DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 891 CE 060 041

TITLE	Rural Workplace Literacy Project: Northern California. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	California Human Development Corp.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	30 Sep 91
CONTRACT	V198A00139
NOTE	54p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; Adult Literacy; Illiteracy; Job Skills; Job Training; Limited English Speaking; *Literacy Education; *Migrant Adult Education; Migrant Problems; *Migrant Programs; *Migrant Workers; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Rural Areas; Rural Education
IDENTIFIERS	California; *Workplace Literacy

ABSTRACT

The California Human Development Corporation's Rural Workplace Literacy Project (RWLP) provided migrant and seasonal farmworkers with on-site workplace literacy training designed to enhance their ability to develop job skills. During 1990-91, it provided literacy classes at 15 agricultural worksites and enrolled 282 farmworkers. Of students participating in pre- and post-testing, 96 percent demonstrated improvement in test scores in the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS). Employers provided a variety of support, including classroom space, administrative services, access to equipment, paid release time, and attendance bonuses. A strategy for securing committed partners for RWLP in the future would be to educate employers to realize the benefits of an on-site workplace literacy project. A core curriculum for agriculture was altered for each specific site. An independent evaluation was conducted to assess program strengths and weaknesses and highlight directions for improvement. During visits to six sites, interview and observation data were collected. Evaluation findings were as follows: (1) all participants were very positive toward the program; (2) learning outcomes were positive; (3) most employers did not understand how the literacy program could help them; (4) employers and employees had different objectives for the educational process; (5) most learners participated in workplace literacy in order to move on to a different job; (6) content varied greatly among instructors; and (7) instructors wanted more support. (Appendixes include the evaluation protocol samples with findings and pre/posttest CASAS outcomes.) (YLB)

RURAL WORKPLACE LITERACY PROJECT

FINAL REPORT

-NORTHERN CALIFORNIA-

PERIOD ENDING: SEPTEMBER 30, 1991

CONTRACT NUMBER: V 198 A 00139

U. S. Department of Education
Grant No.: V 198 A 00139
Final Report
November 27, 1991

This is the Final Report for the Rural Workplace Literacy Project (RWLP) which began on April 1, 1990 and concluded on September 30, 1991. This report summarizes the program's activities and accomplishments providing migrant and seasonal farmworkers with onsite workplace literacy training designed to enhance their ability to develop their job skills.

Accomplishments

The Rural Workplace Literacy Project (RWLP) has met its goal by providing literacy classes at 15 agricultural worksites, enrolling 282 farmworkers (118% of Plan). An additional 109 farmworkers attended classes and received literacy instruction, but were not enrolled because they did not complete the assessment and orientation period.

RWLP conducted thirteen of the fifteen classes at the worksite. The average number of hours of instruction offered was 135 hours. Class instruction ranged from a low of 82 hours to a high of 186 hours of instruction.

RWLP created successful partnerships with 12 agribusiness employers in addition to the original partners named in the project proposal.

Of the students who participated in both pre and post testing, 96% demonstrated improvement on the CASAS test scores.

RWLP is currently conducting a follow-up survey, tracking continued job retention, increased earnings and career advancement. Initial responses are very positive.

Variations in Actual vs. Proposed Objectives

When building a house, most of the mistakes are made in the blueprint. This analogy can easily be applied to our RWLP proposal. Actual implementation of the RWLP proposal called for minor "structural" revisions to achieve our contract goals. An example of one of those revisions was the elimination of distinct program cycles.

Cycles of Activity

The original plan proposed 3 separate and distinct cycles, each with quantifiable goals and outcomes. Upon receipt of funding, RWLP staff contacted initial partners. The partner's unanimous response was that April was not an optimal time to begin classes. Due to the seasonal nature of agricultural, it was difficult to parallel the high and

low employment periods because it varied with each partner making distinct cycles impossible.

For example, for vineyards, early spring represents a time after pruning ends and before leaf thinning begins. Several of our partners were vineyards and at this time they were operating with skeleton crews. They do not expect a major influx of workers until the end of April and at that time employees are working long hours doing thinning. During these peak agricultural periods farmworkers were working such long hours that attending literacy classes after work would have been a hardship.

Consequently, RWLP revised the three 6 month cycles in favor of a more accommodating time frame to each agricultural industry served. Several growers stated that May or January start dates would serve the maximum number of participants without running into harvest schedules. All subsequent reporting shows a panorama of activity, rather than clear cyclical activity.

Overview of Instruction

The first class began on April 23, 1990 and the final class completed on September 30, 1991--the last day of the grant. Our RWLP staff provided a total of 2169 hours of actual instruction. The majority of classes were opened and participants enrolled between December 1990 and May of 1991. Three classes requested up to a month break during peak work times. Vineyard managers, or supervisors requested the hiatus in advance with specific dates to resume instruction. In these instances, RWLP staff observed no significant drop in attendance, with most participants commenting that they had missed attending class in the interim.

Scheduling Factors

Due to the nature of agricultural pay customs, workers are not paid on days when it rains and consequently do not report to work or receive paid release time to attend class. In addition, workers worked when their was work and did not work when the work was completed. As a result, classes became precariously dependent upon the weather and the nature of each partners agricultural activities. Classes were extended past projected end dates and scheduling of testing and other planned events were frequently disrupted. This proved to be an unexpected and unavoidable element in the program. Although California has just completed its 5th year of drought conditions, March of 1991 was a month of solid rain, and in some areas snow, which delayed several classes.

Acts of Nature

During the contract period of April 1990 to September 1991--California agriculture has experienced weather conditions of devastating proportion. Many employers, and potential

partners were unwilling to initiate classes as a result of the continued drought having seriously diminished both crop and profits. Regardless of the equation of education and increased productivity, agricultural employers were less willing to commit to participating financially in onsite classes. This situation predated the Freeze of 1990-1991. The Freeze compounded agriculture's problems in what amounted to cataclysmic proporrtions. With no crops to pick, California was flooded with tens of thousands of displaced, hungry and homeless agricultural workers.

Nevertheless, in the face of these conditions RWLP was able to reach our goal of 15 classes and exceed our planned number of students served. Never, however, had the climate been less conducive to employer participation.

Employer Participation

RWLP had 3 employers who contributed paid release time for participants in the program. Understandably, these 3 sites ranked among the most definitive in results. Employers provided a variety of support, including classroom space, administrative services, office space and access to equipment, supervisorial support, paid release time and attendance bonuses. Employer participation in the program totaled 38% in matching funds ($106,318) to the RWLP contract funds.

Class Recruitment

Initial contact to recruit employers was made by field staff from the Migrant 402 program, followed by an interview with the Program Planner. When the field staff and Program Planner identified a class site, the Project Coordinator met with the employer to start the class. The lack of continuity with one person in describing the objective and responsibilities of becoming a partner in the project, resulted in varying levels of commitment and understanding. In the future, the person making the initial contact, should be involved throughout the duration of the project.

