

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 488

AC 012 496

AUTHOR Dutton, Donnie; And Others  
TITLE ABE Staff Development in Middle Tennessee.  
INSTITUTION Memphis State Univ., Tenn.  
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education  
(DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.  
PUB DATE Apr 72  
NOTE 39p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29  
DESCRIPTORS \*Adult Basic Education; Data Analysis; Evaluation  
Techniques; \*Participant Satisfaction; Professional  
Personnel; \*Program Evaluation; Questionnaires;  
Resource Materials; \*Staff Improvement; Supervisors;  
Teachers; \*Workshops

IDENTIFIERS \*Tennessee

## ABSTRACT

The overall effectiveness of the educational experiences provided at three Middle Tennessee ABE workshops was determined. Two instruments were used to collect data from approximately 300 adult basic education personnel from all counties in Middle Tennessee; these instruments were a questionnaire and an evaluation scale. The participants' responses are presented under Profile of the Participants, Physical Facilities, Objectives, Program, Strengths, Weaknesses, and Overall Rating. Analysis of the data shows that the three workshops were successful. Appendixes present a list of Staff and Resource Persons, the Program, a List of Participants, and Evaluation Forms. (DB)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG  
INATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN  
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY  
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU  
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 061488

# ABE STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN MIDDLE TENNESSEE

By

DONNIE DUTTON  
PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR  
ADULT EDUCATION  
MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY  
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

LUKE EASTER  
REGIONAL SUPERVISOR  
ADULT EDUCATION  
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

CHARLES HOLT  
REGIONAL SUPERVISOR  
ADULT EDUCATION  
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LAWRENCEBURG, TENNESSEE

SPONSORED BY

BUREAU OF ADULT, VOCATIONAL, AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION  
OF THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
TENNESSEE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD  
TENNESSEE TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY  
MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY  
MIDDLE TENNESSEE LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS

APRIL, 1972  
MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY  
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

964-0012-496

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to express their appreciation to the many resource persons mentioned elsewhere in this document for their assistance in providing the instruction at these workshops.

Special appreciation is acknowledged for assistance provided by the following persons in arranging the workshops:

1. Dr. D. B. Pockat, Dean, College of Education, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, Tennessee.
2. Mr. Marshall Foster, Director of Adult Education, Davidson County-Nashville Metro School System, Nashville, Tennessee.
3. Dr. O. C. Stewart, Dean of Extended Services, Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee.

A special note of thanks is due Linda Balentine, Adult Education Stenographer, Memphis State University, and Louise Fitzgerald and Janele Holt, Adult Education Secretaries, State Department of Education, Nashville, Tennessee, for typing the materials used in this study and the typing of the study itself.

---

*The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a Grant from the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.*



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. . . . .	ii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Background	
Purpose of Study	
Methodology	
Hypotheses	
II. PRESENTATION OF DATA BY ITEM . . . . .	6
Profile of the Participants	
Physical Facilities	
Objectives	
Program	
Strengths of Workshops	
Weaknesses of Workshops	
Overall Rating	
III. SUMMARY . . . . .	17
Appendices	
A. STAFF AND RESOURCE PERSONS . . . . .	20
B. PROGRAM . . . . .	23
C. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS . . . . .	25
D. EVALUATION FORMS . . . . .	31

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

In implementing one phase of the Tennessee concept of staff development, three adult basic education institutes were held in the Summer of 1971. These were all two-week institutes and carried graduate credit. They were as follows:

1. Guidance and Counseling, Tennessee State University, June 14-25, 1971.
2. Materials, Memphis State University, July 5-16, 1971.
3. Reading, University of Tennessee, July 19-30, 1971.

Approximately thirty ABE teachers and supervisors attended each of the institutes, with the thirty being allocated in the following manner: ten each from East, Middle, and West Tennessee. The rationale underlying this distribution was to place trained personnel in all three content areas in every region of the State of Tennessee to serve as resource persons for local programs.

Another phase of the overall staff development plan was to conduct one-day workshops across the State of Tennessee during the 1971-72 academic year. Those workshops were to serve as a dissemination device for acquainting all ABE personnel in Tennessee with what transpired in these institutes--the multiplier effect. Furthermore, the persons

trained at the institutes were to serve as resource persons in conducting these workshops. Three such workshops were conducted in Middle Tennessee at the following locations and on the following dates:

1. West End Junior High School, Nashville, Tennessee, December 11, 1971 (referred to in the remainder of this document simply as Nashville).
2. Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, Tennessee, December 13, 1971.
3. Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee, January 29, 1972.

