

# **Regional Resource Center Region III**

## **Second Quarter Report FY 07-08**

**(January-March 2008)**

Literacyworks

Peninsula Library System

<b>Award Number:</b>	X257T060004
<b>Name of Organization:</b>	Literacyworks Peninsula Library System
<b>Region:</b>	Region III
<b>Reporting Period:</b>	January 1, 2008 - March 31, 2008
<b>Name of Project Director:</b>	Paul Heavenridge
<b>Name of person preparing this report:</b>	Paul Heavenridge

### **1. Goals and objectives for the past quarter**

- 1) Build Partnerships and Collaboration at the regional and state level
- 2) Present at State Adult Education Conferences
- 3) Participate in LINCS RRC phone and winter meetings
- 4) Work collaboratively with the other RRCs and NIFL to develop and persuade partner states to complete evaluations and professional development mapping data
- 5) Plan for, contract for and implementation of 2008 PD workshops and *Call for Presentations* for conferences
- 6) Plan for and implemented the 2008 Partner Meeting and Health Literacy Summit including travel arrangements, hotel, and agenda information to all partners.
- 7) Complete Health Literacy curriculum with Meg Schofield and Carole Talan for presentation at Partner Meeting and Health Literacy Summit.

### **2. Outcomes and activities for the quarter**

#### **1) Build partnerships and collaboration at the national, regional and state level**

- Contacted state adult education directors and staff in Region III about attending the February 2008 Partner Meeting and Health Literacy Summit
- Broadcast LINCS and NIFL information and workshops on the RRC III regional discussion list to keep partners informed of LINCS activities
- Responded to LINCS related requests and questions from various partners as needed
- Communicated by phone and email with partners concerning status of the Institute LINCS work and the RRCs
- Assisted Christina L. Perez, MN, FNP, RN U.S. Department of Health and Human Services logistics and with invite list of adult education and literacy professional for the federal

Department of Health and Human Services Town Hall Meeting on Improving Health Literacy  
Monday, March 10, 2008 in Sacramento, CA.

## **2) Present at State Adult Education Conferences**

Kathy St. John and Marilyn Gillespie presented at the professional development workshop at Las Cruces Community College, New Mexico on January 12, 2008 entitled “*Applying Research in Reading Instruction for Adults: Using Literacy Research and Publications Developed by the National Institute for Literacy to Improve Practice*”. The workshop had 100 participants. The workshop agenda is below.

### **Applying Research in Reading Instruction for Adults Using Literacy Research and Publications Developed by the National Institute for Literacy to Improve Practice**

Las Cruces Community College, New Mexico  
Presenters: Kathy St. John and Marilyn Gillespie  
January 12, 2008  
8:30-12:00

#### Agenda

##### I. Warm Up

###### Pre-Course Reflection

Handout: Completed in pairs\*, with partner who teaches at similar reading level

Objective: To access prior knowledge, successes and challenges related to teaching reading.

###### Improving Reading Instruction: Personal Action Plan

Handout: Completed in pairs

Objective: To identify existing goals related to reading instruction and topics of interest to participants. These goals will be revisited and refined at the end of the session.

##### II. Introduction

Introduction of Presenters Introduction to include GED and ESOL leads from Las Cruces Community College who will assist with small group instruction; recognition of planning team

Overview of Purposes and Goals of the Workshop Purposes including helping instructors to:

Become introduced to 5 key NIFL publications:

What is Scientifically-Based Research?

Using Research and Reason in Education

Teaching Adults to Read: Research-Based Principles

Applying Research in Reading Instruction for Adults

Teaching Adults to Read: Summary

Understand “scientifically-based” research and its implications for teaching reading  
Learn about key research-based tools for assessing and teaching reading identified by the NIFL Partnership for Reading  
Set goals and action plans for improving reading instruction

### III. What is Scientifically Based Research?

What can practitioners learn by reading research?  
Criteria for evaluating research claims  
Experimental and quasi-experimental research  
Replication of research, meta-analysis  
Using NIFL publications to understand reading research  
Converging evidence on research in reading in K-12  
Adult education research in reading  
The role of professional wisdom

### IV. Reading Components and Reading Assessment

Why silent reading assessment is not sufficient  
The Adult Reading Components Study(ARCS): Overview  
Viewing of Video: ARCS Reading Panel Discussion  
    Handouts: Pre-and post viewing questions  
                Overview of reading components  
                Overview of categories of assessments  
Overview of learner profiles  
    Brief post-viewing discussion

### BREAK

NIFL and ARCS website will be available for viewing during the break and after the session

### V. The Components of Reading: Print-Based Skills

Note: This section will summarize key points addressed in Applying Research in Reading Instruction for Adults and refer instructors to sections to consult for further study.

#### Alphabets: Phonemic Awareness Training and Phonics Instruction

    Overview and definitions  
Assessment: Uses and tools  
What kinds of phonemic awareness training is most effective?  
    Why is decoding important?  
    What kinds of phonic instruction is most effective?  
    Implications for ESOL students  
    Interactive pair/small group discussion of applications

#### Fluency Development

    Overview and definitions: Why is fluency important?  
    Assessment: Uses and tools

What kinds of fluency instruction are most effective?  
Implications for ESOL students  
Interactive pair/small group discussion of applications

## VI. The Components of Reading: Meaning-Based Skills

### Strategies: An Overview

What are learning strategies and why are they important?  
How are strategies taught? (Modeling/think-aloud and guided practice)

### Vocabulary Development

Overview: Why is vocabulary important? Needs at varied instructional levels

Assessment: Uses and Tools

What kinds of vocabulary instruction are most effective?