An employer contract was developed to delineate the employers specific commitments regarding incentives or other forms of participation and support for the program. Some employers tended to take a "wait and see" posture putting responsibility for the program success back in the hands of the workers. They stated they wanted to see how serious the workers were about the program before they decided on an incentive plan. In these situations, no plan ever materialized, in spite of subsequent meetings with Project Coordinator to try and secure them. Also, although work related curriculum was emphasized, employers by and large did not play an active roll in contributing to curriculum, even when invited and encouraged to do so.

Strategies for Future RWLP Activity

Development of future worksite class will begin with specific endorsements from previous employers. Targeted worksite employers will be introduced to a written agreement designed to promote a more pro-active employer. Educating employers to the expanded benefits of an onsite workplace literacy project would be the foremost strategy for securing committed partners for RWLP in the future. The equation of literacy equals productivity is one that many employers are skeptical of. Evidence of the positive influence of worksite literacy programs can spark enthusiasm in employers where pessimism has existed before. Results we have documented either anecdotally or statistically include the following:

* self-esteem gains for individuals
* greater safety awareness/more hazards reported
* reduced workers compensation claims by participants
* more universally understood communication
* initiating social responsibility
  a. students voluntarily reducing alcohol consumption
  b. students instituting recycling programs
* increased ability to conduct personal business away from the job
* better work attendance

RWLP staff maintain that more attention must be focused on merging program objectives with industry goals in order to secure optimum support from the employer. All this must be accomplished without losing sight of worker input and areas of interest regarding curriculum. Negotiations for incentives and employer support should be conducted in a businesslike manner, with commitments made in writing well in advance of the class start date.

Curriculum

Curriculum was based on a core curriculum for agriculture provided by the RWLP Project Coordinator. The curriculum blended several methodologies including a whole language approach, natural approach, cooperative learning components and phonetic structuring. Each student built a notebook based on Paulo Freire's problem posing techniques. Due to the remote locations where classes were conducted, RWLP staff screened instructors for hiring, in part, on the basis of their ability to deliver the training independently, with little institutionalized support. Although materials were universally distributed throughout the program, teaching styles varied greatly. In addition, each site required alterations in work related curriculum due to differences in types of crops, methods of vineyard/crop management, variations in climate, etc. Ultimately curriculum varied more widely than initially anticipated and supervision was challenging with existing staff. Project Coordinator visited each site to observe class instruction once a month, and some classes with much greater frequency.

Assessment/Testing

Initial assessment of literacy skills was conducted by the instructor through oral interview and filling out both student application/contract and Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) forms. Based on this skills assessment, RWLP instructors administered A, B or C levels of the CASAS Adult Life Skills or Employability Series in the 3 competencies of listening, reading comprehension and math to students.

The initial contract proposal called for a project developed test, but staff opted to use existing CASAS tests because they are recognized and standardized instruments. The CASAS instruments proved to be a logistical problem in that testing required 3 separate class sessions to complete, and many students were absent for one or more of the scheduled testing dates. In addition, a significant number of students at the low end of the literacy skill level were intimidated by testing and did not return to class after being tested.

In the case of post testing, many students with good attendance in classes, in some instances having attended more than 100 hours of instruction, were laid off before post testing was administered. Seasonal agricultural workers traditionally return to Mexico during layoffs, or move on to other farms, making it impossible to complete testing. In many instances, employees had only one day's notice before being laid off. As a result, no advance planning could be done by the instructor. During the contract period, and in anticipation of future literacy grants, CHDC staff has begun negotiations with CASAS to create one instrument specifically for farmworkers, using a menu of relevant items appropriate to their work environment which includes all three competencies in a 90 minute time frame.

Job Upgrades

To date 18 OJT's have been secured to program participants. The weather factors previously described contributed profoundly to the discrepancy in actual vs. planned job upgrades. Migrant 402 staff are currently working to develop upgrade OJTs for clients who completed literacy training in the last 3 months.

Follow-up Survey

RWLP is currently conducting a follow up survey on program participants regarding job retention, increased earnings, career advancement and continued education. Any significant findings will be reported the ERIC Clearinghouse and DOE, following compilation.

Support Services

Although students were interviewed with regard to their need for support services, a minimum of services were requested or given. This appears to be a result of the instructors not having been well informed about the channels to be used in requesting services. No cases have been found, however, of participants requesting services that were not provided. One site did receive ongoing services in the form of child care. Special attention will be given to insure that this resource will not go untapped in the future, highlighting this asset in teacher orientation.

Employer Follow-up

To better serve agricultural employers/employees needs in the future, we have developed a follow-up survey to obtain suggestions, comments and other data from employers. Any significant findings will be forwarded to DOE and ERIC Clearinghouse after compilation and analysis.

Independent Evaluation

Negotiations and parameters for independent evaluation were completed by February 1991. Evaluators agreed to visit 6 sites twice each. Subsequently, the evaluators decided that one visit per site was sufficient. RWLP staff maintain that the findings, based on one site visit, do not allow for maturation of attitude, or due process on the part of the instructors, students or employers. As the tenor of the evaluation is positive, we do not object strongly to any of its findings, however, the evaluation does not reflect the evolution of the program, or individual site classes as it was, in part, designed to do.

Specifically, progressive outcomes may have been more extensive and varied then stated in the evaluation. Secondly, several employers who may not have initially understood the benefits of the literacy program, were prepared by the completion of the program to acknowledge unexpected positive outcomes, directly or indirectly resulting from the literacy class.

Third, content appeared to vary greatly, but at closer investigation, what varied was the order and style of presentation and not curriculum as a whole. Finally, instructors requests for more support were legitimate, but support increased at each site as communications were effectively established.

Recommendations from the evaluation under review to increase effectiveness of a workplace literacy project include:

* More comprehensive feedback loop with/to employers--regarding objectives and results.
* Using IEP more fully with the learner managing the progress and using class sessions for updates.

* More materials for multiple levels of students.
* Regularly scheduled and mandatory teacher trainings.

In addition to these recommendations, RWLP would benefit significantly by implementing a student self assessment with lessons on personal goal setting to enable them to more fully engage in the process of their education. This would take place in the initial stages of the program and be updated periodically.

To increase the number of target language speakers per student in class by inviting tutors, volunteers and community members would promote interaction with various native speakers to offset fear and inhibition in conversation.

To conduct a pilot class to define and produce replicable curriculum that teachers feel confident with, and which delivers desired results for increased standards of literacy.

To replace testing with a project specific instrument that is psychometrically accurate for scoring gains in literacy.

In conclusion, an overriding strength of the program has been the strong positive response to the program by workers and employers alike, which has created widespread interest in literacy training in an industry not historically known for extending benefits to its ranks.

All forms utilized in this project have been attached for reference.

In compiling a report on the Rural Workplace Literacy Project the need for brevity precludes us from recounting the stories of the many individuals who benefitted from the program. However, to personalize the experience, and offer some detail we have included the following story about a program participant.

