacement of the ABE Supervisor for Suffolk Public Schools, and a change in the industry's financial contribution from ten percent to seventy percent. How has PET survived these transitions? Has it changed? Was it ever and is it now effective?
For PET, as a model demonstration system, to answer the questions from potential adopters, it was essential that it be thoroughly evaluated to determine its effectiveness in meeting the needs of the organizations and individuals it purported to serve. The potential of this cooperative ABE delivery system in (1) meeting the needs of undereducated workers facing displacement and (2) expanding the financial resources to meet those needs, necessitated a thorough evaluation of PET as a model delivery system. This study conducted that evaluation.
Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine the value of the Planters Employee Training Program as measured by its merit and worth. Worth refers to the value it has shown for the individuals and organizations involved. Merit refers to the degree to which it meets standards established for similar programs.

Foreshadowed Evaluation Questions

Evaluation is more than determining if objectives have been achieved and standards have been met. Objectives change. Standards do not always fit. Unexpected benefits and failures occur. Therefore, in this study, the evaluator used objectives and standards as a base of development and anticipated, or "foreshadowed," the questions that he in his professional judgement believed were appropriate to the evaluation setting. However, in the course of the evaluation, as other objectives and standards were identified, the evaluation process accommodated them.

Listed below are the foreshadowed questions that were prepared for this study. Chapter 4 describes the methodology by which these questions were adapted during the study to be responsive to the particular setting of Planters Employee Training Program.

Specifically, the foreshadowed evaluative questions addressed were as follows:

1. Had PET met its original intent of preparing undereducated adults for apprenticeship training programs?
1.1 To what extent had PET students improved their reading and math ability?

1.2 How did their educational advancement in reading and math relate to advancement in the Suffolk community-based evening ABE program?

1.3 How did their educational advancement in reading and math relate to the reading and math advancement of other ABE students across the Commonwealth?

1.4 How many students completed PET?

1.5 How many former PET students entered apprenticeship training programs?

1.6 How did their performance in apprenticeship training programs compared with non-PET students in apprenticeship training programs?

1.7 How many PET students completed apprenticeship training programs?

2. How did the operation of PET compare to criteria developed by Ohio State University for cooperative public school/industrial adult education programs?

2.1 To what extent was the program based on identified needs?

2.2 To what extent was the program operation based on specified objectives?

2.3 To what extent was the program staff qualified and trained to deliver instruction to adults in an industrial setting?
2.4 To what extent did the program utilize procedures and materials appropriate for adults?

2.5 To what extent was there documentation and utilization of pre-planning activities and who was involved in that pre-planning?

2.6 To what extent was on-going funding from specified sources identified?

2.7 To what extent were the administrative responsibilities and procedures specified and utilized?

2.8 To what extent were job and training placement procedures and processes that involved the learner specified and utilized?

2.9 To what extent were effective internal and external communication systems specified and utilized?

2.10 To what extent were on-going evaluation activities specified and utilized?

2.11 To what extent were processes for recruiting, screening, and selecting participants specified and utilized?

2.12 To what extent were counseling services specified and utilized?

3. What unintentional positive effects did PET have on the employees at Planters Peanuts?

3.1 Were there patterns of perceptions of these unintentional
positive effects within employee, management, union, and school system groups?

3.2 Were there patterns of perceptions of these effects among employee, management, union, and school system groups?

4. What unintentional negative effects did PET have on the employees at Planters Peanuts?

4.1 Were there patterns of perceptions of these unintentional negative effects within employee, management, union, and school system groups?

4.2 Were there patterns of these effects among employee, management, union, and school system groups?

5. What unintentional positive effects did PET have on plant operations at Planters Peanuts?

5.1 Did perceptions of PET's unintentional positive effects on Planters Peanuts vary among employee, management, union, and school system groups??

5.2 Were there patterns of these perceptions within employee, management, union, and school system groups?

5.3 Were there patterns of these perceptions among employee, management, union, and school system groups?

6. What unintentional negative effects did PET have on plant operations at Planters Peanuts?

6.1 Did perceptions of PET's unintentional negative effects on
Planters Peanuts differ among employee, management, union, and school system groups?

6.2 Were there patterns of these perceptions within employee, management, union, and school system groups?

6.3 Were there patterns of these perceptions among employee, management, union, and school system groups?
Definition of Terms

Adult Basic Education (ABE): an education program that provides academic and life coping skills instruction for adults who function below the high school completion level.

Cooperative Adult Education Program: an ABE program that is jointly sponsored by a public school and a local industry for the employees of that industry.

Planters Employee Training (PET) Program: a Cooperative Adult Basic Education Program sponsored by Suffolk (VA) Public Schools and Planters Peanuts, a Division of R. J. Reynolds Brands, Inc.

Established Criteria for Cooperative Adult Education Programs: those twelve criteria developed by The Ohio State University Center for Vocational Education in 1978. (Moore, 1978, pp 9-23) (see Appendix A)

Stakeholders and Stakeholder Groups: those persons who have a stake in the entity being evaluated; those persons who are affected by that entity. In the evaluation of PET, the stakeholder groups include Planters’ management, the union, PET students, former PET students, non-student employees, PET staff, and Suffolk Public Schools Staff.
Apprenticeship Training Program: those instructional programs that prepare the learner to enter one of the skilled crafts or trades.

Educational Advancement: the grade level advancement per instructional hour in reading and math as reported by the instructors on the ABE Student Data Sheet.

Evaluand: "the entity being evaluated" (Guba and Lincoln, 1982, p. 340). In this study, the evaluand is the Planters Employee Training (PET) Program at Planters Peanuts in Suffolk, Virginia.

Value: "the term evaluate suggests that the function of evaluation is to place a value on the . . . evaluand" (Guba and Lincoln, 1982, p. 39). Value may take two forms: merit and worth.

Merit: "determining the degree to which (an evaluand) conforms to certain standards upon which a group of experts agrees" (Guba and Lincoln, 1982, p. 45). In this study the merit standards were developed by Ohio State University and can be found in Appendix A.

Worth: the value placed on the evaluand by the stakeholder group members and is expressed in terms of the benefits derived from the evaluand and the lack of negative effects of the evaluand on individuals and the organization.
The stakeholder group members of this study are cited above (Guba and Lincoln, 1982).

**Foreshadowed Question:** the evaluation questions that are derived from the literature review, evaluand objectives, and the evaluator's experience (Schumacher, 1985).

**Emergent Questions:** the evaluation questions that emerge from concerns and issues derived from the document review and interviews. Emergent questions are either integrated into similar foreshadowed questions or developed as unique questions (Schumacher, 1985).

**Significance of the Study**

This study was significant in that in the Commonwealth of Virginia, cooperative adult education programs have potential for meeting the educational needs of undereducated adults. Since current funds allow community based ABE programs to serve only two percent (2%) of the undereducated adults in the Commonwealth, the joint funding helped expand the limited federal resources available to meet those needs. The evaluation determined that this resource-expanding delivery system is meeting those needs.

Secondly, this study provides data relevant to future development of this delivery system in other workplace settings in the Commonwealth. Though each site differs from Planters, information regarding PET's
organizational and instructional practices may be useful to prospective adopters.

Thirdly, this study was significant in that it examined PET by way of established criteria for cooperative programs. That data and accompanying recommendations provided the PET staff with direction for improving their delivery of services.

Lastly, this study was significant in its methodology. Quantitative techniques have proven cumbersome in adult education due to the inability to control participation and the limited ability of undereducated adults to respond to printed questionnaires and surveys. Also, the historically erratic attendance of ABE students confounds most empirical methodologies. The case study design, using naturalistic methodology and taking advantage of qualitative data, however, offers an alternative that suits ABE arena.

Limitations of the Study

A primary limitation of the study was the possibility of observer bias. The evaluator was a member of the Adult Education Service, Virginia Department of Education and served as the primary technical advisor and resource person to the PET Program since its inception. To avoid this bias, two measures were taken. First, detailed evidence was gathered to support each evaluation question in an effort to avoid dependence on preconceived assumptions. Secondly, the draft results of the study were presented to the PET Director, the school system's Director of Adult and Vocational Education, and the Personnel Director of Planters in order to conduct a
metaevaluation; an evaluation of the evaluation. The resulting discussion was used as a check on observer bias.
CHAPTER 2

THE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter examines the research and related literature relative to this study. The first section examines the philosophical and conceptual framework of evaluation. The following section illustrates the uniqueness of Adult Basic Education as a field of practice and the influences of those peculiarities on the application of evaluative theories and concepts. The third section summarizes the evaluation activities in in-plant ABE programs. The final section of this chapter recaps the significant concepts identified in the literature and relates each to this study.

Evaluation

Evaluation is complex and multidimensional. A generic definition derived from a variety of sources might read as follows: Evaluation is a systematic process to determine the value of an entity. However, that definition contains three highly variable components: (1) systematic process, (2) value, and (3) the entity.

Beginning with the latter, "the entity," this term identifies the subject of the evaluation. In this study, the subject is referred to as the "evaluand" (Guba and Lincoln, 1982, p. 340). An evaluand may be as specific as a particular instructional technique used to introduce a specific skill to a
specified level of student with a specific learning disability. In another instance, an evaluand may be as broad and complex as the entire educational system in the nation. Thus, evaluation first considers, clarifies, and delineates the evaluand which is the subject of the study.

The second component of the definition of evaluation, "value," may take at least two forms: "merit and worth" (Guba and Lincoln, 1982). Worth refers to the value placed on the evaluand by those individuals who come in direct contact with the evaluand. These individuals may be categorized into "stakeholder groups" (Guba and Lincoln, 1982), those who have a stake in the evaluand's operation. In an educational program these groups would include students, teachers, administrators, funding agents, and others. Thus, one determination of "value" of the evaluand is to determine its "worth" for each stakeholder groups.

A second measure of value, termed "merit," measures the evaluand against a set of criteria or performance standards suggested for similar evaluands. For example, education accrediting organizations have developed standards against which certain educational institutions measure themselves. Professional associations such as medical associations and realty associations also generate standards for their profession. These criteria are used to determine the "value" of the evaluand in terms of its "merit."

The third variable in the definition of evaluation, "the systematic process," is generalized from Wothern and Sanders' (1973) discussion of the state of the art of evaluation. This component focuses on the quality of the
evaluation and denotes an information gathering and analysis process that is replicable and believable. Therein, the "process" is planned and carried out in such a way that it ensures either validity, reliability, and objectivity in the quantitative methodologies or credibility, auditability, and confirmability (Guba and Lincoln, 1982, p. 104) in the qualitative methodologies. A full range of quantitative and qualitative applications are available to the evaluator. The final design formulation is a product of blending appropriate, alternative strategies that respond to (1) the evaluation questions that are founded in merit and or worth, (2) the breadth and complexity of the evaluand, and (3) the setting.

Theorists who approach the development of evaluation models in attempts to clarify and explain the complexity of evaluation, do so from a variety of perspectives. For example, "some explore evaluation from the standpoint of its purpose, some from the standpoint of need, some from the view of organization and system, and some from the interactive elements involved" (Steele, 1973, p. 20).

Evaluation's responsiveness to context and intent, coupled with its inherent flexibility, confounds attempts to develop a taxonomy of evaluation models similar to those developed for research design by Campbell and Stanley (1966) and Lindquist (1953). Each attempt (e.g. Steel, 1973; Worthern and Sanders, 1973) falls short of such a taxonomy. The potential evaluator is thus advised to study the field and create a scheme from the parts of the various models to suit the evaluand and the setting (Worthern and Sanders, 1973).
In the absence of a taxonomy, Stufflebeam (1981) suggests the questions below as a framework for organizing the complexity of approaches to evaluation.

1. What is it? (Definition)
2. What role(s) should evaluation play? (Purpose)
3. What general questions should be addressed by the evaluation studies? (Questions)
4. Who should perform evaluations? (Evaluators)
5. What audiences are to be served? (Audiences)
6. What is the design of evaluation? (Processes)

The remaining sections of this chapter apply these six framing questions as organizers of the relevant evaluation literature. Particular attention will be paid to the naturalistic methodology and qualitative data issues that are germane to this study. Naturalistic evaluation is a methodology that intends to "study the phenomenon naturally in the field rather than in an artificial setting . . ." (McMillan and Schumacher, 1984, p. 308). The data is primarily qualitative thereby providing information that allows the evaluator "to fully understand an individual's behavior" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1984, p. 308) through personal interviews and observations. The nature of ABE described below and the limitations of undereducated adults to respond to data requests in written form support the use of a naturalistic evaluation methodology.
The literature review is presented in a descending form from general to specific. Thus, the following presentation of the literature involves the application of Stufflebeam's (1981) six framing questions to (1) evaluation in general, (2) preceded by a brief review of Adult Basic Education literature, to evaluation as it is practiced in ABE, (3) to cooperative ABE program evaluation, and (4) to this study. The last section relating to this study will bring together the salient points from the previous three sections and apply them to this study. This application provides the framework for a systematic process to determine the value of Planters Employee Training program. The following initial section focuses on evaluation in general.

The Evaluation Literature

Definition

Evaluation is defined in a number of ways. Sample definitions include "examining and judging" (Stufflebeam, 1971), assessment of value (merit or worth) (Scriven, 1967), and portraying (Wolf, 1979). Wolf (1979), one of the naturalistic methodology proponents, points out that in any setting there are different views from which to judge. The "judging" and the "assessment of value" will yield varying responses that reflect the multiple perspectives of the possibly divergent stakeholder groups. Thus, evaluation is "portraying" those perspectives.

Common to each evaluation definition are at least two components. The first component requires a systematic means to gather pertinent
information on which to make a value judgement. Secondly, each definition proposes a judgement be made.

**Purpose**

The purpose of evaluation can be divided into at least three groupings. The first portrays evaluation's purpose as proactive (Stufflebeam, 1981), formative (Scriven, 1967), process (Boone, 1973), or information for decision making (Stake, 1967). This grouping proposes gathering information to be used internally to improve the evaluand's processes. A second grouping portrays the evaluation's purpose as retroactive (Stufflebeam, 1971), summative (Scriven, 1967), product (Boone, 1973), or information for accountability (Stakes, 1967). The purpose of evaluation, therefore, focuses on outcomes and accountability for those outcomes. These first two groupings related to the purpose of evaluation focus on determining if the evaluand accomplished what it set out to do. A third conceptualization, from naturalistic evaluation by Wolf (1979), suggests that the evaluation's purpose includes both intended and unintended outcomes. Steele (1973), for instance, questions educational program administrators' ability to foresee and document all the outcomes of a program of services. To only measure those intended outcomes is to lose potential determinations of program value.
Questions

Most theorists agree that evaluation questions should address the evaluand's "goals, designs, activities, and results" (Stake, 1981, p. 5) based on intended outcomes. However, the naturalistic evaluation literature states that questions can only be "foreshadowed" (Schumacher, 1985) or speculated prior to the study. Other questions will emerge.

Thus, for naturalistic evaluation methodology, two types of questions occur in an evaluation. First are the foreshadowed questions that are developed from a variety of sources including merit standards, the literature, and the evaluator's experience. When developing the evaluation strategies, these questions appear relevant to the study. However, as the data gathering begins, the foreshadowed questions that are not appropriate for the evaluand are noted and discarded.

A second type of question in the naturalistic repertoire is the unanticipated question that emerges during the study. This type question is termed "emergent" in this study. They represent critical concerns that are only discovered once the evaluation has begun.

Intended outcomes, therefore, are not the only basis for evaluation questions, but rather, the emergent questions allow the evaluation to be responsive (Guba and Lincoln, 1982) to the "needs, interests, and perceptions" (Wolf, 1979, p. 6) of the evaluand and the individuals who comprise stakeholder groups.
Evaluator

Who actually conducts the evaluation; someone inside the evaluand or someone external to it? Stufflebeam (1971) suggests that formative, process-oriented evaluation is better conducted internally while summative evaluation should be external. Eisner (1967) and Provus (1973) propose the use of external experts to critically examine an evaluand. Hammond (1973) suggests that part of the external evaluator's role is to train internal personnel to continue the evaluation activities. The naturalistic evaluation theorists propose an external evaluator who is thoroughly familiar with the evaluand or similar evaluands; or, as Schumacher (1985) expressed it, the evaluator should enter the evaluation with an "open mind not an empty head" (Schumacher, 1985).

Because of the dependency on qualitative methodology, the naturalistic evaluator is required to have specific skills and aptitudes (Wolf, 1979) of an interpersonal nature. These attributes facilitate the interview process.

Audience

The determination of the audience for evaluative information varies from decision makers (Alkin, 1969) to multiple audiences including all stakeholder groups (Stufflebeam, 1971; Guba and Lincoln, 1981; and Wolf, 1979). In the case of multiple audiences, the information of interest to each group may vary. Multiple audiences thus may equate to multiple reports.
Processes

Evaluation design can be described from an action perspective such as "delineating, obtaining and providing information" (Stufflebeam, 1971) or from a results view such as "criteria, evidence, and judgement" (Steele, 1973, pp. 143-145). Though the terminology differs, each purports three similar processes: (1) deciding what questions need answering, (2) obtaining the evidence to answer the questions, and (3) organizing and presenting data appropriate for making value decisions based on the evidence.

As discussed above, often evaluation designs use program goals or intended outcomes as the criteria for information to be gathered. Because evaluation is a "disciplined inquiry" (Worthen and Sanders, 1973), a variety of the research designs and techniques can be, and are, employed. The evaluation results are reported to the decision makers for use in adjusting program processes or in program continuation or termination. Thus, standard designs statistically measure the significance of the difference between intentions and outcomes and report those findings, usually with recommendations, to the decisions makers.

Naturalistic evaluation theorists vary in their perception of criteria, evidence, and judgement. Based on the assumptions regarding the existence and importance of multiple perceptions, the naturalistic evaluators depend on the stakeholder groups to contribute criteria to the delineation process. Likewise, with a focus on how stakeholders "feel" about the evaluand (i.e. the "worth" of the evaluand), Guba and Lincoln (1982) suggest the naturalistic evaluator employ a variety of qualitative data gathering
techniques including the interview, observation, and the review of historical documents and records.

The naturalistic evaluation design process uses a variety of strategies. For example, in addition to randomized and matched sampling, the naturalistic evaluator may use emergent and purposive samples (Wolf, 1979). Samples are chosen for a purpose; because of their particular values, beliefs, roles, or levels of participation (Wolf, 1979). Supporting the naturalistic evaluation philosophy, the use of purposive samples highlights variance among and within stakeholder groups rather than neutralizing it. The naturalistic evaluation design may adapted while in process and probably will evolve as it progresses. Continuous analysis and triangulation of concerns, issues, and data are tools used to stabilize the potentially unsystematic activities.

However, an ever changing evaluation process can become unmanageable. To add stability, the naturalistic evaluator includes processes of regularly analyzing the questions and triangulating the data. The analysis allows for discardirrelevant foreshadowed questions that prove irrelevant to the study and for including emergent questions that promise to offer insight.

