



Ohio's Project IDEAL Annual Report Fiscal Year 2004-2005

In Brief

This report presents the objectives and outcomes of the third year of Ohio's exploratory project in distance learning for Adult Basic and Literacy Education (ABLE) students. This experiment was developed and implemented under a grant funded by the Ohio Department of Education (ODE), Adult Basic and Literacy Education (ABLE) Office. The project was administered by the Ohio Literacy Resource Center (OLRC) and managed by the Distance Learning Coordinator at the OLRC. The OLRC collaborated with many other key personnel throughout the year. A list of key personnel and advisors is included in Appendix C.

The OLRC in collaboration with the ODE ABLE Office, and the Ohio Literacy Network (OLN) has worked with seven ABLE programs to establish, develop, and explore the delivery of distance-learning instruction in Ohio ABLE programs. This initiative has been conducted in conjunction with the national Project IDEAL Distance Learning Project. Project IDEAL is a multi-state consortium coordinated by staff at the University of Michigan.

In Ohio, during Fiscal Year 2004-05, Project IDEAL provided an opportunity for seven ABLE-funded pilot sites to develop and expand services beyond the classroom, through distance education using *GED Connection* on-line instruction, videos, and workbooks, *Pre-GED Connection* and *SkillsTutor*. Descriptive data about implementation and teaching practices, as well as quantitative data concerning the enrollment and retention rates of distance education students, were gathered.

The Issues

Ohio wanted to continue to explore the potential of distance education for adult learners and reflect on issues related to successful implementation and teaching at a distance, by expanding services and integrating distance education in the Adult Basic and Literacy Education (ABLE) programs. In addition, Ohio wanted to continue to observe "what works" and "what doesn't work" in regards to serving adult learners, as well as gain insight into the amount of teacher and administrator time required when working with adult learners at a distance. For the first year and a half, the seven pilots offered GED instruction at a distance for students residing in their demographic area. Prior to the beginning of the FY 2004-05 project year, pilots expressed an interest in expanding their curriculum, offering to address the learning needs of students not yet ready to study for the GED. Thus, during the FY 2004-05 program year, *SkillsTutor* and *Pre-GED Connection* were made available to the pilot agencies.

Lastly, Ohio continued to explore the role of professional development in creating a pool of skilled distance educators by providing:

- Distance Learning 101: Teaching Adult Learners at a Distance, a course offered through its involvement in Project IDEAL to all new Project IDEAL instructors and,
- Distance Learning 102: Virtual Study Groups, a follow-up course to Distance Learning 101, which is also offered through its involvement in Project IDEAL. All experienced Project IDEAL

instructors in Ohio who took Distance Learning 101 during Fiscal Year 2003-04 were required to take Distance Learning during Fiscal Year 2004-05.

- Distance Learning D103: Evaluating Resources for Pre GED and GED Resources, a follow-up course to Distance Learning 102, Virtual Study Groups, which is also offered, through its involvement in Project IDEAL. All experienced Project IDEAL instructors in Ohio who took Distance Learning 102 during Fiscal Year 2003-04 were required to take Distance Learning D103 during Fiscal Year 2004-05.

Agency Participation and Recruitment Goals

Ohio renewed funding for the seven ABLE-funded Project IDEAL pilot sites who participated in the second year of the pilot project. These pilot sites were funded to continue to develop, implement, and expand distance education using *GED Connection* on-line instruction, videos and workbooks, *Pre-GED Connection* and *SkillsTutor*. The seven Project IDEAL sites were asked to complete and submit a continuation proposal that demonstrated "satisfactory completion" of the fiscal year 2004 pilot project, by having met project requirements, including the following:

- Attempted to recruit target number of students
- Completed and submitted requested surveys and reports in a timely manner
- Participated in conference calls and meetings associated with Project IDEAL

The recruitment target for each pilot site ranged from 20-80 students with the population of the local site taken into consideration. The target number could include active *GED Connection* students who were working at a distance as of June 30, 2004, and who were planning to participate in the distance project September 2004.