As representation of the many instances of increased self-esteem with both direct and indirect effect on productivity and improved quality of life we offer the case of Francisco Negrete. Francisco is 26 years old, a native of Michoacan, Mexico with 7 years of education in his native country. He came to California at the age of 18 and began immediately working in the fields. Francisco lives with his girlfriend, a woman of Mexican heritage and a native speaker of English and their 3 year old daughter. His only previous contact with education in the U.S. was an ESL class held at his worksite in 1989 through SLIAG funding, which he attended sporadically. Francisco felt a sense of lost opportunity when that class ended.

In December of 1990, Francisco enrolled in the Rural Workplace Literacy Project at Clos du Bois Wines in Healdsburg, California, where he was a crew supervisor,

overseeing 12 workers. Francisco successfully completed the program with 123 hours of instruction in June of 1991, the highest attendance in the class.

During the spring of 1991, the Vineyard Manager, Steve Smit reported to the instructor that Francisco had begun speaking over the radio to him on the job in English. This seemed to be a turning point for Francisco who had previously stated his reluctance to speak English in front of his boss for fear of being made fun of. Conversely, the Vineyard Manager, raised in South America, made it easy for Francisco to continue to converse in his native language. However, the assertion of Francisco in using his English, prompted the realization by Steve Smit that Francisco could be entrusted with other responsibilities, as he was not only a trusted worker, but was demonstrating his ability to communicate with other English speaking staff and members at large of the agricultural community.

Francisco is now titled an "Irrigation Specialist". He has a house on a neighboring ranch cultivated by Clos du Bois and is directly responsible for the irrigation of 650 acres of grapes.

This would seem to meet our criteria for success quite sufficiently for the Rural Workplace Literacy Project, but another unexpected result surfaced and was acknowledged by Francisco himself. During the summer of 1991, Francisco married his girlfriend, the mother of their daughter. As previously mentioned, Francisco's wife, although she learned Spanish in her home as a second generation Hispanic women, was a native speaker of English. Francisco, frustrated by his limited English, only spoke Spanish in the home. This created some tensions as he desired to conduct business as the head of the household, but deferred to his girlfriend for all contact with the community where English was required. Francisco's new freedom to express himself in English has allowed him to assume the role he is most comfortable with in managing the family's business affairs and is able to stay linguistically one step ahead of his 3 year old daughter, he jokes. The impact of Francisco's expanded job responsibilities, and increased ability to communicate in and outside of his primary relationship has clearly demonstrated his enhanced self esteem and quality of life.

EVALUATION OF

CALIFORNIA HUMAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Workplace Literacy Program

Presented by

Kissam & Associates
Sebastopol, California

September, 1991

Table of Contents

CHDC Workplace Literacy Evaluation

Kissam & Associates
September, 1991

I. INTRODUCTION

Literacy affects workers' ability to obtain work, retain work, and performance on the job. The concern about adequacy of literacy skills embraces all sectors of industry and types of industries. While most business owners and leaders are concerned about illiteracy among their workers, and expect the problem to get worse, very few have programs which address workers' skill needs (BCEL, 10/90). The need for literacy and communication is as apparent in the agricultural worksite as in other industries. In agriculture, there are even fewer programs addressed to enhance migrant and seasonal workers' literacy skill needs (Slaughter & Associates, 1991).

While the U.S. Department of Labor projects that immigrants will account for 25% of the increase in the labor force nationwide (in all industries) by the year 2000, in agriculture, a majority of the farm labor force already consists of immigrants (Mines & Martin, 1986, NAWs, 1991, Kissam, 1991). Agricultural workers tend to be both limited in English proficiency and low in educational attainment. Average grade level attained for farmworkers is well below sixth grade (and some researchers claim it is more appropriately third grade). Most farmworkers work for 30 weeks or less during the year (CHDC Proposal, Part III, page 9).

Labor-intensive agriculture historically has been less interested in issues of workforce productivity than many other industries. In part, this is because of the constant availability of newly arriving immigrant workers. Several current trends have made the issue of workforce productivity more salient, however; and are likely to push agricultural employers to increase their interest in their workers' literacy. These trends are:

- Larger production units increase demand for skilled managers and supervisors;
- Increasingly complex agricultural technology requires literacy;
- Market demand increases procers' emphasis on quality control (particularly in fresh produce).

In agriculture, as in other industries, literacy levels affect rates of productivity, ability to solve problems effectively, accident rates, disability rates, and production quality. In order to perform effectively on the job, workers need to be able to read labels and follow the directions on them, fill out forms, read manuals about how to use equipment correctly and conduct the operations required for effective machine maintenance, carry out the mathematical operations necessary to carry out one's tasks, estimate wages due, and communicate with peers and supervisors. These are critical skills to ensure tools and materials are used appropriately and safely, tasks are completed accurately and adequately, and problems are identified in a timely and effective manner (Carnevale, et al., 1990). As the marketplace becomes even more complex for agricultural employers, workers' functional literacy levels becomes a more salient competitive tool for them.

A. The California Human Development Corporation (CHDC) Program Design

To address the need for literacy enhancement among farmworkers, California Human Development Corporation (CHDC) instituted a Rural Workplace Literacy Project. The program goal is "to expand basic worksite literacy of farmworkers who wish to remain and advance in agriculture" (CHDC Proposal, Part III, page 7). The objective is to provide "seasonal farmworkers with job-related literacy (language, math, and problem-solving) training at the workplace, allowing them access to upgraded jobs with higher pay and decreased seasonality". (Proposal, Part III, page 8). The specific aim was to tailor general learning material to be specifically applicable to

a workers' specific job and work context; and "to provide the supportive services necessary to reduce barriers to participation by farmworkers" (CHDC Proposal, Part III, page 8).

While there are some agricultural employers with worksite literacy programs nationally (Planters Peanuts, for example); few of these involve migrant and seasonal workers; and few are in place in the medium-size farms that constitute the majority of the agricultural worksites. CHDC focuses on the medium-size rural agricultural worksites in Northern California which hire migrant and seasonal farm laborers. In so doing they make a contribution from the first: They bring instruction to a site where workers with limited available time and financial resources can easily take advantage of such a program.

The CHDC program aimed to provide the following program features to migrant and seasonal farmworkers:

- an average of 126 hours of literacy instruction
- provided to 240 farmworker participants
- at 15 sites were targeted.

Instruction was to consist of two or three hour sessions, two or three days a week. The specific length of the training was to be based on an individual's learning plan. Participating employers were to provide a class location and some amount of paid released time or other incentive for program participation, (Proposal, pages 7 and 13). Instruction was to be focused on specific needs of the agricultural worksite. Skills entailed in greater worker productivity, increased safety, issues of the work environment, and problem solving were particularly highlighted, in addition to basic literacy. Program activities aimed to promote increased productivity, continued employment and career advancement in agriculture. (Proposal, page 12). Specific emphases of the program were (Proposal, pages 12-13 and 16):

- Instruction at the workplace
- Instruction tailored to specific job-related literacy needs of particular employers
- Literacy development in the context of other occupational skills development
- Instruction provided in a bilingual context, allowing simultaneous acquisition of oral communication and literacy skills.
- Individual educational plans

Performance objectives were:

- 75% (or 180 participants) were to pass a project-developed test based on CASAS in English Comprehension, Reading, and Computation
- Follow-up and report on the continued job retention, earnings increase and career advancements for all 240 participants up to 180 days after conclusion of the training.

