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Abstract

Many training programs have been developed in diverse settings to prepare nonformal educators for specific tasks. A comprehensive curriculum for nonformal educators, however, has eluded international educators. This article describes a case study in curriculum development and evaluation which was undertaken in Pennsylvania and Mexico to remedy this gap. A manual was developed, and evaluated by university students and extension agents in Pennsylvania. It was then used to teach similar audiences in Monterrey, Mexico. Evaluations of the curriculum in the classroom and in workshops indicated that the curriculum was well received in these settings. Gaps and weaknesses in the manual were identified. A revised and expanded version of the curriculum was developed which has promise for a variety of nonformal education settings around the world. It has potential for organizations that promote community development, youth development, health education, adult education, and nonformal leadership development.

A comprehensive curriculum to prepare nonformal educators has been a dream of international extension educators for years. Curricula for specific training programs have been developed by the U.S. Peace Corps, by funded projects, and by governmental and non-governmental organizations (Center for International Education, 1982; Coombs, 1974; Etling, 1975; Food and Agriculture Organization, 1978; Hoxeng, 1973; Samanta, 1993). These training programs have often been successful in preparing educators for specific tasks, but they have limited application to other sites. They seldom attempted to develop a comprehensive base curriculum which could be adapted to a variety of settings.

This article describes how such a curriculum evolved as the first author (referred to as Etling hereafter) and his colleagues, all nonformal educators, responded to immediate needs. Not all curricula are developed using Tyler's (1950) classic model of (a) establishing objectives, (b) selecting learning experiences appropriate to the objectives, (c) organizing the selected learning experiences into a teaching plan, and (d) evaluating accomplishment of the objectives. In the evolution of this curriculum, however, Tyler's curriculum development rationale was followed. The culmination of the evolution process came during the 1995 spring semester when a Fulbright program of teaching and research at the University of Monterrey
(UDEM) in Nuevo Leon, Mexico provided the opportunity to test and strengthen the curriculum.

**Background**

The stages in the evolution of the curriculum are shown in Figure 1. The curriculum began with research on characteristics of facilitators in a nonformal education project of the University of Massachusetts in Ecuador (Etling, 1975). In that research, the competencies (skills, knowledge, and attitudes) of effective nonformal educators in Ecuadorian villages were identified using a modified Delphi questionnaire. A taxonomy of competencies was established to design training for nonformal educators in other settings.

That taxonomy was used, along with research on the competencies of extension educators (Itulya, 1973), to develop the extension education major at the University of Arizona in 1975, which was then taught and refined between 1976 and 1979. This major included a comprehensive curriculum, based on the Tyler rationale, to prepare nonformal educators at the undergraduate level. The curriculum was research-based, focused on competencies, evaluated extensively, and documented the accomplishment of program objectives (Etling, 1979).

Later, much of the curriculum was incorporated into a Cooperative Extension manual to train community leaders to conduct extension (nonformal education) programs in local communities, using the Tyler rationale. The manual, *Getting Results: A Guide to Effective Leadership*, (Dunn, Etling & Williams, 1987), was written for group or individual self-study in small Arizona communities where a trainer and technology for distance education were not available. It was pilot tested, evaluated, and used across the state with positive evaluations from its users.

Subsequently, Etling developed a university course (INTAG 497: Community Development in International Agriculture) and workshops for extension agents and volunteers at The Pennsylvania State University using the Arizona manual as the primary reference. Evaluations of the classes and workshops were conducted using instruments approved by the faculty at Penn State. The manual was well received both by university students and extension agents.

The manual was seen by Extension administrators to have potential to meet the needs of Latinos in Pennsylvania as well. An Extension Committee on Outreach to Diverse Audiences was especially interested in generating relevant materials for Spanish-speaking immigrants to Pennsylvania. Cooperative Extension materials in Spanish were collected from Puerto Rico, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and California. These materials covered many technical topics in agriculture and family living. Materials on leadership and community development, however, were missing.

A review of literature in Spanish on leadership and community development uncovered few sources. Some theoretical books and articles existed, but almost none were written for practical training applications at the local level. One of the few practical sources found, the Family Community Leadership (FCL) material (Tillson, 1987), was available in Spanish under the title *Familia, Comunidad, Liderato*. The content of FCL left many gaps, however, and the material was not freely accessible.

As a result of these experiences and the literature review, the Arizona manual was translated into Spanish. The Fulbright program in Mexico was proposed to determine how the manual would be evaluated by Mexican audiences. Evaluations of the manual by participants in university courses and workshops for educators in Pennsylvania and Mexico were proposed for comparison.
Figure 1
Curriculum Evolution


Itulya Thesis 1973 → Leader Workshops

EXTED Case Study 1979

AZ CD Curriculum Development 1979-87 → Getting Results Notebook 1987

Bennett Thesis 1987

Mexico Course & Workshops 1995

Spanish Version - Getting Results 1994

PA Extension Workshops Penn State Class on CD 1987 - 1996

Evaluations


Curriculum for NFE 1995

Gaps Identified

Research Study 1996?

