

PN-ABK-712
ISA 76140

**UNITED STATES COALITION FOR EDUCATION FOR ALL
FIRST ANNUAL CONFERENCE**

Assessment/Evaluation Report

Prepared by: Catherine Balsis

**Under the Social Sector Policy Analysis Project
Contract PDC-0082-C-00-9080-00
Agency for International Development**

November 11, 1991

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
OVERVIEW: A NOTE OF CONGRATULATIONS	1
FEEDBACK IN FOUR AREAS: COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS	3
I. Conference Structure	3
A. Comments	3
B. Suggestions	3
II. Interest Group Representation	4
A. Comments	4
B. Suggestions	5
III. Substance of the Sessions	5
A. Concerns	5
B. Suggestions	6
IV. Future Directions	6
A. Comments	6
B. Suggestions	7
ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS REVISITED	8
ATTACHMENT A - Interviewees for Assessment/Evaluation	
ATTACHMENT B - Assessment/Evaluation Approach & Questionnaire	
ATTACHMENT C - Suggestions by Participants for Expanded Membership	
ATTACHMENT D - Additional Comments Not Covered in the Report	
ADDENDUM	

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Coalition for Education for All (USCEFA) sponsored its first annual conference, **Learning for All: Bridging Domestic and International Education**, October 30, 31 and November 1, 1991. The purpose of this evaluation was to assess the conference, and through it, the effectiveness of the U.S. Coalition. It was intended to be impressionistic in nature, capturing the larger picture, as reflected at the conference. Ultimately, this exercise was to answer two questions:

- * To what degree has the U.S. Coalition been effective in broadening participation in education agenda-setting, as shown by new linkages forming, issues and agendas being redefined, and boundaries between different groups disappearing or reforming?
- * What needs to be done to expand/extend the Coalition, particularly in terms of what the participants want?

The agreed-upon approach for this evaluation is described in Attachment B.

Three basic methods were used for information gathering: evaluator's observations at the conference, interviews with participants, and a written questionnaire (shown as part of Attachment B). As the conference evaluator, I attended the event in its entirety. During that time I interviewed 26 individuals and held briefer conversations about the event with another 11 participants. Additionally, twenty-seven questionnaires were completed and returned to the registration desk.

By far, the interviews were the most effective information gathering technique. Those interviewed represented a cross-section of the interest groups attending the conference (see Attachment A for a list). Without exception the interviewees were candid and eager to have their views known. The questionnaires, though providing less detail, substantiated the opinions communicated in individual conversations. Given my own observations, I found no inconsistencies in the information collected, which is described below.

OVERVIEW: A NOTE OF CONGRATULATIONS

Generally, conference participants were laudatory about the conference activities. Consistently, people praised the smoothness of logistics, the hotel facilities, the size of the participant group, and the layout of meeting rooms

and exhibits. They were excited about the diversity and experience of participants, the resources, and the quality of presenters. When asked how they were benefiting from the event, respondents identified networking and

exposure to resources as the top two items. For a small number of groups/individuals (such as the Consultative Group for Early Childhood Care and Development, the International Academy of Integrative Learning, and the representative from California State University on the application of brain research to learning) the conference was viewed as an opportunity to promulgate (or advocate) their particular agenda.

However, as is frequently the case in evaluations, people focused on what they would like to change or improve.

As one participant put it, "75% of what is happening is wonderful, but I have some major concerns." Thus the feedback presented in the section below highlights comments and suggestions for improvement in four areas: conference structure; interest group representation; substance of the sessions; and future directions. In no way should these comments detract from the momentum gained at the conference. Rather, the energy and enthusiasm which people put into their ideas should be viewed as an investment in the purposes and work of the Coalition.

FEEDBACK IN FOUR AREAS: COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

I. Conference Structure

A. Comments

With very few exceptions, participants wanted more interaction with the presenters and each other, and less "talking at them." They wanted more opportunities to participate. They were very impressed by the caliber of the presenters and found the majority of presentations informative; yet at least half of the people interviewed felt the panels were too academic and the presentations uncoordinated. As one individual expressed it, "what is the bottom line?...my people are out in the field working under adverse conditions, sometimes without running water and electricity...research findings need to be translated into operational terms." Interviewees also expressed a concern that too much was going on, that "there were too many simultaneous panels, leaving one scattered and un-focussed." Comments of this type came from individuals seeking a more work-oriented and participatory environment. By and large, those interviewed did not feel either the plenaries or panels built the bridge between domestic and international experiences, and in part that was seen as a structural issue.