Employers were to work directly with project staff to identify specific literacy requirements, assist in customizing the curricula, and assist in identifying trends that are expected to affect employees' future job mobility and stability (Proposal, page 19).

Project staff were to initiate assessment of need for the program and recruit participants. In addition to assessment, counseling and supportive services (such as monies for child care, transportation, and problem solving concerning other barriers to participation) were to be provided. Individual plans were to consist of assessment and

demographic information, a job skills inventory, projected literacy needs, supportive services received, and outcomes from the training (both tested outcomes and findings from an exit interview with the learner). As a result of participation in the training, some of the farmworkers would participate in on-the-job-training agreement for upgraded positions.

B. Evaluation Approach

Kissam & Associates evaluated California Human Development Corporation's (CHDC's) Workplace Literacy Programs. The purposes of the evaluation were to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the programs and to highlight directions for improvement for future programs.

Six sites were visited for the purpose of the evaluation--each once. Sites selected were those where classes were conducted during the second and third program "cycles". (Sites with programs during the first cycle were not visited as this was considered a start-up period.) Appointments for the visitation were made in advance. (The evaluation did not pretend to assess teaching technique, rather its focus was to obtain perceptions and a sample of performance. Thus, advance notice was not a problem.)

During each site visit, interview data and observation data (including data from an in-class assignment to students) were collected. Interviews were conducted either in English or Spanish, whichever language the respondent felt most comfortable--the interview team was competent in both. Demographic information on learners and information about learner performance on tests administered before and after learner program participation also were made available to the evaluation team. Together these data constituted the primary vehicles for the evaluation. **Exhibit 1** details the data provided for the evaluation by each program participant. (**Appendix A** provides samples of the actual data protocols.)

Exhibit 1: Description of Evaluation Data Sources

Data Source	Types of Data: Oral Interview	Intake & Test Data	Observation Data	In-class Assignment
Employer	✓			
Instructor	✓		✓	
Selected Learners	✓	✓	✓	✓
Program Administrators	✓			

Interviews

Interviews took about 45 minutes each for the employer and instructor and 15 minutes each for the learners. Each utilized a structured format, but built in some open ended questions as well. Questions concerned:

- expectations for the literacy program,
- information about the program and how it operated at a site,
- instructional content, resources, and support,
- attitudes toward the literacy program and participation in it,

- perceptions about outcomes from the program,
- perceptions about factors influencing program success, and
- suggestions for improving the program.

Intake and Test Data

Intake and test data were collected by CHDC instructional and administrative staff. These data were gathered for each student at each site. They included :

- amount of program participation, in hours, for each student,
- level of previous educational attainment,
- student gender
- student age
- student's job title
- student's rate of pay
- pre and post test scores in comprehension reading and math, and
- whether the student was newly legalized or not

The intention was to use these data to describe program participants.

Observation Data

The Evaluation Team observed the majority of a class session at each site visited, and notes were made about the observation. These notes focused on:

- number of students in class
- level and range of abilities in the class
- amount of Spanish::English spoken
- subject matter addressed and types of exercises utilized
- relative emphasis on reading, writing, language, and math
- relation of topics addressed to worksite issues
- relation of subject matter to lifeskill issues
- types of materials used and relation to worksite/lifeskill issues
- amount and type of student participation in the class

- apparent student engagement in and attitude toward class
- type of feedback provided to learner
- instructor::learner interaction and ease

Notes on these issues served two functions. First, they provided assistance to the evaluation team in understanding participant and staff reflections on their program experiences. Second, they were used to suggest issues to discuss or clarify with instructors.

In-class Assignments

The evaluation team asked the participants in each class visited to take part in a written "assignment". (No learner refused to participate.) Assignments consisted of a paper and pencil task which learners undertook with the assistance of instructional staff. Assignments could be written in either English or Spanish. (Please see **Appendix A** for a sample of the actual form and responses to it.) Its aim was to understand level of learner performance as well as learner perceptions of the program and the outcomes they saw from their participation in it. Completing theassignment took about 25 minutes each.

Overall, the evaluation aimed to synthesize information about: project coordination, implementation, and outcomes. An overview of the programs implemented, seen through the eyes of the evaluation team, occurs next.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE WORKSITE LITERACY PROGRAM

Beginning in April, 1990, California Human Development Corporation began to implement Worksite Literacy programs in conjunction with agricultural employers. Between that time and August 1991, 18 employers participated in 15 literacy programs at their sites (two programs had multiple employers involved: Prakash and Tijsseling). The sites were:

- Anderson Vineyards
- Bailey Nursery
- California Vegetable Specialties
- Clos De Bois Wines Inc
- Faye Properties
- Fetzer Winery
- Guenoc Winery
- Lester Farms
- M&T Ranch
- Pacific Environment
- Prakash-Gosal-Pamma Growers
- San Giacomo Vineyards
- Schastiani Ranch/Vineyards
- Seghesio Winery
- Tijsseling/Nelson Vineyards

Employers included vineyards, ranches, vegetable growers, and growers of fruit and nuts. All employers were in Northern California. A few had worksite literacy programs previous to this program. For most this was their first worksite literacy program.

The employers participating in the CHDC workplace literacy program are broadly representative of labor-intensive agriculture in the area, with a particularly high representation of wine grape producers. Patterns of farm labor utilization in this part of the industry are to employ a workforce consisting of a relatively small number of "core" employees, another slightly larger group of "regular, seasonal" employees, and, to fill peak labor demand with casual workers. Participants in the CHDC workplace literacy program were core and regular, seasonal employees, because of the timing of the program (i.e. not at peak harvest).

Employers' motivation to take advantage of the CHDC program stemmed as much from the fact that provision of ESL/literacy classes was a benefit to workers, serving to strengthen attachment to the employer, as from an immediate need to improve the literacy skills of the workforce. While improved workplace productivity was seen as the long term benefit of the classes, the short-term benefit from the employer's perspective was primarily that classes were "good" for workers.

A. Program Overview

Participation in the program was generally voluntary for employees. Although at one site the owner mandated the program, learners indicated they went voluntarily and were anxious for the program. A total of 264 employees participated in the programs for an average of 74 hours each[1]. [Note: Average hours only figured on those sites where programs were completed at the time of the analysis.] This constitutes about 70% of the total workforce at these sites at the time the classes were implemented. [Note: Since the number of employees varies during harvest and off-peak seasons, and the need for language and basic skill development is not assessed, the actual proportion of workers in need of such training cannot be calculated. The figure presented was calculated by dividing the number attending by the number of workers estimated during program period.]