Fourteen teachers and seven administrators at the seven pilot sites participated in the FY 2004 – 05 efforts. A list of the sites and personnel participating in the third year's efforts is included in Appendix C.

Timeframe

The distance learning implementation period for the third year ran from July 2004, to June 2005, and included use of all three components of the *GED Connection* curriculum, *Pre-GED Connection* and *SkillsTutor*. **Please note:** Implementation period begins with the month when teachers were trained and ends when the state declares the current year's distance experiment ends. Instructional period begins when teachers first began recruiting students to study at a distance and ends when the Implementation period ends.

Table 1. Timeline for Fiscal year 2004-05

Date	Product or Activity
August 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continuation proposal due ▪ Approval notification sent to pilot sites ▪ DLC, along with representative from Ohio Department of Education, Pilot site Administrator and Instructor attended a week long meeting/workshop for Project IDEAL in Ann Arbor, Michigan
September 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pilot sites began recruiting distance learners
October 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pilot sites continue recruiting distance learners ▪ Pilot sites begin orienting and teaching distance learners ▪ Panel presentation at Fall Directors' meeting
November 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pilot sites participated in conference call with Donna Walter (U of M) to discuss requirements and expectations of uploading files using new On-line Data system ▪ Pilot sites continue recruiting, orienting and teaching distance learners
December 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pilot sites continue recruiting, orienting and teaching distance learners ▪ Pilot sites continued collecting and submitting data to IDEAL's On-line Data System
January 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pilot sites continue recruiting, orienting and teaching distance learners ▪ Pilot sites continued collecting and submitting data to IDEAL's On-line Data System
February 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pilot sites continue recruiting, orienting and teaching distance learners ▪ Pilot sites continued collecting and submitting data to IDEAL's On-line Data System
March 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pilot sites continue recruiting, orienting and teaching distance learners ▪ Pilot sites continued collecting and submitting data to IDEAL's On-line Data System
April 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pilot sites continue recruiting, orienting and teaching distance learners ▪ Pilot sites continued collecting and submitting data to IDEAL's On-line Data System ▪ Distance Learning 101: Teaching Adult Learners at a Distance started for new instructors and/or administrators ▪ Distance Learning 102: Virtual Study Group D102 cycle D started, a follow-up course to Distance Learning 101 ▪ Distance Learning D103: Evaluating Resources for Pre GED and GED Resources started, a follow-up course to Distance Learning 102 ▪ IDEAL Advisory Board met to discuss project, next steps, future plans etc.
May 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pilot sites continued teaching distance learners ▪ Pilot sites continued collecting and submitting data to IDEAL's On-line Data System ▪ Distance Learning D103: Evaluating Resources for Pre GED and GED Resources ends ▪ IDEAL Coordinators/Administrators Meeting with DLC and ODE-ABLE Consultant
June 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pilot sites continued collecting and submitting data to the IDEAL's On-line System (LAST SUBMISSION FOR FY 2004-05) ▪ Distance Learning 102: Virtual Study Group D102 cycle D ends ▪ Distance Learning 101: Teaching Adult Learners at a Distance ends ▪ Pilot sites gathered for one-day wrap-up session to discuss issues and

	<p>concerns around Project IDEAL for year three</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IDEAL Partnership Proposals (Distance Learning Hubs) RFPs sent to pilot sites
July 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Key Personnel met with University of Michigan, Project IDEAL representative in Columbus to discuss next steps and future plans for distance implementation in Ohio
August 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IDEAL Partnership Proposals (Distance Learning Hubs) RFPs due to ODE Adult Basic and Literacy Education Office ▪ ESOL IDEAL RFPs mailed to EL/Civics Grant Recipients ▪ ODE-ABLE Consultant and IDEAL trainer attended meeting/workshop for Project IDEAL in Ann Arbor, Michigan

***DLC: Distance Learning Coordinator**

Data Collected

Data from the pilot sites was collected using several methods. The pilot sites participated in conference calls and attended face-to-face meetings, maintained information about their learners, reported NRS data on students and completed surveys about their experience as distance students, educators and administrators. Each of these methods provided insights into the process of implementing the Distance Education Pilot Program within the state.