The facilitators' intervention in the panels did not get high marks, mainly because it conflicted with the little bit of time that remained for questions, answers and general discussion. In almost all cases presenters went over their allotted time. Many of the interviewees were supportive of

processing information in a group, but felt the role of the facilitator at this conference was poorly defined and not coordinated with other elements of the sessions. Some noted an inherent conflict of structure and process in the panel sessions, i.e. the facilitating process does not complement the more rigid academic approach of the panels.

The last concern in this area of conference structure was the feeling that the conference coordinators, presenters and participants were all guilty of "not practicing what we preach at this conference" either in terms of the appropriate use of technology or in taking into account cultural and learning differences. A specific comment was that the conference structure was very Western and not "inviting" for Third World participants or for individuals with non-auditory learning styles. Noted were the poor, disruptive use of overhead projectors by presenters and the lack of innovative learning approaches used during the conference proceedings. One individual suggested that there might be a connection between the drop-out rate at U.S. schools (where 30% have a kinesthetic learning style) and the drop-out rate at the conference.

B. Suggestions

Three major suggestions about the conference structure emerge from participant comments. First: follow the

successful design of the Boston conference where "participants were engaged from the beginning in constructive dialogue with each other and successfully came to consensus on a number of issues." Second: seriously consider a series of "mini-conferences" devoted to the exploration of one issue/area/sub-strand, instead of allocating a whole year's resources to one event. One individual making this

recommendation felt certain that a series of smaller meetings could be held throughout the year at the same price as one annual conference. Third: look at USCEFA conferences and meetings as "learning" events and model the technical and attitudinal innovations being advocated for "Education for All." In other words, "practice what we preach."

II. Interest Group Representation

A. Comments

Participants found the diversity of the group refreshing and exciting, yet felt many key interest groups were missing, particularly if the Coalition is serious about education for all. Many different suggestions were made to me about who should be included. Some felt the conference was lacking representatives from the second world as well as the Third World. Others felt there needed to be a much stronger representation from the industrialized countries, including Japan and Europe. People working on domestic education issues felt U.S. cultural groups were sorely missing, such as the African-Americans, Asian-Americans and immigrants from the Caribbean. One speaker said to me that it was never made clear to her who the audience was going to be. Once she saw the program and the list of speakers she asked "where are the Washington folks, people who work right here, in town, on education issues?" I have combined all specific suggestions, and have included them as Attachment C to this report.

Discussion and comments about which groups were attending the conference brought up the larger question of who was to benefit from the conference. As noted in the section below (Substance of the Sessions), people working domestically seemed to benefit much more from the Third World experience, than the reverse. Another twist on who should be present was born out of a suggestion that a future conference focus should be to foster dialogue between the field and policy-making levels, and that attendees be identified accordingly. Ultimately, the concern (and struggle) with participation was viewed as the "inherent contradiction" in the Coalition itself. The U.S. Coalition has dedicated itself to launching a U.S.-based dialogue in support of the vision of Jomtien, yet most of the sponsoring organizations for USCEFA are concerned with basic education efforts in the Third World. It was perceived by several individuals that the major stakeholders for expanding education for all in the United States have not bought into the U.S. Coalition. Therefore, an observation from a

domestic participant was that she had the sensation that she was attending someone else's business meeting. Her conclusion was that the real purpose of the conference was to enable the major donors, NGO's and development consulting firms to get together.

B. Suggestions

Issues around participation will only become resolved as the goals of the Coalition, and of its individual events, are clearly articulated. If the Coalition truly wants to foster a U.S.-based dialogue and bridge domestic and international education concerns, serious consideration must be given to getting major domestic players on board. People working internationally wanted to "internationalize" the participation at the conference. People working on the domestic front wanted the Coalition to make a concerted effort to expand its domestic network at both the grassroots and/or policy levels. Given the multiplicity of interests at play, the first step is for the Coalition to decide what

its audience and geographic focus are.

Some possible choices:

- * USCEFA is a group of U.S.-based citizens, organizations and institutions concerned with fostering education for all in the developing world.
- * USCEFA is a group of U.S.-based citizens, organizations and institutions concerned with extending educational opportunities to all children and adults in the United States, especially those at risk, culturally isolated, etc.
- * USCEFA is a group of U.S.-based citizens, organizations and institutions concerned with extending educational opportunities to all children and adults, throughout the world (not just LDCs), who presently do not have access to basic education. Its focus is on the poorest, disempowered segments of society, both in the United States and abroad.