Vocabulary instructional strategies

Vocabulary development for ESOL students

Interactive pair/small group discussion of application of vocabulary strategies

### Comprehension Strategy Development

Overview: What is reading comprehension?

Assessment: Uses and tools

What kinds of vocabulary instruction are most effective?

Implications for ESOL students

Interactive pair/small group discussion of applications

## VII. Applying What You Have Learned to Your Student Population

Small group discussion and activities

Participants grouped into 3 ABE and 3 ESOL instructional levels

Applications of research for varied levels of learners

Sharing of resources (reading texts, lesson plans, other tools)

Group discussion of review and revision of action plans based on what has been learned and

NIFL publications provided

## VIII. Review and Revision of Individual Action Plan

Action plans revised in pairs

Key goals on chart paper for whole group sharing

## IX. Closing

Sharing and discussion of goals/action plans

Suggestions for next steps

Informal evaluation of learning

\* In smaller sized training sessions a think-pair-share and other cooperative learning techniques could be utilized; however, give the size of this session (100 participants) paired activities will be used.

### **3) Participate in LINC'S RRC phone and winter meetings**

- Hosted and attended NIFL Regional Resource Centers Meeting at the Claremont Hotel in Berkeley, CA on January 29-30, 2008.

#### **Outcomes:**

1. Reviewed Training Materials
2. Practitioner Needs Assessment: results and noted trends/issues
3. PD Mapping: Ask states to bring needs assessments to partner meetings and will present Executive Summary
4. Discussed Framework for Dissemination Plans
5. Coordinated State Partner Meetings
6. Coordinated Health Literacy Summits
7. Discussed gender Items for New Orleans

#### **Next steps:**

- PD Mapping—deadline for purpose of preparing the report—Feb. 15
  - Executive summary for needs assessment—due Feb. 12—Jean
  - Executive summary for PD mapping—Kaye
  - Flash drives for state directors—Chas to order; Tim and Bill to auto load
  - Information on state directors meeting—Paul
  - Evaluation forms for state partner meetings and health lit summit—Carole
  - List on wiki for training manuals—all/Max—Feb. 18—Kaye & Leah to copyedit/proof
  - Dissemination plans—all—due May 31, 2008
  - Video and sound clips for TAR to Tim—Jo
  - PPT on HL curriculum—Paul/Carole
  - America's Literacy Directory—one page description for partner meetings—Jo
  - Add STAR trainers to expert list—Kaye
  - Evidence-based Practices Workshop—Word files for entire and half day sessions—Kaye
- Participated in RRC informational calls and LINC'S monthly phone conferences in February 2008 and March 2008.

### **4) Work collaboratively with the other RRCs and NIFL to develop evaluations and professional development mapping data including:**

- Updated listing of potential national experts and trainers for NIFL approval
- Region III states completed online PD Mapping form and evaluations, compiled Region III report on Mapping and Evaluations for Partner meeting.

### **5) Prepared for 2008 PD workshops and *Call for Presentations* for conferences**

- Paul Heavenridge's *Call for Presentation* to the Mountain Plains Adult Education Association was accepted. The workshop is titled *Free! LINC'S Ready Research Resources to Improve Your*

*Literacy Services Locally* for the conference at Salt Lake City, UT on Wednesday, April 23rd to Saturday, April 26<sup>th</sup>.

- Meg Schofield's ***Call for Presentation*** to the Mountain Plains Adult Education Association was accepted. The workshop is titled *Overview of a New Research-based Health Literacy Curriculum for ABE Locally* for the conference at Salt Lake City, UT on Wednesday, April 23rd to Saturday, April 26<sup>th</sup>.

- Noreen Peterson's ***Call for Presentation*** to the Mountain Plains Adult Education Association was accepted. The workshop is titled *LINCS: Another Link in Professional Development* for the conference at Salt Lake City, UT on Wednesday, April 23rd to Saturday, April 26<sup>th</sup>

- Meg Schofield's ***Call for Presentation*** to the COABE 2008 MAACCE/COABE National Conference St. Louis, Missouri April 28-May 1, 2008 was accepted. Meg Schofield's presentation will be reporting on the development of the research-based health literacy curriculum, designed to simultaneously improve both literacy and health literacy outcomes in low literate populations and to introduce the free curriculum and instructor-training manual.

- Kathy St. John's ***Call for Presentation*** was accepted for *Applying Research in Reading Instruction for Adults* Teacher's Institute New Mexico Adult Education April 11th & 12th, 2008 in Santa Fe New Mexico.

- Marilyn Gillispie's ***Call for Presentation*** was accepted for the READ/San Diego's 18th Annual Tutor Conference at the University of San Diego Joan Kroc Institute for Peace and Justice San Diego, CA **Estimated # of Participants:** 300 ABE instructors, literacy tutors, and library literacy staff.