The CHDC Program really encompasses a series of classes with a wide variety in program content, emphases, and experiences. There are some common themes, however. These program characteristics are profiled in **Exhibit 2.**

Exhibit 2: Program Characteristics

Characteristics	Description
Program Length	22 Weeks; Varies from about 14 weeks to 27 weeks.
Employer Involvement	3 Observed; 3 did not observe 2 Obtained class information primarily from their foremen 3 paid 1/2 hour of class attendance 1 provided released time
Instructional Site	3 Lunch rooms, 1 Warehouse, 1 Shop area, 1 Tasting room.
Instructional Materials	Core Materials from CHDC Teacher-developed materials. {including: Tools from site, Community detritus, Magazines, Tapes}
Instructional Emphasis:	Life & Work skill-related Language/Comprehension/Oral conversation: (Vocabulary, Pronunciation, Language Patterns).
Instructional Personnel	1 Teacher and 1 or 2 Aides per class, 1 class had no aides Teachers had non-traditional experience relevant to (but not in) adult education. 1 was a credentialed teacher; 2 had TESOL certificates; 2/3 had neither.

All programs were held on site, scheduled to meet employer and employee needs. One of the programs was conducted during lunch period (although the farmworkers ate first); another took place during the workday in the late afternoon (3:40 to 5:10 pm). Most were in the evening after work (6:30 or 7:00 pm to 9:30 pm).

Employers generally were not involved in the development of curricula, however CHDC met with them to discuss their needs, and instructors were responsive to their requests for coverage of specific content. While only three of the six employers had observed a class, all were aware of what was going on in the classrooms in a general sense, and, very specifically, of employees' response to the program.

Employers provided a site for the program. In most cases this was a room for the class to meet in, with fan and/or heat. In some cases this included other space for the teachers to meet. Some employers also provided specific incentives to attend the class. The majority of workers were paid for attending at least one half hour of the 2-3 hours of instruction. One employer offered paid released time to attend the class.

Materials were generally teacher-developed. Although a core set of general materials was provided to instructors by CHDC, these were expected to be supplemented and were. The core set contained a pesticide safety booklet written to require low level of language proficiency; picture cards showing different members of a family engaging in different activities at home, at work, and at play; and selected exercises for learners to complete.

Instructors used a range of instructional approaches, and the materials they brought in were oriented to these approaches. Materials brought in included newspaper and magazine articles, pictures from those sources, props related to life in the community (menus, bank deposit slips, etc.) tools from the workplace, charts of parts of the body.

The basic principle of the CHDC program was to insure that the instructional approach reflected learners' concerns. In most cases this resulted in a curriculum which emphasized life skills needed to function in U.S. society. This tailoring of the curriculum was most requested at worksites where foremen, managers and owners spoke Spanish and where, essentially, the workplace had been adapted to the workforce. Learners there felt they could function adequately at the worksite in Spanish, and wanted English for their interaction with the community. In all cases, instruction emphasized oral conversation, vocabulary and pronunciation, to a lesser extent reading, and to a much lesser extent writing. Mathematics was focused on only occasionally. Instructional approach and emphasis was left to the discretion of the teachers, based on their experiences with the site and learners and training.

The CHDC instructional team was composed of a teacher and one aide. The larger classes had an aide and a volunteer. Personnel spoke Spanish and had experience relevant to such work. Since this program pioneers education in agricultural worksites, personnel did not have this experience before teaching here. However all had worked previously either in bilingual programs of some description or in other adult programs in multi-cultural contexts. One instructor was a certified teacher. Two had certificates for teaching English as a second language, a central component of worksite literacy in these settings; and the others had been instructors for adults in a variety of settings requiring cross-cultural and motivational techniques.

B. Participant Overview

Participants in the programs included fieldworkers, lettuce packers, a tomato sorter, winery workers, horticultural and nursery workers, landscaping and landscaping maintenance workers, ranch equipment and irrigation machine operators, bottlers, cooks, housekeepers, construction workers, and foremen and supervisors. They represented a wide range of proficiency levels both in language and in basic skills. **Exhibit 3** profiles the participants.

All learners were Spanish speaking, most were male (90%), and most were newly legalized (89%); but there the similarity among participants ended. Within any given class there were both advanced learners and basic learners. This mix of abilities often reflected a mix of backgrounds and individual learning objectives as well. Some of the participants had been in the U.S. for 15 years or more; often these were the less educated individuals. More recently arrived farmworkers tended to have 6th grade or better education and wanted to use the English to obtain better jobs. Learners with better education did not necessarily have the higher paying jobs, however; the present job was a first foothold in this country, for many of them.

More advanced students were reported (and reported themselves) to be somewhat frustrated with the classes. If anyone dropped out of classes, it was usually they. Some of the learners were illiterate in both Spanish and English. These learners also presented a challenge to instructors. In many classes the group work aimed to provide special instruction to the very basic and the more advanced students. But the range of abilities and learning objectives in the class was a constant challenge for instructors; (please see **Appendix A** for report of instructor interviews).

Relationships among classmates were complex in other ways beside the diversity of attainment and ability levels represented. Some of the participants were from the same family; many from the same community as each other. This meant brothers, fathers and sons often participated in the same class.

Besides familial relationships were the friendships arising from having worked at the same place for over 10 years or having come from the same town in Mexico. Some in the class had known each other for a long time (being from the same homebase community in Mexico); others had just met. Some in the class were foremen or supervisors, and were a main source of information for the owner about how the class was going; who participated in it and who did not. Others in the class worked under these people. Sometimes attendance fluctuated based on which constellation of workers were going to attend that evening.

Exhibit 3: Description of Learner and Their Program Participation

Characteristics	Description
A. Learners	
1. Language:	Spanish; All used Spanish as their primary language
2. Age:	33 years; Range was from 17yrs old to 80yrs old, but 75% were less than 40 years old.
3. Education:	23% completed grade 2 or less; Range was 0 to 13th grade 47% completed 5th grade or less; 66% completed 6th grade or less; 18% completed 7th-9th grade; 16% completed 10th-12th grade.
4. Wages:	50% earned $5.50/hour or less; Range was $4.25 to $10.90 12% earned $4.25 per hour; 30% earned less than $5.00 per hour; 66% earned less than $6.00 per hour; 78% earned less than $7.00 per hour; 96% earned $8.00 per hour or less.
B. Program Participation	
1. Instructional	50% attended 74 hours or more; Range was 6 to 180 hours.
2. Participation[a]:	30% attended 100 hours or more; 56% attended 61 hours or more; 86% attended 21 hours or more.

[a] (Note figures based on classes concluded by printout date).

In general, all participants--employers, participants, and instructors--were very happy with the CHDC program. While it is difficult to distill outcomes from such a short intervention, many learners improved in both reading and math. The next sections present in more detail the findings from the evaluation.