III. Substance of the Sessions

A. Concerns

As noted elsewhere, participants were impressed with the caliber of the speakers and found the presentations informative. Those interviewed felt the theme of "bridging domestic and international education" was very important, and indeed were impressed with the representation of domestic and international speakers on almost all

panels. Nevertheless, many felt the "bridge" was not really built. Some of those from the Third World (or implementing programs in the Third World) stated there was too much emphasis on technology, except, perhaps in those sessions concerned with distance education. Others questioned whether there were any salient lessons from the U.S. which were applicable to settings in developing countries. One

clear exception to that trend was a post-conference statement to me that the Third World participants at the New Visions for Education panel were very excited about the information communicated in those presentations. All of the speakers, in that case, were from the U.S. and talking about cutting edge thinking in U.S. education.

In contrast to the above, many expressed the belief that there were valuable lessons to be learned from the educational efforts in the Third World (South-North). As noted by one participant, "Ai Shanker said there were no quick fixes, no easy answers. Those of us working in the Third World already knew that. However, in the United States we are always looking for the next new answer. We have a lot to learn from the developing world about systemic change." Related to learning from the South, it is relevant to note that a variety of interviewees identified the presentation by Unna Huh on Korea's experience with systemic change as very useful. In fact, several suggested that a whole workshop or panel could have been devoted to that experience alone.

It appeared that people were

generally happy with the three "strands" that were chosen for exploration at the conference. The one exception to that, voiced by several, was that adult literacy did not get enough attention. They believed adult literacy problems were of sufficient scope and gravity that they deserved a strand of their own.

B. Suggestions

Three recommendations emerged from these comments. First, the difficulty people had in seeing the transferability of U.S. experience to the developing world suggests that presenters and their panel chairs need to work at developing the conceptual bridge between and among them prior to their presentations. Making this effort during the design stage, at least in part, may pay dividends in helping participants make connections. Second, the interest in learning from the Third World is a definite opportunity to exploit, both in terms of expanding the Coalition's membership and for new programming efforts. Third, the interest in putting more emphasis on adult literacy should be considered for inclusion on the U.S. Coalition's agenda as a fourth strand.

IV. Future Directions

A. Comments

People were clearly attracted to the overall goal of "Education for All" and perceived the bringing together of such a diverse group of people, in such an important area, as "exhilarating" and

"unprecedented." As one woman suggested, "this really is the only place I know where education is being looked at on a global scale." Simultaneously, people referred to the Coalition's goals as elusive. Some felt at a loss as to what the next step should be, and

indeed, expressed disappointment that a common agenda had not been articulated in the last plenary. One way or another, individuals suggested that the Coalition needed to "get hold of something" if it was going to last.

B. Suggestions

My interpretation of "get hold of something" is the need to make the Coalition's goals and programs more tangible. One specific way to do that is to set a quantitative target or action goal that everyone can buy into and work toward in their local situations.

A very specific program recommendation was born out of a conversation with Alan Hill, the representative from Apple Computers,

and the participant from the National Ministry of Public Education in Mexico. They saw a real potential for the Coalition to develop and coordinate a computerized information exchange program for members located in the United States and abroad.

Essentially, the purpose of this program would be to facilitate the information dissemination about successful practices used throughout the world that reflect the priorities of the Coalition. The core of the program would be a database composed of country profiles (possibly State profiles in the case of the US), which would be updated and distributed yearly. Alan Hill believes that the cost of the program is modest and very feasible. He offered his assistance in further developing the idea if the Coalition wants to pursue it.

ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS REVISITED

1. To what degree has the Coalition been effective in broadening participation in Education Agenda-Setting?

As reflected by the conference, the Coalition was successful in stimulating participants to begin to look at the possibilities in education agenda-setting, but it is just the beginning. Certainly, the opportunity to form new linkages was made available to the participants by the diversity of presenters and participants. Whether the opportunity was taken by the majority of individuals is less clear. Not surprisingly, the majority of domestically-oriented interviewees stated they were making new and not usual contacts. One U.S. presenter said, "I talk with educators all the time...this is different...I don't need to talk to more educators." A Fairfax County vocational teacher in international trade and marketing suggested there were very few places where she could meet colleagues with an international agenda. A middle school teacher and Kellogg National Fellow, who is looking for ways to make U.S. schools more culturally responsive was very excited about the new contacts she was able to make at the conference. All the examples she gave me were individuals and groups working internationally.