Triangulation, which requires verifying data or concerns by obtaining similar reports from more than two sources, serves two purposes. First, it is used to verify emergent questions as having general rather than individual relevance by measuring the breadth and depth of an issue or concern within the evaluand. Secondly, triangulation is used to confirm a response to a
question by reporting the breadth and depth of that response within the evaluand.

Adult Basic Education

Throughout the evaluation literature review, the importance of considering the evaluand and its context regularly appears. One facet of this study of a cooperative ABE program is Adult Basic Education (ABE). ABE is unique in a number of areas. The application of the concepts of evaluation to ABE must consider those peculiarities. A summary of those characteristics follows.

Characteristics of Adult Basic Education

Clark (1958) introduced the concept of the marginality of adult education. ABE, as a facet of adult education, is an example of the concept. For example, the organization in which ABE is housed (e.g. public schools, community colleges, sheltered workshops, state hospitals) has as its primary mission something other than teaching adults. Thus, ABE is marginal to the organization that serves as its parent organization.

Similarly, the marginality concept can be extended to ABE’s role in the student’s life. The role of student is secondary to many other roles including parent, worker, husband, or wife. Likewise, the marginality concept can be extended to the predominately part-time administrative and instructional staff members employed by ABE. The major emphases in their professional lie in their full-time jobs.
Marginality can result in diminished allegiance and commitment. The instability of the marginal situation can create a setting that challenges both programming and the evaluation thereof.

Organizational Relationship

In addition to ABE's marginality to its parent organization, other organizational relationships are to be considered. These considerations include relationships within ABE and between ABE and the parent organization.

In its marginal state, ABE in Virginia proposes to teach all things to all people who are functioning below a high school completion level. This ambiguous goal manifests itself in the classroom that potentially includes twelve grades of academic and coping skills instruction for a student body that includes such diverse groups as beginning readers, senior citizens, displaced workers, and the unemployed needing employment. As Clark (1958) states, within the program, the resulting goal diffusion only enhances the marginal atmosphere of the program. Externally, the flexibility required to maintain such diverse program offering clashes with the comparative rigidity of the parent organization hindering ABE's acceptance into the mainstream of the organization's mission.

The nature of ABE is often incompatible with the parent organization from a number of other theoretical and practical perspectives. Applying Clark's (1958) concept to ABE, the following example is presented. When ABE is housed in a public school system, increased visibility through
promotion and recruitment campaigns offends the host organization because promotional efforts highlight the parent organization's failures. Public awareness of the number of citizens who have not completed school has a negative effect on the support for the parent organization--the school system. Thus, program promotion and public awareness may be discouraged. That limited visibility coupled with the clientele who are not politically active yields limited advocacy from within the parent organization nor from the community at large. Furthermore, as Clark (1958) points out, the typical school leadership values the formal, scheduled structure. The family and employment demands on the ABE student's schedule inhibit the development and maintenance of fixed schedules for attending class. The flexibility and informality required by the nature of the ABE student contradicts the rigidity and formality in the day school's curriculum, scheduling, and organization. Thereby, educational operations that do not reflect those standards are not respected.

Also, because they are adults, the atmosphere in the classroom and in teacher-student interactions is much less formal than in the superordinate-subordinate nature of the day school operation. These organizational incompatibilities contribute to the maintenance of ABE's marginality.

Staff

Even though many of the ABE staff are professional educators, their role in ABE is primarily part-time. The few staff members who work full time seldom receive a contract but rather are paid on an hourly basis with
no benefits. Therefore, little opportunity is available for growth and professional development in the extrinsic rewards a full-time system offers. The supervisors are "assigned" their duties with little training and with the knowledge that this job is not in their career plan and is of short duration.

Fingeret (1985) reported that the teachers do not view themselves as professionals who need to acquire a unique set of skills and knowledge. Rather they see themselves as helpers who need to have "genuine concern" and "enthusiasm."

**Learners**

The ABE learners are primarily part-time participants. ABE is marginal in their lives. There are multiple demands on their time. The beginning readers survive in the community in an oral sub culture that is supported by a social network. Network members unite to cope in a literate world. Participation in ABE threatens that network by threatening to disrupt the interdependency established between the readers and the non-readers in the social network. Thus, they face the choice between class or clan and clan is often chosen. (Fingeret, 1983)

An Ohio study (1978) reports that fifty percent of ABE students have learning disabilities. Older adults attended a public school system prior to the time such disabilities were recognized. However, Knowles (1970) identifies several positive adult learner attributes. They do have experiences on which the instructor can draw as examples of application of newly acquired skills. Adult learners tend to be task oriented rather than
subject oriented, focusing on short term application of what is
learned. They tend to want to be involved in planning as well carrying out
their learning. The instruction thus is student oriented rather than focusing
on some prescribed set of needs.

**Evaluation of Adult Basic Education**

The evaluation of ABE thus must consider marginality, the focus on
learner centered curriculum, and the informal, flexible programming
required by these conditions. The application of Stufflebeam's six
framework evaluation questions to evaluation in adult education, and more
specifically, adult basic education follows.

**Definition**

The definition of evaluation in adult education focuses on the student's
goal attainment. One author (Knowles, 1970) states that an evaluation
conducted on external criteria is invalid, and only those based on the
programs goals should be considered. However, that same author devotes
numerous pages to the establishment of what would be "external criteria."
None the less, the emphasis on student goals and program goals based on the
compilation of individual goals is well taken. The definition of evaluation in
adult education, therefore, includes an emphasis on value as defined as
worth.
Purpose

Both proactive and reactive purposes are viewed as important in adult education (Tobias, 1972; Roomkin, 1972; Lenzer, 1960; Knox, 1969). Stufflebeam (1981) reports that the reactive, summative activities have received more emphasis originating from the 1952 Adult Education Association guidelines which he quotes as stating that "the primary purpose of evaluation is to find out how much growth and change have taken place as a result of educational experiences". Hampton (1973), for example, listed four purposes for adult education evaluation:

1. to determine the degree to which program objectives were met,
2. to identify reasons for success or failure,
3. to improve future programs,
4. to improve organizational operations.

Steele's (1973) analysis of evaluation of programs for disadvantaged adults proposes that evaluation should focus on the program not on the plan. There are too many beneficial side effects that are unforeseen by program planners that are overlooked if the evaluation focuses only on the intended purposes, according to Steele.

Questions

The questions that adult education evaluation should address are variations on the theme of goals, design, activities, and results presented
above. For example, Tobias (1972) listed five evaluative questions for adult education:

1. Effort--the resources available and the energy and activity involved.

2. Process--the factors within a program that make it "good" or "bad," "successful" or "unsuccessful".

3. Effects--the results of the effort and the process; achievement of objectives and unanticipated and unintended consequences.

4. Adequacy--the extent to which the program solves the problem.

5. Efficiency--was this the best way to do it?

Others (Steele, 1973; Knowles, 1970) relate to the student population's heterogeneity and suggest that the questions of effect are not concerned with the average gain of an entire group but rather with individual gains. Steele (1973) warns against general evaluation of "efficiency" because disadvantaged adults are not an "efficient" clientele.

**Evaluators**

A number of alternatives are suggested in the literature regarding the better evaluator. Sample examples include the opinions that adult education evaluation is an internal process conducted by the student, the only one who can truly determine the value (Thiede, 1964), the staff (Knowles, 1970), or every person involved who can comment on the value of the evaluand (Knowles, 1970). Again, a major focus on value as "worth" is indicated.
Audiences

The adult education literature espouses multilevel involvement in the entire evaluation process including the audiences to which the findings are reported. Grotelueschen (1974) and Steele (1973) include funding agencies, program staff including teachers and administrators, participants, community groups, content specialists, and legislators. Each group's expectations are to be considered, and those expectations will guide the development and implementation of the evaluation processes and activities.

Processes

The evaluation processes identified with the adult education literature vary from the delineating, obtaining, and providing information processes found in the evaluation literature. The major variance results from the focus on the student (Theide, 1964; Stufflebeam, 1981) and the situational factors (Steele, 1973) that impinge on program operation. This focus on the student and the uniqueness and autonomy of the individual local program support a micro rather than a macro approach to delineating, obtaining, and providing information. Accordingly, adult education can best be evaluated on an individual program basis. Thus, Knowles (1970) adds a step to the processes which calls for the "use" of the data gathered to make corrections in the program operation. "The kind of evaluation models that are most needed are those that can deal with real-life situations and make valuable contributions in an every-day environment" (Steele, 1973, p. 20).
The purpose should include unintended as well as intended goals of all the stakeholder groups (Steele, 1973). The criteria, evidence, and judgements should be derived from the same groups. These requirements necessitate a very flexible evaluation design.

Summary

Even though contributions have been made regarding what evaluation "should" be in adult education, the practice of evaluating for purposes other than meeting funding guidelines are rare. The evaluation concepts in the adult education literature generally, and ABE specifically, are for the most part conceptual discussions only regarding the appropriateness of questions, processes, and design. The practice of evaluation is rare.

Evaluation of Cooperative ABE Programs

Industrial literacy programs have little evaluation history. The most comprehensive study of similar programs (Granger, Moore and Winkfield, 1975; Moore, 1975; and Moore, Granger and Winkfield, 1975) identified 238 persons across the nation as potential directors of cooperative adult education programs. A follow-up survey identified 108 actual programs. Twenty nine programs in twenty nine different locations participated in a subsequent telephone interview (Granger, Moore, and Winkfield, 1975). On site case studies were conducted in five of these sites (Moore, 1975). In neither the twenty nine programs interview by telephone or the five case studies was an evaluation plan reported.
In the telephone interviews, respondents did mention criteria they used to determine if the program was successful including the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Completers (GED, AHS, Program)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student Academic Progress</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job Placement/Advancement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Class Attendance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Progress on Student Goals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Entered Another Program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Student Evaluation Forms</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five of the interview abstracts reported no evaluation activity.

The sparsity of evaluative literature regarding cooperative ABE programs limits the application of Stufflebeam's six evaluation framework questions. However, the literature does provide information for consideration.

Definition

The scant literature regarding cooperative programs dealt with the practical applications of evaluation and bypassed any discussion regarding the evaluation definition. Therefore, no contribution to the definition was found.
**Purpose**

The evidence from the interviews cited above implied that in practice, evaluation, when performed, proposed to justify the programs existence. The guidelines for such evaluation by Moore et al. (1975) stated that evaluation's purpose was to improve programs; the proactive, formative stance. More specifically, they proposed that evaluation was to determine if the objectives established by the two cooperating parties in setting up the program were met (intended outcomes).

A second unique consideration derived from the interview data specified that evaluation should determine if the goals and purposes of each of the cooperating parties have been furthered. This second indication of purpose had not appeared in the literature previously. It suggests that each of the cooperating parties--i.e. the industry and the public schools--has overarching goals and purposes as organizations. The evaluation should consider if those organizational goals and purposes have been furthered.

**Questions**

In conceptualization and application, cooperative programs are concerned with outcomes. The evidence from the twenty nine telephone interviews cited above reflect an overarching concern with program completers. The guidelines by Moore et al. (1975) identified the following questions: (a) has the program made any difference in the participants work or his or her attitude, (b) has it reduced turnover, and (c) have completers enrolled in other programs?
In addition to program and organizational goals and objectives, Moore et al. (1975) suggested questions of "cost/benefit analysis, relationship of program to job placement (if applicable), participant and staff attitudes, program spin-offs or unanticipated results, (and) participant peer attitudes." Moore warns that a cost/benefit analysis is difficult at best due to the in-kind contributions that most industries make to a cooperative program.

A listing and development of a specific set of merit criteria has been developed for cooperative programs by Moore (1978). A detailed description of these criteria is found in Appendix A. Generally, the twelve criteria are as follows:

1. Needs Assessment: An Adult Cooperative Education Program should be based on identified needs.

2. Objective Setting: An Adult Cooperative Education Program should be based on specified objectives (i.e., written goals, purposes and desired outcomes).

3. Staffing: An Adult Cooperative Education Program should be staffed (i.e., instructors, administrators, etc.) with appropriate (i.e., program related experience and training) personnel.

4. Procedures and Materials: An Adult Cooperative Education Program should utilize procedures and materials appropriate (i.e., specifically designed) for adults.

5. Pre-Planning: An Adult Cooperative Education Program should be based upon and show evidence (i.e., documented, written) of pre-startup (i.e., pre-planning, advanced planning) activities.

6. Funding: An Adult Cooperative Education Program should have identified and specified (i.e., in writing) on-going sources of funding and materials.

7. Administration: An Adult Cooperative Education Program should have an administrative component (i.e., with individual and designated authority and responsibility).
8. Job Placement: An Adult Cooperative Education Program should include specified (i.e., in writing) procedures and processes for participant job placement.

9. Communications: An Adult Cooperative Education Program should provide for (i.e., plan and implement) an effective internal (i.e., participants, staff, cooperating agencies) and external (i.e., industry management, employee representative group, community, etc.) communication system.

10. Evaluation: An Adult Cooperative Education Program should include and on-going evaluation (i.e., planned, periodic, continuous).

11. Recruitment and Selection: An Adult Cooperative Education Program should have a specified (i.e., in writing) process for accepting (i.e., recruitment, screening, and selection) participants.

12. Counseling: An Adult Cooperative Education Program should provide effective (i.e., appropriate for adults) counseling services (i.e., academic and personal).

Evaluator

Both internal and external evaluators are suggested for cooperative adult education programs by Moore et al. (1975). Internal responsibilities involve gathering and analyzing test results and reporting observable measures by the instructors. External evaluation should involve summative evaluation after the program has operated for "some time" and thus has some results to be studied (Moore, et al. 1975, p. 74).

Audiences

Audiences for evaluation reports include the program director and the two cooperating parties. The later are interested if their mutual goals have
been forwarded and if advancement on their individual goals have been made.

Processes

Suggestions are made for both qualitative and quantitative strategies. Proposed techniques to determine group attitudes include questionnaires and interviews. "In order to get defensible data the method used to get the data must also be defensible" warn Moore et al. (1975, p. 75).

Summary

The literature reveals evaluation suggestions for cooperative ABE programs, but no example of those suggestions being used was found of those suggestions nor of was any other comprehensive plan found.

Summary of the Review of the Literature

This section recounts those concepts and applications found in the literature and relates them to this study. The factors identified herein guided the development of the systematic evaluation process described in Chapter III.

The first consideration in this section is the evaluand, its uniqueness and its context. The second is the determination of value. The final consideration applies Stufflebeam's framework to conceptualize evaluation for this study.
The Evaluand

The literature suggests that consideration be given to the uniqueness and the context of the evaluand when developing a systematic evaluation process to determine value. From the literature and the setting descriptions, several factors emerged that affect this study. Those factors include the nature of the respondents, the numbers and types of stakeholder groups, the varying interests and perceptions between the stakeholder groups, the critical involvement of each, the varying information needs of each, and the nature of ABE as a profession.

Potential respondents include members of the following stakeholder groups: union, management, PET staff, student employees, former student employees, non-student employees, school system staff, and potential adopters (school systems and industries) across the Commonwealth. These groups serve several functions. First the key actors of each group will identify concerns, issues, criteria, and evidence during the open-ended interviews. Likewise, they will serve as the audiences of the study reports. Reports will be developed, as an executive summary, to address the concerns, issues, criteria, and evidence identified by the members of each group. Finally, key actors in each group will be solicited to support the study to insure cooperation of the other respondents.

The employee groups present a data gathering consideration. Their limited reading ability limits the choices of data gathering processes. The open-ended interview is most appropriate and will be employed.
The literature also recounts the uniqueness of Adult Basic Education and cooperative educational programs. Apparent is the absence of evaluation application even though there is ample discussion of suggestions for future evaluation efforts. Another factor from the preceding literature review is the need for two kinds of information regarding value. The adult education theorists cited above report that evaluation "should" focus on student skill development as a measure of value. Practitioners report program completers as a measure of value. Each type of information will be collected to gain a complete determination of value.

Value can be measured as merit and worth. Worth relates to the value expressed by the stakeholder group members. Each group cited above potentially benefits from the evaluand. These benefits, either explicit or implicit, need to be identified and the degree to which PET provided those benefits be measured. Both document review and interview are required to delineate the benefits for each appropriate stakeholder group.

Merit, on the other hand, is a measure of value against an external list of standards. The Ohio State University studies (Granger, Moore, and Winker, 1975; Moore, 1975; and Moore, Granger, and Winkfield, 1975) provides those standards (see Appendix A).

With those details as a back drop, the following narrative conceptualizes evaluation as applied to Planters Employee Training Program in Planters Peanuts. Stufflebeam's six questions again frame the decisions.
Definition

Evaluation meant the determination of the merit and worth of Planters Employee Training from document data and the viewpoints of its stakeholder groups.

Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation was twofold: (1) to examine both intended and unintended outcomes and determine their worth to the stakeholders groups, and (2) to determine PET's merit compared to external standards. This evaluation determined PET's worth to the various stakeholder groups and its merit as compared to external standards.

Questions

Questions were generated by the evaluator as a knowledgeable professional, and from the stakeholder groups, and external merit criteria. These questions were foreshadowed and additions (e.g. emergent questions) and deletions were made as they were confirmed or rejected through triangulation and analysis.

Evaluator

The evaluator was an external evaluator who was thoroughly familiar with ABE and cooperative adult education programs. The naturalistic processes required skills and aptitudes supportive to interview, observation
and document review that the evaluator had developed during his professional career.

**Audiences**

Audiences for this study included the union executive committee, employees, management, PET staff, the public schools staff, and potential adopters. These groups represented the stakeholders. They were queried regarding criteria for the evaluation and a summary report for each will be developed.

**Processes**

Processes generally related to identifying criteria, obtaining evidence that related to that criteria, judging the value based on the evidence, and planning and implementing actions based on those judgements. In this study, criteria are derived from the evaluator as a knowledgeable professional, the key actors in each stakeholder group, and the external criteria for cooperative adult education programs.

Evidence was obtained from document review, interviews with respondents, observations and other means that evolve from the expansion and reduction of emergent questions.

Judgements and recommendations were made by the evaluator in response to all evidence and specifically to each stakeholder group. Each group will be instructed to evaluate those conclusions and recommendations, evaluate the evidence, draw conclusions, and develop recommendations.
CHAPTER 3
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter describes the design of this study. The first sections describes the choice of overall design and the rationale for the selection of the study site. The second section specifies the methodology employed. The data collection and analysis procedures are identified in the third and fourth sections.

Design

The design of this evaluation study is case study. A case study is described as one that focuses on "... one unit of analysis. The researcher defines and designates a single unit of analysis regardless of the number of events, participants, or phases of a process" (MacMillian and Schumacher, 1984, p. 322). The case study focuses on that unit of analysis or evaluand in order to gain a full, rich understanding of the related events, participants and phases. In this study, that one unit of analysis is the Planters Employee Training Program (PET) in Planters Peanuts in Suffolk, Virginia.