The primary objective of the three workshops was to acquaint the participants with what transpired in the summer institutes in order that they might be cognizant of the resources that are available to them as they encounter problems in local programs.

Specifically, those participants attending the summer institute on guidance and counseling were provided with learning experiences to assist them in developing the ability to:

1. Assist adults in planning programs that will enable them to capitalize on their interests, strengths, and weaknesses as they pursue their educational and/or vocational goals.
2. Provide the individual assistance in planning an educational program based on his capacity, interests, and potential designed to help acquire the competencies and skills that will assist him in seeking solutions to personal and community problems.
3. Provide a setting in which the individual seeking assistance is able to develop sufficient insight and self-understanding so that he can make his own decisions and select procedures that will lead to solution of his problems in a personally satisfying and socially acceptable manner.

Specifically, those participants attending the institute on materials were provided with learning experiences to assist them in developing the ability to:

1. Evaluate commercial materials based upon recognized accepted principles of material evaluation.
2. Develop materials suitable for use in local ABE classrooms.
3. Use commercial newspapers in the various instructional areas--reading, language arts, math, social studies, etc.

Specifically, those participants attending the institute on reading were provided with learning experiences to assist them in developing the ability to:

1. Increase their understanding of the subject of reading as related to word attack and comprehension skills.
2. Develop skill in diagnosing reading difficulties and placing students in reading programs.
3. Increase their competency in the selection and evaluation of reading materials.
4. Incorporate reading skills into other curriculum areas in ABE.

#### Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the overall effectiveness of the educational experiences provided at the three Middle Tennessee ABE workshops conducted December 11, 1971, December 18, 1971, and January 29, 1972, excluding an objective measure of gain in knowledge.

#### Methodology

##### Source of Data

The population used in this study was local adult basic education personnel from all the counties in Middle Tennessee. Responsibility

for recruitment and planning was assumed by the State Department of Education's Adult Education Staff and Local ABE Program Supervisors. Approximately three hundred persons, excluding staff and consultants, attended these sessions.

#### Collection of Data

Two instruments were used to collect the data for this study. The first was a questionnaire designed to obtain demographic data and participant reaction to the various facets of the workshop.

The second instrument was an evaluation scale developed by Russell Kropp and Coolie Verner.<sup>1</sup> According to its authors, it appears to be a valid instrument for obtaining overall participant reaction to a short-term workshop. The scale consists of twenty items arranged in rank order of value, with item number one being the best thing that could be checked, item number two, the second best, and so on, with item number twenty, the least favorable response.

#### Statistical Technique

It was not the intent of the writers to make any generalizations to a broader population; therefore, no inferential statistics were used. Only arithmetical means and percentages were employed.

---

<sup>1</sup>Russell Kropp and Coolie Verner, "An Attitude Scale Technique for Evaluating Meetings," Adult Education, Volume III, No. 4 (Spring, 1957), pp. 212-215.



Hypotheses

In the absence of any attempt to generalize to a broader population and the deletion of any statistical technique designed to test significant differences between variables, no hypotheses were formulated.

## CHAPTER II

### PRESENTATION OF DATA BY ITEM

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the responses to the items in the questionnaire and to the Kropp-Verner Scale. It will consist of the following sections:

1. Profile of the participants.
2. Physical facilities.
3. Objectives.
4. Program.
5. Strengths.
6. Weaknesses.
7. Overall rating.

#### Profile of the Participants

Relative to the profile of the participants attending the workshops, the following distributions were noted:

	<u>TTU<sup>1</sup></u> <u>Per Cent</u>	<u>MTSU<sup>2</sup></u> <u>Per Cent</u>	<u>N<sup>3</sup></u> <u>Per Cent</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Per Cent</u>
1. <u>Sex</u>				
Male	49.09	33.33	39.45	39.37
Female	50.91	66.67	60.55	60.63
Total	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>
2. <u>Age</u>				
Less than 35	13.13	17.98	42.20	28.46
35 and over	81.82	82.02	57.80	71.54
Total	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>

---

1, 2, 3TTU refers to the workshop held at Tennessee Technological University; MTSU refers to the workshop held at Middle Tennessee State University; N refers to the workshop held at Nashville.