## **6) Planned and Presented 2008 Partner Meeting**

- The LINCS Region III Regional Resource Center 2008 Partner Meeting was held on February 26-27, 2008 at the Mark Hopkins Intercontinental Hotel, San Francisco, CA. 47 representatives from our 16 partner states attended. The agenda and minutes from the meeting are below:

### **PARTNER MEETING AGENDA**

#### **LINCS Region III REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTER 2008 PARTNER MEETING** February 26-27, 2008

*REGION III RC PARTNERS MEETING: Intercontinental Hotel, San Francisco, CA*

**Tuesday, February 26, 2008**

1:00-2:00 Registration and networking

- 2:00-2:30 Welcome: Paul Heavenridge, Director, LINCS Region III Regional Resource Center
- Introductions
  - Icebreaker: Each state has previously contributed 3 trivia statements about their state. Attendees try to identify which state the trivia is about. State with most correct answers wins a prize
  - Today's Agenda Review
- 2:30-3:30 National Institute for Literacy and LINCS update:  
Mary Jo Maralit, NIFL Senior Program Officer, Technology
- The new LINCS Regional Resource Centers  
Paul Heavenridge, Director, LINCS Region III RRC
  - The new LINCS Resource Collections  
Drucilla Weirauch, LINCS Collection staff
  - Other National Institute for Literacy programs and plans
- 3:30-3:45 Q&A with Jo and Drucilla
- 3:45-4:15 BREAK and hotel checkin
- 4:15-5:45 Partners Presentations of Literacy Professional Development Issues by State Partners for each state in Region III
- 5:45-6:00 Wrap-up and Questions
- DINNER on your own

### **Wednesday, February 27, 2007**

#### REGION III REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTER PARTNERS MEETING (continued)

- 8:30-9:00 Coffee and networking
- 9:00-9:15 Welcome: Paul Heavenridge
- Today's Agenda Review & discussion of needed changes/adjustments
- 9:15-10:15 LINCS Professional Development Mapping & Needs Assessment  
Surveys results presentation and discussion  
Dr. Carole Talan, formerly CA Library Literacy Services & Exec Dir State Literacy Resource Center of CA, Moderator
- 10:15-11:15 Each state meets together or with contiguous state to
- Identify PD needs based on NIFL PD Mapping & Needs Assessment surveys review and
  - Develop plans for PD trainings based on NIFL offerings.

- 11:15-12:00 States report back to larger group on what they have decided.
- 12:00-1:00 LUNCH (provided)
- 1:00- 2:30 Presentation: New Curriculum and Teachers/Training Manual for Beginning ABE Health Literacy created for scientifically based research project. Led by Meg A. Schofield, M.Ed
- 2:30-2:45 Q&A with Meg concerning health literacy curriculum and how to access and use
- 2:45-3:00 BREAK
- 3:00-4:00 Large group discussion on dissemination plan for PD in Region III; experts who can deliver; use of online PD; use of all NIFL resources and dissemination of information about them and about RRC III throughout each state.
- 4:00-5:00 Large group discussion on what other PD needs states have; what and how they would like NIFL to address these needs in the future. What more can NIFL do to help you?
- 5:00- See you at the Health Literacy Summit tomorrow!  
DINNER on you own!

## **MEETING MINUTES**

### **MEETING MINUTES**

LINCS REGION III REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTER 2008 PARTNER MEETING SAN FRANCISCO, CA FEBRUARY 26-27, 2008

Attending Margaret Bowles (MT), Jacquie Brinkley (CA), Arva Carlson (AK), Michele Centrella (NM), Melody Clegg (ID), Kathy Cooper (WA), Babette Dickinson (NE), Debra Fawcett (CO), Max Ferman (Literacyworks), Suzanne Flint (CA), Jane Greiner (ProLiteracy), Susan Handy (CA), Sheryl Hart (AZ), Paul Heavenridge (Literacyworks), Marilee Hertig (WA), Amy Iutzi (AK), Margaret Jacob (ID), Marty Kelly (UT), Mary Jo Maralit (National Institute for Literacy), David Massey (ND), Wendi Maxwell (CA), Debbie Miyao (HI), Jeff Myers (SD), Susana Navarrette-Rodriguez (NM), Kim Olson (SD), Norene Peterson (MT), Lynn Reed (AZ), Kathy Sakuda (HI), Kelli Sandman-Hurley (CA), Meg Schofield (Literacy Solutions), Jan Sears (NE), Shauna South (UT), Kathy St. John (CA), Carole Talan (Literacyworks), Drucie Weirauch (Penn State University), Sharyn Yanoshak (NV).

**Tuesday, February 26, 2008**



Welcome and Introductions Paul welcomed the partners and reviewed the agenda. Partners introduced themselves with their organization, state, and favorite dance.

Ice Breaker Carole organized the partners in an ice breaking activity that required small teams to identify which state is associated with previously provided trivia.

Partner Presentations: PD issues **Alaska** TQI work to organize database. More small group PD initiatives. TABE online. Corrections group.

**Arizona** Arizona has the Leadership Excellence Academy, a certification program for program leaders. It is a two-year course developed by ProLiteracy America and the state directors association. Teach I Adult Numeracy (TIAN), developed by the National Science foundation, is for instructors. The Professional Development Leadership Academy is for teachers (K-12 and adult). [www.azed.gov/pdla](http://www.azed.gov/pdla) The distance learning project for Arizona is Project IDEAL, which involves a consortium of states. The goal is to build good distance learning programs. Technical integration is provided by Education Technical Experts (ETE).