Use in diverse settings

Comprehensive, adaptable curriculum

Final Revisions
**Purposes**

The purposes of this curriculum evaluation in Mexico were:

1. Test the existing curriculum in Mexico.
2. Compare scores of Mexican and Pennsylvanian participants.
3. Identify gaps in the content of the curriculum.
4. Develop a revised curriculum to prepare nonformal educators.

At this point, research studies to test the validity and reliability of the curriculum could be designed.

**Procedure**

Etling was assigned for his Fulbright scholarship to the UDEM Psychology Department where Professor Evangelina Reyes was teaching a course on community development as well as working with local communities in outreach programs. She also had professional experience with the federal adult education agency (INEA) and the contacts to arrange workshops for nonformal educators employed by INEA.

An announcement for the community development course was developed and it was offered at UDEM in the spring semester of 1995 (Jan 17-May 23). The course was team taught by Professor Reyes and Etling. The class met twice a week, 75 minutes each time, which is comparable to a three-credit semester course at Penn State. Twenty students took the course. They evaluated the course using instruments which were translated versions of those used previously at Penn State.

INEA agreed to sponsor a workshop for its employees to learn skills for nonformal educators in community development. The workshop met 7 times, 3 hours each time. Nineteen zone coordinators, whose responsibilities are similar to county extension agents in Pennsylvania, were selected as workshop participants.

A second workshop was presented at UDEM to a mixed group of faculty, students, and other interested community educators. As a result of that workshop, a monthly discussion group was organized where members evaluated the chapters of the manual, and helped make editorial revisions.

The two groups who received instruction using the curriculum, namely university students in the formal course, and nonformal educators in the inservice workshop, evaluated the curriculum. These groups corresponded to the groups who were instructed in the same curriculum at Penn State, i.e., university students in a formal course, and Pennsylvania extension agents (nonformal educators) who participated in inservice workshops. Comparisons were made among the four groups.

Professor Reyes, who team taught the class, and Dr. Zeta M. Triana, Head, UDEM Psychology Department, visited the class three times and completed a Spanish version of the standard Penn State peer evaluation instrument. Their scores were compared to those of Penn State professors who had evaluated the course in 1993 and 1994 when Etling taught the course at Penn State. The peer evaluations focused on both content and instruction.

The INEA workshop was team taught by Etling and Professor Reyes for a group of 19 zone coordinators employed by INEA. These coordinators organize educational programs outside the school system. They hire and supervise the educators. An extension workshop evaluation instrument from Pennsylvania Cooperative Extension was used by participants to evaluate 5 of the 7 workshop sessions. Evaluation scores of Mexican coordinators and Pennsylvania extension agents taught the same topics in their respective workshops were compared.
Peer evaluations were administered during the workshops. These evaluations were compared with peer evaluations for extension workshops in Pennsylvania.

UDEM students and workshop participants evaluated their textbook (the Spanish version of the Arizona manual) for readability, usefulness, and increase in knowledge. These scores were compared with similar scores for Penn State students.

Gaps in the Arizona manual were determined from three sources: (a) all of the evaluations described above, (b) review of other leadership training materials (Bennett, 1987; Etling, 1975; Hastings, Rennekamp & Gerrhard, 1988; Tillson, 1987), and (c) observations by the mixed discussion group at UDEM. As these gaps became apparent, Etling added content to the Arizona manual, and reformatted the content from 15 chapters into 79 modules.

**Findings**

**Testing the Curriculum in Mexico**

Three instruments were used to evaluate the curriculum - the Student Rating of Teaching Effectiveness instrument for preservice students to rate the community development course, the Peer Evaluation instrument for UDEM faculty to rate the community development course, and the Extension Workshop Evaluation instrument for course and workshop participants to rate the manual. All three instruments used in the evaluation of the curriculum in the formal course and workshop settings, and the manual, had a 7-point response scale, 1 signifying the lowest (unacceptable) rating and 7 the highest (exceptional) rating. A rating of 5 on this scale was considered to be an acceptable score. Evaluation of teaching was also included because some of the questions addressed content of the curriculum and provided another perspective on the acceptability and effectiveness of the curriculum.