	<u>TTU</u> Per Cent	<u>MTSU</u> Per Cent	<u>N</u> Per Cent	<u>Total</u> Per Cent
3. <u>Race</u>				
White	94.44	78.89	63.30	75.49
Non White	5.56	21.11	36.70	24.51
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
4. <u>Education</u>				
Less than Master's	69.81	68.54	55.56	63.20
Master's or more	30.19	31.46	44.44	36.80
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
5. <u>ABE Experience</u>				
Less than 1 year	25.92	34.00	18.52	24.06
1-3 years	27.78	36.00	47.22	39.62
More than 3 years	46.30	30.00	34.26	36.32
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
6. <u>ABE Position</u>				
Supervisor	23.64	16.67	6.54	13.89
Teacher	76.36	83.33	93.46	86.11
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

#### Physical Facilities

Relative to the physical facilities provided, the following ratings were obtained out of a maximum potential positive score of 5.00.<sup>4</sup>

	<u>TTU</u>	<u>MTSU</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Adequate space was provided for large group meetings.	4.36	4.21	4.29	4.28
2. Adequate space was provided for small group discussions.	4.35	4.22	4.17	4.22
3. The meeting facilities were conducive to learning.	4.44	4.12	4.27	4.25

<sup>4</sup>These ratings were based on the following scale:

- 5=Strongly agree
- 4=Agree
- 3=Undecided
- 2=Disagree
- 1=Strongly disagree

Objectives

Relative to the feedback pertaining to objectives of the workshops, the following ratings were received out of a maximum potential positive score of 5.00.<sup>5</sup>

	<u>TTU</u>	<u>MTSU</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. The objectives were relevant to the needs of the participants.	4.35	4.06	4.14	4.15
2. The objectives were clearly defined to the participants.	4.20	3.99	3.93	4.01
3. Adequate time was available for the objectives to be realized.	3.00	3.47	3.84	3.52

Program

Relative to the program conducted at the workshops, the following ratings were received out of a maximum potential positive score of 5.00.<sup>6</sup>

	<u>TTU</u>	<u>MTSU</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. The content was relevant to my needs.	4.09	3.93	4.09	4.03
2. The program was in line with the stated objectives.	4.07	4.04	4.09	4.07
3. The content was such that it answered questions that concerned me relative to my job.	4.06	4.08	3.89	4.00

---

<sup>5</sup>These ratings were based on the following scale:

- 5=Strongly agree
- 4=Agree
- 3=Undecided
- 2=Disagree
- 1=Strongly disagree

<sup>6</sup>The ratings were based on the same scale as in Footnote 5.



## Strengths of Workshops

### Tennessee Technological University

The strengths of the workshop at Tennessee Technological University, as listed by the participants, were as follows:

1. Competent leaders and instructors (22 responses).
2. The main speaker was excellent (10 responses).
3. Usefulness of material presented since it related to ABE teachers' needs (10 responses).
4. Provided an awareness of what others are doing in ABE (8 responses).
5. Was well planned (8 responses).
6. Guidance and reading (6 responses).
7. Question and answer sessions (3 responses).
8. Meeting place was excellent; hospitality extended by hosting institution (3 responses).
9. Small group discussion (2 responses).
10. Information presented on materials (2 responses).
11. Can do a better job of recruiting; better understand our students (2 responses).
12. Provided me with greater insight into the program.
13. Helped me to examine again the objectives of ABE; also encouraged me to strive to improve my teaching.
14. Helped me to evaluate my own strengths and weaknesses; much 'food for thought' and future improvement.

### Middle Tennessee State University

The strengths of the workshop at Middle Tennessee State University,

as listed by the participants, were as follows:

1. Competent consultants and instructors (28 responses).
2. Reading session (13 responses).
3. Materials session (12 responses).
4. Well planned and organized (11 responses).
5. Gained new ideas from instructors and other ABE teachers (10 responses).
6. Content met the needs of ABE teachers (3 responses).
7. Small group discussion (5 responses).
8. Inspired me to do a better job (5 responses).
9. Guidance and counseling, including recruitment and retention (4 responses).
10. Meeting place and overall atmosphere good (2 responses).
11. Participation by participants.

### Nashville

The strengths of the workshop at Nashville, as listed by the participants, were as follows:

1. Competent consultants and instructors (41 responses).
2. Small group discussions (16 responses).
3. Materials session (13 responses).
4. Well planned and organized (12 responses).
5. Content covered was related to my needs (11 responses).
6. Guidance and counseling, including recruitment and retention (9 responses).
7. Learned some new techniques (7 responses).
8. Exchange of ideas with other teachers (5 responses).

9. Reading (5 responses).
10. Participant involvement (5 responses).
11. Each participant allowed to choose group session (2 responses).
12. Made aware of problems that exist in general manner.

#### Weaknesses of Workshops

##### Tennessee Technological University

The weaknesses of the workshop at Tennessee Technological University, as listed by the participants, were as follows:

1. Lack of time (31 responses).
2. None (4 responses).
3. Need to examine more materials (2 responses).
4. Too many materials to be examined.
5. Need more information on testing.
6. Tried to cover too much.
7. Dinner was put off too long.