This design was chosen for this study for three reasons. First, PET was the only cooperative ABE program in the Commonwealth of Virginia with a history to study. Thus, the limiting choice of study sites indicates a case study design. Secondly, in PET's six years of operation, no study of its value had been conducted. The evolutionary changes within the stakeholder groups and the resulting changes in operations were best discovered through
this in-depth design. Thirdly, the foreshadowed questions that guided this study required a depth of data that a case study design accommodated.

Methodology

The methodology employed within this evaluative case study design is naturalistic and the data, qualitative. The method is naturalistic in that the intent is "to study the phenomenon naturally in the field rather than in an artificially arranged setting" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1984, p. 308). PET is an ongoing program that can be studied naturally.

The data was qualitative in that it proposed that in order "to fully understand an individual's behavior, one must also understand the person's feelings and thoughts about the particular behavior" (McMillian and Schumacher, 1984, p. 308). In attempts to gain understanding of individual and group feelings and behavior, it was acknowledged that feelings and behavior do not occur in a vacuum. Also, it was acknowledged that individuals act and react to similar situations differently just as they react similarly to different situations. In order to untangle this web of feelings and behavior, the qualitative methodology in a naturalistic setting offered the greatest potential in developing a holistic, rich understanding of the evaluand.

Procedurally, the methodology of this evaluative study follows a naturalistic inquiry for educational evaluation models developed by Guba (1978), Guba and Lincoln (1982), and Wolf (1979). Naturalistic evaluation proposed that evaluation is most productive when carried out in a
naturalistic setting. Qualitative methodology involves amassing data via documents review, open-ended interview, and observations to determine the value (merit and worth) of the evaluand.

Rather than focusing on predetermined facts and their relationship (the positivist approach), naturalistic evaluation is concerned with "describing and understanding a social phenomena" (Guba, 1978, p. 12). Rather than entering the evaluation with preconceived notions tied to instructional objectives (Tyler, 1950; Stake, 1967) or decisions as organizers (Cronbach, 1963; Stufflebeam, 1971; Alkin, 1975), naturalistic evaluation replaces verification with discovery (Guba, 1978). Though not as adirectional as Scriven's (1973) "goal-free" design, it does provide a structure in which the evaluator is provided the flexibility to follow a discovery line of inquiry to accomplish the data gathering.

Even so, naturalistic evaluation is a matter of degree--the degree to which the investigator manipulates inputs and outputs of the study. The degree of that manipulation varies with the evaluative question being considered and the sources (unobtrusive, observations, interviews) available to answer the questions. Thus, a variety of sources and strategies are possible. The naturalistic evaluation philosophy frees the investigator to adjust and adapt strategies and sources to gain the holistic understanding of the setting.

In this study, naturalistic evaluation produced several advantages. First, it provided maximum information from unobtrusive document sources prior to the interviews. Secondly, the interviews allowed the examination of
concerns from the variety of interrelated perspectives while honoring the inherent differences of each. Third, the design allowed the investigator to focus on the concerns and issues that were critical to the particular setting or context.

Data Collection

The evaluation questions in data collection system take two forms: foreshadowed and emergent. The foreshadowed questions are those developed from the literature review and the evaluator's experience prior to the actual study. These foreshadowed questions gave the evaluator a reasonable framework on which to structure the initial phases of the study. At times, foreshadowed questions that the evaluator anticipated to be appropriate to the evaluand prove not to relate and not to be germane. For example, a foreshadowed question from the literature review indicated that one standard for cooperative programs involved the number of employees received job placement assistance. In the study of PET, job placement was neither an objective or perceived need for PET. Because PET is an inhouse program in a unionized industry, placement on jobs either inside or outside the plant proved not to be a function for PET. In such cases, it is the evaluator's responsibility to document the findings and discard those questions. A second example in this study regarded the original intent questions that focused on students' performance in apprenticeship training programs. Because the apprenticeship issues that generated PET were replaced, and no PET students ever entered an apprenticeship program, the
foreshadowed questions relating to apprenticeship program performance were discarded.

The second form of question, emergent, are those that grew out of issues and concerns that were identified during the data collection. These questions were unanticipated by the evaluator or not predicted from the literature review. As these items emerge during the document review, interviews, or observations, they were integrated into the data collection scheme. Examples are given below.

**Foreshadowed Questions**

As identified in the planning matrix, the foreshadowed questions are divided into three topical categories: (a) original intent, (b) criteria, and (c) unanticipated effects. Each question relied on a variety of data sources from which evidence was gathered.

The original intent questions focused the reasons for establishing a program such as PET. It was assumed that the perception of the intent of the program would vary between and within stakeholder groups. Also, it was assumed that the original intent in 1978 might have evolved over PET's six years of existence. The six years of documents identified the original intent and the alterations therein. The interview data determined variations of perceptions of intent and the underlying perceptions of assumptions, goals, and objectives for PET within and between the stakeholder groups.

The documents review also offered evidence as to the accomplishment of the intent(s) of the program. There were a variety of relevant documents
utilized. A listing is found in Appendix B. The various applications for funds indicated the original and subsequent program leaders' perceptions of program needs as well as their plans (goals, objectives and strategies) for meeting those needs. Quarterly reports, final reports, and student records indicated the successes in accomplishing those intentions.

The second set of questions focused on the standards that The Ohio State University studies (Moore, 1978) identified as important for cooperative adult education programs. In the twelve categories of standards which are listed in Appendix A and reflected in the planning matrix (Table 2), two concerns were generalized. First, was each of the twelve crucial processes planned? Secondly, were the planned processes executed? For example, the first criteria focuses on the needs assessment process. To address this criteria, there were questions to determine if a needs assessment was planned. Secondly, there were questions to determine if the plans were carried out.

Each of the twelve criteria processes were thus examined for planning and execution evidence. The evidence was obtainable from the available documents, interviews, and observations. The documents, especially the funding applications, gave indications of the plans for each process. Other documents such as the quarterly and narrative reports, reflected the execution of those plans. The interviews verified the various stakeholders' involvement in planning and executing each process. Likewise, observations of the instructional and administration activities added evidence.
The third category, unintentional effects, focused on those effects of PET that were not planned. No social activity occurs in a vacuum. Multiple factors impinge on the setting. These questions accepted and highlighted the dynamics of the social situation. Therefore, these questions focused on those unintended effects that PET had on (a) individuals in the Planters community and (b) on the industry as an organization. The evidence to address these questions was derived from the quarterly and narrative reports, from respondent interviews and from observations.

**Emergent Questions**

All the questions that are relevant to this evaluation were not anticipated prior to the data collection. Other issues and concerns emerged. This study's methodology allowed for those emergent questions and expected them to emerge. To integrate these emergent questions into the process, the investigator began generating characteristics, classes, and interrelationships of "events, participants, and phases" (MacMillian and Schumacher, 1984, p. 322). The emergent question, therefore, became a facet of an existing foreshadowed question regarding intent, criteria, or unanticipated effects, or were added as additional emergent questions. The generation, examination, and regeneration of the classes served as the primary guide for the continuous data analysis. The process was developmental as it evolved over the span of the data collection and final analysis process. This developmental process was facilitated with the use of the technique triangulation (Denzin, 1978; Schatzman and Strauss,
1973) to generate viable classes. Triangulation involves a verification of issues and concerns within a stakeholder group and among the groups.

The questions regarding PET's "image" are an example of an emergent issue from which questions were generated. The issue emerged from an observation during the evaluator's attendance at an advisory board meeting. A discussion there centered on employees viewing PET as "kindergarten" and others being teased for attending. This emergent issue was furthered by the observation of the classroom decorations, some of which were juvenile. These two observations, coupled with interview reports from management, verified the issue of the image PET. That issue was subsequently added as a part of the recruitment series of questions.

A second set of emerging questions are represented by the McCluskey (1973) paper that generated the policy issues. These issues emerged from a discussion with the author and subsequent document review data.

Data Collection

This study's data collection system was guided by the data collection planning matrix (Table 2) that included the foreshadowed questions and the sources of data to answer those questions. The planning matrix's columns represented data sources and the rows identified the foreshadowed questions. This matrix offered at least three advantages in managing the data collection system. First, by citing the data sources available to answer each question, the matrix assured that no source was overlooked. Secondly,
Table 2

Data Collection Planning Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNING VARIABLES</th>
<th>EVALUATION QUESTIONS</th>
<th>DOCUMENTS UTILIZED</th>
<th>SOURCE OF DATA</th>
<th>MATERIALS/METHODS</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>COMMUNICATIONS</th>
<th>PERSONNEL PLACEMENT/TRAINING</th>
<th>PERSONNEL PLACEMENT/TRAINING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APPLICATION</td>
<td>MANAGER'S OFFICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NARRATIVE REPORTS</td>
<td>STUDENT DATA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AGREEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>519 PROPOSAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>QUARTERLY REPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FINAL REPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TRAINING RECORDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DIRECTOR OF TRAINING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LINE SUPERVISOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BOARD MEMBERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRESENT STUDENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FORMER STUDENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NON-STUDENT EMPLOYEES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COORDINATOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FORMER COORDINATOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INSTRUCTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AIDES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FORMER AIDES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DIRECTOR ADULT &amp; VOC ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUPERVISOR OF ABE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FORMER SUPERVISOR OF ABE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STATE DIRECTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FORMER STATE DIRECTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUPERVISORS ADULT ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATA COLLECTION**

**PLANNING VARIABLES**

- MANAGEMENT
- COORDINATED
- PERSONNEL
- MATERIALS/METHODS
- ADMINISTRATION
- COMMUNICATIONS
- PERSONNEL PLACEMENT/TRAINING
- PERSONNEL PLACEMENT/TRAINING

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

- APPLICATION
- NARRATIVE REPORTS
- STUDENT DATA
- AGREEMENT
- 519 PROPOSAL
- QUARTERLY REPORT
- FINAL REPORT
- TRAINING RECORDS
- DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS
- DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL
- DIRECTOR OF TRAINING
- LINE SUPERVISOR
- PRESIDENT
- BOARD MEMBERS
- PRESENT STUDENTS
- FORMER STUDENTS
- NON-STUDENT EMPLOYEES
- COORDINATOR
- FORMER COORDINATOR
- INSTRUCTORS
- AIDES
- FORMER AIDES
- DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT
- DIRECTOR ADULT & VOC ED
- SUPERVISOR OF ABE
- FORMER SUPERVISOR OF ABE
- STATE DIRECTOR
- FORMER STATE DIRECTOR
- SUPERVISORS ADULT ED

**DOCUMENTS UTILIZED**

- MANAGER'S OFFICE
- STUDENT DATA
- SUPERVISION OF ABE
- FORMER SUPERVISOR OF ABE
- STATE DIRECTOR
- FORMER STATE DIRECTOR
- SUPERVISORS ADULT ED

**SOURCE OF DATA**

- MANAGER'S OFFICE
- STUDENT DATA
- SUPERVISION OF ABE
- FORMER SUPERVISOR OF ABE
- STATE DIRECTOR
- FORMER STATE DIRECTOR
- SUPERVISORS ADULT ED

**MATERIALS/METHODS**

- MANAGEMENT
- COORDINATED
- PERSONNEL
- DOCUMENTS UTILIZED

**ADMINISTRATION**

- MANAGEMENT
- COORDINATED
- PERSONNEL
- DOCUMENTS UTILIZED

**COMMUNICATIONS**

- MANAGEMENT
- COORDINATED
- PERSONNEL
- DOCUMENTS UTILIZED

**PERSONNEL PLACEMENT/TRAINING**

- MANAGEMENT
- COORDINATED
- PERSONNEL
- DOCUMENTS UTILIZED

**PERSONNEL PLACEMENT/TRAINING**

- MANAGEMENT
- COORDINATED
- PERSONNEL
- DOCUMENTS UTILIZED
each column guided the development of data collection schedules by citing the information to be gathered from each source. Lastly, the matrix was adaptable. Emerging concerns, issues, criteria, and evidence derived from the data sources were accommodated.

The data collection involved three major data sources: documents, interviews, and observations. The bulk of the data was obtained by open-ended interview and document review.

Chronologically, the data collection system involved the development of a data collection instrument based on the Data Collection Planning Chart at each phase. The first phase of the plan involved a review of the 1979 - 1986 documents. Based on the Planning Chart, a review schedule was developed identifying the specific questions for which answers were sought. Other questions and data responses were generated during the process. This phase of the investigation (a) provided data addressing the foreshadowed questions and (b) familiarized the investigator with the historical details of PET's evolution. Also, the investigator gained detailed knowledge of the program changes and operations that enhanced the acuity with which the interview and observation sources were used. Documents included project and program applications, quarterly and yearly progress reports, and individual student data records. A complete listing is found in Appendix B.

Similarly, the other two data sources (interview and observations) involved the development and application of instruments guided by the Planning Matrix. Unanticipated issues and sources were integrated into the matrix as the investigation developed.
The interview phase of the investigation was conducted during the month of December, 1986 and involved various members of each stakeholder group. A interview listing is found in Appendix B. School and industry officials were interviewed in their respective offices. Current employee/students were interviewed in the vacant PET classroom during class hours. Former students were interviewed in the vacant PET classroom during work hours and after work hours. The union vice president was interviewed in the vacant PET classroom. One first line supervisor was interviewed in the cafeteria while the others were interviewed at home by telephone. The non-student employees were interviewed in small groups in the plant cafeteria during their break time. The PET staff members were interviewed in their classrooms or offices.

The interviewer had planned to interview in the plant, but the plant was too noisy to carry on a conversation. Also, the interviewer became sensitive to disruptions in the production schedule and did not wish to interrupt work hours. Management expressed appreciation of the evaluator's sensitivity to production disruptions.

Except for the spontaneous interviews in the cafeteria, all interviews were tape recorded and verbatim transcripts typed. Confidentially was stressed and no interviewee hesitated when asked for permission to be recorded.

The last phase is a metaevaluation which is an evaluation of the evaluation. The fourth and fifth chapters of this study plus an Executive Summary were presented to the Policy Board for their reactions. Errors in
analysis were discussed and documentation provided to support differing views.

Population

The population under study included those "stakeholders" (Guba and Lincoln, 1982, p. 304) in PET. Stakeholders are those who are "involved in or affected by the entity being evaluated" (Guba and Lincoln, 1982, p. 304). They included the following: (1) Planters' management, (2) a union executive, (3) PET students, (4) former PET students, (5) non-student employees, (6) PET staff, and (7) Suffolk Public Schools Staff.

Instrumentation

Guba and Lincoln (1982) referred to the evaluator as the primary instrument in a study. The naturalistic evaluation assumptions cited above focused on description and understanding of a social phenomena. Thus, naturalistic evaluation requires sensitivity to idiosyncrasies and adaptability to search for patterns rather than the norm.

To that end, the investigator developed document review and interview schedules based on the planning matrix. These schedules served as a guide to the continuous data gathering and analysis process. See Appendix C and Appendix D for copies of the questions used to develop the schedules.
Data Analysis

The data collected in this study by open ended interview, document review, and observation were primarily qualitative. Numerical data was analyzed for descriptive purposes where logical. Qualitative data analysis was both continuous and developmental following the Glaser and Strauss (1967) and Schatzman and Strauss (1973) concepts for constant comparative methods. Early in the data collection process, the analytic processes were begun.

The foreshadowed questions were first applied to the documents identified in Appendix C. A record sheet was developed for each foreshadowed question, and evidence was recorded for each question. The quantity of evidence recorded for each question varied from no evidence to substantial evidence from a variety of sources. That evidence, once complied, was analyzed.

That document review analysis answered some of the original questions, highlighted original questions that remained unanswered, and generated additional emergent questions that required clarification. The two sets of unanswered were compiled into one listing and can be found in Appendix D. This revised set of questions was used as the basis for the development of the interview schedules. A separate tabulation sheet was developed for each question, and evidence from the interviews was recorded on each. Observations were also made during the interview visits and that evidence applied to the appropriate tabulation sheet.
The document, interview, and observation evidence was merged into one body of data organized by the foreshadowed and emergent questions. The analysis of that data follows.
CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

The following analysis of the data gathered to answer the foreshadowed and emergent questions served as a basis for assessing the worth and the merit of the Planters Employee Training Program. The presentation of the data analysis is divided into two major sections followed by a summary. The first section, analysis of merit data, is subdivided into three parts that reflect the three major divisions of the foreshadowed and emergent questions: (1) original intent, (2) criteria, and (3) unintentional positive and negative effects. The second section, analysis of worth data, focuses on the stakeholder groups' opinion of PET's value.

Analysis of Merit Data

Intent

The original intent section of this inquiry focused on the reason for which PET was established. Included in this section are the various perspectives of PET's purpose and the assumptions on which they were based. Questions relating to the goals identified by and the benefits anticipated by the various stakeholder groups were also used to generate data related to intent. Basic to this discussion is the data relevant to how well and what content the employee/students learned while enrolled in PET.
Intent was reflected in statements of purpose(s), statements of goals, statements of "anticipated" benefit(s), and statements of "actual" benefits reported by the stakeholders in the documents and interviews. Thus, the document review and interview data relating to these fours areas were included in this analysis. Specifically, the following analysis focuses first on the original statements of purpose and the subsequent evolution of those statements. Secondly, the varying perspectives of PET's purpose or "anticipated" benefits are presented first from the documentation and secondly from the interviews with the various stakeholder group members. Lastly, the data relevant to the "actual" benefits reported by the stakeholders are presented. The actual benefits to the workplace from the stakeholders' perspectives is followed by the student reports of actual benefits to their lives outside the plant. This analysis of reported actual benefits also includes a data presentation related to academic advancement of PET, Suffolk ABE and statewide ABE students. As a summary to this first set of questions are the emergent questions from McCluskey (1973), that helped fill the original gaps in the foreshadowed intent questions.

Original intent

In the area of original intent, several general questions were considered. Why was PET established in Planers Peanuts? What purpose was it intended to serve, and what need was it to fulfill? To answer these questions, part of this study focused on the original intent of PET. Why was PET established? What were PET's goals? What benefit was PET intended to provide for those involved with it?
The early planning documents in 1979 cited PET's purpose as "preparing undereducated employees for entrance into apprenticeship and other training programs" (D-05-79, p. 19) to be held in conjunction with the local area vocational/technical center. Within the next eight months, a revised purpose was reported as giving "the participating employees an opportunity to receive help in filling their educational requirements as well as receiving the personal satisfaction that comes with learning" (D-07-79, p. 14). Within another three months, a second revision appeared in the preplanning documents for 1980 which read: "to provide Planters' employees with the opportunity to improve their reading, writing and math skills in order that they might perform better in their present jobs, become eligible for promotion, become better citizens of the community, and experience the personal satisfaction that comes with learning" (D-10-79-A). At this study's conclusion, this purpose statement remained the official statement of purpose for PET.