Evaluations of the community development course were completed by students and faculty (peer evaluation). Similarly, evaluations for the workshops were completed by participants and faculty (peer evaluation). Evaluation scores are summarized in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

As shown in Table 1, student and faculty evaluations of course content and instruction, both at PSU and UDEM, were higher than that considered to be acceptable (5 on a 7-point scale). Nonformal educators in Pennsylvania and Mexico also rated the workshops higher than 5 for content and instruction (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDEM</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (peer evaluation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDEM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Scale: 1 = lowest-worst; 7 = highest-best
Table 2

Evaluation of Workshop Content and Instruction by Participants and Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (peer evaluation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Scale: 1 = lowest-worst; 7 = highest-best

The data in Table 3 show that all five groups of participants rated the content of the manual above 5, except Penn State students who rated chapters 2, 8, 11, and 15 below 5 in the evaluation which was done prior to 1996, and UDEM students who rated chapter 11 below 5.

Comparison of Evaluations of Mexican and Pennsylvania Participants

Penn State students rated the community development course higher than the UDEM students (Table 1). In contrast, the INEA group (Mexican nonformal educators) rated the workshops higher than Pennsylvania Cooperative Extension agents (Table 2). The data in Table 3 show that the nonformal educators' ratings of the chapters of the manual were generally higher than the ratings of university students, and that the INEA group's ratings were consistently higher than the ratings of the other groups.

Identifying Gaps in Curriculum Content

The evaluations indicated gaps and weaknesses in the curriculum. Etling (1975), Bennett (1987), and Hastings, Rennekamp and Gerhard (1988) had also identified gaps in the content of the textbook. Their lists of competencies were used to expand the topics addressed in the textbook.

Developing a Revised Curriculum to Prepare Nonformal Educators

The Spanish text used in Mexico for the class and the workshops was edited by the UDEM discussion group. The suggested revisions were made and a copy of the edited manuscript in hard copy as well as on computer disk was left at UDEM. The English translation of chapters of the document, Comunidades para el siglo 21: El rol del liderazgo educativo (Etling, 1995a) are listed below.

1. What is your leadership style?
2. Habits and attitudes of leaders
3. Group identity and direction
4. Teamwork
5. Getting people to support your cause
6. Motivating people in volunteer groups
7. Speaking up for yourself
8. Teaching others
9. Resolving differences
10. Resolving conflicts
11. Moving from ideas to action
12. Managing projects
13. Making formal meetings work
14. Making informal meetings work
15. What’s wrong and how to fix it
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Useful Information</th>
<th>Well Written</th>
<th>Knowledge Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chap 1. Leadership Style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU(^b)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDEM</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDEM Discussion Group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEA Workshop</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU(^c)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chap 2. Leadership Habits and Attitudes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU(^b)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDEM</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDEM Discussion Group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEA Workshop</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chap 4. Teamwork</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU(^b)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDEM</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDEM Discussion Group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEA Workshop</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU(^c)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chap 8. Teaching Others</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU(^b)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDEM</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDEM Discussion Group</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEA Workshop</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU(^c)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chap 11. Program Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU(^b)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDEM</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDEM Discussion Group</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEA Workshop</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU(^c)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chap 15. Program Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU(^b)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDEM</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDEM Discussion Group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEA Workshop</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU(^c)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Scale: 1 = lowest-worst; 7 = highest-best  
\(^b\) Evaluation of manual chapters (prior to 1996)  
\(^c\) Evaluation of revised manual chapters (1996)
The English version of the text was rewritten to organize the 15 chapters into 35 shorter modules to correspond to competencies needed by nonformal educators. Forty-four new modules were added so that the competencies identified in the studies cited above were all incorporated into a new, expanded version of the textbook. A copy of the revised English modules, Preparing community-based educators (Etling, 1995b), was also left at UDEM in hard copy as well as on computer disk. The following is a list of the contents.

INTRODUCTION
Purpose of this Curriculum
How the Curriculum was Developed
Philosophical Base

LEADERSHIP
L-1 Styles
L-2 Teamwork
L-3 Conducting Meetings
L-4 Small Group Dynamics
L-5 Personal Goals
L-6 Organizing Committees
L-7 Self Image
L-8 Mentoring
L-9 Decision Making

EDUCATIONAL DESIGN
E-1 Learning Theory
E-2 Principles of Adult Education
E-3 Nonformal Education
E-4 Program Planning
E-5 Needs Assessment
E-6 Setting Priorities
E-7 Writing Objectives
E-8 Assessing Resources
E-9 Writing a Plan
E-10 Program Evaluation
E-11 Calendar of Activities
E-12 Curriculum Development
E-13 Mission Statement
E-14 Organizational Philosophy

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
M-1 Social Action Process
M-2 Implementing a Plan
M-3 Managing Conflict
M-4 Time Management
M-5 Stress Management
M-6 Using Advisory Groups
M-7 Resource Development/Marketing Programs
M-8 Budgets
M-9 Reporting to Sponsors
M-10 Inter-organizational Coordination