**California** Wendi (Department of Education) illustrated the size of California (If on the East Coast, would run from Pennsylvania to Georgia) to provide a geographic context for the state. There are 1/4 million students and 12,000 adult educators and 26 staff in the state office. Wendi distributed a recent publication Research Digest: Evidence-based Reading Instruction, developed by CALPRO. The PD system evaluated workshops and identified 45 good research-based workshops. The Comings "Persistence" study circle was especially popular with 60 participants. On-line PD is provided for teachers and learners, with over 60,000 participating. CA has a teacher-mentoring-teachers process. Professional development is site-based, but there is also a national portal. The USDOE focus on Homeland Security is a priority for an online setting to teach English, transitioning learners from ELL to ABE to workplace. Jackie (California Library Literacy Services) has used the STAR project. There are seven regions. There are ample video resources. One highlights 17 different learners' lives, which is important for new learners to see. [www.libraryliteracy.org](http://www.libraryliteracy.org).

**Colorado** Debbie explained that the emphases for PD changes every five years. New policy in place by July 1, 2008 for 50% of literacy instructors to be authorized (> 20 per week). PD system is integrated. An online self-assessment of knowledge and skills descriptors invites teachers to identify areas of need. The top 10 items direct the PD for the state. Online PD is available for each skill descriptor. There are also four professional development centers and three professional development resource libraries.

**Hawaii** Debbie and Kathy are new to adult education (less than one year). Hawaii needs to develop a strategic plan for professional development. There is a new ESL initiative that will have to be incorporated in the strategic plan. Adult education falls under the K-12 area.

**Idaho** Idaho is a very rural state with limited resources, which requires creativity to maximize PD. Most teachers are part time. There is a 5-year plan with National Reporting System modules. They have conducted research on short-term study circles vs. mentoring. Key issues are the distribution of PD funds and incentives for teachers to participate in PD.

**Montana** Montana now has a new data system (NRS) which will inform PD. Distance learning will also affect PD needs. There is a growing need for a systemic way to provide workforce literacy. The website has a calendar to support PD, "flavor of the month." Montana maintains its Montana LINC website with archived webinars.

**Nebraska** There has been an increase in ELL. Nebraska has fall ABE Conference and Math Institutes. They have a new data system. They are exploring managed enrollment. There is a need for workplace literacy skills. There is no state funding for adult education.

**Nevada** There are many PD needs in this large, mostly rural state. Most instructors (95%) are part time. Very limited resources and stretched staff. There is a catalogue of PD and approximately two trainings are provided for each site. Nevada provides pre-service PD in person, then participants move to more independent PD. For example, programs participated in the John Comings Study Circle and moved on to more individual work. Nevada has an action research model in place.

**New Mexico** New Mexico is now using LITPRO for data management. It uses data for decision making and has NRS certification. There are area cluster trainings (e.g. math for the GED) there is a focus on learning differences. ESL uses CALA resources. There is a distance learning project, Project IDEAL, which is a consortium of states using research and evaluation to improve distance learning.

**North Dakota** North Dakota shares similar challenges to those listed already: resources, geography, weather. Therefore PD is a challenge to deliver. Adult Education is housed in K-12. Dave supervises K-12 through adult education. PD for math and ESL is open to all teachers. Needs assessment of PD and delivery of services is conducted annually. North Dakota has an electronic state network.

**Oregon** In Oregon, ABE is housed in community colleges, where discrete PD can occur in the same space (e.g. accountability training). There are several state initiatives, but local involvement makes such initiatives more sustainable. Oregon provides tutor training for reading and math. Study circles are working well. PD is local and regional and is determined at these levels. Rural geography is a problem. There has been recent turnover at the state level.

**South Dakota** There have been recent changes in the state delivery of PD, due to turnover of PD providers (68%). There will be a summer institute with teacher training, ESL and STAR. South Dakota will host the regional COABE July 28-30.

**Utah** Utah uses the Utopia data base. This will allow all students to be tracked, even when they move from one program to another. This serves as a common link to higher education and high school diploma. There are five regions for Departments of Labor and Education. There is a common referral form across agencies. For example, the common data base can identify drop outs to refer to ABE programs and workforce services. There are distance learning opportunities through A+ and NOVANET and the Utah Education Network.

**Washington** PD is provided in four regions. Recent trainings have included Judy Alamprese on program improvement using data and NIFL adult education standards. Washington utilizes two notable researchers' work. John Strucker and Steve Reder.

Adjourned for the evening.

**Wednesday, February 27, 2008**

Welcome: Paul welcomed the group back and reviewed changes to the agenda.

National Institute for Literacy Overview: Jo reviewed the mission and vision of the National Institute for Literacy, which has changed somewhat over the past months. There is an advisory board of 10 members who are Senate approved.

An interagency group is comprised of representatives from Department of Labor, Department of Education, and Health and Human Services.

Jo reviewed the history of The Institute which started in 1991 with the National Literacy Act and has grown and changed through 1998 Workforce Investment Act and the 2001 *No Child Left Behind*, which introduced the need for scientifically-based reading research.