When I queried people about whether their agendas had been changed or redefined by the proceedings, responses were not consistent. Several individuals said they were very influenced by the sessions on early childhood development and, indeed, were giving thought to including that component in their programming efforts. The strong, positive reaction to the New Visions Panel also suggests that those presentations may influence a redefinition of issues for some participants. Another perspective on this was offered by a USAID education officer presently serving overseas. She attended the conference with her Minister of Education, and felt the Minister had been stimulated to redefine her stand on a specific topic. In other words, the USAID Officer perceived that the conference had helped her in her advocacy with the Minister. There may be a lesson here for a future mini-conference where participants are invited jointly with their counterparts or policy-makers, and the design of the program facilitates an exploration of key or unresolved issues.

Very little concrete evidence was accumulated on the degree to which boundaries between different groups were disappearing or reforming. And, perhaps, this is an indicator that will be seen only over more time. During the Friday morning panels I took an approximate head count in each of the sessions. About 68 people attended the New Visions for Education program. Of that number, I recognized some 12 individuals with an international orientation. Approximately 20 attended the Training Educators for Schooling in the 21st Century. I estimated that about 5 of that number were non-US, and another 10 were U.S. with an international agenda. The International Cooperation for Education for All session was attended by 65 participants. I did not note any participants there who I knew had a domestic agenda.

One interpretation of these numbers is that, when given a distinct choice, individuals will choose what is closest to their line of work...what is familiar. Within that context, it is interesting to note that several U.S. individuals from the development field thought it was very informative to learn what the various donors were doing. They thought it was helpful to their own work and essential that donors continue an inter-institutional dialogue. Does improved international cooperation on education qualify as a disappearing boundary?

II. What needs to be done to expand/extend the Coalition; What do participants want?

Building on the various suggestions made under the section above, several actions appear very important.

First, the Coalition must do more to make its goals more tangible to its membership. One step in this direction would be to refine the Coalition's Mission Statement to include a visionary paragraph which describes the "essence" of Education for All. A second step would be to establish a major quantitative target (suggested above) which everyone can work toward. A third step would be to implement the information exchange program described above as an alternative/additional means to forming linkages and facilitating information across boundaries.

Second, the Coalition must attract the stakeholders in U.S. domestic education. Notwithstanding the great difficulty of this action, I do perceive one step is for AID to continue working on forging a liaison with the Department of Education. Beyond that connection, a domestic membership strategy needs to be formulated and implemented over the next year. This strategy should identify potential groups at both the policy and field level (see attachment C), and include increased participation by cultural/ethnic U.S. education sub-sets.

Third, the Coalition must create opportunities for members to participate more fully in activities. People want to participate. Give serious consideration to the mini-conference idea described in the feedback section above. Another step might be to provide guidance (written and on video) to members on how to establish Education for All coalitions at the local level. This item dovetails with the clear call from attendees for more participation, and builds on the "town meeting" concept articulated in one of the plenary sessions.

United States Coalition for Education For All
First Annual Conference

Interviewees for Assessment/Evaluation

Individuals Interviewed

- * Sandra G. Pritz, Center on Education and Training for Employment, Ohio State University
- * Liza Loop, LO*OP Center, Inc., Palo Alto, California
- * Myrna Norris, Office of Training and Program Support, U.S. Peace Corps, Washington, D.C.
- * Yuko Nakazono, Visiting Researcher, University of Oregon
- * Nittaya J. Kotchabhakdi, M.D., Faculty of Medicine, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand
- * Alan T. Hill, Apple Computer, Inc., Cupertino, California
- * Manuel Gandara, Director of the Center for Educational Technology and Media, National Ministry of Public Education, Mexico
- * Mindy C. Reiser, American Jewish World Service, Washington, D.C.
- * Vicky Colbert de Arboleda, UNICEF, Colombia
- * Robert Myers, Consultative Group on Early Childhood Care and Development, New York City
- * Jack Downey, Academy for Educational Development, Washington, D.C.
- * Renate Nummela Caine, California State University, San Bernardino, California
- * Howard Reed, University of Connecticut
- * Gina Bottoms, Teacher, Mclean High School, McLean, Virginia
- * Marta Arango, International Center for Education and Human Development (CINDE), Fort Lauderdale, Florida
- * Michael J. Gibbons, Save the Children, Westport, Connecticut