Qualitative Data

From September 2004–June 2005, pilots participated in two conference calls and two face-to-face meetings. These activities were designed to:

- Provide an overview of IDEAL’s On-line Data System
- Allow pilots to share lessons learned to date, as well as discuss issues and concerns
- Provide a forum in which teachers and administrators could share information and provide support for each other’s efforts
- Provide a forum where administrators could discuss issues and concerns pertaining to the project (i.e. employees, scheduling, compensation etc.)
- Explore larger issues related to the goal of integrating distance education into the program’s adult education environment

Quantitative Data

Teachers collected several types of quantitative data. At the time of intake, data including NRS demographic descriptors, learner goals, and base-line test scores on a standardized test were recorded for each learner.

On a monthly basis, teachers input information about their distance students to the Project IDEAL’s Online Data Collection system located at <http://seattime.projectideal.org>. This system enables teachers to record seat time, demographic information, goal and assessment data for each of their distance students. This year teachers had the option of placing students in two different curricula and data was collected that demonstrated retention and seat time. Also, in late spring of 2005, teachers and administrators completed surveys in which they described their experience and assessed the worth of the distance program. The Project IDEAL Support Center at the University of Michigan organized and analyzed the data. The information below contains the key findings.

Findings: Learner Demographics

Pilot sites recruited **336** distance learners; **329** of those learners (**98%**) were considered enrolled. Enrolled learners' ages ranged from 16 to over 60 years of age with the majority of distance learners (**48%**) being between 25 and 44 years old. Most of the learners were female **235 (71%)** and most identified themselves as white **259 (79%)**. Out of the **329** enrolled distance learners **149 (52%)** were considered employed and **116 (40%)** were considered unemployed. **Please note:** the NRS findings for age, gender, ethnicity, and Labor Force Status for each pilot program are available in Appendix A and B.

Table 2. Demographics for Enrolled Learners

Characteristic	Category	N	%
Total enrolled learners		329	100
Age	16-18	12	4
	19-24	116	35
	25-44	158	48
	45-59	39	12
	60+	4	1
Gender	Male	94	29
	Female	235	71
Ethnicity	Am Ind/Alaskan	3	1
	Asian	3	1
	Black/Afr Amer	56	17
	Hispanic/Latino	7	2
	Haw/Pac Islander	1	<1
	White	259	79
Labor Status	Employed	149	52
	Not Employed	116	40
	Not in Labor Force	24	8
Rural Status	Rural (Pop. <=5000)	23	12
	Not Rural	162	88
Disability Status	Learning Disabled	4	2
	Physically Disabled	2	1
	No Disability	173	97
Public Assistance Status	Receiving Public Assistance	52	28
	No Assistance	133	71

Retention and Seat Time

Agencies ran their Distance Learning Programs for an average of twelve months (July 2004, to June 2005). During this 12 month period, the seven pilot sites recruited **336** adults to study at a distance; **329 (98%)** of them were engaged for at least 12 hours and qualified as enrolled students. This triples the first year's goal of serving 100 students through the Distance Education Pilot Program. In addition, this exceeds the proportion of students enrolled in both the first and second years of the program: in the first year, **215** learners were recruited and **182 (85%)** reached enrollment status and in the second year, **304 distance** learners were recruited and **275 (90%)** were enrolled.