Thus, the original "pre-apprenticeship" purpose statement was replaced by a broader purpose statement that included language that focused not on job advancement but job maintenance; being able to perform the job an employee presently held. In a 1980 proposal, the "Statement of Need" section cited the employees' limited ability to read and fill out forms in their present jobs which was not only "embarrassing, demeaning, and frustrating to the employee, but also costly to the industry."

In 1978, PET was initiated to respond to a specific need for upward mobility through apprenticeship and other training programs. That specified
purpose broadened to emphasize basic skills, job maintenance, job promotion, citizenship, and love of learning purpose.

Two factors may account for that evolution of the purpose statement from pre-apprenticeship to a broader general education statement. First, the funding source for the establishment of PET, the Virginia Department of Education, was focusing on a national policy that emphasized serving the "least educated, most in need." This policy targeted money to the lowest functioning level adult reader. Secondly, the union required that seniority be one of the criteria for an employee's acceptance into PET. These two factors, lowest reading level and high seniority, limited the employee/student population from which PET could draw to the older, illiterate or semi-literate worker. These employees did not fit the pre-apprenticeship mold.

Perspectives on purpose and anticipated benefit

One of the quarterly reports in 1980 (D-06-80-2) cited the varying perspectives that were influencing PET. For the employee, the report stated that jobs were changing and employees needed the basic education to learn new skills and insure job security. From the management perspective found in the report, the belief was cited that having employees who could not perform their jobs was costly. From the school systems perspective, there was not enough money to provide inplant programs, and this shared fiscal arrangement helped provide the service. Another report (D-10-80-A) cited the industries inability to promote consistently from within due to
employee undereducation resulting in lowered morale and decreased job satisfaction and job performance.

Each perspective of purpose was accompanied by a set of statements of assumptions and expectations of benefits. The education that PET provided for the employees was expected to provide those benefits. And, the stakeholder groups believed it could provide those benefits. When asked in an interview what the purpose of PET was, the PET Director quoted verbatim, the official statement of purpose cited above. Planters' management believed PET could perform to their expectations. When asked his opinion regarding PET's purpose, the Director of Personnel and Training further responded "Productivity, period" (ME1, p. 21). By improving the employees reading and writing ability, PET would increase their productivity and their opportunity to make a better life and a safer employee. When asked if PET provided more productive and safer employees for Planters, the Director answered a resounding "Yes." To him, PET could and did provide what might be called a "humanistic" productivity; i.e. a better education allowed the employee to be more productive in all aspects of his or her life, he believed.

Similarly, the union executive, in his interview, stated that PET's purpose was to give the worker an opportunity to better his or her education. To him, education helped improve job performance, home life, self-respect, and self-image. Management and union officials each report broad, positive expectations for education, in general, and PET specifically.
These officials include both work-related as well as community-related benefits for the workers.

**Perspectives of actual benefit**

Each stakeholder group anticipated benefits from a program like PET. Labor anticipated job security and improved quality of life. Management foresaw a reduction in cost and improved productivity and quality of life for the employee. The school system appreciated the ability to expand community offerings with minimal cost to their existing budget. The following presents the various perspectives of "actual" benefit from the view of the students, the first line supervisors, and the school system.

Management's perspective was reported above.

During the interview sessions, current and former students, both completers and dropouts, were asked "Has what you learned here helped you on your job?" The overwhelming positive response came from all job levels from sanitation to mechanic. Examples include the following:

The biggest advantage, they taught me how to count. I can count! And I can read some. And most of the time I weigh bins... It helped me a lot. (a former student who dropped out of PET)

Yeah, with the computers and everything. I'm a cooker operator and I don't have to do much writing but I have to figure my numbers a lot and then sometimes you have to weigh things. (a current student)

Normally I operate a machine in sweet and crunchy. That requires reading the certain buttons and a whole lot of things I did not get when I was going to school. I feel like I can move up from there and get a better job and a better spot. (a current student)

Yes, I operate a prototype machine. We run different items and there are some days you've got to go pick your stuff out of the book, what you are going to run. And if you can't spell, you don't know what it is.
It ,PET, has helped me a whole lot. (a former student who dropped out of PET)

During the interviews, the first line supervisors were asked if employees in their section were attending or had attended PET. Even though some supervisors were selected because they had not referred their workers to PET, each said he had employees that had attended. The supervisor may not have actually referred them or the employee may have enrolled in PET prior to coming into that supervisor's section. None the less, supervisors were familiar with PET and had seen improvement in both work performance and, more importantly to them, the worker's attitude. One supervisor explained as follows:

If an employee cannot do a job, 1. mechanics and other operators have to help out which takes them away from their jobs and you loose time, 2. the supervisor has to "disqualify" him or her for the job. It (disqualification) is a long, drawn out process that results in a demotion for the employee. It takes six months to do it.

PET reportedly has helped employees do their jobs. Two supervisors gave examples as follows:

Yes, some of them it helped in the math right much. In production, they have to fill out cards which require math and it helped that and, with, identification of products.

It helped them out sure. I could see the change in them. At least they are able to read and write.

A benefit reported by the supervisors was the employees' change in attitude as a result of what the employee learned at PET. One supervisor explained it this way.
A person that doesn't have the education, they always feel like someone is picking on them. . . . That is the biggest thing that takes place in a person. The attitude changes to where they can understand better. You understand better and you don't fight.

The union executive interviewed agreed that the employees were benefiting on the job from the education that PET provided. He also identified the following benefit:

I think one way it helps the union is you have less grievances because people don't make mistakes as often. A lot of grievances are actually because a person simply made a mistake—miscounted something or didn't read it completely or didn't understand fully what they were supposed to be doing. When they check their weights, they have to be milligrams and being able to set the scales up, normal everyday jobs. The more education they have the less hassles and the less grievances we are involved with. . . . So it helps the union in the respect that it makes our job easier.

The superintendent of schools in the City of Suffolk recounted the benefits for the schools system in terms of the improved abilities of the employees and the opportunity the school system had to serve the community with a unique effort.

Other benefits emerged from the interviews. Because part of the PET's purpose involved the student's contributions to his or her life outside the plant, the employees were asked if what they learned helped them in their community life. Their reactions to this question and the tones of their responses to this question were even more positive than to the job-related questions. There were a number of prefaces regarding (1) their inability to go to school when they were children and (2) their longing for an education. Following these preambles, a number of examples of benefits were reported.
Two interviewees were also ministers and others were heavily involved in church work. PET reportedly helped them in these roles and improved their confidence level when reading or speaking before a group.

A second benefit related to children and homework. The employee/students reported being better able to answer the questions their children have. Another benefit was related by a lady as follows:

A certain hour in the evening we...do homework. Everybody was doing their homework...me. and the kids. We have a big table, and this was the hour or two that everybody...did. their homework.

Each interview included questions related to the benefit PET provided. This section relates to those benefits that were anticipated. In a later section this analysis includes unanticipated positive effects and the negative effects that occurred as a result of PET.

Student learning

The next data gathered was on student learning. Because a part of PET's intent was to improve the employee's educational level, these document review and interview questions related to student advancement in reading and math.

As cited earlier, the instructional emphasis in PET's beginning stages was Level I employees; those reading below the fifth grade level. Thus, early planning called for trying to enroll twenty five Level I and fifteen Level II employees. Level II students functioned between fifth and ninth grade levels. In 1980, thirty Level I and ten Level II employees were enrolled, and over one hundred employees were included on a waiting list for enrollment in PET.
By 1984 there was no waiting list and enrollments included eight Level I, twenty Level II, and six GED students. In 1985 only twenty nine employees enrolled for the forty student slots available.

In 1981, "most participants increased their reading and math entry levels by at least one grade level." (D-02-81) However, different instruments for pre-test and post-test were used, thus raising into question the reliability of those results. In 1984-1985, with the testing procedure rectified, student advancement steadily declined.

Student data for the period from 1982 through 1985 contributed to this discussion on student learning. Student achievement data indicated that while the state-wide ABE program and the city program maintained enrollment over the period, PET's enrollment declined to a low of twenty nine in 1985. The overall decline was accompanied by a greater decline in Level I employees and an increase in Level II. After no dropouts from PET were reported in 1982, the drop out rate fluctuated from thirty to fifteen to twenty-five percent in the subsequent three years. The city and the state experienced a reduction in the number and percentage of dropouts for the same period.

PET's instructional and student contact hours also declined over the period while the city and state maintained or increased the hours. During instructional hours, PET averaged three students per teacher while the city averaged over ten, and the state average was seven.

Average hours of attendance indicates the contact hours for the students enrolled. PET students averaged ninety hours a year for the period
1982-1985 while the state averaged approximately fifty, and the city fluctuated from a low of fifty and a high of eighty-six hours of instruction per student per year.

Approximately six percent of the state's ABE students completed ABE during the period 1982-1985. PET's and the city's completions rate fluctuated over the same period. In two of the four years from 1982-1985, no students completed PET. During the other two years, three students and one student completed PET which represented six percent and three percent respectively. The city reported completion rates that fluctuated between two and seven percent over the period.

Academic advancement is difficult to generalize for a program due to high fluctuations of class performance within the program. For example, in the city program and PET, each program had classes of students with high achievement and others with equally low achievement. Table 3 provides an example for 1985. According to the documents, the city classes were each composed of predominately Level I students. PET class 1 was the GED level; PET class 2 was Level II; and PET class 3 was Level I.

Early documentation reported student learning in terms of work-related skill improvement. For example, a 1981 coordinator's narrative report of the years progress cited that "14 participants learned to read an average of 31 new trade words. (Fourteen) 14 learned an average of 11 new abbreviations/symbols. (Nineteen) 19 learned an average of 17 new signs" (D-02-81). No later documentation reported work-related skill advancement
Table 3

1985 Adult Basic Education Academic Advancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Number of Grade Levels Advanced Per Student</th>
<th>Percentage Who Made No Advancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suffolk City Classes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pet Classes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Total</strong></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and interviews in 1986 indicated that current instruction focuses on academic rather than job-related learning.

Since PET's first year of operation in 1979, when eight students completed PET, approximately three students have completed the program annually. Since the GED component was added in 1986, most completers reenroll in hopes of passing the GED test and receiving that certification. None had received a GED at the termination of this study.

The foreshadowed questions relating to PET's intent included the number who entered and completed apprenticeship training, as well as, the quality of their work in that program. Those questions were included because PET was created to prepare employees to enter apprenticeship. As presented above, PET's purpose was altered shortly after its inception to focus on job maintenance rather than job advancement. No apprenticeship program has been established, and no students have enrolled in apprenticeship programs in the adjacent communities. Therefore, the questions relating to apprenticeship were eliminated from this study.

McCluskey

The final intent section follows the analysis elements identified earlier as developed by McCluskey (1973). These criteria were included under intent due to their focus on the commitment level of the stakeholder groups. The McCluskey issues of "assumptions" and "goals" were addressed in the preceding section. This section will focus on the remaining five issues in the McCluskey series.
The five intent measures addressed in this section are as follows: (1) Policy -- the level to which the parties commit policy to a project; (2) Curriculum Objectives -- the degree to which time and effort are expended to develop and maintain specific curriculum objectives for the project; (3) Resources -- the degree to which the parties commit resources to a project; (4) Conversions -- the degree to which adjustments are made in current operations and facilities to accommodate a project; and (4) Processes -- the degree to which unique administrative and instructional processes are developed and maintained to support the project; and (5) Performance Assessment -- the degree to which performance criteria are established and utilized to assess the project's success.

Policy. The first issue, related to policy, questions the degree to which PET has become formalized or institutionalized by the development of organization policy within the various organizations that are cooperating to maintain its existence. It is assumed that the generation of a policy statement that becomes a part of the organizations existing policy structure displays a high level of commitment to PET. Less formal and unratified statements may reveal lesser commitment.

The documentation relating to PET revealed no formal, ratified policy by either of the cooperating parties -- the schools, the industry, or the union. There is, however, a cooperative agreement (D-04-85) that was developed to formalize the fiscal and administrative relationship between the school system and the industry. Generally, the school system agreed to employ and supervise the staff and obtain state funds for a portion of PET's
cost and the industry agreed to provide the space and pay the remainder. This document changed very little over PET's history except for the percentages of the cost for which Planters was responsible. Each summer the public schools' Coordinator of Adult and Vocational Education and Planters Director of Personnel reviewed the budget and reached a consensus on the fiscal requirements of each.

During the interviews, the three cooperating party's executives were asked for information regarding the policy level at which PET operated in their organization. Planters management explained that PET was not corporate policy. It was a local function.

There is nothing documented in the contract. No formal documentation says here is what we will do, here is what the companies rights are and here are what the union rights are.

The union executive confirmed that the contract contained a general training section under which PET was legitimized. However, PET, as a specified program, was not in the contract. He further explained the following:

There is some language in the contract that says that the company agrees to furnish training on the company at company expenses. PET is part of that program.

In the school system, PET does become a part of the vocational education plan which was voted on by the board. Each year the board also approves the cooperative agreement between the school system and Planters.

Thus, PET was not the official policy of either the union or the industry. It remains an informal agreement between the two parties. The
school board does take official action on the cooperative agreement and the vocational plan that includes objectives relating to PET. These were maintenance objectives for the school board provides no local funds for PET because the state and the industry share the costs.

**Curriculum objectives.** The Cooperative Agreement (D-04-85) spells out the curriculum procedures and intents related to PET. Therein was stated the intent to develop an open entry, open exit basic skills program that will integrate trade terminology and trade math into the existing adult basic education curriculum. Individualized instruction with some group instruction will be used. The focus would be on Level I.

Subsequent documents (1979-1980) record the development of a procedure to gather the math and reading material from the plant and integrate them into the standard basic skills curriculum. The coordinator reported spending time in the plant gathering that information. She noted in one report that this was a time consuming process for which she got little help, and that the curriculum development roles and responsibilities were not documented and became misunderstood by industry and school management personnel. Nonetheless, the reading and math skills needed in the plant were integrated into the students' curriculum.

Discussions in the documents relating to trade-related instruction waned in 1982 and 1983. During that time there were personnel changes in the following positions: PET director, ABE supervisor, and personnel director in the plant. After those dates, the quarterly and yearly reports no longer mentioned trade-related curriculum development activities, but
rather references to curriculum presented learning related to academics rather than an integrated curriculum in which learning was related to work.

The interview series focused heavily on the curriculum items in order to determine the existing curriculum format. What was discovered and will be evidenced below was the change of the curriculum concept under which PET was operated. The assumption that prevailed in the early planning documents and in the cooperative agreement relates to the concepts of transferring learning from the classroom to the job and the "integrated curriculum." The first concept proposed that students, any students, often must learn a skill, be it reading, multiplication or fractions, in the isolation of the classroom. Once the skill was learned, it becomes the students responsibility to "transfer" that skill to the "real world" where it could be used. However, by locating the learning setting in an industry and integrating the workplace into the curriculum by using the reading material and the math skills that were needed in the real world of the job, the student could avoid the step of transferring the learning.

Furthermore, other related assumptions proposed that the student would be more likely to take an interest in subject matter related to his or her livelihood. Also related was the assumption that the student would be able to grasp the "academic" skills to be learned if they were presented in a familiar job-related context.

Based on those assumptions, the initial curriculum development activities were devoted to the identification and integration of reading and math skills and contexts from the student's workplace into the standard ABE
During the interviews, the personnel director and, to a lesser extent, the PET director, expressed a disagreement with the integrated curriculum concept. Further probing found that, at the time of their employment, neither had been thoroughly oriented to and trained in the integrated curriculum approach for workplace programs. Each reported an academic curriculum perspective.

Thus, the curriculum evolved to an academic base with less job-related skills and materials included. The estimate of academic versus job-related elements varied with the perspective. Management estimated the instruction to be eighty-nine percent academic, the PET director, seventy-five percent, and the teachers, fifty percent. The PET director gave the following rationale for the academic emphasis: "Seventy-five percent is basic ABE and twenty-five percent trade-related; only because (of) the Level Ones. There is no need to try to work with trade-related until they get some of the basics down" (PD1, p 8). This statement represented the antithesis of trade-related, integrated curriculum assumptions and demonstrated the inadequacies of the communication of trade-related basic skills instruction concepts to a key position such as the PET Director.

When asked what the curriculum objectives should be, the interviewees fell into two groups. One group composed of management, the union executive, and the PET director fell into the academic education group. They felt that PET should teach basic skills, and the student should transfer that knowledge into a number of settings including the workplace.
The second group included the PET teachers, the school system coordinator, some of the students, and the first line supervisors. This group varied in its specific recommendations, but generally felt instruction should be related to the job.

The teachers, for example, mentioned in their interviews that their visits into the plant allowed them to see what skills their students needed and to understand the students' environment. The school system coordinator explained that the staff needs to find out what the employee and industry needs were and gear the learning to that. "That is called learning relevancy," she stated. The first line supervisors see the need for specific skills training for their workers such as abbreviations or converting ounces to grams. One supervisor related his concern as follows:

PET should concentrate on what we are doing in the plant. The instruction should not be reading, writing and arithmetic in isolation but job related. That would help my employees.

In summary, the interviews revealed that the curriculum focus evolved to a general academic, adult basic education curriculum similar to one found in any adult basic education class. There were two perspectives related to what the curriculum objectives should be. These issues will be addressed further below in the curriculum section.

Resources. The third McCluskey issue related to the level of resources devoted to a program. According to the cooperative agreement, Suffolk City Schools would provide staff supervision, curriculum expertise, a portion of the total program cost from its ABE allocation from the state. For their part, Planters would provide facilities, payment for employee/students (on a
weekly basis) for two hours at the regular rate if the student attended four hours per week, commencement activities, a portion of the total program cost, and in kind contributions, e.g. office equipment, supplies, guidance regarding plant operations.

As a result, Planters constructed a three room classroom site at one end of the main plant cafeteria. Initially they provided ten percent of the funds to operate PET, and the school system obtained ninety percent of the funding from special project funds from the Virginia Department of Education. When the special project status was discontinued, the proportions shifted. At the time of this study, the total operation budget for PET was $33,000 of which Planters provided sixty-five percent and state ABE funds provided thirty-five percent. In eight years of operation, Planters estimated that they contributed over $175,000 in operations funds alone.

For the school system responsibilities, however, the documentation held little evidence of the school systems' supervision or curriculum assistance. Interview data from school system personnel and the PET director confirmed the scarcity of assistance. In practice, the PET director operated independently. This issue is addressed in more detail in the section below entitled "Administration."

The documents indicated and the interviews confirmed that the school system contributed no local money to PET's operation. The contribution made in their name was a portion of the federal funds received from the state ABE allocation.
Conversions. Other than the classroom construction, which was a major conversion, no other major conversions of industry procedures and facilities were made for PET. The employees attended class after work, thereby limiting interference with work schedules. The standard overtime payment system was used for paying employees who attended PET. One supervisor noted in his interview that he did make changes in the shift assignment of some employees so they could take advantage of PET.