Jo explained that the LINCS collections are taking on a new look.

Drucie extended discussion on the LINCS collections, sharing handouts. The focus on the collections is on highest-quality resources that are research and evidence-based. The resources must be available on-line and be free. There are three Collections, each with three sub-topics: Workforce Competitiveness (ELL, technology, workforce education), Program Planning (assessment, learning disabilities, program improvement), and Basic Skills (reading, writing, math/numeracy.) Resources may cross over the Collections and sub topics. The LINCS team, comprised of experts from Kent State University, Penn State University, and University of Tennessee-Knoxville, as well as consulting experts, devised a stringent review process and identified expert reviewers. When a resource (either product or research) has been vetted, LINCS will place a profile on the website. This should be available in April. Drucie urged the partners to send her links to any resources their states may have developed for review. Partners voiced some concern over the Profiles and wanted them to be clear about how to use them. Partners suggested that Research profiles should include implications for practice.

LINCS Professional Development Mapping and Needs Assessment Carole reviewed the recent PD Mapping Survey and Needs Assessment Survey (winter 2008). The PD Mapping Survey (draft) was completed by 42 state adult education offices and 16 state-level organizations. It tracked types of PD, hours, who receives, priorities, methods of delivery, and suggestions for future PD. The PD Needs Assessment Survey gathered information from individual practitioners to determine their PD needs. The survey was administered over the web from August 20 to Nov. 30, 2007. 2,239 returned the completed survey, approximately 200% more than expected. 49 states were represented. The survey collected information on types, frequency, topics, and needs for PD. Practitioners were also asked if/how PD has helped to change their practice. Three top areas of unmet needs were: multilevel classrooms, persistence and retention, and ESOL. These reports, in full, are included in the USB drive that Paul distributed.

Carole then reviewed the NIFL Professional Development Offerings to State Organizations coordinated by LINCS Regional Resource Centers. (also included on the USB drive). States were instructed to work on identifying PD needs based on the Mapping and Needs Assessment survey results, develop plans for PD from the NIFL offerings, and identify training that their state may be willing to share.

State/Group Results AZ's Proposition 300 intends that AE cannot serve any undocumented learners. This will impact who they serve and, therefore, will need PD in serving ABE learners, as they will not be able to serve as many ESOL. Specific areas of PD include persistence and retention, reading and basic skills, transitioning to postsecondary. There is also a need for "soft skills" such as critical thinking, time management, self-image as AZ transitions to serving ESOL learners to ABE learners who will be needing to be prepared for the workforce or postsecondary training. SD, MT, ND, and NV identified PD needs in math and workplace essentials (soft skills).

UT identified ABE and ESOL, especially for reading; administrator training for persistence and retention; corrections education.

OR and WA focused on career pathways and transitions and content standards as areas for PD. CA was comprised of the DOE and the Library Literacy System. How to maximize their efforts. They identified collaboration at the local level and a continuum between a tutor-system and

classroom-system. The lowest level of ABE are served by the library system. They get their basic concepts for PD from NIFL.

ID identified evidence-based research, reading through train the trainers and study circles as areas of PD. They intend to use the LINCS collections and facilitate on-line courses. The state conference is Oct. 16-17.

NE needs PD for multilevel classes, reading strategies, online alternatives, and preparing learners for college or work. They prefer 1/2 day workshops and group instruction.

CO and NM has a task force to survey practitioners to determine their PD needs. There are quarterly meetings and regional cluster meetings. Webinars also provide PD. Identified PD needs include transitions, employability skills, health literacy, distance learning, ESOL, and learning disabilities.

AK EL Civics is and area of need. How to institutionalize beyond the workshop. They have developed a master math teacher, Math for the Trades, a 20-30 hour course. Go to [www.ninestar.com](http://www.ninestar.com)

HA has a need for ESOL PD as they serve learners from across the Pacific rim who have migrated to HA. Their classes serve learners in 52 languages. They also want to find out how to sustain knowledge, beyond the work shop. Need to develop a strategic plan for AE. They have no annual state conference.

Health Literacy Curriculum Meg Schofield presented the Health Literacy Curriculum, which is based on an (NICHD and OVAE) five-year research study by Susan Levy, University of Illinois, Chicago, and others. The curriculum was written to increase adults' (beginning level ABE) literacy skills as well as provide them with knowledge and skills to navigate the health care system. The study was a randomized design, conducted with 1,946 adult learners in 42 Illinois adult education or family literacy centers. With support from National Institute for Literacy, LINCS Region III, Meg converted the curriculum from its pilot form to an online, narrative based curriculum, expanding the curriculum and making it more usable for instructors and learners. She also developed an on-line instructor manual. There are 18 sections that focus on various health issues. Each section includes:

- Presentation of new vocabulary
- Multi-sensory sight word practice
- Phonemic awareness activities
- Phonics and word analysis activities
- Pre-reading discussion
- Highly readable stories (GE 2-3) on health related topics
- Fluency and comprehension reinforcement
- Additional activities (comprehension, oral, writing, vocabulary)