##### Middle Tennessee State University

The weaknesses of the workshop at Middle Tennessee State University, as listed by the participants, were as follows:

1. Lack of time (23 responses).
2. None (7 responses).
3. Materials session needed strengthening (6 responses).
4. The building was spacious but heating poor (2 responses).

5. Too near Christmas (2 responses).
6. Guidance session; participation not encouraged (2 responses).
7. Reading session.
8. Math.
9. Social studies.
10. Repetition of previous program.
11. Instruction in class was not as well organized as could have been.
12. Too many canned talks and not enough people that have actually been in the field.
13. Did not tell what to do in separate cases.
14. Unable to see overhead projector.
15. Oversimplification of problems; idealism spoken of as actual when it probably is not possible.
16. Too much sitting; more committee work to discuss other adult education classes in Middle Tennessee.

### Nashville

The weaknesses of the workshop at Nashville, as listed by the participants, were as follows:

1. Lack of time (18 responses).
2. None (10 responses).
3. Would liked to have visited the other consultants' presentations (7 responses).
4. Need more specifics (5 responses).
5. Difficult to hear the speakers in the auditorium (5 responses).
6. Persons from other counties seemed to be excluded--problems and discussion unrelated to them (2 responses).



7. Too long (2 responses).
8. Began too early.
9. Speaker should have been first on the program so that after small group discussions we could have regrouped and discussed.
10. Less speeches and more time to actually prepare something instead of being told how.
11. Attempted too wide an area, better to cover a smaller area in greater depth than to skim--leaves a frustrated feeling of unanswered questions.
12. My instructor did not give enough time to important things; time schedule was not followed and was confusing.
13. Would like to have had a choice of group attended.
14. Lack of practical involvement.
15. Refreshments were not ready.
16. Too lengthy in general meeting.
17. Introductory directions unclear.
18. Interest area leader spent too much time on introduction and, hence, did not finish material (reading) to be covered.
19. Lack of participation by those attending.
20. Sessions not geared to what the teacher would like.
21. My group did not stick with objective; guidance raised questions but no answers.
22. Too much "speaking"; not enough idea exchanging; did not meet my personal needs.
23. Some speakers qualified in profession; however, not all can relate effectively what they know (lack of speaking skills).
24. Need more material.
25. Nothing practical--just "lofty" psychological learning factors; needed more give and take in our group meetings and less lectures.

26. In some areas, group discussions wandered too far from my areas of interest.
27. Lack of prior preparation.
28. Held on Saturday.
29. Not being able to obtain the benefit or hear reports of other group meetings.
30. Quality of leadership.
31. Not enough breaks.
32. More individual sharing.
33. Breaks lasted too long; our group wasted thirty minutes.
34. Small group facilities.
35. Tight scheduling.
36. Resource person in my group.
37. Not enough directness in making points in small group.
38. Time of year.
39. No clearly defined objectives.
40. Too much time in certain sections.
41. "Set-up" for coffee break less than desirable.
42. Lack of discussion and exchange of ideas.
43. My attention span is shorter than 1 1/2 hours.
44. The length of the meeting seems to exceed the time one is able to enthusiastically participate.
45. No opportunity to share in experiences; meeting on Sabbath Day.
46. There was no need to have an hour speaker that talked about a topic of comparing adults to children; the techniques are different for adults!
47. Did not take handicapped into consideration.

Overall Rating

Three measures were taken in an attempt to measure the overall value ascribed to the ABE workshops. The first of these was the participants' reaction to the statement: As a result of the in-service, I feel that I will now be better able to perform my job more satisfactorily. Available responses for their selection were strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree. Out of a maximum possible score of 5.00, the value ascribed to this item was 4.19 for those participants attending at Tennessee Technological University, 4.01 for those attending at Middle Tennessee State University, and 4.10 for those attending at Nashville. The combined total was 4.13.<sup>7</sup>

The second measure taken was the participants' reaction to the statement: My overall rating for the in-service is very high, high, medium, low, or very low. Out of a maximum possible score of 5.00, the value ascribed to this item was 4.43 for those participants attending at Tennessee Technological University, 4.07 for those attending at Middle Tennessee State University, and 4.15 for those attending at Nashville. The combined total was 4.14.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>These ratings were based on the following scale:

- 5=Strongly agree
- 4=Agree
- 3=Undecided
- 2=Disagree
- 1=Strongly disagree

<sup>8</sup>These ratings were based on the following scale:

- 5=Very high
- 4=High
- 3=Medium
- 2=Low
- 1=Very low

The third measure taken was the participants' reaction to the workshops as measured by the Kropp-Verner Scale. The ratings of the participants were analyzed, and the obtained weighted mean, according to values on the Kropp-Verner Scale, was 3.35 for those participants attending at Tennessee Technological University, 3.60 for those attending at Middle Tennessee State University, and 3.65 for those attending at Nashville (the lower the score, the better the workshop as viewed by the participants; the maximum desirable score is 1.13 and the least desirable score is 10.89). The combined rating for all three workshops was 3.56. The 3.56 rating placed the value of the workshops in Middle Tennessee at approximately item five on the Kropp-Verner Scale, which means that there were fifteen less favorable responses below the mean rating but only four more favorable ones above.