Processes. Administrative and instructional processes were planned for PET. The curriculum processes have been addressed above. A number of administrative processes were developed to give the PET director and instructors access to information and people in the plant. These procedures included recruitment, curriculum development, and followup activities that were detailed in the cooperative agreement and quarterly reports.

Performance assessment. The documents contained little evidence related to performance assessment of the students or the program. In a 1979 report, the director cited evidence of success using the following criteria: low absentee rates, motivated participants, enthusiastic staff, attendance higher than required, additional registrations, and managements' involvement. No performance standards were used, and thereby, no data presented to support this report.

In the absence of any performance criteria, the interviews first sought to confirm the absence of performance criteria and, then, concentrated on the question "What performance criteria should be developed for PET?"

From PET staff, to management, to school system staff, to union executive,
the response was the same: student progress. Each identified pre-test, post-test student data as the criteria that should be used.

A second potential criteria, included by the school superintendent, the school system's ABE supervisor and the PET Director, relates to the students' meeting their own goals.

When asked to identify the criteria other stakeholders groups would suggest were appropriate for measuring PET's performance, the PET Director suggested that management might consider work-related performance such as decreased absenteeism, improved productivity, cooperativeness, the employee better understanding his/her role, and being able to complete the forms needed on the job. She thought the school system might measure performance by the number who completed the eighth grade reading level and the number who completed the GED. She proposed that the union might measure performance by increased self confidence level of the members, more active union participation, and leadership development. The teachers proposed that Planters might measure performance by better quality work, increased production, less errors, and more responsible workers.

Original intent summary

This first section of the analysis has concentrated on critical items that assist in understanding PET's original intent(s) and, in some cases, the evolution of those intents to current practice. The section that follows focuses on PET's operation. It identifies the systems that were put in place to accommodate PET's operations, the staff hired to manage and deliver
PET's services, and the interrelationships of the stakeholder groups. This analysis is organized around the foreshadowed "criteria" questions cited in Chapter 1.

Criteria

A number of criteria for measuring a cooperative ABE program's merit have been developed at Ohio State University (Appendix A). The following analysis presents the data for each of the criteria.

Needs assessment

The documents and the interviews revealed that few needs assessment activities had been or were currently used (1) to identify employee and industry needs and (2) to use those needs to adjust PET's procedures and services. The documents revealed and the Director noted in her interview that the students were surveyed at the end of each year. However, according to the documentation, the staff often read the survey to the students which would bring into question the reliability of the results. In 1984 this practice has been changed. More advanced students read the survey to those students who can not read it themselves.

On at least one occasion, PET was responsive to the industry's needs. In 1980, "floating" student slots were added to PET. Floating slots were unassigned student positions. If a supervisor found a student deficient in a skill needed on the job, he or she could refer that student to PET to learn that one skill. The employee/student would not be a permanent student but rather one that attended until that one skill was mastered. No indication
was given as to how this need was identified. The staff reported in the metaevaluation that the floating slots capability remained a part of PET offerings, but few supervisors have responded to the information regarding these opportunities. However, in their interviews, the supervisors recommended that PET adopt such an effort.

Documents revealed that in 1984 and 1985, the Director added group activities such as sessions on income tax and local political races to the curriculum. The interviews revealed that this change in the curriculum was made to add variety to the classroom activities and were based on expressed needs of some of the students but not as the result of formal needs assessment.

Objectives

Because PET was initially funded by ABE special projects funds, the first objectives reflected a responsiveness to the funding source. For example, the initial objectives included the establishment of a learning center, enrolling forty students, development of curriculum development procedures, development of a handbook, and providing technical assistance to other industries. No evidence of student outcome objectives was found in the documentation. After 1981, no program objectives were cited.

As for involvement in developing program objectives, management, public school staff, and the Virginia Department of Education were identified as being involved in the development of the objectives in the first year of operation. No mention was made of supervisors, participants or union leaders being involved at any time during PET's existence.
Staff qualifications and training

The PET staff was composed of several positions including a supervisor supplied by Suffolk Public Schools, a teacher/director, teachers, and teacher's aides. The numbers of teachers and aides varied from one to two based on the number and types of students. The aides were employees and usually were shop stewards. At the conclusion of this study, the staff was composed of one teacher/director, two teachers, and no aides.

There were no job written qualifications for any positions. The present director gave an example of the problems that caused.

I was hired as an administrator. They explained that my job was to administer the program, but when I got here, the former director told me I had to teach reading.

Neither were there written qualifications for teachers. With no job qualifications from which to work, the director was asked in the interviews what kind of person she looked for when hiring. "I look for a reading specialist we feel will work well with adults, who prefers part-time work, and who has an educational background."

One instructor, at the time of the study, was not a certified teacher. However, the director reported that her natural attributes plus the staff support system generated positive results from her efforts. Students also reported her positive attributes.

Neither of the PET directors had industrial experience prior to accepting the leadership of PET. The former director, due to PET's curriculum development emphasis, reported a great deal of time spent in the plant. That experience reportedly helped with her learning the industry's
procedures and facilities. The current director was not allowed in the plant by the former personnel director for what was reported as "safety" reasons.

Neither PET director had experience in developing individualized curricula for undereducated adults. The director at the time of this study held a masters degree in adult and continuing education.

In the absence of formal and informal qualifications regarding knowledge of adult learning, experience in teaching adults, or industrial experience, how then were the staff trained and prepared to work at PET? The instructors at the time of this study were oriented to PET with a staff handbook and a plant tour. For the two years prior to the study, they had not visited the plant's production area. The PET director explained that due to their working hours, they were to teach and did not have time to go into the plant.

The academic orientation toward instruction discussed above decreased the need, from the perspective of the current PET director and the director of personnel, for the teachers to go in the plant. The teachers stated that when they went into the plant it helped their instruction. First, they became familiar with the terminology the workers were using. Secondly, it helped them appreciate the fatigue that the students felt when they came to class after work.

The director and staff reported that they rarely attended the local inservice and more rarely attended regional or state-wide staff training activities. In the metaevaluation, the teachers reported that they received training for at least two days prior to the beginning of the program year, at
least one day in the middle of the program year, and for two days at the end of the program year. Other training during the year was provided if requested. The needs were identified by the director's observations and from the teacher's request.

No evidence was found of a staff evaluation system or any self development plans developed to overcome instructional skill deficiencies.

Instruction

PET's statement of purpose focused on improving the employees' opportunities by upgrading their educational level. Thus, data regarding instruction were analyzed to determine if that purpose was achieved. In that data, both students and first line supervisors reported that PET's instruction contributed to that end. Furthermore, the students related that the instruction helped them meet their individual goals both at work and in the community. They were better able to do the reading and the math their jobs required. They also reported that they could take a more active part in their church activities, help their children with homework, and get more from leisure time activities such as reading and traveling.

The staff did develop a study plan for each individual based on "level of performance" (D-05-80). The student advanced at his or her own pace. The students reported their appreciation of the pacing that allowed them to progress as quickly as possible with the patient, helpful staff support. The materials utilized in PET reflected appropriate adult-relevant instructional materials. The commercial materials were standard materials used throughout ABE in the Commonwealth. The teacher-made materials
relating to safety signs, job related forms used by the employees were appropriate for adult instructional purposes. An adequate supply of all materials was on hand.

As reported above, the instructional facilities consist of one large room that can be divided into three by sliding partitions and equipped with the tables and chairs and the latest equipment. Some instructionally oriented decorations on the walls were juvenile. Management and union executives each mentioned the inappropriateness of some of the decorations.

Instructional content changed during PET's years of operation. As discussed earlier, the initial PET effort concentrated on the director spending time in the plant to identify job terminology and job math to integrate in the curriculum. Two aides who were shop stewards were hired to work in PET to maintain the relationship with the work environment and the union. The changes in plant, PET and school system staff in 1982 and 1983 resulted in a more academic content that did not use the job as a basis for instructional content. Evidence from interviews suggested that the change from job-related to academic was not intentional. Rather, the interview responses revealed that the shift resulted from a failure to communicate the intent and processes when in one year the PET Director, the school system ABE supervisor, and the industry's personnel director were replaced. None the less, both students and first line supervisors related that participation in PET improved the employee/student's work. However, both students and first line supervisors have suggested that PET could help with "short courses" much like the floating slot idea. Employees had specific
needs (e.g. converting grams to ounces, abbreviations) with which PET might help, they suggested.

Student objectives and/or competencies in a form that identified the functions or skills they were to perform were not seen. As the school system's Coordinator of Adult and Vocational Education programs suggested in her interview, PET is a perfect program for developing a competency based approach to student objective development and curriculum building. She hoped to explore CBAE in the near future.

The testing procedures at PET used adult placement and diagnostic instruments in an appropriate testing procedure. The Adult Basic Learning Examination could perhaps be replaced with an adult instrument that provided more diagnostic results.

Group instruction was sporadic and focuses on topics the staff identified as relevant at the time. Topics have included consumer economics and, in an election year, government and law.

Planning

From 1979-1981, planning meetings were held on a yearly basis. Management, school system personnel, and the Virginia Department of Education Adult Education staff members were invited to these meetings. The quarterly reports documented that the director presented the plan, and the attending representatives of the cooperating parties gave input. From 1982 to 1986, involvement in planning decreased. During these years of operation, the director compiled a yearly activities report and submitted it to management, school personnel, and the Department of Education with no
discussion meeting. Since 1986, the report was submitted to an advisory committee.

As cited above, no substantial needs assessment has been conducted. No performance criteria were established. No program objectives other than the early project-related objectives were reported.

The budget was determined each summer in a meeting between the Personnel Director of Planters and the Coordinator of Adult and Vocational Education from the school system. The delineation of the other responsibilities in the cooperative agreement were not changed substantially during PET's existence. Prior to the initiation of the advisory committee in 1985, neither participants nor union was involved in planning PET's operations.

As will be discussed in detail below under the section on administration, both the school system and the industry left the program planning and administration to the director. The director recently (1985) developed an advisory committee composed of representatives of all the stakeholder groups including students, union, industry and school system, and staff to assist her. Their role was undefined.

Thus, there was little history of representation by the stakeholder groups in the following activities: planning pre-startup activities, the purpose of PET, the time-frame, budget, benefits to participants, the conditions, tasks and responsibilities of all the cooperating parties, relationships to cooperative organizations' goals, funding sources, and personnel requirements.
The cooperative agreement and fiscal agreement

PET was grounded in an informal agreement between the school system and the industry. No formal contract existed between the cooperating parties. The base document was a cooperative agreement that was developed with PET's inception and has not changed substantially since then. The budget was not a part of the cooperative agreement. The original cooperative agreement called for Planters to provide ten percent of the cost and the school system received ninety percent of the cost from the adult education special project grant. When the program no longer qualified for special funds, the school system committed a portion of its Adult Basic Education allocation from the state which greatly decreased the funds available to operate PET. The school system chose to provide no local funds to PET and therefore, Planters contributed the remainder of the funds needed. In 1986, the $33,000 budget for PET was sixty-five percent Planters funds and thirty-five percent from Adult Basic Education funds from the state. The yearly adjustments of percentages were determined by the coordinator from the school system and the industry's personnel director each summer.

The cooperative agreement also identifies the in-kind contributions to be provided by the schools which included expertise in curriculum development and instructional management and by the industry which included classrooms, office equipment and supplies and guidance from industry staff. No evidence supported the school system actually providing that technical assistance.
Administration

The PET Teacher/Director was the person responsible for the coordination, day-to-day operations, and personnel and fiscal management. The documents contained the following duties for the position: designing the instructional program, supervising the instructional staff, evaluating PET's operations and offerings, recruiting students, communicating with the cooperating parties, teaching a section of students, and assessing the plant and staff needs, among other duties. No formal job qualifications for the position was found.

The responsibility for overall supervision for PET was unclear. During the interviews, the Union executive stated that the union was not involved in program management. He stated that Planters' management was responsible for that supervision. Planters' management cited that "99% of the effort has been done by the school system. It has been a school system function primarily." (ME 1, p. 22) The school system coordinator expressed concern about the quality of supervision they were providing.

The school personnel, the PET director, and management agreed that the Director administered the program as she saw fit calling on the school system or the personnel director when ever she deemed it necessary. When asked if she were comfortable with this arrangement, the PET Director gave the following answer:

Yes . . . as long as you know your guidelines you can work within. So both Planters and Suffolk City School system say 'You know what you are doing. Carry on.'" (PD1, p. 7)
However, no such guidelines, either performance standards or objectives, were discovered by this investigator.

In 1985, the director initiated an advisory committee composed of representatives of the union, students, management and the school system. Their role was undefined, but the intent was reportedly to assist with administrative duties and decisions.

Placement

One group of the foreshadowed question dealt with student placement in other jobs. Placement did not emerge as a consideration in this study. PET's original intent was pre-apprenticeship instruction. But, as described above, the instructional focus quickly changed from job mobility to job maintenance. In the interviews, one student did mention his hope to be able to in the future try for a better job, but most responses focused on job maintenance. Both management and union executives discussed the possibility of long term advancement for PET students. However, that benefit remains subordinate to job maintenance, attitude improvement, and safety.

Communication system

The communication system criteria refers to a number of communication levels. Those levels include a general, overarching written communication plan, the communications system during student intake, staff/student communications, external communication with local, regional and national organizations, oral as well as written communication, formal as
well as informal communications, student access to their records, and the communication budget.

In the original agreement, the cooperating parties agreed to provide a contact person who would attend all meetings concerning PET. That agreement also specified the industry and school system responsibilities.

A document listing for this study (see Appendix B) reveals a regular pattern of reports to cooperating parties. These were attempts early in PET's operation to clarify expectations and establish communication channels. However, there was no evidence of a comprehensive, written plan that specified the two-way communication system involving all the levels of the cooperating parties.

The union had not been responsive in the flow of communication. In the interview, their executive admitted their lack of involvement with PET. There was evidence of various communication levels established between PET and the other cooperating parties and stakeholder groups. For example, there was evidence of PET's communications with the first line supervisors and provisions were planned for making presentations at occasional union meetings. There was, however, an absence of evidence of communication between PET and the ABE program in the school system.

The underdeveloped communication system created management problems for PET. For example, in the first year of the curriculum development facet of the project, the director reported the following in a quarterly report: "Roles and responsibilities were not documented or were misunderstood." Specifically, plant engineers, the training director, the
consultant and school system's adult education director were to help with the curriculum development process and had failed to do so.

The student screening and intake procedures were not specified, but rather the process in the cooperative agreement called for explaining to the student the reasons for screening, explaining the next procedures, and answering any questions. There were no guidelines for discussions of expectations, responsibilities, and realistic career outcomes for the participant.

As for teacher and student communications, in their interview the teachers stated that they felt they had developed a positive rapport with the students, and in their counseling role, they helped the students with personal problems that were interfering with learning. The current and former students relate positive attributes to the teachers. The individualized instructional approach and the rapport established by the staff reportedly created the opportunity for communication between staff and students regarding progress, expectations, and problem solving.

As for communications outside the industry, the documentation contained examples of communications with local, state and national organizations. Articles appeared regularly in Planters Pep, the company newsletter and the state ABE Newsletter. Periodic articles were found in regional newspapers, parent company newsletters, and the union newsletter. Presentations were made at state and regional conferences, and interested organizations either visited or wrote for information regularly. Regularly generated reports were disseminated locally and at the state level.
Communication inside the industry included oral and informal as well as written and formal communications. The 1979 and 1980 curriculum development plans called for the PET "teachers to interview supervisors and department heads, the employee, and the support services (e.g. first aid, personnel department) to identify reading, writing and math skills" (D-06-79-2, pp. 5-6) the employees needed to learn. It was reported during that time that line supervisors would also contact PET for help for their employees. Since 1982, the curriculum development process was no longer reported; nor was there evidence of oral and informal communications between PET staff and the other stakeholder groups. As noted earlier, the current PET director was not allowed to go into the plant until 1985. Her contact with the supervisors was through memo and formal presentations at their business meetings.

Communications between students and staff in the way of formal records was documented. The students' educational records were kept in the PET classroom. They were accessible to the students and could be reviewed at any time. The students rarely if ever requested to do so.

Since there was no specified communication system, there was no budgeted item to support it. There were funds for communication costs and in-kind contributions from the industry for telephones and printing.

**Evaluation**

Little evidence regarding an evaluation system for PET was reported. During the special project activities an external evaluator was noted in the
applications and reports, but no subsequent evaluation report was mentioned or located. The student survey mentioned above under "needs assessment" was utilized once a year.

The absence of performance criteria against which PET would be assessed limited the evaluation evidence in the various reports to (a) numbers of students who have participated, (b) academic advancement, and (c) anecdotal comments from stakeholders. The section above entitled "performance criteria" recounts the interview data regarding the current and suggested criteria for PET.

Recruitment

Efforts to recruit students to PET included a number of activities. Posters were placed on the bulletin board. Presentations were made at supervisor's meetings and, more rarely, union meetings, and notices were placed in pay envelops. The director interviewed placed heavy responsibility for low enrollment on low support by the first line supervisors' unwillingness to refer their employees. Even though the reports contained evidence of a variety of recruitment activities, there was no written recruitment plan that focused efforts and identified the responsibilities of each of the cooperating parties.

In the first two program years, there was a waiting list of employees who wished to enroll. That list dissolved and in 1985 and 1986, the staff was unable to fill the forty student slots that were available.

However, PET did not have a recognition problem. Interview data from management, union, students, and non-student employees indicated that PET
was well known throughout the plant. Thus, awareness was not indicated to be a problem. When asked about reasons for non-participation, the following personal, job-related, and informational causes were cited. Primary responses focused on the employees unwillingness to let other workers know he or she was uneducated. Akin to that response was the expressions of PET's image as a "kindergarten" for adults. Even with the addition of GED components, students reported the continuation of the elementary school image.

A second series of responses regarding non-participation focused on the work schedule in the plant. These responses were most often reported by former students who dropped out of PET. Due to demand for their product, the industry had been operating double shifts, and employees had been working ten hour days for up to two years. The supervisors confirmed that the work schedule was difficult for everyone. The changing shifts and long hours made participation difficult.

A third series of responses regarding barriers to participation was informational in nature. Two major items are prominent. First, several students explained that the common belief among the employees was that a student must to "go back to the primer" when entering PET. Employees did not realize each student began at his or her own level. Also, the students identified a second informational issue regarding individualized instruction. Several students recounted experiences in public school in which they were laughed at by other students, or if they were slow to grasp a new skill or
concept, they were told the class must move on. Reportedly, the employees thought PET was also a class-size learning environment and did not realize that it was individualized and self-paced.

A third informational barrier, though not as prevalent as the two major ones above, involved misconceptions about PET's enrollment practices. It was reported that the posters on the company bulletin board carried announcements of an open house and registration in the fall of each year. It was not clear that an employee could enroll any time after that.

Students reported that, no matter the barrier, the most significant barrier to participation was simply entering the door for the first time. Overcoming a combination of personal pride and fear was nearly insurmountable barriers.