The eighteen sections include: 1-2 Health professionals 3 Emergency care 4 Self-care and non-emergency care 5 Preventive care—Regular check ups 6 Preventive care—Physical activity and good nutrition 7 Taking and keeping an appointment 8-9 Talking to health professionals 10 Filling out medical and family history forms 11 After a visit to a health professional—Tests 12 After a visit to a health professional—Medication/drugs 13 Medication warnings 14 Information about medications 15 following directions and dosages for medications 16 Other drugs 17 Paying for your health care 18 Getting healthier

Meg demonstrated the anatomy of the curriculum, choosing several sections and taking the partners through each of the parts or folders (vocabulary, read and comprehend, supplemental activities) The curriculum is in final review and will be available on-line in several months. The pilot was evaluated using reading scores (from AE program assessment in place) and a common multiple choice assessment of health literacy concepts and attitudes. Meg recommended using the pre-test as an advanced organizer with the learners. The on-line curriculum is being field tested by Literacy Action, Inc., Atlanta, GA.

### Large Group Discussion on Dissemination of NIFL Resources, Region III

#### **Challenges and Barriers**

Dissemination is difficult. There is frequent turnover that requires new dissemination. How do we network better to ensure resources are available?

The following challenges/barriers were listed:

Time

Money (need a plan to prioritize)

Multiple voices (OAVE, NCSALL, NIFL, etc.)

Sometimes, too much information. Need to prioritize

Better marketing tool for communication (website)

#### **Recommendations**

Out of the challenges emerged some recommendations:

Need to manage the information, annotate it/abstract

Provide a ‘cookbook’ for using (Jo—the website will take care of this)

For research articles, provide ideas on how to use the research

Cluster the resources, especially in the Collections

Make clear the underlying assumptions about the resources (e.g. SBRR)

RRC should pull this together

Email “what’s new?” (Jo—This is in place. Explained how to get on list)

For RRC III meetings, group regionally

Clarify role of meetings (Networking? New information?)

Organize the meetings by having us provide ideas for the agenda (One thing I want to get out of this...One thing I want to bring/share...)

Have a NIFL/LINCS presence at state conferences

Let us help to assert NIFL direction and suggestions for the research agenda

### List of Health Literacy Issues to Guide Discussion at Health Literacy Summit

Paul and Carole led the discussion of topics to guide the Health Literacy Summit on Thursday. Partners provided the following ideas:

Identify the issues from the medical field and our students

Develop plan to partner—How do we begin to bring health, literacy communities and learners/patients together (where do we start?)

Where do we start? (action at local level; policy and PD at state and national)

Growing number of ESOL and ABE with health needs

Non-standardized language – How can we talk to each other?

What is the value added?

How do we sustain this for long term?

## **7) Planned and Presented 2008 Health Literacy Summit**

• The LINCS Region III Regional Resource Center 2008 Health Literacy Summit was held on February 28, 2008 at the San Francisco State Downtown Campus Westfield Center, San Francisco, CA. 127 attended from our 16 partner states, health professionals, and adult learners. Two states, Arizona and New Mexico, have begun statewide Health Literacy initiatives because of the Summit and Region wide discussions have started sparked by the day's discussions. A website of the Summit's video, presentation's and Powerpoints is at <http://literacyworks.org/hls>.

### **HEALTH LITERACY SUMMIT AGENDA**

**National Institute for Literacy  
LINCS Region III Regional Resource Center  
Literacyworks**

**Health Literacy Summit  
Creating Better Health Communication: Adult Literacy Providers Partnering with Health  
Care Providers**

**Purpose:** The Summit will address the pivotal role adult literacy providers and their adult learners partnering with health care providers can play in eliminating literacy barriers that interfere with adults with low literacy's access to quality health care

**Hosted by:** National Institute for Literacy (NIFL) and its LINCS Region III Resource Center and Literacyworks in partnership with the Center for Immigrant and Refugee Community Literacy Education (CIRCLE), San Francisco State University College of Humanities; Community Engagement Program, UC San Francisco; and the Center for Vulnerable Populations at UC San Francisco / San Francisco General Hospital

**Date:** February 28, 2008 (8:00 – 4:30)

**Location:** San Francisco State Downtown Campus Westfield Center 6F  
835 Market Street (at Powell Street)  
Room N609 from 8:00 – 4:30

**Agenda:**

- 8:00-8:30      **Continental breakfast/coffee/tea, check-in, and informal networking**
- 8:30            **Welcome & Logistics:** Paul Heavenridge, NIFL LINCS Region III Resource Center
- Welcome and Opening remarks:** Dr Gail Weinstein, Professor, San Francisco State University and founder of CIRCLE (Center for Immigrant and Refugee Community Literacy Education).
- 8:45      **Summary of health literacy work from the NIFL Region III Resource Center Partners meeting and California Dept of Education’s health literacy initiative:** Wendy Maxwell, California Department of Education Adult Ed and Susan D. Handy, R.N. Principal/Director Bakersfield Adult School
- 9:00      **Local collaborative health literacy partnership:** Pat Lawson-North, Santa Clara County Library literacy services’ (VISION LITERACY) director and Carolyn Brown, Director of Performance & Outcome Management, Santa Clara Valley Medical Center
- 9:15            **Audience Q&A with presenters**
- 9:30            **Adult Learner Perspectives on Health Literacy**  
Dr. Carole Talan, literacy specialist and documentary filmmaker, introduces two adult learners, Enrique Ramirez and Kristi Clontz.
- 9:45      **BREAK**
- 10              **Plenary Address:** Dr Dean Schillinger, leading health literacy doctor/advocate, practicing primary care physician at San Francisco General Hospital and Director of the UCSF Center for Vulnerable Populations, a new research center committed to transforming clinical and public health practice and policy to improve health and health care for socially vulnerable people.
- 10:30          **Audience Q&A:** with Dr Dean Schillinger, Enrique Ramirez, and Kristi Clontz
- 10:45          **Panel Discussion on Ideas for Partnerships that Support Health Literacy:** Focus will be on cross-disciplinary collaborations in health; comments from not for profits on how to frame the dialogue to promote collaboration between communities, adult education and the safety net hospitals and public health clinics;
- 11:00          **Audience Q&A with not-for-profits.**
- 11:15          **A Health Literacy Curriculum for Beginning ABE:**  
Meg Schofield M.Ed.
- 12:00-1:00    **LUNCH:**