The median seat time hours for Ohio's distance education students is **23.3** hours of study. The largest proportion of students (**41%**) recorded between 12 and 19 hours of seat time. The Mean number of weeks in the program is 21.5 weeks. **Distance students were enrolled on average for 16 weeks, which is three weeks longer than last year.**

Table 3. Overall Retention and Seat Time for Distance Learners

Overall Retention and Seat Time for Distance Learners	n	%
Learners Enrolled (Reached 12-hour Status)	329	100
Median Weeks in Program*	16	
Seat Time of Enrolled Students †		
12-19 Seat-Time Hours	134	41
20-29 Seat-Time Hours	81	25
30-39 Seat-Time Hours	42	13
40-49 Seat-Time Hours	26	8
50-59 Seat-Time Hours	23	7
60+ Seat Time Hours	23	7
Median Seat Time *	23.3	

NOTE: † Seat time includes credit given for intake and orientation activities.

Overall Retention and Seat Time for Distance Learners by Curriculum

Distance teachers had the option of utilizing three curricula: *GED Connection*, *Pre-GED Connection* and *SkillsTutor*. Enrollment by curriculum shows that *GED Connection* students studied for a much longer period of time (median = 24 weeks) than students studying only *SkillsTutor* (median = 11 weeks). The reasons for this are not clear, but it is possible that the students studying *SkillsTutor* had more limited goals (e.g., improve my algebra skills) than those studying *GED Connection* who may have been preparing for the GED exam. While the GED Connection students reportedly were enrolled in the program for a longer period of time than Skills Tutor students, the actual instruction that students in GED Connection and Skills Tutor logged were very close, 23 for the former and 21.3 for the latter. The amount of seat time achieved by *GED Connection* students was comparable to last year's numbers (median = 23 hours). However, distance learners

who combined *GED Connection* with *SkillsTutor* had a median of 30 hours of seat time. This suggests that the combination of the curricula may help the instructor better meet students' needs, resulting in increased study time. In terms of post-testing, 45% of distance students took a post-test which more than doubled the number of distance learners who took a post-test last's year (22%). These findings suggest that as programs become more experienced in delivering distance education they are able to do so more effectively, enrolling more students and encouraging more of them to return for post-tests.

Table 4. Overall Retention and Seat Time for Distance Learners by Curriculum

Distance Learners By Curriculum	GED Connection		Skills Tutor		GEDC combined with another curriculum**	
	n	%	N	%	n	%
Learners Enrolled (Earned 12-hours)	105	100	149	100	64	100
Median Weeks in Program*	23.6		11.1		23.4	
Seat Time of Enrolled Students †						
12-19 Seat-Time Hours	47	45	68	46	15	23
20-29 Seat-Time Hours	24	23	39	26	15	23
30-39 Seat-Time Hours	15	14	12	8	13	20
40-49 Seat-Time Hours	7	7	8	5	10	16
50-59 Seat-Time Hours	4	4	10	7	8	13
60+ Seat Time Hours	8	8	12	8	3	5
Median Seat Time *	23		21.3		30.3	
Mean Seat Time*	26.9		30.5		33.6	
Mean Weeks in Program*	30		13.5		27.1	

NOTE: † Seat time includes credit given for intake and orientation activities.

* Given the skewed distribution of the data, the appropriate average measure is the Median, not the Mean. **GED Connection in any combination with Skills Tutor and/or Pre-GED Connection.

Survey Findings

Teachers and administrators were asked to complete surveys about their experiences in the Distance Education Pilot Program in late spring of 2005. The Project IDEAL Support Center prepared two reports; one for Ohio Distance Teachers and the other

for Ohio Distance Administrators. Please see both reports for more in-depth information on survey findings.

Teacher Surveys

Teachers were asked to complete surveys that addressed issues, such as the amount of time teaching at a distance required, improvements and suggestions for distance education in Ohio, reactions to the three curricula they utilized this year (*SkillsTutor*, *GED Connection* and *Pre-GED Connection*) and whether or not they were still interested in teaching at a distance. Teachers who used *SkillsTutor* stated that they were very pleased with the curriculum and would recommend using it at a distance. The instructors who utilized *GED Connection* would also recommend the curriculum but had some reservations (*see report for more in-depth information*). The distance instructors who used *Pre-GED Connection* would strongly recommend using it at a distance but cited the on-line portion as a weakness of the curriculum.