## CHAPTER III

### SUMMARY

As one peruses the various evaluative data presented in this study, it should become evident that the three workshops were successful. Most of the items received a 4.00 rating or higher out of a maximum potential of 5.00.<sup>1</sup> This plus the participants' comments relative to strengths and weaknesses resulted in this conclusion. Possibly, the major problem that evolved was that of trying to accomplish "too much in too short a time." This should be considered in future formulation and implementation of staff development activities.

---

<sup>1</sup>This does not include the Kropp-Verner Scale rating which is measured in a reverse manner; i.e., the lower the score the better the rating. It proved to be reflective of a successful endeavor also.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

STAFF AND  
RESOURCE PERSONS

Tennessee Technological University Workshop

Mrs. Sophia Brotherton  
Memphis State University  
Memphis, Tennessee

Mr. Charles Holt  
Adult Education Supervisor  
State Department of Education  
Lawrenceburg, Tennessee

Dr. Edward T. Brown  
Director, ABE Project  
Southern Regional Education Bd.  
Atlanta, Georgia

Mr. Charles Kerr  
Coordinator of Adult Education  
State Department of Education  
Nashville, Tennessee

Mr. Luke Easter  
Adult Education Supervisor  
State Department of Education  
Nashville, Tennessee

Miss Deotha Malone  
Sumner County Schools  
Gallatin, Tennessee

Mrs. Flora Fowler  
East Tennessee State University  
Johnson City, Tennessee

Miss Ruby Spear  
Lawrence County Schools  
Lawrenceburg, Tennessee

Dr. O. C. Stewart, Dean  
Division of Extended Services  
Tennessee Technological University  
Cookeville, Tennessee

Middle Tennessee State University

Dr. Leonard Breen  
University of Tennessee  
Knoxville, Tennessee

Mrs. Flora Fowler  
East Tennessee State University  
Johnson City, Tennessee

Mr. Luke Easter  
Adult Education Supervisor  
State Department of Education  
Nashville, Tennessee

Mr. Charles W. Holt  
Adult Education Supervisor  
State Department of Education  
Lawrenceburg, Tennessee

Mrs. Joan Ford  
Bristol City Schools  
Bristol, Tennessee

Mr. Charles Kerr  
Coordinator of Adult Education  
State Department of Education  
Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. D. B. Pockat, Dean  
College of Education  
Middle Tennessee State University  
Murfreesboro, Tennessee

Dr. Charles Sams, Supervisor  
Pupil Personnel Services  
State Department of Education  
Nashville, Tennessee

Nashville

Mr. Howard Allen  
Nashville, Tennessee

Mr. Charles Holt  
Adult Education Supervisor  
State Department of Education  
Lawrenceburg, Tennessee

Mr. Ray Baker  
Riverbend School  
Nashville, Tennessee

Mr. Charles Kerr  
Coordinator of Adult Education  
State Department of Education  
Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. Edward T. Brown  
Director, ABE Project  
Southern Regional Education Bd.  
Atlanta, Georgia

Miss Deotha Malone  
Sumner County Schools  
Gallatin, Tennessee

Mrs. Sophia Brotherton  
Memphis State University  
Memphis, Tennessee

Mrs. Sallye J. Moore  
Montgomery County-Clarksville  
Clarksville, Tennessee

Mr. Luke Easter  
Adult Education Supervisor  
State Department of Education  
Nashville, Tennessee

Miss Ruby Spear  
Lawrence County  
Lawrenceburg, Tennessee

Mr. Marshall Foster  
Director of Adult Education  
Davidson County-Nashville  
Metro Schools  
Nashville, Tennessee

Mr. Jim Wright  
Nashville, Tennessee

**APPENDIX B**



ABE IN--SERVICE\*  
DECEMBER 11, 1971  
WEST END JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL  
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

Program

Registration . . . . .	8:00 - 8:20
Welcome . . . . .	8:20 - 8:25
Administration . . . . .	8:25 - 8:30
Interest Sessions . . . . .	8:30 - 11:30
Reading Address . . . . .	11:30 - 12:30
Lunch . . . . .	12:30 - 1:30

---

\*The programs at the other two workshops followed this same format.