III. EVALUATION FINDINGS

In this section we present findings synthesized from Evaluation Team interviews with employers, instructors, participants and program administrators about their experiences with the program, and Evaluation Team observations and review of materials related to the program. These findings are summarized in **Exhibit 4.**

Exhibit 4: Summary of Evaluation Findings

Finding 1: All program participants were very positive toward the program.

Finding 2: Learning outcomes from the program were positive. They included:

- tested improvement in basic skills,
- increased learner self-confidence,
- more frequent English use at the worksite, and
- increased willingness to participate in educational settings.

Finding 3: Most employers didn't understand how the literacy program could help them.

Finding 4: Employers and employees had different objectives for the education process.

Finding 5: Most learners want workplace literacy in order to move on to a different job.

Finding 6: Content Varied Greatly Among Instructors

Finding 7: Instructors Wanted More Support

The picture presented is of a program which is positively regarded by all participants, and which makes a definite contribution to both sponsors (employers) and participants (farmworkers), but which can be strengthened.

Each of the findings is discussed in turn. The understanding of the program functioning leading to the finding, the data used to develop the finding, and implications to be drawn from the finding are discussed in that order.

Finding 1: All program participants were very positive toward the program.

An important finding which may frame all the others relates to the level of satisfaction with the program. Continuation of efforts toward enhancing literacy depends upon CHDC being able to generate a positive attitude toward sponsoring and participating in classes, and good will towards their specific efforts.

We asked employers, program participants and instructors about their attitude, overall, toward the program. Please see **Appendix A** for a synthesis of the findings from the interview protocols.) All participants indi-

cated they were *very* satisfied with the program overall. Four of the six employers expressed to the evaluation team a very positive attitude toward the CHDC program and CHDC personnel. Other employers were only slightly less than "very positive". (Sixty-six percent of the workers indicated they were very positive about the program also. Instructors, while more split in the extent to which they would be positive, were definitely at the high end as well. **Exhibit 5** presents the findings for levels of satisfaction with the program overall.

Exhibit 5: Overall Satisfaction with Program

[Source: Interview Protocols. See Appendix A]

"How is your overall attitude to the program?"

	1 *Not Positive*	*2*	*3* *Medium*	*4*	*5* *Very Positive*
Employers (n=6)	0	0	0	2	4
Learners (n=29)	0	0	0	10	19
Instructors (n=5)	0	0	1	2	2

Even while suggestions were made for improvement, this level of satisfaction indicates that the program is positive. The slightly lower levels of satisfaction expressed by instructors signify only commitment to improving program content, process and outcomes. All said they would gladly work in and with the program again, but had specific ideas about how the program may be improved.

Finding 2: Learning Outcomes from the Program were Positive.

Learners entered the program with differing levels of attainment and objectives; (see **Exhibit 3**). Individual learning plans were prepared for each student, based on a conversation with that student. These learning plans were maintained by the instructor and included pre-entry tests of attainment, demographic information, post-participation tests of performance, and other notes the instructor felt useful. Based on the proposal, indicators of successful Program participation were to be (a) that a set proportion (75%) pass project-developed tests in English Comprehension, Reading, and Computation, and (b) that learners retain jobs, that earnings increase and that careers advance after conclusion of the training.

The main method for identifying learning outcomes was the CASAS tests (Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System) of basic skills. Learners were tested prior to program participation and at the conclusion of the course. In addition to these measures, however, the Evaluation Team asked employee participants as well as instructors and employers to identify outcomes from Program Participation. Outcomes from the Program included both attitudinal and demonstrated performance factors. They included:

- tested improvement in basic skills,
- increased learner self-confidence,
- more frequent English use at the worksite, and
- increased willingness to participate in educational activities.

These are positive outcomes for any program. Given the short length of the CHDC program, they have to be considered very positive outcomes. Each is discussed further below.

Tested Improvement in Basic Skills

The program is a short one (less than 200 hours). The competencies tested is not necessarily what is taught; and some of the learners have had no experience performing in educational settings. The tests were set up for learners at a particular level (A, B or C). This meant that learners could bottom out (not be able to answer any questions on the test) or hit the ceiling (be able to answer everything on the test, because it was too low for them). Which level test the learner took depended on the accurate perception of the test administrator.

Test administrators reported frustration at giving the tests, and indicated learners felt similar frustration. In addition to the problem of guessing the level of the learner, there were many cultural "tricks" in taking the tests which could adversely affect level of response and score on the test. Those farmworkers, who did not have previous experience with educational settings did not understand these tricks at first.

Learners reported frustration in taking a test which did not relate to them. While the CASAS test is workplace based, it is not agricultural worksite based. The difference is a great one, and literacy level for one type of worksite may not carry over for another. The cultural milieu in which these individuals live may have adversely affected their score on the pre-test. Teachers who went over the test item-by-item with the learners no doubt helped their post-test scores.

For these reasons the Evaluation Team is very cautious about interpreting the test outcomes as indicative of actual level of learner performance. On the one hand, one might not expect the learners to do well on the pre-tests because they are unfamiliar with testing contexts. On the other hand, significant and spurious increases in scores might occur between the first and second test administrations due to one of three reasons: learning how to take the test, retesting with the same instrument, and/or instructors teaching to the test.

There is another reason to be cautious in interpreting the outcomes, however. This is the small number of learners from the program who were tested both pre and post - fewer than 10%. The reasons behind this small number of tested students, in large part, are the awkwardness of logistics required for testing learners once they have completed the program, and the slow start to the program. Learners in cycle 1 classes generally were not tested. The result, however, is that interpretation of outcomes as indicating program impact overall may be biased. With this said, however, one must note that, for the students who were tested, most showed improvement. **Exhibit 6** presents the outcomes.

Exhibit 6: Tested Learning Outcomes

[Source: August 15 CHDC Student Report]

	# Learners			Outcomes[a]			
Subject	Tested Pre	Tested Post	Tested Both	# Lost 4<10	# No Chng ±3	# Gained 4<10	# Gained 10+ pts
Comprehension	58	24	20	1	4	7	8
Reading	59	29	28	2	3	2	18
Mathematics	50	20	18	0	6	2	10

[a] Outcomes were computed as Post-test score - Pre-test score; ± 3 points was considered to indicate no change. Sometimes the same form was used on the post test as the pre-test. Other times not. The learner was tested with the test level the administrator thought best. Because of this, the number of students gaining a level is not presented, as it is likely to be an artifact of testing strategy rather than student achievement.

The largest number of students improved in Reading, where 83% improved, most of them with a significant improvement. The least number demonstrated improvement in math. However, here too a majority, 67%, improved; most a significant amount. (Please see **Appendix B** for the replication of the pre-post scores, without learner names.)

In addition to the difficulties cited above for interpreting the improvement reflected in **Exhibit 6** as real, is the question of whether the impact was meaningful for the learners who participated, and the employers who sponsored the program. The learning plans started at the beginning of the course were intended as documentation of participation more than as an ongoing heuristic device for instruction. So it is not possible to use them to indicate learners' goals. They were a tool for the program, more than the learner. The Evaluation Team, therefore, asked learners, instructors, employers and Program administrators what they perceived to be learning outcomes.