The majority (83%) of teachers described their distance learning programs as hybrid programs. *Hybrid distance learning programs are those in which the primary mode of instruction occurs at a distance, but students also have the opportunity to meet with an instructor face-to-face.* Teachers stated that they worked ¼-time. On average, they recruited 25 students of whom 20 were considered enrolled. Not all students were active at the same time: teachers reported that, on average, they worked with 9 students in any given week.

Administrator Findings

Administrators were asked to complete surveys that addressed issues such as students served, distance education model and curricula, teachers and finding, administering a distance program, centralized delivery at a distance, and benefits as well as challenges of offering distance education.

Administrators stated that without the distance options, large proportions of their distance students would not have enrolled in the adult education programs. Specifically, three of the administrators estimate that less than 25% of their distance students would have enrolled in traditional classroom programs. Two administrators estimated that less than half of the distance students at his/her program would have done so and two indicated that between 50% and 75% of their students would have enrolled in classroom programs. Furthermore, all of the administrators stated they would like to continue to offer distance learning either as a hybrid and/or pure distance model.

In terms of benefits and challenges of distance instruction, one administrator stated the following:

It allows us to keep working with students who get jobs or lose childcare. It gives students who would otherwise be unable to attend, due to work schedules or other conflicts the opportunity to work from home and still meet their obligations to family and/or work. It encourages those who enjoy being on-line to pursue a positive outcome in their time on-line. It allows us to work with a variety of Community Technology Access Agencies and individuals all over town in an effort to serve the most diverse population possible.

Ohio's National Involvement

The pilot sites in Ohio continue to be viewed as highly skilled professionals with enthusiastic attitudes, who are eager to learn and share as much information as possible about distance education in the ABLE environment. Ohio was once again one of two states to successfully pilot test a new Professional Development course developed by Project IDEAL. Entitled Distance Learning D103: Evaluating Resources for Pre GED and GED Students, the model was tested in Ohio and Pennsylvania. Based on the results, the Project IDEAL Support Center is currently recommending that this professional development approach be implemented by experienced distance teachers in other member states that who have completed Distance Learning 102: Virtual Study Group.

Furthermore, Ohio was one of four states to participate in a cross-state DL102 Virtual Study Group during FY 2004-05. According to the comments the teachers provided, this professional development experience was extremely beneficial and useful. *To illustrate, 57% of the participants acknowledged that they received a number of useful suggestions from the course. In addition, 71% of the participants stated that they have a greater familiarity with the GED Connections materials and 85% of the participants agreed that if there was a Professional Development required for adult educators in their state that the Virtual Study Group should be included as part of the requirement.*

Once more the Project IDEAL Support Team has worked, consulted with and/or collaborated with Ohio Adult Education Practitioners to create several working papers around distance education issues in the adult education setting. For example, in FY 2003-04, these working papers included: *A Pilot Test of Study Groups: Professional Development for Experienced Distance Teachers; Using Assessment to Guide Instructional Planning for Distance Learners; and Assessment and Accountability Issues in Distance Education for Adult Learners.* In FY 2004-05, these working papers include: *Exploring Policy Issues and Options in Distance Education for Adult Learners; State Policy for Distance Education Programs for Adult Learners; Beyond the Classroom: and Six States Develop Distance Programs for Adult Learners.*

In addition, Ohio assisted Project IDEAL with evaluating and critiquing their new On-line Data Collection System. Project IDEAL believes that this system is easier for teachers in the consortium states to use than the Excel logs previously used in the project. Project IDEAL points out that one advantage of the new data collection system is the ease with which they can capture a snapshot at any time, of the status of distance enrollment throughout the consortium.