APPENDIX C

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Tennessee Technological University

Eledsoe County

Norma Jean Panky

Clay County

Geneva Bartlett  
Wanda Meadows  
Tim Reecer  
Eldon B. Scott  
Carl Walker  
Lillian White

Cumberland County

Everett L. Gibson  
Cora Lee Jewell  
Norene Padgett

Dekalb County

Phillip Ashburn  
Woodrow Frazier  
James McGinnis

Fentress County

Virgil V. Easley  
O. O. Frogge  
Ruble Upchurch  
Luther B. Wilkinson  
Eugene Wright

Macon County

Philena Blankenship  
Lucille Jenkins  
E. B. Krantz

Overton County

Mary M. Beard  
Steve Daniels  
Charles B. Davis  
Edwin S. Garrett  
Glen H. Masters  
Billy Joe Officer  
Hugh L. Ogletree  
Benny Smith  
William E. Smith

Pickett County

Luther E. Brooks

Putnam County

Goodwin Harding  
Charles Looper  
Elaine Patton  
Retta Sells  
J. G. Shelley

Smith County

Louise Sharenberger  
Eleanor Smotherman  
Odell Winfree

Warren County

Synda Ruth Batey  
Elsie Sue Cowell  
Katherine David  
Mary G. Higginbotham  
Peggy Jennings  
Thedra Newby  
Larry Rich  
Rad Spivey  
Maxine Winton

White County

Laurabel Cloyd  
Powell Hipsher  
Beulah Johnson  
T. L. Leonard  
Frances Looney  
Frances Marriott  
Lee Milligan  
Ruby Sparkman  
Martha Speck  
Mamie Sorell  
Pauline Walker  
Fay Wallace  
Robertta L. Warren

Others Attending

Jim Andrews  
 Charles Bates  
 Luke Easter  
 Flora Fowler  
 Billy Glover  
 Charles Holt

Tom Jones  
 Charles Kerr  
 Deotha Malone  
 Allen Peters  
 Mutt Quillen  
 Ruby Spear

O. C. Stewart

Middle Tennessee State University WorkshopCoffee County

Melvin Duke  
 Roy Perry  
 Elaine Umbarger

Franklin County

Lois Acklen  
 Elizabeth Baker  
 Thelma Brazier  
 Bethel Clark  
 Gilbert Clark  
 Lola Clark  
 Louise Dement  
 John Hunt  
 Fayna Kennedy  
 Katrine Kolodjizky  
 Ruth Langford  
 Mary London  
 Ethelene Lujan  
 Connie Partin  
 Patty Priest  
 Agnes Sargent  
 Annie Shedd  
 Peggy Soderham  
 Richard Soderham  
 Juanita Syler  
 Becky Templeton  
 Mildred Trayvick

Giles County

Alice Coleman  
 Dalcie Crenshaw  
 J. R. McClure  
 James L. Wood

Grundy County

Mike Bryant  
 James Campbell  
 Kathleen Jones  
 Nannie Kilgore  
 S. H. Northcutt  
 Henrietta Ray  
 Lynda Schoenmann  
 Carl Shetter  
 Patsy Tucker

Lawrence County

Horace Alsup  
 Hughes Cheatwood  
 Martha Crawford  
 Joseph Douglas  
 B. H. Hardwick  
 Ruby Spear  
 James Story  
 Mary Sutton  
 Dwight Woods

Lincoln County

Melvin Allison  
 Geda Craig  
 John Taylor  
 Lois White

Marion County

Mary Anderson  
 Sandra Anderson  
 Bob Colston  
 Ruth Deakins  
 Edna Graham

Marion County (cont.)

Jo Dean Humphreys  
 Patricia Lambart  
 Allie McConnell  
 Ann Metz  
 Fred Morrison  
 Edna Pickett  
 John Shelby  
 Blanche Turner  
 Lynn Yound

Marshall County

Earl Barnes  
 Linda Ledford  
 Mrs. Robert Mason  
 Elaine Wilson

Maury County

Douglas Burton  
 Edward Kimes  
 James Peebles  
 Joan Spencer  
 Hittie Taylor  
 Ruth Whitaker  
 Mattie Wright

Moore County

Kathleen Smith  
 Helene Wiseman

Rutherford County

Susan Barnes  
 Preston Blakney  
 Mary Butler  
 Frances Carlson  
 Fruzzie Foster  
 Margaret Hitt  
 Geneva Johnson  
 Patricia Kownslar  
 Quindal Lane  
 Myrtle Lord  
 Barbara Meacham  
 Jim Neely  
 Ronald Richmond  
 Elizabeth Robinson  
 Joe Troop  
 Jim Tune  
 Queen Washington  
 Marie Witherspoon  
 Annie Zackery