Increased Self-Confidence, English Use, and Willingness to Participate in Educational Settings

The interviews occurred midway through the programs at which site visits were conducted. Because of this it was difficult for those interviewed to pinpoint outcomes they had experienced as yet. However, all participants (in the In-class assignment), instructors and employers (in the interview) were asked to identify such outcomes. The responses are reported in detail in **Appendix A**, but the preponderance indicate increased self-confidence, more willingness to use English, and some willingness to try out other educational settings. All agreed the program was a positive educational experience.

Few employers interviewed had thought much about outcomes from the program. When pressed, however, they noted learner/s:

(Note Employers reported multiple outcomes)

- self-confidence, in general, improved (4/6 Employers)
- dare to speak to them more in English now (3/6 Employers)
- communicate more with other workers about the tasks (3/6 Employers)
- speak more in English after class (2/6 Employers)
- speak English at the office (1/6 Employer)
- do part of reporting in English now (1/6 Employer)

Instructors also were asked what outcomes they noticed. They also had no ready answers, but they reported learner/s:

- self-confidence, in general, improved (5/5 Instructors)
- participation in class improved (3/5 Instructors)
- more frequent use of English among workers (2/5 Instructors)
- friendships among workers solidified (1/5 Instructors)

Most learners reported they used English more in the stores in town (26); some said communication in general (8); and a few said that now they did not have to ask as much help from the Employer's Office in filling out forms or could understand the boss better (5).

Almost all participants, sponsors and instructors stated that the program was a definite contribution to their lives or the lives of the workers at their site. For both the employer and the learner, however, the statements were

as much expressions of good will toward the program as they were identification of actual outcomes. This was seen in the difficulty each had in identifying outcomes to which they would point. Neither employer nor participant knew what positive "outcomes" would look like.

The implications from these findings - the positive gains, the increase in self-confidence, as well as the hesitancy in pointing to outcomes - indicate the need to strengthen the communication and feedback process in the Program.

- The individual learning plan has to be made a useful tool for the learner as well as for program documentation. Learners should be actively involved in assessing their progress toward their goals; and indicating ways in which they could improve their satisfaction with their progress.

- Specific behavioral objectives should be set for participation in the course, so that measurement of outcomes is meaningful to learners and employers, as well as to program staff.

- Tools to measure outcomes should be meaningful to specific program and employer objectives as well as useful for program documentation.

This finding indicates that there is need to improve information flow about the nature of the program and progress in it. To be successful - not a burden to the program and useful to the participants - that information has to be developed in a decentralized fashion. That is, learners have to be encouraged to participate in directing their own learning. They, and the employers, have to be given the tools to assess the quality of learning outcomes in relation to their own objectives.

Finding 3: Most employers didn't understand how the literacy program could help them.

CHDC recruited employers through a three-stage process. First the Employment Training Council contacted agricultural employers in an area to determine interest in such a program occurring at their site. Then, if interest was established, the CHDC program administrator met with the employer to negotiate a "contract" indicating what the employer was to provide and what CHDC's responsibilities were. The typical contract specified that employers were to provide facilities in which to conduct the program and support to workers for participating in the program. Support consisted in financial incentive (some employers paid workers for attending 1/2 hour of the two to three hours of instruction); and encouragement (following up when there was low attendance to understand why and encouragement of workers to attend). While upgrade at the end of participation in the program was supposed to be part of the incentive for participation, in most cases this was negotiated away. Employers did not have formal career ladders, so the concept of "upgrade" was foreign to them.

The third prong was the CHDC Program Manager who also met with employers to discuss literacy and curriculum needs. Employers were offered the opportunity of inserting worksite concerns into the class. Most did not take advantage of it and did not want to be part of the curriculum development process. Rather, they preferred to tell the instructors themselves of particular concerns as they came up. For example, one employer came into a class to discuss how pesticides were used. Another indicated benefit packages should be discussed. The one attempt made to draw concerns about worksite vocabulary out of the employer, was considered unsuccessful--the employer found it difficult.

The Evaluation Team asked employers about their understanding of the goals of the program, the outcomes produced for them, and what they would like to see change in the program. (Please see **Appendix A** for a summary of employers statements about the program.) From their reports, the results of this recruitment strategy appears to be employer good will, but not necessarily employer understanding of the program. Employers' source of information about the program was often selected key workers who participated in it. They were unclear about what the program was doing for them and what might be reasonable outcomes to look for from it. A common

statement was:

'The program is (primarily) a benefit for the worker rather than for me.'

Employers did not see the majority of their fieldworkers to need basic skills. At most, they said, one or two workers might use them for cost accounting purposes (supervisors) or writing bin tags; the majority did not. Rather than basic academic skills, employers focused on need for understanding worksite expectations of work procedures (calling in sick, understanding when overtime would be required etc.). Even though one employer had a field worker who had used the wrong chemical and poisoned 12 acres of land, improved English seemed to employers more a luxury than a necessity. The other basic skills (mathematics, writing and reading) definitely seemed to employers more relevant to life skills than to work skills. Four of the six employers said one or another version of: 'Basically this is manual labor. If they learn English they leave.' Or, 'I'm doing this to show good will toward the workers; especially the older workers who have come to work here year-after-year.'

Implications from this finding relate to the process of educating the employer about the nature of the literacy skills used at their site (even in the most manual labor), the likely outcomes to be expected from the program, progress toward reaching them, and how to make use of them. The program is but one small element of the grower's labor management concerns, but it can be of greater importance than it looks. In order for this to happen workplace literacy has to be made more meaningful to the employer. The relation of program performance and outcomes to grower competitiveness have to be emphasized and strengthened for the grower to seriously invest in it. Enhancing the meaning of the program for the grower has to begin at the initial stage of project interest assessment and recruitment.

- The process for initiating and continuing the contact with the employer has to contain a more elaborate literacy needs identification process than was used. The program staff should undertake this, and report results back to the employer.

- Specific behavioral objectives should be set for the program, and for participating individuals, and what the employer will see as a result of participation clarified. The objectives set should be clearly linked to the needs identified, so the employer can know what to expect.

The steps recommended are part of a "literacy audit" process. Steps in a literacy audit include observing work at the site, talking to supervisors, and talking to employees. The aim is to develop a needs analysis both for current jobs and for ways in which the jobs might change in the near future. Such a process can be time consuming and expensive, but it does not have to be. Many of the tasks performed at the site and across sites are similar, so the time entailed can be reduced.

At least one instructor undertook an informal audit. The employer reported she had gone out into the field to observe, jot notes, and bring back samples of tasks as focuses for instruction. Other instructors were said to have done this, but the employers did not report it; and they, themselves, did not highlight this during their interviews. These findings may mean that instructors did not see finding ways to enhance "employer education" about the focus, meaning and usefulness of the classes as part of their job. It was left up to the employer to find out by themselves what was going on and what it meant for them.