Working Lunch with small group discussions about issues / partnerships related to health literacy

- 1:00       **BRIEF reports:**  
Reports from lunch table discussions presented to the full group.
- 1:30       **Breakout Sessions:** Divide by topics based on the lunch discussions. Groups present ideas for potential Health Literacy projects and existing projects as best practices.
- 2:45       **BREAK**
- 3:00       **Breakout Sessions Discussion:** Sharing from breakout groups and discussion of next steps to the full group.
- 3:30       **Large Group Discussion:** Visioning for the future: What is possible and what needs to be done next for partnerships to move forward with specific projects..
- 4:00       **Summation of the Day:**  
Dr. Gerald (Jerry) Eisman, Director of the Institute for Civic and Community Engagement, San Francisco State University, Moderator
- 4:15       **Closing remarks:**  
Paul Heavenridge,

**8) Health Literacy curriculum:** Completed curriculum with Meg Schofield and Carole Talan for presentation at Partner Meeting and Health Literacy Summit. Meg Shofield worked with Carole Talan to produce supplemental material for each of the existing 18 Health Literacy lessons, consisting of the Institute for Health Research and Policy University of Illinois at Chicago researched based Health Literacy Curriculum:

- An original vocabulary list
- A supplemental vocabulary list
- A sight word list
- A “readable” text for ABE Beginning Level students
- A cloze exercise for ABE Beginning Level students
- An additional exercise/activity worksheet for ABE Beginning Level students
- References as applicable to other web-based resources, materials and lessons

A training manual for literacy instructors (teachers and tutors) that will –

- provide a curriculum overview and rationale
- incorporate information on best practices, based upon the four core instructional components: vocabulary, alphabetics, fluency, and comprehension and referencing and incorporating NIFL’s literacy resources and research

The LINCS Region III Resource Center provided:



- Technical assistance and formatting of documents for final publication.
- Review and feedback /acceptance by Carole Talan of each deliverable within one week of delivery.
- Liaison with NIFL to obtain any documents or information that may be necessary for fulfillment of this contract.

**To Do:** The curriculum is being reviewed by the Basic Skills Resource Collection (Drucie Weirauch, M.Ed. Family Literacy Specialist Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy and Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy) and field tested by an Atlanta adult literacy program.

Carole Talan has written a description of the curriculum development and review process and a draft of an Instructor and Learner Feedback Survey:

## **HEALTH LITERACY CURRICULUM FOR BEGINNING ABE: A Research-Based Curriculum and Instructor's Manual**

### **TIMETABLE:**

The curriculum in pdf and DOC versions will be delivered to the Institute after:

1. Revision (if necessary) based on the feedback from the field testing in Atlanta
2. Review by Drucie Weirauch, Pennsylvania State University and LINCS Basic Skills Collection contractor, in most current form after any above referenced revisions (feedback available from Drucie by mid-April)
3. Revision if needed after Drucie's review, and
4. Delivery to the Institute in late April.

### **BACKGROUND:**

We have a number of concerns about the original research that was conducted. These include:

- A final report has never been written.
- Health information was not even mentioned to the control group in any of their lessons; thus the improvement in health knowledge for the experimental group who used the curriculum was a given when compared to the control group.
- Specific basic skill building at the Beginning ABE level was very minimal.
- No written feedback was collected from either the instructors or the adult learners using the curriculum in the experimental group.

In order to address the lack of written feedback and to assess the usability and value of the curriculum from the instructor and learner viewpoints, the expanded version of the curriculum and the new instructor's manual were both field tested in part by Literacy Action, Inc., Atlanta, Georgia. Two teachers in two different ABE classes used the curriculum for approximately one month. In order to gather written instructor and learner feedback, both instructors and learners completed feedback forms designed to provide written comments and ratings of the curriculum and, in case of the instructors, of the manual. (see feedback forms attached)

### **DOCUMENTATION CONCERNING WORK DONE:**

In telephone conversation with Dr. Susan Levy, the researcher, she confirmed that little gain was made in basic skills for ABE students at the lower levels in the study. After viewing the research curriculum, it was easy to see why. Little actual basic skill building work was included while much health literacy information was provided. Evidence-based best practices so critical to the Institute and to basic literacy improvement were minimal in the original Beginning ABE materials. We explained to the researcher that we needed to expand the basic skill development components of the curriculum while maintaining the health literacy information intact in order to make it effective. Expanding these components with evidence-based best practices in no way takes away from the quality/effectiveness of the health information. In fact, it strengthens it. The researcher is neither a curriculum nor a literacy specialist and she did not voice an objection to this at the time of the discussion. Both the writer Meg Schofield and editor Dr. Carole Talan are curriculum & literacy specialists. Dr. Talan's doctorate is in curriculum & instruction with an emphasis in reading.