Tullahoma City

Dean Allison  
 Mildred Bennett  
 Harry McDonald

Wayne County

Pauline Dixon  
 Marietta Lay  
 Ethel McWilliams  
 Eva Smith

Williamson County

Don Calvert  
 Margaret Cunningham  
 Henry Hardison  
 Ed Slayton  
 Mrs. H. L. Watson

Wilson County

Gracie Lou Garrett  
 Floyd Graham  
 Homer Smith

Others Attending

Jim Andrews  
 Luke Easter  
 Joan Ford  
 Flora Fowler  
 Charles Holt  
 Tom Jones  
 Charles Kerr  
 Allen Pettus  
 D. B. Pockat  
 Charles Sams

NashvilleDavidson County

Howard Allen  
 Jacqueline Baker  
 Jewell Baker  
 Ray Baker  
 Catherine Barbee  
 Victoria Barefoot  
 Sharron Bell  
 Victoria Bell  
 Edwin Bohanon  
 Minnie Brazleton  
 Carolyn Bridges  
 Edith Brooks  
 Barbara Brown  
 Beth Brown  
 June Brown  
 Ann Bryant  
 Dena Buktenica  
 Eunice Campbell  
 Kenneth Clay  
 William Crawford  
 James Crowder  
 Susan Crowder  
 Mackie Driver  
 Nannie Driver  
 Norman Edwards  
 Virginia Frazier  
 Marshall Foster  
 Mary Goldman  
 Mary Hamby  
 Donna Hase  
 Sedley Hassel  
 Ann Haynes  
 Franklin Jones  
 Mary Jones  
 Mary Koory  
 Gladys Lawrence  
 Edwina Lee  
 R. E. Lee  
 Ruth Loftin  
 Joan Lovell  
 Patricia Maclin  
 Sadie Madry  
 Richard McMillen  
 Connie Moore

Nancy Officer  
 W. J. Officer  
 Ann Parker  
 Mary Parrish  
 Bettye Payne  
 John Ponder  
 Hugh Raines  
 Bobbie Ray  
 Barbara Richards  
 Iva Robertson  
 Emmett Scott  
 Joe Seibert  
 Barbara Shelton  
 Leara Simmons  
 Margaret Sims  
 Patricia Sisemore  
 Arnold Smith  
 Lynda Smith  
 Howell Sparks  
 Mildred Starks  
 Elizabeth Stewart  
 Judith Stockton  
 Ann Sullivan  
 James Thompson  
 Ronald Turner  
 Jerre Vaughn  
 Joan Walker  
 Florence Weiland  
 Ella Wilkins  
 Catherine Woodson  
 James E. Wright  
 Jim Wright

Houston County

George Alsobrooks  
 Raymond Blair

Humphreys County

John Larkin  
 Gloria Logan  
 Andrew Stitt

Lawrence County

Ruby Spear



Montgomery County-Clarksville

W. C. Cowan  
 Marty Darnell  
 Norman England  
 Arthur Hunt  
 Marianne Jacumin  
 Lettie Kendall  
 Mrs. M. D. Moon  
 Sallye J. Moore  
 Flora Richbourg  
 Mrs. M. B. Sleight  
 Marie Stephenson  
 John Wilson

Perry County

Ronnie Graves  
 Sarah Lyon

Robertson County

Billy Carneal  
 Sylvia Malone  
 Joe Morris  
 Nora Payne  
 Jim Sutes  
 Clayton Sykes  
 Bert Tolleson  
 Hugh Traugher  
 Harriett Villines

Stewart County

Merle Chance

Sumner County

Frank Brinkley  
 James Epperson  
 Larry Foxall  
 General Freed  
 Hazel Hall  
 Ronnie Holderfield  
 Anna B. Ligon  
 Deotha Malone  
 Henry Roark  
 Carrie Smith  
 Inez Upton  
 Linda Webster  
 Nellie Yokley

Others Attending

Jim Andrews  
 George Brooks  
 Sophia Brotherton  
 William Brotherton  
 Luke Easter  
 Charles Holt  
 Mildred Hurley  
 Tom Jones  
 Allen Pettus  
 Toni Powell  
 Olen B. Wall