Conclusions

What we learned to date

Some of the major conclusions that have been drawn from the last three years of the Distance Learning Project are as follows:

- Distance Learning can be an effective instructional delivery mode for some students

- Most of the pilots provided distance learning within a “hybrid” context where instruction occurs primarily at a distance with the opportunity for some face-to-face interaction between teacher and students
- Students who do well in Distance Education tend to be those who are higher functioning, have the necessary computer skills and can work independently, and
- Distance learning takes at least as much teacher time as regular classroom instruction.

As Ohio continues to implement and expand its efforts with Distance Education, the pool of distance professionals will expand. In addition, it will increase the knowledge base of best practices among teachers, coordinators, and administrators. Furthermore, it will ensure that a feasible design is considered in order to successfully implement Distance Education in the ABLE arena. Working with multiple curricula at a distance will assist the state with determining whether or not Distance Education is a viable option for programs and provide guidance about the choice of appropriate curricula for distance study.

Ohio’s progress over the last three years has been astonishing. To illustrate, during FY 2002-03, Ohio aimed to recruit 100 students; the pilot sites exceeded this goal by recruiting 215 learners, of whom 182 were considered enrolled. During FY 2003-04, 304 distance learners were recruited and 275 of those learners were considered enrolled. During FY 2004-05, 336 adults studied at a distance and 329 of them were engaged for at least 12 hours and qualified as enrolled students.

Jere Johnston, Project IDEAL Director states it best, *“From our perspective, your distance programs showed outstanding progress.”*

Recommendations

- Continue to explore as many curricula as possible for Distance Education
- Review those that are being utilized in other states and evaluate the positives and negatives of each
- Continue to build, expand and maintain partnerships with local area agencies to increase awareness of distance learning opportunities for ABLE learners throughout the state
- Continue to explore distance learning policies implemented in other states
- Develop distance learning training for interested Ohio ABLE staff
- Identify options for ABLE programs to participate with distance learning delivery
- Move forward with a state-wide implementation plan of distance education for Ohio
- Start to consider what support methods and options will be needed for distance learners, teachers and administrators/coordinators statewide
- Continue to expand resources and content on Ohio’s Project IDEAL Web site
- Continue working towards creating and maintaining a core group of skilled distance professionals that will assist with distance education training and implementation statewide
- Explore use of distance instruction with ESOL students
- Explore delivery of distance learning through a partnership mode
- Develop standards for distance learning programs

Appendix A.

Table 5. Seat Time for Enrolled Learners by Program

Program	Seat Time Enrolled Learners						Total
	12-19 hrs	20-29 hrs	30-39 hrs	40-49 hrs	50-59 hrs	60+ hrs	
ACES	12	10	9	2	1	4	38
Canton City	28	24	7	7	9	11	86
Cuyahoga Community College	18	4	3	1	2	1	29
Franklinton Learning Center	13	16	4	4	3	3	43
Hamilton City ABLE	13	12	12	7	5	2	51
Ohio Hi-Point	5	1	0	2	2	0	10
Six District ABLE	45	14	7	3	1	2	72
Total	134	81	42	26	23	23	329

Table 6. NRS Age by Program

Program	NRS Age Categories					Total
	16-18	19-24	25-44	45-59	60+	
ACES	1	13	17	4	3	38
Canton City ABLE	2	35	42	7	0	86
Cuyahoga Community College	0	6	17	6	0	29
Franklinton Learning Center	0	16	24	3	0	43
Hamilton City ABLE	8	13	21	8	1	51
Ohio Hi-Point	0	1	6	3	0	10
Six District ABLE	1	32	31	8	0	72
Total	12	116	158	39	4	329*

*NRS Labor Force Status Information was reported for enrolled learners (12+hours)

Appendix B.