When asked about possible activities to recruit students, the supervisors cautioned about their limited power over their employees. The union/management relationship limited the benefit the supervisor could be. They reported that they encouraged employees to attend, and one supervisor changed workers shifts to make attendance easier. However, the supervisors suggested that the most influential person in affecting attendance was the union representative, the shop steward. The union executive stressed that the shop steward was the information base for most employees, and he concurred that the steward could serve as a valuable resource for recruiting and supporting participation.

Students and supervisors each suggested the use of short courses or general educational classes related to work be offered by PET. These "brush
up" or introductory courses would be a legitimate excuse for the employees to come into PET and see how it functions.

**Counseling**

The document review revealed no evidence regarding provisions for counseling services. Union, school and PET personnel agreed that counseling was not PET's role. The teachers agreed that they were thrust into a counseling role by the nature of the job, and the students needed to clear problems from their minds so they might concentrate. The teachers felt equipped to handle the small problems. Larger problems, they reported, they referred to ministers or doctors.

**Unintentional positive and negative effects**

This last section analyzes the unintentional effects PET had on the stakeholder groups and their institutions and organizations. The documents revealed no unintentional negative effects other than occasional logistical, short term problems. The follow up interviews produced minimal responses. One substantive item reported by the school personnel related to the supervision of PET. It was reported that "the school people do not have enough time to get involved. We are not supervising the program." That situation is addressed in the "administration" section above.

Unintentional positive effects vary with the stakeholder group. Management and the PET Director identified the positive public relations exposure that Planters has received. The union executive explained that the new computerized equipment that was installed was a challenge for the
training efforts. The education that employees received in PET helped with that equipment/training transition. Lastly, the union representative reported a reduction in the number of grievances and the first line supervisors confirmed less conflict on the job by those who attended PET. Each attributed this positive outcome to the employees increased self confidence and ability to perform the job.

Analysis of Worth Data

The data regarding the worth of PET was gathered through interviews with the stakeholder groups. In the interviews, each reported positive results from PET's activities. The employees who had not been enrolled in PET reported that they knew co-workers who benefited from participation in PET. Some related specific examples of student/employees improving their job skills.

The student/employees interviewed reported both job-related and personal benefits from participation in PET. The gains in reading and math skills helped them perform their jobs. The self-confidence as well as the acquired skills helped them contribute in their parent, church, and community roles. A recurring theme was their increased confidence to express their thoughts in group settings such as church and PTA.

The union official interviewed reported positive effects resulting from the memberships' participation in PET. His discussion included the reduction in grievances and the increased harmony between student/employees and their supervisors. Likewise, management reported
the positive comments from throughout the plant regarding PET participants. A most impressive response came from the first line supervisors. Even though some did not have current employees enrolled in PET, each supervisor interviewed had had an employee that attended PET at some time. Each one, first of all, reported the positive effect PET participation had on the employee's job performance. Secondly, and more importantly to them, the supervisors reported an improvement in the employees' attitude toward their work. As the union representative confirmed, an educated employee has more self-respect and is less likely to react defensively to the supervisor.

The school system staff members were pleased with PET for it enabled them to provide a much needed service that few other school systems offered to their supportive industrial neighbors. Finally, the PET staff report positive accounts of employee/students who benefited personally and professionally from their participation in PET.

This review of PET's "worth" notes the positive reactions of the various individuals and groups to PET. These positive reactions, coupled with the absence of criticism of PET, were representative of PET's worth to those who were directly or indirectly effected by it.

Summary

From the foreshadowed questions, the documents were reviewed and emergent questions integrated. The data derived was analyzed and a refined
set of questions was developed into interview schedules. The analysis section above recounts the result of that effort.

The following section entitled conclusions and recommendations presents the culmination of this evaluative effort. Therein the evidence is organized in such a way to be helpful to PET in improving their delivery of services and to be helpful to other cooperatives who might wish to gain insights into ABE and industry linkage.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the value of the Planters Employee Training (PET) Program. Value was measured by two criteria: merit and worth. This chapter presents the conclusions drawn from the analysis of the evidence presented regarding PET's worth to the stakeholder groups and PET's merit as measured by the external criteria. Where the conclusions reflect the need, recommendations are presented.

Worth

Worth, as defined in this study, refers to the value placed on the evaluand by those individuals who come in direct contact with it, i.e. the stakeholder group members. In a variety of interviews with the union executive, employees who were not PET students, upper level and first line management, employee/students, and school personnel, the positive feelings toward PET and its contribution to the employees' lives and the cooperating parties was unanimous. Evidence was given regarding the PET's benefit to the employees and to the stakeholder groups. Therefore, it is recommended that PET continue to provide its service.

Merit

This section focuses on the foreshadowed and emergent questions used to measure PET's merit. Because many standards were found to be met,
only those areas that require action to improve planning, operation, or monitoring are reported in this chapter. Because the problems influencing the standards were found to be interrelated, the areas have been collapsed into the following categories: (1) purpose, (2) administration, (3) instruction, and (4) relationships. Specific conclusions and recommendations are incorporated in the presentation of each

**Purpose**

The first category relates to the original intent for PET and the subsequent verbal and written changes that occurred. PET's overall purpose evolved from a specific pre-apprenticeship statement to a broad general education statement. The specific curriculum objective evolved from a trade-related emphasis to an academic one. Neither evolution was intentional. The first was an adjustment due to the influence of the union's requirement for seniority as a criteria for entrance to PET accompanied by the Virginia Department of Education's emphasis on recruiting beginning readers. The second, the curriculum evolution, was the result of poor communication of PET's intent during personnel changes which in a short period replaced all but one of the key actors. In the process of these two evolutions, the unique instructional opportunity of an adult basic education program housed in an industry was diminished.

The PET program with its forty instructional slots can not serve all the industry and employee needs. It cannot be all things to all who need educational services to improve their contributions to their livelihood and to the industry's livelihood. The industry has critical needs.
Recommendation. The PET staff should identify and examine those needs and choose those that PET can best serve. This effort requires reexamining PET's purpose on a regular basis in order to remain responsive to the needs of the employees and the industry. Recommendations regarding "how" these steps can be taken are addressed below in the section entitled "administration."

Administration

This review of the conclusions and recommendations regarding administrative procedures incorporates several areas of the preceding analysis including needs assessment, establishing objectives, staffing, planning, communications, and evaluation. As was evidenced in that the analysis section, there is a lack of clarity and direction regarding PET's administrative functions and procedures. Generally, PET's administrative structure needs time and attention from the cooperating parties. Several issues are involved.

The first issue is administrative isolation. During the interviews, the union executive reported that management was responsible for PET's administration. Management stated that the school system was "ninety-nine percent" in charge. The school system personnel reported and the PET Director concurred that the school system provided very little program supervision. The PET Director has been left in isolation to conduct the entire operation. That isolation coupled with unclear administrative procedures complicated that job.
The second issue involves data for decision making. An isolated administrator can survive if there is sufficient data on which to plan and make decisions. However, the PET operation had a limited needs assessment system to determine employee or industry needs from the variety of available sources including management, first line supervisors, union executives, shop stewards, employees, students, and PET staff. There are no written performance criteria and thereby no evaluation activities to provide evaluative data for the decision makers.

The result of (a) the miscommunicated expectations, (b) the absence of data on which to make decisions, coupled with (c) the staff's truncation from the plant resulted in an isolated, uninformed PET director. Clarified job responsibilities, coupled with a needs assessment and evaluation data system, would enhance PET's responsiveness to the instructional needs of the industry and its employees. In short, PET lacks an administrative support structure to provide information, supervision, and direction to the PET operation. Plans for policy development, planning, and staffing are needed.

**Recommendation.** Taking into consideration PET's context, a viable administrative support structure might include a Policy Board, an Advisory Committee, clarified staff responsibilities, and a data collection and analysis system.

The Policy Board would be composed of those who are fiscally and operationally responsible for PET's operation including the PET Director, Planters' Director of Personnel and Training, Suffolk Public Schools'
Coordinator of Adult and Vocational Education, and the President of the Union. The Policy Board responsibilities might include (1) meeting semiannually, (2) developing policy regarding PET operations, (3) communicating that policy to their respective boards and/or executives, and (4) securing endorsement of and commitment to that policy by their respective boards and/or executives.

The Advisory Committee would be composed of the various stakeholder groups including students, former students, first line supervisors, union stewards, and Suffolk Public Schools ABE teachers or advisory board members. Their responsibilities might include (1) to meet quarterly (2) to develop strategies to identify employee and plant needs, (3) to recommend performance criteria and performance measures to the Policy Committee, (4) to analyze and suggest improvements in administrative and instructional operations to the PET Director, and (5) to directly assist in recruitment and recognition activities.

Another facet of the responsibilities of these two administrative assistance committees is the development of data collection procedures to generate the information needed to make decisions and adjust program offerings. Those data collection procedures include both a systematic, multi-level needs assessment system, and a systematic evaluation procedure.

The needs assessment system should indicate the current and projected educational needs of the employees and the industry. The system should be multi-leveled in that it gathers data from employees, supervisors,
management, union, schools, and other programs in industry. The Advisory Committee should design and help implement the system. The PET Director should coordinate the system's implementation. The Advisory Committee should prioritize the needs identified and report them to the Policy Board for policy consideration.

The evaluation system assumes the development of performance criteria and measures for PET. The Advisory Committee would review the evaluation results and recommend corrective actions to the Policy Board.

These data collection and analysis processes add two critical components to PET's administration. Each data source, needs assessment and evaluation, offers the Policy Board information relative to the needed adjustments in the administrative and instructional components of PET's operation. Secondly, these strategies decrease the PET Director's isolation and provide that position with support and guidance.

Staffing, a third administrative issue that arose from the analysis, is characterized by ambiguity resulting from the scarcity of job qualification requirements and job descriptions, and verbal miscommunications of job expectations.

**Recommendation.** Job descriptions should be developed that reflect PET's responsiveness to the needs of the employees and the industry. That responsiveness requires that the staff, either director or teachers, be allocated time and resources to visit the plant's production areas (1) to analyze jobs or discuss with supervisors the educational needs fostered by integration of new machinery on the job, (2) to identify skills needed and to
develop the needed learning activities, and (3) recreate the informal communication system between PET and the supervisors. If the decision is made to convert to a competency based instructional program, the job descriptions should reflect the time and resource implications for the staff.

Participation, a fourth administrative issue, is critical. Employee enrollment in PET has waned to a point that PET has difficulty filling the forty possible slots available. The interviews indicated that no awareness problem exists. Interviews with employees found that they were familiar with PET. The first line supervisors know about the program and all those interviewed have had employees who participated in PET.

In attempts to increase participation, the PET Director has expended major effort on management's, especially first line supervisors', responsibility for encouraging employees to participate. However, this effort may have been misdirected. First, the supervisors are aware of PET and are supportive. Secondly, the supervisors reportedly are limited in what they can say to the employee or require of the employee due to the natural adversarial relationship between union and management and due to the procedures for bidding for jobs, disqualification from jobs, and the seniority system. There are complicated legal procedures that must be considered. Conversely, the union executive stated and the staff agreed that the shop steward is the person that the employee goes to for advice.

**Recommendation.** Thus, to encourage participation, effort should be directed to the stewards in addition to the supervisors. The staff reported in the metaevaluation that attempts to reach the union were unsuccessful.
It is recommended that the Advisory Committee give priority to union involvement strategies. Those Advisory Committee members who are also union members should use their affiliations to get access to the union board and to the membership. They should be the ones to contact the union leadership and make presentations to the board and the membership.

The students reported many fellow employees want to participate, but there are hindrances to participation that the current students experienced and others have reported to them. The first is image. PET has an "old type school" image characterized by students who must start in the primer, keep up with everyone else, and subject themselves to fellow students making fun of them when a mistake is made. These fears plus "pride," not wanting to let others know they are not educated, stand in the way. Once those obstacles are overcome, the students reported difficulty in "getting in the door" the first time. The staff has sought to dispel the "old school" image, but a renewed, concentrated effort is required and should be considered by the Advisory Committee.

Recommendations. Dispelling the myths and getting the employees in the door the first time presents the challenge for increasing participation. The first recommendation involves making the curriculum more visibly job-related. This recommendation returns the staff (teachers or director) to the plant's production areas, makes them visible, and better represents PET as job development rather than kindergarten.

A second suggestion supported by first line supervisors, current students, and PET staff reflects the strain placed on lower functioning
employees when new machinery is brought into the plant. The metrics, conversions from ounces to grams, and the abbreviations present a major problem. It is recommended, therefore, that PET offer short courses or "brush up sessions" much like the "floating slots" PET once provided.

Additionally, prior to new equipment coming into the plant, the PET staff should receive the manuals and develop the necessary math and vocabulary activities for the employees. This option meets a critical industry need and gets a employees "in the door" the first time to become acquainted with PET's operations.

In order to provide instruction to meet short term needs, staff training and responsibilities should be expanded to include curriculum development. Increased emphasis in this area will help to clarify PET's image.

To dispel the "kindergarten" stigma, the union members of the advisory committee and/or current an former students should be asked to make presentations at union meetings to clarify that PET students do not have to start in the primer, that enrollment is always open, that the instruction is individualized and self-paced.

Instruction

The curriculum issue, the fifth issue, is a matter of degrees. It focuses on the gradual evolution of the job-related, industry-responsive instructional format to a more standard academic format. The change was not intentional, but rather, was the result of inadequate communication of the intent of an inplant program to the new staff. Generally, the curriculum
needs to reemphasize the responsive, work-based format that involves the staff in developing reading and math, individualized and group instructional materials and activities that are related to the workers' jobs. Those materials and activities integrated into the basic academic curriculum increases the relevancy and responsiveness of the instruction.

Curriculum responsiveness also entails being responsive to the employees needs as a group. In that vein, this study's analysis surfaced three areas of instructional needs in Planters Peanuts: (1) long term basic skill development for the least educated employees, (2) short term in-depth education to meet changing job demands, and (3) adult secondary education for academically advanced employees.

The first is long term, basic skills education. Many employees did not receive much formal education when they were children because it was not available to them or they did not need it to go to work to support the family. In order for them to be safe workers and to maintain their current job, they must improve their basic skills.

Secondly, employees who need basic skills and others who possess only basic skills are facing technology entering their work area. These employees need short-term, in-depth instruction in a specific subject or subjects such as those identified by employees and supervisors in the interviews, i.e. metrics, converting ounces to grams, and abbreviations.

The third instructional need comes from those upper level employees who could become supervisors or shop stewards and want a GED certificate. They are more independent learners but need direction and encouragement.
It is PET's responsibility to examine these and the other educational needs of the employees and industry and determine which and to what extent to emphasize each.

**Recommendations.** To accommodate these and other plant needs, PET should, as discussed above, write staff job descriptions to include both teaching and curriculum development responsibilities. This effort fosters PET's responsiveness to the client needs. The director with the help of other resources should develop staff training in the curriculum development process for short term, skill-specific courses. Once their capabilities are formalized, a system to target promotion of this service to the first line supervisors, department heads, and shop stewards should be developed and implemented. Procedures should be developed by management to deliver this training. Also, procedures should be developed to let the PET Director know about new technology coming into the plant in order that the department head and supervisor can be involved in planning the skill development courses.

Several companies now market computer software to prepare students for the GED test. PET should investigate and incorporate computerized GED instruction for these more independent, motivated learners. The computers' presence in the PET classrooms will also enhance its image.

**Relationships**

The sixth issue is the relationship with the school system and the union. The school system issue was discussed earlier in two instances. First is the
need for stronger leadership from the school staff including the need for more careful new staff orientation to PET's intent. Second is PET's unnecessary isolation from the evening ABE program sponsored by the school system. As discussed in the analysis, the two programs are similar in many ways and could benefit from a professional relationship.

Recommendations. The school system should take the leadership in overseeing the involvement of the staff, the Advisory Committee, and Policy Board in the development of more definitive guidelines and performances standards. The schools should also give direction to the progress toward the performance standards.

A critical role the school system must play grows out of its role of hiring new staff for PET. History has shown the ease with which PET's unique attributes are miscommunicated to new staff. Therefore, the orientation of new key actors in the industry, the union, the advisory committee, or the school system becomes an important priority.

The recommendation also suggests that the two ABE programs under the direction of Suffolk Public Schools be merged under one supervisor. Joint preservice, inservice, and evaluative staff meetings should be the rule rather than the exception.

The final issue focuses on the limited interaction between PET and the union, UAW Local 26. The president is reportedly unresponsive to request from the PET Director for assistance. He would return no phone call from this study and sent the vice president for the interview. The absence of the union's involvement, much less its encouragement, is conspicuous.
Ironically, UAW-Ford developed a similar program for its membership and goes to great lengths to promote it. UAW Local 26 is largely responsible for initiating PET, but now scarcely recognizes its existence.

PET can and has served as a benefit to the undereducated union members. They reported in this study that participation has enriched their lives and made them better workers. Line supervisors have confirmed these reports. The union vice president recalled the decrease in grievances as a result of employees making fewer mistakes. More of the membership could benefit if the union would add its support and legitimize PET's existence. The employees look to the union for guidance.

The interview data regarding the union's involvement in PET is captured by one employee who stated that "union ain't involved. It's a management program." A multiple loss results. First, the union gets no credit for generating this rare employee benefit call PET. Secondly, the union loses potential leadership that could be developed through their membership's participation in PET. And most importantly, their membership loses because without the encouragement from the leadership they respect, the encouragement they need to overcome their own pride, they are hindered from participating.

**Recommendation.** The union involvement should become a priority issue for the Policy Board and the Advisory Committee. Each of those bodies should focus efforts on involving the union in PET activities.
Summary and Recommendations for Further Study

PET has made contributions to Planters Peanuts, the union, the school system, and to the employees. The purpose of this evaluation was to provide the information to assist the decision makers in expanding those contributions by improving service to the industry and its employees. By examining the analysis and recommendations cited above, those benefits can be extended. The leadership must come from the school system. The industry has expressed confidence in the schools ability to deliver the instruction necessary for their employees. The school system has expressed its intent to analyze this evaluation and actively seek to improve PET's delivery. Therein, this study will have accomplished its purpose.

Further studies that wish to use a design and methodology similar to the one in this study might wish to adjust the procedure somewhat. The first adjustment suggested by this investigator is a procedure suggested by Guba and Lincoln (1982) regarding interviewing key members of the stakeholder groups in the early stages of the study in attempts to involve them in identifying evaluation criteria. This process would have identified more quickly those measures of success that were important to the study.

A second adjustment is the metaevaluation process. This process allows those being evaluated a chance to review and react to the findings prior to their publication. In the case of this study, a series of documents that were overlooked during the document review were presented by the PET staff and the results of the study adjusted to reflect this evidence.
Though the process is time consuming, naturalistic evaluation has proven to be a valuable tool for adult basic education. This process should be employed in other settings and the system thereby improved to provide even more data for similar programs.
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Appendix A

Criteria for Evaluating Cooperative Adult Education Programs

(Moore, 1978, pp 9-23)
CRITERIA 1

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

AN ADULT COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM SHOULD BE BASED ON IDENTIFIED NEEDS (i.e., NEEDS ASSESSMENT)

Specific Statements

Identified needs are reviewed and revised as needed on a regular basis.