VOLUNTARISM
V-1 Basic Human Needs
V-2 Job Descriptions
V-3 Recruitment
V-4 Motivation
V-5 Orientation
V-6 Supervision
V-7 In-service Training
V-8 Recognition
V-9 Legal Considerations

PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT
P-1 Ages and Stages
P-2 Family Strengths
P-3 Values Development
P-4 Cultural Awareness
P-5 Career Skills
P-6 Current Issues
P-7 Problem Solving

COMMUNICATION
C-1 Interpersonal
C-2 Listening
C-3 Public Speaking
C-4 Writing
C-5 Nonverbal
C-6 Preparation to Teach
C-7 Teaching Behaviors
C-8 Using Learning Techniques

LEARNING/TEACHING TECHNIQUES
LT-1 Workshop
LT-2 Lecture
LT-3 Brainstorming
LT-4 Overhead Transparencies
LT-5 Slide Sets
LT-6 Newsletters
LT-7 Farm-Home Visit
LT-8 Technical Bulletin
LT-9 Tour and Field Trip
LT-10 Self Training
Conclusions

1. Student and peer evaluations of the course indicate that it was as well received at UDEM as at Penn State. Apparently teaching style and course content were as compatible with UDEM and its Mexican culture as with Penn State and its US culture.

2. Evaluations by participants and peers indicate that the workshop content and instruction were as well received in Nuevo Leon as in Pennsylvania.

3. The manual chapters were rated as high or higher by the Mexicans than by the class at Penn State. With the exception of chapter 11, all scores by Mexicans exceeded the criterion of 5 on a scale of 7. The manual, therefore, appears to be appropriate for use at UDEM and in workshops for nonformal educators in Nuevo Leon.

4. No cultural biases were found in the manual which would prevent its use in other Mexican states. Because Mexican culture varies from state to state, however, testing and evaluation will be necessary to determine if the manual can be used across the country. Mexican academics from other state universities indicated interest in piloting the textbook in their states.

5. INEA workshop participants rated the chapters higher than university students at either UDEM or Penn State. This may indicate that the workshop setting was more appropriate than the classroom for this subject. It may also indicate that participants with more experience appreciate the chapters more than students with limited or no experience in community work. Both explanations are probably responsible, to some degree, for the difference in evaluations by the groups involved.

6. More course and workshop evaluations in both settings would help clarify and support or refute the above conclusions.

7. Gaps and weaknesses in the textbook were identified. The new expanded version of 79 modules was used by Penn State students during the fall of 1995. Their evaluations were higher than the two previous Penn State classes with regard to the textbook content. Therefore, the new modules have more promise than the 15 chapters for the preservice preparation of nonformal educators, at least in the U.S.

8. Evaluation is needed to determine the impact of the participants’ learning in the courses and workshops. A separate study will be needed with a new evaluation design.

9. Based on the evaluation scores and interest for these training materials by educators in Monterrey and other sites in Mexico, similar workshops should be offered in other Mexican states and possibly in other countries in Latin America.

10. As a result of this effort, institutional linkages were developed among Penn State, UDEM, and INEA. Such linkages become increasingly important as we look to the 21st century.

Educational Importance

In the course taught at UDEM, three student community development projects were successfully completed. These projects involved educational services beyond the classroom to neighborhoods around the UDEM campus. They provided experiential learning opportunities for the students.
The UDEM discussion group examined the need for an academic program at UDEM in community development/nonformal education. Participants indicated interest in exploring that possibility. Etling promised to communicate UDEM's interest to faculty in the community development minor offered in the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology at Penn State. Subsequently, during the fall semester of 1995, Professor Reyes taught the community development course at UDEM. Etling, likewise, taught the course at Penn State during the same semester. Evaluations completed in 1996 indicated that the revised manual with 79 modules is an improvement over the original version.

In 1996 and 1997, UDEM faculty arranged for publication in Mexico of the manual which was to be disseminated throughout Latin America. Dissemination of the manual should provide opportunities for UDEM and Penn State faculty to consult on programs to prepare nonformal educators. Faculty from both institutions are working on evaluation instruments to test the outcomes of the curriculum on university students and nonformal educators. These instruments will document the impact of the curriculum on the participants after they have a chance to apply their new competencies to their diverse community development projects.

A curriculum that strengthens the competencies of community-based educators has great potential to strengthen communities in both the U.S. and Mexico. Such a curriculum also has potential for organizations that promote community development, youth development, health education, adult education, and leadership development. This curriculum is already changing the way that UDEM and Penn State prepare nonformal educators, both preservice and inservice, to assist communities. The institutional linkage between UDEM and Penn State is enabling the development of a stronger curriculum in terms of quality and transferability.
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