**APPENDIX D**

TENNESSEE REGIONAL IN-SERVICE  
1971-72

PERSONAL DATA

1. SEX

\_\_\_\_\_ Male

\_\_\_\_\_ Female

2. AGE

\_\_\_\_\_ Less than 35

\_\_\_\_\_ 35 and over

3. RACE

\_\_\_\_\_ White

\_\_\_\_\_ Non White

4. DEGREE PRESENTLY HELD

\_\_\_\_\_ Less than Master's

\_\_\_\_\_ Master's or more

5. ACTUAL TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN ABE

\_\_\_\_\_ Less than 1 academic year

\_\_\_\_\_ 1-3 academic years

\_\_\_\_\_ More than 3 academic years

6. ABE POSITION HELD

\_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_ Teacher

7. PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT

\_\_\_\_\_ West Tennessee (Glover)

\_\_\_\_\_ Middle Tennessee (Easter & Holt)

\_\_\_\_\_ East Tennessee (Bates)

\*\*\*\*\*

Following are some statements with which you may agree or disagree. There are no correct or incorrect answers so feel free to express your feelings. Please give us your own opinion about these items by circling the answer that best describes how you feel. Also, a blank is provided after each statement for any written comments that you may care to make.

PHYSICAL FACILITIES

8. ADEQUATE SPACE WAS PROVIDED FOR LARGE GROUP MEETINGS.

Strongly Agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

9. ADEQUATE SPACE WAS PROVIDED FOR SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS.

Strongly Agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

10. THE MEETING FACILITIES WERE CONDUCIVE TO LEARNING.

Strongly Agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

OBJECTIVES

11. THE OBJECTIVES OF THE IN-SERVICE WERE RELEVANT TO THE NEEDS OF THE PARTICIPANTS.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

---

12. THE OBJECTIVES OF THE IN-SERVICE WERE CLEARLY DEFINED TO THE PARTICIPANTS.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

---

13. ADEQUATE TIME WAS AVAILABLE FOR THE OBJECTIVES OF THE IN-SERVICE TO BE REALIZED.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

---

PROGRAM

14. THE CONTENT OF THE IN-SERVICE WAS RELEVANT TO MY NEEDS.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

---

15. THE PROGRAM WAS IN LINE WITH THE STATED OBJECTIVES OF THE IN-SERVICE.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-----------	----------	----------------------

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

---

16. THE CONTENT OF THE IN-SERVICE WAS SUCH THAT IT ANSWERED QUESTIONS THAT CONCERNED ME RELATIVE TO MY JOB.

Strongly Agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

EVALUATION

17. AS A RESULT OF THE IN-SERVICE, I FEEL THAT I WILL NOW BE BETTER ABLE TO PERFORM MY JOB MORE SATISFACTORILY.

Strongly Agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

18. MY OVERALL RATING FOR THE IN-SERVICE IS:

Very High      High      Medium      Low      Very Low

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*

Please complete the following items:

19. Identify the greatest overall strengths of the In-service.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



20. Identify the greatest overall weaknesses of the In-service.

---



---



---



---

21. What topics do you feel need to be covered in future in-service sessions?

---



---



---



---

22. Following is a list of the major topics that participants attending the summer institutes at Memphis State, Tennessee State, and UT this past summer indicated that should be covered in future two-week institutes. Please add any additional ones that you feel are important and rank them in order of importance by placing a 1 by the one most important, a 2 by the one of second importance, etc.

- Guidance and Counseling \_\_\_\_\_
- Recruitment and Retention \_\_\_\_\_
- Teaching of Reading \_\_\_\_\_
- Materials Selection & Development \_\_\_\_\_
- Principles of Curriculum Development \_\_\_\_\_
- Adult Learning Centers \_\_\_\_\_

23. Did you attend a two-week institute this past summer?

- Yes
- No

KROPP-VERNER EVALUATION SCALE\*

Please follow directions carefully: Read all twenty of the following statements. Check as many statements as necessary to describe your reaction to the Institute.

1.  It was one of the most rewarding experiences I have ever had.
2.  Exactly what I wanted.
3.  I hope we can have another one in the near future.
4.  It provided the kind of experience that I can apply to my own situation.
5.  It helped me personally.
6.  It solved some problems for me.
7.  I think it served its purpose.
8.  It had some merits.
9.  It was fair.
10.  It was neither very good nor very poor.
11.  I was mildly disappointed.
12.  It was not exactly what I needed.
13.  It was too general.
14.  I am not taking any new ideas away.
15.  It didn't hold my interest.
16.  It was much too superficial.
17.  I leave dissatisfied.
18.  It was very poorly planned.
19.  I didn't learn a thing.
20.  It was a complete waste of time.

\*Dr. R. Kropp and Dr. C. Verner, Florida State University

(If you wish, add any comments on reverse side of this page.)

36

39

ERIC Clearinghouse

MAY 11 1972

on Adult Education