Needs are based on current information.

Learner needs are specified (i.e., in writing) in both career (i.e., vocational) and self-development areas.

Industry's human resources (i.e., manpower) needs are determined and specified in writing.

Information about local or regional programs, past or present, with similar purposes is identified and utilized.

DISCUSSION

One intent of this concern is that needs be identified, written and distributed to the cooperating parties prior to the setting of objectives. By "current" it is meant that the needs assessment is most useful if performed a relatively short period of time prior to the program start-up. In addition local manpower needs, another important aspect of a thorough needs assessment is the determination of the projected demand, both on a regional and national level, for persons who will be participating in the program. This point is of particular interest in programs which are of a skill training nature. In addition to basing needs on current information, care also should be taken that the information be reliable in that it reflects many points of view.
CRITERIA 2

OBJECTIVE SETTING

An adult cooperative education program should be based on specified objectives (i.e., written goals, purposes and desired outcomes)

Specific Statements

Both cooperating parties are involved in objective setting and review.

Objectives are flexible enough to allow for change based on feedback (i.e., evaluation).

Program objectives are related to identified needs.

Industry supervisors are involved in objective setting.

Objectives are formulated with participants or their representatives (i.e., past, present or potential participants) involved.

Program objectives are clearly stated and specified in writing.

Existing employee representative organizations (i.e., unions) are involved in objective setting.

DISCUSSION

An important theme in this concern is that there is input from a number of groups and individuals in the setting of objectives. It is especially important that participants and representatives of both cooperating parties be involved in the setting of objectives to avoid conflict at a later time in the programs.
CRITERIA 3

STAFFING

AN ADULT COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM SHOULD BE STAFFED (i.e., INSTRUCTORS, ADMINISTRATORS, ETC) WITH APPROPRIATE (i.e., PROGRAM RELATED EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING) PERSONNEL

Specific Statements

Instructors have on-the-job experience and competence in work areas (i.e., occupations) related to the program.

Instructors and all other staff have preparation/education (i.e., formal and informal, in-service) in adult learning.

Program personnel are replaced or given in-service training as program operations change.

All individuals working with the program are identified (i.e., listed) and their responsibilities are designated.

Job descriptions for instructors and all other program staff are listed.

Instructors and all other staff members have opportunity for professional development (i.e., in-service upgrading).

DISCUSSION

In addition to the importance of pre-program experience and education, this concern stresses the importance of in-service training opportunities for the program staff. This in-service type of updating may be supported by either of the cooperating parties and include instruction in: adult, academic and personal counseling, characteristics of the adult learner, and adult program planning. This additional training may have as one of its objectives the redirection of staff who might otherwise be replaced as a result of changes in program goals.
CRITERIA 4
PROCEDURES AND MATERIALS

AN ADULT COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM SHOULD UTILIZE PROCEDURES AND MATERIALS APPROPRIATE (i.e., SPECIFICALLY DESIGNED) FOR ADULTS

Specific Statements

The subject matter is related to program goals (i.e., purposes, objectives).

Materials (i.e., instructional materials) utilized in the program are appropriate (i.e., specifically designed) for adults.

Opportunities for student "hands-on" application (i.e., practical experience) is provided in the program especially in skill areas.

The physical facilities (i.e., classrooms, learning labs, equipment shops) are appropriate to the learning objectives.

Materials and equipment be assured (i.e., identified and procured) and available before the program is implemented.

Individual (i.e., individualized, self-paced) instruction is included in the program.

Procedures and materials used by instructors are related to employment experiences.

Participant objectives are stated in behavioral terms (i.e., functions or acts participants are required to perform).

There are specific (i.e., appropriate for adults) diagnostic (i.e., determines participants abilities) and placement procedures in the program.

Group instruction is included in the program.
DISCUSSION

The primary theme of this concern is that the materials (such as test, books, equipment, etc.) and methods (such as individualized instruction, etc.) all be specifically designed for and appropriate to the adult learner. In addition, all materials and equipment in skill training programs should be in good repair and representative of the type of equipment that the participant will be coming into contact with in any planned employment. Finally, this concern suggests that, where possible, diagnosis of participant abilities, aptitudes and motivations be made prior to placement in the program in order to maximize the chances for individual success. This diagnosis may be made in the form of tests, but other methods such as interviews may be used as well.
CRITERIA 5

PRE-PLANNING

AN ADULT COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM SHOULD BE BASED UPON AND SHOW EVIDENCE (i.e., DOCUMENTED, WRITTEN) OF PRE-STARTUP (i.e., PRE-PLANNING, ADVANCED PLANNING) ACTIVITIES

Specific Statements

Representatives of all cooperative organizations are involved in pre-startup activities.

Pre-startup activities are recorded in a document which could include: the overall program purpose; the time frame; budget; general benefit to participants; conditions, tasks, and responsibilities of cooperating agencies; how the program relates to cooperative organizations' goals; funding sources; and personnel requirements.

Potential participants or participant representatives (i.e., past, present, or potential participants) are involved in pre-startup activities.

If a labor organization or employee representative unit exists, it is involved in pre-startup activities.

Community representatives (i.e., agencies, groups or individuals related to program goals) are involved in pre-startup activities.

DISCUSSION

The document suggested by this concern may be of a formal or informal design, and could act as a guide to the program operation. Most important is that the efforts in this area of planning prior to program implementation be carried out with the inputs of all those groups and individuals who are likely to be affected by the program or are most interested in its outcomes.
CRITERIA 6

FUNDING

AN ADULT COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM SHOULD HAVE IDENTIFIED AND SPECIFIED (i.e., IN WRITING) ON-GOING SOURCES OF FUNDING AND MATERIALS

Specific Statements

There is a written contractual agreement between the cooperating agencies. Participants are advised of their personal program expenses (i.e., monetary, time, etc.).

"In-kind" (i.e., other than money, materials, facilities, or equipment) resources are identified and communicated (i.e., cooperating parties are made aware of) where appropriate.

DISCUSSION

As with any well run educational program, adult cooperative programs must be able to rely on identified and specified resources. Thus an agreement which spells out each of the parties' contributions to the program makes planning possible. "In-kind" here refers to any contributions made by the cooperating agencies which are not a part of the formal agreement. Also in-kind here refers to contributions made to the program by sources which are not members of the cooperative agreement.
CRITERIA 7  
ADMINISTRATIVE  

AN ADULT COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM SHOULD HAVE AN ADMINISTRATIVE COMPONENT (i.e., WITH INDIVIDUAL AND DESIGNATED AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY)

Specific Statements

There is an identifiable individual with responsibilities for coordination of all components and day-to-day operations such as selection/engaging of personnel and maintaining the program budget.

Administrative authority and responsibilities are specified (i.e., in writing) and communicated to all groups (i.e., cooperating parties, participants, supervisors, etc.).

There is an identifiable person responsible for each of the program components such as counseling, evaluation and communication.

There is an advisory committee made up of representatives of all affected groups (see discussion).

There is an identifiable (i.e., separate) program budget.

There are specified (i.e., written) procedures, agreed to by the cooperating parties, for selection of an individual to be in charge of the program.

Staff development (i.e., in-service, professional development) opportunities are specified in writing and related (i.e., communicated) to staff.

An effort is made to keep participant paper work (i.e., tests and forms) to a minimum.
A major intent in this concern is that there be an individual to which the cooperating parties, participant and other interested persons can turn to, and who has designated responsibility and authority for program implementation. The advisory group which would make recommendations to the program administrator may be made up of the following: representatives of the cooperating parties (the administrative person in charge may be an employee of one of these organizations), program staff, instructors, employee representatives organizations or unions, on-the-job supervisors where applicable and community agencies which are closely related to the program such as schools. This may not be a formal advisory panel but rather an information link with the various groups.
CRITERIA 8

JOB PLACEMENT

AN ADULT COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM SHOULD INCLUDE SPECIFIED (i.e., IN WRITING) PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES FOR PARTICIPANT JOB PLACEMENT

Specific Statements

Each participant is involved in (i.e., the awareness and opportunity to direct) his/her placement process.

There is a written plan describing the placement process.

The placement procedures are developed and changed when needed by the cooperating agencies.

Program participants are made aware of local and regional job opportunities and the process to learn of other positions.

The program advisory committee is involved in the development and implementation of the placement process.

DISCUSSION

Job placement in this concern may mean either securing a new position or job upgrading depending on the nature and intent of the program. By having the advisory committee involved in the design and implementation of the phase, a wide range of opportunities may be discovered.
CRITERIA 9

COMMUNICATIONS

AN ADULT COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM SHOULD PROVIDE FOR (i.e., PLAN AND IMPLEMENT) AN EFFECTIVE INTERNAL (i.e., PARTICIPANTS, STAFF, COOPERATING AGENCIES) AND EXTERNAL (i.e., INDUSTRY MANAGEMENT, EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVE GROUP, COMMUNITY, ETC.) COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

Specific Statements

There is a specific (i.e. written) plan for two-way communication involving all levels of the cooperating agencies.

The system encourages communication between participants and program personnel (see discussion).

Appropriate local, regional, and national organizations and agencies are periodically informed of program progress.

The system encourages oral as well as written communication.

Participants have access to and can review their educational records.

There is a budgeted item for the communication system.

DISCUSSION

The important communications between program personnel and participants ideally would keep the participant fully informed of the program's time and effort demands, expectations, work responsibility, changes and most importantly realistic career and personal development opportunities resulting from his/her participation. In addition, participants should be fully aware of the intent and the nature and degree of involvement on the part of the cooperating parties.
CRITERIA 10
EVALUATION

AN ADULT COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM SHOULD INCLUDE AN ON-GOING EVALUATION (i.e., PLANNED, PERIODIC, CONTINUOUS)

Specific Statements
Evaluation data indicate degree of objective attainment.
There is a written plan for evaluation data gathering and utilization.
Cost/benefit data are collected in evaluation.
All program components are monitored for (i.e., evaluated with regard to) their relationship to participant job placement.
There is provision for both internal (i.e., within the program) and external (i.e., third party) evaluation.
Participant and staff attitudes are noted in evaluation.
Program spinoffs (i.e., unanticipated benefits and liabilities) are evaluated.
Participant peers (i.e., fellow workers who are non-participants) attitudes (see discussion) are noted in evaluation.
The evaluation design utilizes techniques of experimental research (see discussion).
DISCUSSION

While evaluation will be determined by the individual information needs of the program, certain information may be helpful to all such efforts. Long range studies of the participant may indicate if the program is making any difference in their work, attitudes or development. This would tie into studies of industry turnover rates and job mobility. The attitudes of participants' fellow workers who are not in the program may point out if there are stigmas attached to participation or resentment of special treatment such as release time. The techniques of experimental research refer to the use of methods of data collection and analysis which produce defensible results as opposed to judgemental statements of program accomplishments.
CRITERIA 11
RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION

AN ADULT COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM SHOULD HAVE A SPECIFIED (i.e., IN WRITING) PROCESS FOR ACCEPTING (i.e., RECRUITMENT, SCREENING AND SELECTION) PARTICIPANTS

Specific Statements

Recruitment is implemented with the involvement of the cooperating agencies.

Recruitment information (i.e., advertising) clearly states participants's program benefits and responsibilities.

The program has a written recruitment plan.

Minimum qualifications for including participants in the program are specified (i.e., in writing).

Individuals not included in the program should be given reasons for non-selection.

DISCUSSION

Recruitment refers to any methods by which programs are made known to potential participants. Often, this takes the form of advertising. When programs are announced to potential participants it is important that information (accurately and honestly) describes the program, what the participants can expect to be the result if they complete the program, and what the intended outcomes are. Likewise, where a program has as an end result "new" employment, industry minimum requirements for placement need to be clearly stated.
CRITERIA 12

COUNSELING

AN ADULT COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM SHOULD PROVIDE EFFECTIVE (i.e., APPROPRIATE FOR ADULTS) COUNSELING SERVICES (i.e., ACADEMIC AND PERSONAL)

Specific Statements

All staff members are involved in providing (i.e., referrals to counseling services) counseling.

Counseling services are readily available (i.e., awareness and accessible) to program participants.

Program personnel involved in counseling have adequate preparation (i.e., education and experience) for working with adults.

A referral system (see discussion) is part of the counseling component.

Provisions are made to assist persons with learning and/or physical handicaps.

Both cooperating agencies are involved in (i.e., participate in the planning and execution of) the counseling services.

DISCUSSION

While all staff members may be involved in the process of counseling, that is identifying problem areas or referring participants, not all will act as counselors. It is a theme of this concern that a procedure be established by which supervisors, co-participants, staff members or others can refer participants who are experiencing problems to proper individuals. In addition, there may be mechanism whereby professional help can be sought by program staff for students with particular problems.
Appendix B

Sources of Data:

A Listing of Documents Reviewed and Persons Interviewed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT NUMBER</th>
<th>DOCUMENT NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-01-81</td>
<td>SUFFOLK PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ADULT BASIC EDUCATION APPLICATION FOR FY 81.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-02-81</td>
<td>COORDINATOR'S NARRATIVE REPORT, JUNE, 1981 These are final reports submitted by the coordinator to all cooperating parties at the end of each program year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-02-82</td>
<td>COORDINATOR'S NARRATIVE REPORT, JUNE, 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-02-83</td>
<td>COORDINATOR'S NARRATIVE REPORT, JUNE 6, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-02-84</td>
<td>COORDINATOR'S NARRATIVE REPORT, FY '84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-02-85</td>
<td>COORDINATOR'S NARRATIVE REPORT, FY '85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-02-86</td>
<td>COORDINATOR'S NARRATIVE REPORT, FY '86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-04-85</td>
<td>COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT between the cooperating parties. (It has not changed significantly over the life of the program. Financial data is not included. It is also entitled &quot;Staff Handbook&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-05-79</td>
<td>309 FULL PROPOSAL 'FY 79. &quot;Development of Planters Peanuts In-Plant Learning Center.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-05-80</td>
<td>309 FULL PROPOSAL 'FY 80. &quot;Cooperative Adult Basic Education Curriculum Development and Technical Assistance&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-06-79-1</td>
<td>309-79 FIRST QUARTERLY REPORT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-06-79-2</td>
<td>309-79 SECOND QUARTERLY REPORT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-06-79-3</td>
<td>309-79 THIRD QUARTERLY REPORT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-06-80-1</td>
<td>310-80 FIRST QUARTERLY REPORT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-06-80-2</td>
<td>310-80 SECOND QUARTERLY REPORT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-06-80-3</td>
<td>310-80 THIRD QUARTERLY REPORT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-07-80</td>
<td>310-80 FINAL REPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-07-79</td>
<td>309-79 FINAL REPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-10-79-A</td>
<td>PRE-PLANNING MEETING MEMORANDUM AND DOCUMENT FOR FY 79.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-10-79-B</td>
<td>MEMORANDUM AND REVISED PLANNING DOCUMENT--revised based on planning meeting using D-10-79-A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-10-80-A</td>
<td>PRE-PLANNING MEETING MEMORANDUM AND DOCUMENT FOR FY 80.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-EC1-111</td>
<td>Interview with an Employee/Completer--a former student who has completed PET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-EC2-90</td>
<td>Interview with an Employee/Completer--a former student who has completed PET.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-EC3-107</td>
<td>Interview with an Employee/Completer--a former student who has completed PET.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-EC4-143</td>
<td>Interview with an Employee/Completer--a former student who has completed PET.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-EC5-157</td>
<td>Interview with an Employee/Completer--a former student who has completed PET.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-EE1-192</td>
<td>Interview with Employees who had never been students in PET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-EN1-78</td>
<td>Interview with an Employee/Noncompleter--a former student who had dropped out of PET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-EN2-82</td>
<td>Interview with an Employee/Noncompleter--a former student who had dropped out of PET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-EN3-87</td>
<td>Interview with an Employee/Noncompleter--a former student who had dropped out of PET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-EN5-95</td>
<td>Interview with an Employee/Noncompleter--a former student who had dropped out of PET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-EN6-98</td>
<td>Interview with an Employee/Noncompleter--a former student who had dropped out of PET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-EN7-104</td>
<td>Interview with an Employee/Noncompleter--a former student who had dropped out of PET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-EN8-115</td>
<td>Interview with an Employee/Noncompleter--a former student who had dropped out of PET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
student who had dropped out of PET

I-ES1-119  Interview with an Employee/Student--a current student who is enrolled in PET

I-ES2-125  Interview with an Employee/Student--a current student who is enrolled in PET

I-ES3-129  Interview with an Employee/Student--a current student who is enrolled in PET

I-ES4-134  Interview with an Employee/Student--a current student who is enrolled in PET

I-ES5-138  Interview with an Employee/Student--a current student who is enrolled in PET

I-ES6-147  Interview with an Employee/Student--a current student who is enrolled in PET

I-ES7-150  Interview with an Employee/Student--a current student who is enrolled in PET

I-ES8-153  Interview with an Employee/Student--a current student who is enrolled in PET

I-ES9-162  Interview with an Employee/Student--a current student who is enrolled in PET

I-ES10-165 Interview with an Employee/Student--a current student who is enrolled in PET

I-ES11-168 Interview with an Employee/Student--a current student who is enrolled in PET

I-ES12-171 Interview with an Employee/Student--a current student who is enrolled in PET

I-ME-19  Interview with Management Executive--Director of Personnel

I-MS1-174  Telephone Interview with a Management Supervisor--a first line supervisor in the plant.

I-MS2-178  Telephone Interview with a Management Supervisor--a first line supervisor in the plant.
I-MS3-180  Telephone Interview with a Management Supervisor--a first line supervisor in the plant.

I-MS4-183  Telephone Interview with a Management Supervisor--a first line supervisor in the plant.

I-MS5-186  Telephone Interview with a Management Supervisor--a first line supervisor in the plant.

I-PD-1     Interview with PET Director/Coordinator

I-PT-31    Interview with the PET Teachers

I-SA-44    Interview with the School Systems Supervisor of ABE

I-SC-53    Interview with the School System's Coordinator of Adult and Vocational Education

I-SS-65    Interview with School System's Superintendent

I-UE-69    Interview with a Union Executive--the Vice President
Appendix C

Document Review Questions
ORIGINAL INTENT

1.0. OVERALL INTENT

(document title or interviewee and date)

WHAT IS PET'S PURPOSE?

WHAT BENEFIT IS IT SUPPOSED TO PERFORM FOR YOUR ORGANIZATION?

HOW DOES THE INTENT MATCH UP WITH THE ORGANIZATION'S GOALS?
ORIGINAL INTENT
1.1. READING AND MATH

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE PET STUDENTS IMPROVED THEIR READING AND MATH ABILITY?