11-1

- * Jerry Perez de Tagle, International Academy of Integrative Learning, Syracuse, New York
- * Viveca Nadya Villarin, Interne, Syracuse University
- * Janet Thornton, World Vision
- * Joyce White, Continuing Education Center, Ottawa Board of Education, Ottawa, Canada
- * Frank Dall, UNICEF, New York City
- * Patsy Layne, USAID/San Salvador
- * Eta Mbuye, School Principal, Namibia
- * Dutte Shinyemba, Teacher Training, Namibia
- * Cynthia Newell, National Middle School Association and Kellogg National Fellow, Columbus, Ohio
- * David Nyamwaya, African Medical Research Foundation

Briefer Conversations

- * Clayton Seeley, Seeley Educational Consultants, Virginia
- * Doe Mayer, University of Southern California
- * Karen Canova, Plan International
- * Linda Roberts, Office of Technology Assessment, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.
- * Rosny Desroches, Haitian Foundation for Private Schooling
- * May Rihani, Creative Associates, Washington, D.C.
- * Clifford Block, Far West Regional Lab for Educational Research and Development, Berkeley, California
- * Ray Chesterfield, Juarez and Associates, Washington, D.C.
- * Beau Fly Jones, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, Oak Brook, Illinois
- * Elena Lenskaya, Ministry of Education, Russia
- * Heather Sutherland, Spiral International and Coordinator of Facilitators at the Conference, Bethesda, Maryland

Assessment/Evaluation Approach
United States Coalition for Education for All
First Annual Conference

Introduction: The U.S. Coalition for Education for All (USCEFA) is a facilitative mechanism for setting the education agenda for tomorrow. It is a diverse network of international and domestic, public and private sector groups created as an outgrowth of the World Conference on Education for All held March 1990 in Thailand. USCEFA is sponsoring its first annual conference, **Learning for All: Bridging Domestic and International Education** October 30, 31 and November 1, 1991. From an assessment point of view, this Conference is seen as a "reality test" for the U.S. Coalition.

Essential Questions: This evaluation exercise will attempt to answer the following questions:

- To what degree has the U.S. Coalition been effective in broadening participation in education agenda-setting?
 - * Are new linkages forming?
 - * Are issues/agendas being redefined?
 - * Are boundaries between different groups disappearing or reforming?
- What needs to be done to expand/extend the Coalition? What do participants want?

Indicators of Effectiveness: Determining the effectiveness of the Coalition, as evidenced by the conference, would include the following indices:

- the Coalition facilitates dialogue among network members about educational reform;
- Conference participants are developing a shared concern, commitment and vision regarding "Education for All;"
- Coalition members have increased opportunities to discuss the future of education, to problem-solve and to set action agendas;
- Coalition members are forming partnerships for educational reform movements;
- Membership in the U.S. Coalition is growing.

Methodology/Approach: Three basic methods will be used to collect information: evaluator's observations at the conference; interviews with participants; and a written questionnaire.

- A. Observations - the evaluator will attend the conference in its entirety, including plenary and panel sessions, the receptions, luncheon and dinner. She will assess the degree to which the above indicators appear to be happening and will provide concrete examples in her report.
- B. Interviews - Some 165 paying participants are presently registered for the conference. The evaluator will interview at least 10% (16-17) of those attending during the three days. A list of conference participants will be faxed to AED on Tuesday so that Frank Method can identify "must" interviews. A formal interview will be at least 10 minutes long (15 minutes if feasible). The evaluator will solicit specific information and examples regarding the indicators listed above, as well as participant ideas on future directions for the Coalition.
- C. Questionnaire - A sample questionnaire is attached. If possible, it will be included in all information packets and a drop-off box will be set-up by the registration booth. The logistics of the questionnaire have already been discussed with the conference coordinators.

**United States Coalition for Education for All
First Annual Conference**

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. When did you first become involved with the U.S. Coalition for Education for All (USCEFA)? What attracted you?

2. How does USCEFA and this Conference contribute to your institution's agenda for educational reform? How can this contribution be improved? Please be specific.

3. How can the U.S. Coalition better support you in your advocacy role?

4. How can the U.S. Coalition better support your institution or organization?

5. What other groups or advocacies do you think would benefit from participation in the Coalition? How can USCEFA encourage their participation?