As research has proven, the more **interactive** a curriculum or tool can be, the more effective it is. For this reason we want to include in the web version (and can include a URL in any written copies) hot links to a number of free websites, including some of NIFL's own. Instructors are especially encouraged to use the Institute's online learner assessment, Assessment Strategies and Learner Profiles at <http://www.nifl.gov/readingprofiles/>

We would like to include links in the manual that take the instructor to short (1.5 to 3.5 minute) video clips on the web to demonstrate with actual beginning ABE students a variety of evidence-based techniques used in the curriculum to build basic skills (see website for clips at end of next paragraph). This video material was created by Meg Schofield a number of years ago for her program in Chula Vista Library Literacy and has proven very effective here in California and across the country.

The clips are short, free and very motivating. They include mini-demonstrations of techniques described in the manual, for example: reviewing new vocabulary; doing a "copy the phrase" (beginning writing) activity; conducting a guided reading activity; learning sight words; and systematic phonics/word analysis instruction (all evidence-based techniques). This is "bonus" material and not a required component of the curriculum but it is very helpful. When the curriculum was demonstrated at the LINCS Region III Partner Meeting and Health Literacy Summit in San Francisco, everyone loved this "live" part. One of the field test instructors in Atlanta was so impressed by the video clips she contacted Meg and asked if she could include them in her presentation for the LINCS Region II Health Literacy Summit there. All the clips can be downloaded for free at: [http://literacyworks.org/meg\\_video/CompressedClips/](http://literacyworks.org/meg_video/CompressedClips/)

**Health Literacy Curriculum  
INSTRUCTOR Feedback Survey**

Which Section(s) of the curriculum did you teach? \_\_\_\_\_

Please answer the following questions about the Section(s) you used on a sliding scale of 1 – 5:

1. Rate helpfulness/relevance of the **health** topics covered from not very (1) to very helpful (5)  
1      2      3      4      5

List any specific topics that you consider **not** helpful \_\_\_\_\_

2. Rate student interest in topics from not at all to very interested      1      2      3      4  
5

List any specific topics that were **not** of interest to the students \_\_\_\_\_

3. On a sliding scale rate ease of use of the **teacher manual** with 1 being very hard to 5 being very easy:      1      2      3      4      5 Please explain, especially if you marked very hard \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. On a sliding scale rate clarity of rationale for using the specific activities with 1 being not clear to 5 being very clear:      1      2      3      4      5

5. On a sliding scale rate strongly disagree 1 to strongly agree 5 to the following statement:  
“I was able to find activities appropriate for my students’ skill levels in each section.”  
1      2      3      4      5 Please explain, especially if you marked strongly disagree or strongly agree \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

6. Did you find any errors in the **curriculum**? If yes, what and where? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. Did you find any errors in the **teacher manual**? \_\_\_\_\_ If yes, what and where? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

8. Were there any other health topics not covered that the students specifically requested?\_\_ If yes, what were they? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

9. Do you have suggestions for improving the teacher manual or curriculum based on your work with it, and if so, what are they? (use back side if needed) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

**Thank you for using this curriculum and for providing feedback from your experience. Your input will help us design a better and more usable tool for other instructors.**

*A Health Literacy Curriculum for Beginning ABE*, National Institute For Literacy  
LINCS Region III Resource Center Project 2008

**Health Literacy Curriculum  
LEARNER Feedback Survey**

Which Section(s) of the curriculum did you use? \_\_\_\_\_

**Please answer the following questions about the Section(s) you used:**

On a sliding scale of 1 – 5, circle the number that best fits your answer...

10. Rate **how helpful health topics** in the curriculum were to you
- |             |   |   |   |              |
|-------------|---|---|---|--------------|
| 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5            |
| not helpful |   |   |   | very helpful |

List any specific topics that were **very helpful** to you \_\_\_\_\_

List any specific topics that were **not helpful** to you \_\_\_\_\_

11. Were there any **other health topics** not covered that you wish were covered?  
\_\_\_\_\_ If yes, what were they? \_\_\_\_\_

12. **How easy** was this curriculum for you to use, with 1 being very hard to 5 being very easy:
- |           |   |   |   |           |
|-----------|---|---|---|-----------|
| 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5         |
| very hard |   |   |   | very easy |

13. Do you have suggestions for improving the curriculum based on your work with it, and if so, what are they? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

14. In general, did you like working with this curriculum? Yes No

If no, why not? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

15. Would you encourage another learner to work with this curriculum? Yes No

If no, why not?

Thank you for using this curriculum and providing feedback from your work.  
Your input will help us design a better material for other learners and instructors.

*A Health Literacy Curriculum for Beginning ABE*, National Institute For Literacy  
LINCS Region III Resource Center Project 2008