Table 7. NRS Gender by Program

Program	NRS Gender		Total
	Male	Female	
ACES	14	24	38
Canton City ABLE	24	62	86
Cuyahoga Community College	7	22	29
Franklinton Learning Center	10	33	43
Hamilton City ABLE	14	37	51
Ohio Hi-Point	2	8	10
Six District ABLE	23	49	72
Total	94	235	329*

* NRS Gender Information was reported for enrolled learners (12+hours)

Table 8. NRS Labor Force Status by Program

Program	NRS Labor Force Status			Total
	Employed	Unemployed	Not in Labor Force	
ACES	20	18	0	38
Canton City ABLE	44	33	8	85
Cuyahoga Community College	7	6	0	13
Franklinton Learning Center	21	18	2	41
Hamilton City ABLE	25	19	6	50
Ohio Hi-Point	9	1	0	10
Six District ABLE	23	21	8	52
Total	149	116	24	289

Table 9. NRS Ethnicity by Program

Program	NRS Ethnicity						Total
	Amer. Ind.	Asian	Black/African Amer.	Hisp/Latin	Haw/Pac. Isl.	White	
ACES	1	0	0	0	0	37	38
Canton City ABLE	0	2	11	2	0	71	84
Cuyahoga Community College	0	0	21	0	0	8	29
Franklinton Learning Center	1	1	13	2	0	26	43
Hamilton City ABLE	0	0	6	2	0	43	51
Ohio Hi-Point	1	0	2	0	1	6	10
Six District ABLE	0	0	3	1	0	68	72
Total	3	3	56	7	1	259	329/327

Appendix C.

Pilot Sites Personnel

Key Personnel for Pilot sites	Pilot Agency	Curriculum Used
* Joyce Taylor (Administrator/Coordinator) Sandra Golden	Six District Educational Compact ABLE/Kent	GED Connection
Sharon Halter (Administrator/Coordinator) Anita Salyer Dave Ozimek	Ohio Hi-Point ABLE	GED Connection , Pre-GED & Skills Tutor
Shirley Kowalski (Administrator/Coordinator) Milton Clement Kathleen McDonnell	Cuyahoga Community College/Eastern	GED Connection
Kathy Petrek (Administrator/Coordinator) Nancy Schwab Sharon Katterheinrich	Hamilton City Schools ABLE	GED Connection & Skills Tutor
Lisa Ebert (Administrator/Coordinator)	Adult Career Educational	GED Connection

Marcia Pemberton Cheryl Nye	Services (ACES)	
Jane Meyer (Administrator/Coordinator) Cheryl Schnebelen Lori Oliver	Canton City Schools ABLE	GED Connection & Skills Tutor
* Ella Bogard (Administrator/Coordinator) Jerusha McClendon	Franklinton Learning Center	GED Connection & Skills Tutor

* Also Project IDEAL instructors

Key Personnel and Advisors for the Pilot Program

- The Ohio Literacy Resource Center
Kimberly S. McCoy, Distance Learning Coordinator
Marty Ropog, Director (Advisory Committee)
Tim Ponder, Midwest LINCS Coordinator (Advisory Committee)
- Northeast ABLE Resource Center:
Andrew Venclauskas, Technology Trainer (Advisory Committee)
- Northwest ABLE Resource Center:
Diane Ninke, Director (Advisory Committee)
- Southwest ABLE Resource Center:
Lynn Reese, Coordinator (Advisory Committee)
- The Ohio Department of Education, Career-Technical and Adult Education:
Denise Pottmeyer, ABLE State Director (Advisory Committee)
Jeff Gove, ABLE Consultant (Advisory Committee)
Cynthia Zengler, ABLE Consultant (Advisory Committee)
Karen Scheid, ABLE Consultant (Advisory Committee)
- The Ohio Literacy Network
Maureen A. O'Rourke, Executive Director (Advisory Committee)
Brandi A. Barron, Administrative Assistant