SUGGESTIONS BY PARTICIPANTS FOR EXPANDED MEMBERSHIP

- National Association for Education of Young People
- Association for Childhood Education International
- American Home Economics Association International
- National Council for Family Relations (NCFR)
- Various advocacy groups, i.e. Children's Defense Fund
- Domestic community development agencies
- Community-based organizations
- Civic and service groups, such as Rotary
- North American Professional Groups
- School Boards
- Social Studies, ESL and Foreign Language Teachers
- Geographic Area Studies Associations
- Similar groups for young people, students of teaching, vocational teachers
- Disciplinarian Associations
- Organizations representing the various cultural sub-sets in the U.S. (participant Cynthia Newell from the National Middle School Association offered her assistance in identifying groups in this category)
- Legislative Reference Service
- Foreign Relations Committee Staff
- Health-related Legislative Staffs
- American Council on Education
- National Education Association

- **U.S. Association of Land Grant Universities**
- **Regional Educational Laboratories not represented**
- **USDA, HHS**
- **Improved representation from the World Bank**
- **National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA)**
- **Inter-America Foundation (Suggested Contact, Carol Craig)**
- **International Institute for Education**
- **U.S. Foundations**
- **Local Area Colleges**
- **Education Specialists from Embassies**
- **More representation from USAID Education Officers**
- **More NGOs working with children in developing countries**
- **Country NGOs and Missionary Groups involved in development**
- **Leading Pediatric Educators from developing countries**
- **Other members of Interaction who have education departments**
- **University research departments proposing reform ideas**
- **Send Conference Report to: Cultural Attaches from Embassies, Education Advisors from developing countries, U.N. Ambassadors, and Executive Directors of major educational associations**
- **One participant requested that information on future conferences be sent to:**
 Marjorie Hunt (an educator of 3-4 year olds)
 5418 Bethesda Lane
 Indianapolis, IN 46254
- **One participant stated she was not on the participant list, and wanted to make sure she received a copy of the conference's final report:**
 Carol Perronal
 Appalachian Educational Laboratory
 1031 Quarries Street
 Charleston, WV 25325

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS NOT COVERED IN THE REPORT

Thoughts shared by several participants included:

- hard copies of the papers and talks presented would be useful;
- include brief descriptions of the panels and presenters in the brochure or conference schedule so that participants can make a more informed choice;
- a periodic Newsletter, highlighting new directions in research would be helpful to institutions and organizations.

All the other comments listed below were made by individual participants:

- a representative from ASCD suggested that instead of asking how the Coalition could support her in her advocacy, we should turn the question around and ask how ASCD can help the Coalition and "how can we collaborate to further the international reform of education;"
- more organized networking, along subject matter lines, urban/rural, etc;
- put members in touch with grass-roots educators in the developing world;
- become the International Coalition for Education For All;
- finance international research;
- do the next conference in the developing world;
- share learning material resources with developing countries;
- through international cooperation, put pressure on for funds to develop new models for education;
- learn from the major restructuring effort in Kentucky;
- support/facilitate more joint problem-solving.

USCEFA REPORT ADDENDUM

In response to a request made by A.I.D., I conducted a post-conference interview by phone with John Prohaska, Office of Media Services, Fairfax County School System. Mr. Prohaska attended the opening plenary session and was one of the panelists for the *New Technologies for Teacher Training* session. His feedback to me about the conference was very much in line with those of other participants. His overall impression was one of inspiration: "I left the conference with a sense of urgency over the grave disparity that exists between educational systems...there needs to be a unified effort toward equalization." He also, however, expressed some disappointment about the lack of definite direction in the opening addresses. He left the first plenary unclear as to what the coalition wanted from everybody. He suggested that three specific questions needed to be addresses visually as well as verbally: "What is the problem?" "How can we attack it?" "What do we need to do as a Coalition?"

Much like everyone else, Mr. Prohaska was very impressed with the calibre of people attending the conference. He

also put networking at the top of the list of conference benefits. When asked what he saw as the next step for the coalition, he recommended that the organization conduct a major "awareness campaign" (electronic and print) on the problem, the needs, the disparity and why it is everyone's problem. He further suggested that this marketing approach might be a way to engage the business and industry sector, which he feels is essential. As he noted, "they have a stake in education. Right now, they are spending enormous amounts of money on educating their employees...and in this case.. we are talking literacy."

I think this recommendation is a good one. I suggest it be considered as part of the ideas contained on page 10 of the report, in support of the first two actions listed there: making the Coalition's goals more tangible; and attracting the stakeholders in U.S. domestic education. If the Coalition is interested in pursuing this idea, Mr. Prohaska said someone can call him and he would be happy to share what the Fairfax County School System is doing in this area.