EVIDENCE QUESTION

1. WHAT IS THE GRADE LEVEL DISTRIBUTIONS OF STUDENTS ENTERING PET?

2. WHAT IS THE GRADE LEVEL ADVANCEMENT FOR EACH ENROLLMENT LEVEL?
HOW DOES THE EDUCATIONAL ADVANCEMENT IN READING AND MATH COMPARE WITH THE SUFFOLK CITY EVENING PROGRAM?

**EVIDENCE QUESTION**

1. How does the data from Question #1 compare to similar data from Suffolk City's evening program?
1.3 PET VS STATE READING AND MATH

HOW DOES THE READING AND MATH ADVANCEMENT OF PET STUDENTS COMPARE WITH ADVANCEMENT OF ABE STUDENTS ACROSS THE STATE?

EVIDENCE QUESTION

1. HOW DOES THE DATA IN QUESTION # 1.1 COMPARE WITH SIMILAR STATE WIDE DATA?
ORIGINAL INTENT
1.4 NUMBER COMPLETED PET

HOW MANY STUDENTS HAVE COMPLETED PET?

EVIDENCE QUESTION

1. HOW MANY STUDENTS HAVE COMPLETED PET BY SCORING 9.0 OR BETTER ON A STANDARDIZED MATH AND READING TESTING INSTRUMENT?

2. AT WHAT GRADE LEVEL DID EACH BEGIN?

3. IS THERE AN INDICATION AS TO THE CHARACTERISTICS OF COMPLETERS VS NON COMPLETERS?
ORIGINAL INTENT
1.5-1.7 NUMBER ENTERED, PERFORMED AND COMPLETED APPRENTICESHIP

HOW MANY PET STUDENTS (COMPLETERS OR NON-COMPLETERS) ENTERED AN APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING PROGRAM?

EVIDENCE QUESTIONS

1. HOW MANY FORMER PET STUDENTS ENTERED APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING PROGRAMS?

2. HOW HAS THEIR PERFORMANCE IN THE APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING PROGRAMS COMPARED WITH NON-PET STUDENTS?

3. HOW MANY COMPLETED THE APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING PROGRAMS COMPARED TO NON-PET STUDENTS?
ON WHAT FOUNDATION IS THE PET PROGRAM BASED? HOW HAS IT BEEN ASSESSED AND PLANNED?

EVIDENCE QUESTIONS

1. **PROGRAM ASSUMPTIONS:** WHAT PROBLEM WAS PET ADDRESSING AND HOW DID THEY THINK PET COULD HELP SOLVE THAT PROBLEM?

2. **POLICY STATEMENT:** WERE THOSE ASSUMPTIONS TRANSPOSED INTO POLICY STATEMENTS AND, IF SO, BY WHOM?

3. **PROGRAM GOAL:** WHAT GOAL WAS ESTABLISHED FOR PET AND BY WHOM?

4. **CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES:** WHAT CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES WERE ESTABLISHED FOR PET AND BY WHOM?

5. **RESOURCES ALLOCATED AND NECESSARY:** WHAT RESOURCES WERE NECESSARY FOR PET AND WHAT WERE ALLOCATED?

6. **CONVERSION:** WHAT TRAINING, ORIENTATION, AND SCHEDULING ADJUSTMENTS WERE MADE TO ACCOMMODATE PET?
7. **PROCESSES:** WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESSES WERE PLANNED FOR PET?

8. **PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT:** HOW WAS PERFORMANCE TO BE ASSESSED AND BY WHOM?
CRITERIA
2.1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT

(discussion title or interviewee and date)

IS THE PROGRAM BASED ON SPECIFIED NEEDS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>QUESTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>HAS A NEEDS ASSESSMENT BEEN DONE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>IS A NEEDS ASSESSMENT PROPOSED?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>DOES THE PROCESS INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>REVISIONS OF PROGRAM OPERATION BASED ON IDENTIFIED NEEDS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>IDENTIFICATION OF LEARNER CAREER DEVELOPMENT NEEDS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>IDENTIFICATION OF LEARNER SELF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>IDENTIFICATION OF THE INDUSTRIES HUMAN RESOURCE (MANPOWER) NEEDS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>IDENTIFICATION OF PET STAFF NEEDS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>USE OF PREVIOUS EVALUATIVE DATA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>USE OF DATA FROM SIMILAR PROGRAMS?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H. USE OF EXPERTS?
CRITERIA
2.2. OBJECTIVE SETTING

IS THE PROGRAM BASED ON SPECIFIED OBJECTIVES?

EVIDENCE QUESTIONS

1. HAVE THE OBJECTIVES OF PET BEEN IDENTIFIED?

2. WHAT ARE THEY?

3. WHO DEVELOPED THEM?

4. WERE ALL COOPERATING PARTIES INVOLVED IN DEVELOPING OR REVIEWING THEM?

5. ARE THEY FLEXIBLE TO ADJUST TO FEEDBACK?

6. ARE THEY RELATED TO IDENTIFIED NEEDS?

7. WERE THE FOLLOWING GROUPS INVOLVED IN DEVELOPMENT AND OR REVIEW?
   A. LINE SUPERVISORS
   
   B. PARTICIPANTS (PAST OR PRESENT)
   
   C. UNION REPRESENTATIVES
CRITERIA
2.3. STAFFING

DO ADMINISTRATIVE AND INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF HAVE THE APROPRIATE EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING? IF NOT, IS TRAINING PROVIDED AFTER EMPLOYMENT?

EVIDENCE QUESTIONS

1. DO DOCUMENTS IDENTIFY JOB QUALIFICATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF?

2. DO JOB QUALIFICATIONS FOR UNFILLED POSTITIONS AND VITAS OF PRESENT STAFF REFLECT THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENT:
   A. A KNOWLEDGE OF ADULT LEARNING?
   B. EXPERIENCE IN TEACHING UNDEREDUCATED ADULTS?
   C. INDUSTRIAL EXPERIENCE?

3. IS PRESERVICE TRAINING PROVIDED?

4. IS INSERVICE TRAINING PROVIDED?

5. ARE STAFF EVALUATED AND SELF DEVELOPMENT PLANS DEVELOPED TO IMPROVE SKILL DEFICIENCIES?
CRITERIA

2.4. PROCEDURES AND MATERIALS

ARE MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES APPROPRIATE FOR ADULTS?

EVIDENCE

QUESTIONS

1. IS THE SUBJECT MATTER RELATED TO PROGRAM GOALS?

2. IS THE SUBJECT MATTER RELATE TO THE INDIVIDUAL'S GOALS?

3. ARE THE MATERIALS UTILIZED SPECIFICALLY DESIGNED FOR ADULT USE?

4. ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENT "HANDS ON" APPLICATION PROVIDED.

5. ARE THE PHYSICAL FACILITIES APPROPRIATE FOR ADULTS?

6. ARE THE PHYSICAL FACILITIES APPROPRIATE FOR THE OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM?

7. MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT ARE AVAILABLE BEFORE THE PROGRAM IS IMPLEMENTED?
8. Instruction is individualized and self-paced?

9. Procedures and materials are related to employment experiences?

10. Participant objectives are stated in behavioral or student competency terms (i.e., functions and acts participants are required to perform).

11. Diagnostic and placement procedures and materials are appropriate for adults?

12. Group instruction is included in the program to improve verbal communication and problem solving skills?
CRITERIA

2.5. PRE-PLANNING

THERE SHOULD BE EVIDENCE OF PRE-IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING INVOLVING ALL PARTIES.

EVIDENCE QUESTIONS

1. ARE REPRESENTATIVES FROM ALL COOPERATIVE ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED IN PRE-STARTUP ACTIVITIES?

2. DO PRE-PLANNING ACTIVITIES INCLUDE THE DETERMINATION OF THE FOLLOWING:
   A. THE OVERALL PROGRAM PURPOSE?
   B. THE PROGRAM TIME FRAME?
   C. BUDGET?
   D. BENEFIT TO PARTICIPANTS?
   E. CONDITIONS, TASKS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COOPERATING AGENCIES?
   F. HOW THE PROGRAM RELATES TO COOPERATIVE ORGANIZATIONS' GOALS?
   G. FUNDING SOURCES?
   H. PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS?

3. ARE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FOLLOWING INVOLVED IN THE PRE-PLANNING ACTIVITIES:
A. PARTICIPANTS?
B. UNION?
C. OTHER STAKEHOLDER GROUPS
CRITERIA
2.6. FUNDING

ARE ON-GOING SOURCES OF FUNDING AND MATERIALS IDENTIFIED?

EVIDENCE QUESTIONS

1. IS THERE A WRITTEN CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COOPERATING AGENCIES?

2. ARE "IN-KIND" RESOURCES IDENTIFIED COMMUNICATED?
IS THERE AN ADMINISTRATIVE COMPONENT THAT IDENTIFIES INDIVIDUAL AND DESIGNATED AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY?

EVIDENCE QUESTION

1. IS THE AN IDENTIFIABLE INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATION, DAY-TO-DAY OPERATIONS, PERSONNEL AND BUDGET?

2. ADMIN. RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY IS SPECIFIED AND COMMUNICATED TO ALL GROUPS?

3. IS THERE AN IDENTIFIABLE PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR EACH PROGRAM COMPONENT SUCH AS COUNSELING, EVALUATION AND COMMUNICATION?

4. IS THERE AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MADE UP OF REPRESENTATIVES OF ALL AFFECTED GROUPS?

5. IS THERE AN IDENTIFIABLE, SEPARATE PROGRAM BUDGET?

6. ARE THERE SPECIFIED, WRITTEN PROCEDURES AGREED TO BY THE COOPERATING PARTIES, FOR SELECTION OF AN INDIVIDUAL TO BE IN CHARGE OF THE PROGRAM?
7. **IS AN EFFORT MADE TO KEEP PARTICIPANT PAPER WORK (I.E. TESTS AND FORMS) TO A MINIMUM?**
CRITERIA
2.8. JOB PLACEMENT

ARE THERE SPECIFIED, WRITTEN PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES FOR PARTICIPANT JOB PLACEMENT?

EVIDENCE QUESTIONS

1. IS EACH PARTICIPANT INVOLVED IN (I.E., THE AWARENESS AND OPPORTUNITY TO DIRECT) HIS/HER PLACEMENT PROCESS?

2. IS THERE A WRITTEN PLAN DESCRIBING THE PLACEMENT PROCESS?

3. WERE THE PLACEMENT PROCEDURES DEVELOPED AND ARE THEY CHANGED WHEN NEEDED BY THE COOPERATING AGENCIES?

4. ARE PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS MADE AWARE OF LOCAL AND REGIONAL JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND THE PROCESS TO LEARN OF OTHER POSITIONS?

5. IS THE PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE INVOLVED IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTAION OF THE PLACEMENT PROCESS?

6. HAVE PARTICIPANTS BEEN PLACED ON UPGRADED JOBS?
CRITERIA
2.9. COMMUNICATIONS

(document title or interviewee and date)

DOES PET PLAN AND IMPLEMENT AN EFFECTIVE INTERNAL (I.E., PARTICIPANTS, STAFF COOPERATING AGENCIES) AND EXTERNAL (I.E., INDUSTRY MANAGEMENT, EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVE GROUP, COMMUNITY, ETC.) COMMUNICATION SYSTEM.

EVIDENCE QUESTION

1. IS THERE A SPECIFIED, WRITTEN PLAN FOR TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION INVOLVING ALL THE LEVELS OF THE COOPERATING AGENCIES?

2. DO INTAKE PROCEDURES INCLUDE DISCUSSIONS OF DEMANDS, EXPECTATIONS, RESPONSIBILITIES AND REALISTIC CAREER OUTCOMES OF PARTICIPATION?

3. DOES CLASSROOM AND STAFFING ORGANIZATION CREATE TIME FOR STAFF/PARTICIPANTS COMMUNICATION REGARDING EXPECTATIONS, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND PROGRESS?

4. ARE APPROPRIATE LOCAL, REGIONAL, AND NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS PERIODICALLY INFORMED OF PROGRAM PROGRESS?

5. DOES THE SYSTEM ENCOURAGE ORAL AS WELL AS WRITTEN COMMUNICATION?

6. DOES THE SYSTEM ENCOURAGE INFORMAL AS WELL AS FORMAL COMMUNICATIONS?
7. **DO PARTICIPANTS HAVE ACCESS TO AND CAN REVIEW THEIR EDUCATIONAL RECORDS?**

8. **IS THERE A BUDGETED ITEM FOR THE COMMUNICATION SYSTEM?**
CRITERIA
2.10. EVALUATION

(document title or interviewee and date)

IS THERE PLANNED, PERIODIC, CONTINUOUS EVALUATION OF PET?

EVIDENCE QUESTION

1. DOES EVALUATION DATA INDICATE DEGREE OF OBJECTIVE ATTAINMENT?

2. IS THERE A WRITTEN PLAN FOR EVALUATION DATA GATHERING AND UTILIZATION?

3. ARE COST/BENEFIT DATA COLLECTED?

4. ARE ALL PROGRAM COMPONENTS MONITORED FOR THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO PARTICIPANT JOB PLACEMENT?

5. IS THERE PROVISION FOR BOTH INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL EVALUATION?

6. ARE PARTICIPANT AND STAFF ATTITUDES NOTED?

7. ARE UNANTICIPATED BENEFITS AND LIABILITIES EVALUATED?

8. ARE THE ATTITUDES OF FELLOW WORKERS WHO ARE NON-PARTICIPANTS NOTED?
9. ARE EVALUATION DESIGNS DEFENSIBLE?
CRITERIA

2.11. RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION

ARE THERE SPECIFIED, WRITTEN PROCESSES FOR RECRUITING, SCREENING AND SELECTING PARTICIPANTS?

EVIDENCE QUESTIONS

1. ARE ALL THE COOPERATING PARTIES INVOLVED IN RECRUITMENT?

2. DOES RECRUITMENT INFORMATION CLEARLY STATE PARTICIPANT'S BENEFITS AND RESPONSIBILITIES?

3. DOES THE PROGRAM HAVE A WRITTEN RECRUITMENT PLAN?

4. DOES THAT PLAN INCLUDES THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF EACH OF THE COOPERATING AGENCIES AND IS IT AGREED TO BY ALL THE AGENCIES?

5. ARE MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS FOR INCLUDING PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROGRAM SPECIFIED IN WRITING?

6. ARE INDIVIDUALS NOT INCLUDED IN THE PROGRAM GIVEN REASONS FOR NON-SELECTION?
CRITERIA
2.12. COUNSELING

ARE ADULT ORIENTED ACADEMIC AND PERSONAL COUNSELING SERVICES PROVIDED?

EVIDENCE QUESTION

1. ARE ALL STAFF MEMBERS INVOLVED IN PROVIDING COUNSELING?

2. ARE COUNSELING SERVICES READILY AVAILABLE (i.e., AWARENESS AND ACCESSIBILITY) TO PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS?

3. DO PROGRAM PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN COUNSELING HAVE ADEQUATE PREPARATION (i.e., EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE) FOR WORKING WITH ADULTS?

4. IS A REFERRAL SYSTEM PART OF THE COUNSELING COMPONENT?

5. ARE PROVISIONS MADE TO ASSIST PERSONS WITH LEARNING AND/OR PHYSICAL HANDICAPS?

6. ARE ALL COOPERATING PARTIES INVOLVED IN (i.e., PARTICIPATE IN THE PLANNING AND EXECUTION OF) THE COUNSELING SERVICES?
1. WHAT UNINTENTIONAL POSITIVE EFFECTS HAS PET HAD ON INDIVIDUALS AT PLANTER?

2. WHAT UNINTENTIONAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS HAS PET HAD ON INDIVIDUALS AT PLANTERS?

3. WHAT UNINTENTIONAL POSITIVE EFFECTS HAS PET HAD ON PLANTERS AS AN INDUSTRY?

4. WHAT UNINTENTIONAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS HAS PET HAD ON PLANTERS AS AN INDUSTRY?
5.0 EMERGING QUESTIONS

WHAT ISSUES, CONCERNS, OR QUESTIONS HAVE EMERGED DURING THE DATA COLLECTION THAT NEED TO BE INCLUDED?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>QUESTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix D

Emergent Questions
EMERGENT QUESTIONS

The following questions were generated as a result of the first phase of the evaluation of the Planters Employee Training Program. Except for one, these questions will be answered by way of open-ended interview with the stakeholder group members. The one exception is a presented first below.

FROM DOCUMENTATION:

1. STUDENT LEARNING: Questions remain regarding student academic advancement and job related learning while in PET.

   Source: Teacher Registers stored at the public schools warehouse.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS:

1. INSTRUCTION: Is instruction trade related or academic? Documentation over the period of the program emphasized trade related instruction early in the program. Since the new teacher/coordinator has begun, little mention has been made. Emphasis has been reported in attendance awards and other more academic rewards.
2. PROGRAM SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION: The project director (aka teacher/coordinator) seems to be able to do as she pleases. The advisory committee meets once a year to receive a report but seems to have no ongoing involvement. The public school ABE supervisor who on paper is her supervisor does not seem to be involved. With unclear objectives and no performance measures, there seems to be a sparsity of input, needs assessment and direction.

3. POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EFFECTS: Has PET had any positive and negative unintentional effects on the individuals involved in the program and on the organizations involved in the program?

4. POLICY: What is each organizations formal policy regarding PET?

5. GOALS: What are each organizations goals for PET and how does each hope to benefit by being involved in PET?

6. CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES: What are each organizations instructional objectives for PET? What do they think or hope the students are learning?
7. RESOURCES: What is each organization's level of resource commitment to PET?

8. PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENT: On a regular basis, what does each organization see as performance standards that PET should meet?

9. RELATIONSHIP WITH ABE: What is the relationship with the evening Adult Basic Education program in Suffolk? Both are in the same business but there seems to be little communication between the two.

10. QUALIFICATIONS FOR STAFF: The documentation revealed no job qualifications for any staff. Are there job descriptions? Do they require and do present staff possess (a) industrial experience and (b) adult education experience. Is each staff member given a complete orientation to the plant and have contact people or other sources of information about the plant been identified and made available to them on a standing basis? Is inservice provided periodically for identified staff development needs?

11. COUNSELING: The documentation made no mention of counseling services provided for students. Are counseling
services provided in the plant or by the union? Do teachers schedule time for counseling students? Do they do any counseling? Have they been trained in counseling? Do they know where to refer those in need of professional help? Is counseling considered a part of their job?

12. THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE: The documentation and observations indicate that the advisory committee meets once a year at the end of the year to hear the coordinator's report. Little opportunity is given for input in a meaningful way. How do the members view their role? Have they made recommendations in the past and to what result? Do they feel they have enough information about the workings of PET? Do they feel they have enough involvement?
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