Finding 3 from the evaluation suggests a more positive approach toward the employer would be useful. Specifically, providing the employer (in a manner involving little time investment from them) with:

- feedback about what their specific basic skill needs are;

- regular information concerning how the class addresses these needs;

- regular feedback concerning outcomes from the class and emerging needs;

- suggestions about how they can capitalize on outcomes.

The task is to help employers understand what to look for as outcomes relevant to the workplace, and how to capitalize on them. This would both assist the employer in learning how to make use of the program and the worker in what they are gaining from the program. (Please see **Appendix A** for a synthesis of the findings from the interview protocols.)

Finding 4: Employers and employees had different objectives for the education process.

A variety of employers took advantage of the opportunity to have an on-site literacy program; and a variety of employees took advantage of the opportunity to participate in the program. Some employers spoke Spanish and had supervisors who spoke Spanish as well. Others spoke less or no Spanish; and their supervisors or managers did not speak Spanish either. Some employers had tasks where the workers essentially had to be able to speak some English--delivery of product outside the worksite, machine maintenance requiring interaction with a non-Spanish speaking mechanic, or requirements for picking up parts in English-speaking stores.

Employers were asked to comment on how the program was going and what they would do to improve it. They offered a number of suggestions. The predominant response was that the applicability of learning to the worksite should be increased. Even at sites where the instructor had emphasized lifeskills, because learners and supervisory personnel wanted them in place of worksite skills, where all management spoke Spanish, employers stated that learning should be more relevant to the site. While this suggestion may be an artifact of employers not knowing what went on in classes, or do not understand what outcomes would look like if they saw worksite oriented learning, it also is a true statement of what employers want--learning that helps them (the employers) out.

Employers wished for improved basic skills for the workers' own sakes, but they also wanted to be able to take advantage of the skills learned. Even the employer who helped workers move out of farmwork to higher paying jobs, wanted the worksite educational program to be more relevant to worksite needs.

Some participants spoke no English, and were not illiterate in either English or Spanish. Learners also varied in the level of previous education, age, and orientation to learning. These factors were expected to influence how they felt about their participation in the literacy program. To examine this, participants were asked how they saw the program; what they would say to another person if they wanted to convince them to participate in it. While these factors did affect their responses, the majority said they saw the program as a stepping stone to better jobs outside of agriculture and the current job. They said they wanted to learn life-related skills (assistance with interaction with doctors, the post office, stores in town) rather than work-related skills. When they said this they indicated they were functioning in an environment where management and owner all spoke Spanish to some extent. When asked if they would take another class most said they would like classes in specific job skills (welding, electronics, etc); only a few said they wanted other English classes. None mentioned math or writing skills; most focused on oral communication skills.

Employees, too, then, didn't see how they used basic skills, other than in oral communication in English, on the job; but they did understand how they used them off the job. Older workers, recently legalized, wanted skills to function better in the communities in which they worked. Young workers with higher levels of education, saw the class as a stepping stone to other kinds of work and additional educational opportunities.

The implication from these findings is that employers and workers see the role of worksite literacy differently, and often the instructor is caught in the middle. This divergence in perspective often is not dealt with directly in the literacy program. Yet, in order for employers and participants to be satisfied with program outcomes, it has to be. The learner who commented (in the "assignment") that:

> 'The program should set clear objectives, work to meet them, and let learners know how they are progressing toward them; learners drift as it is.'

The student is saying, at least in part, that his expectations for the program are not acknowledged and "shared". (Please see **Appendix A** for a synthesis of the findings from the interview protocols.)

Finding 5: Most learners want workplace literacy in order to move on to a different job.

The wide variety in learners attainments mirrored a similar variety in learners' personal objectives for taking advantage of the worksite literacy classes. When asked what they thought education could do for them, most stated they wanted it to get a job outside of agriculture. When asked if they would take another class after this one, most indicated training in job skills outside of agriculture - welding or electronics. Learners goals varied substantially. Their understanding of how to make their skills work for them in the American marketplace also varied.

The implication of this finding is that focus on learners own objectives, what types of skills are required to achieve them, and how this might be accomplished should be incorporated into the instructional process. In part, the individual educational plan (IEP) is supposed to serve as a forum for this kind of discussion. While these discussions might have taken place, they were not documented for the learner in the IEP, and the IEP was not a tool the learner could or did make use of. The result is that the learning process is removed from the control of the learner and put in the hands of a transient developer - the teacher and instructional aide.

- The IEP should be made a living process which the learner manages.
- Counseling and/or individual teacher-learner discussion should be incorporated into the instructional process and memorialized in the IEP.
- Attendance issues, participation issues, aspirations, performance, and predilections should be grist for the discussion between instructor and learner.

Inaugurating a formal learner-instructor development and feedback system aims to strengthen knowledge of instructional aims and objectives and instructor understanding of how to accommodate the wide range of adults in the class. This - a vibrant individual educational plan - is the basis upon which individualized instruction is built. The challenge to make it a low maintenance teacher activity is met if the learner is the master of it.

Finding 6: Content Varied Greatly Among Instructors.

Instructors were hired by the Program in response to advertisements placed in local papers and word-of-mouth. Since these types of programs are new, none of the instructors had specific experience in worksite literacy in agricultural sites. However, all had taught adults previously either in class or tutorial settings. Instructors were hired through an interview process. The orientation to the program was provided ir this initial interview with the Program Coordinator, through later telephone or in-person discussions with her, and through provision of a notebook to each student in each class.

This notebook was the core "text" for the class. It had handouts selected to be relevant for these students and for them to use. It was expected that instructors supplement these, and they did. The rationale behind using the notebook as the main text was that it would be more appropriate than any available one for these students with their various needs.

This approach epitomizes CHDC's eclectic approach toward instruction. It stresses the peculiar needs of a given set of students and the need to design curricula and approaches to address them. It is an approach which emphasizes learners' (or sponsors') ownership of a program, bending a variety of instructional approaches and materials to meet the given needs of the learners. **Exhibit 7** describes the variety of instructional emphases that emerged from this approach.

Exhibit 7: Description of Instructional Approaches Used[a]

[Source: Instructor Interview; see Appendix A]

	Description	# Instructors Reporting
A.	**What are your particular objectives at the site?**	
	Lifeskills:	6
	Reading:	4
	Writing:	3
	Self-esteem:	2
	Communication:	2
	Dictionary use:	1
	Map reading:	1
	Workplace English:	1
	Complete reports:	1
B.	**What do you emphasize?**	
	In general-	
	Grammar:	3
	Vocabulary:	3
	Pronunciation:	2
	Language patterns:	2
	Conversation:	2
	US Culture:	2
	Listening:	2
	Specific to ESL-	
	Vocabulary	5
	Conversation:	5
	Grammar:	1
C.	**What topics are focused on during instruction (life skills/workskills)?**	
	Life skills:	4
	Work skills:	2
D.	**What materials do you use?**	
	CHDC materials:	6
	Tools at site:	2
	News/magazines:	3
	Community tools (e.g. menus):	2
	Tapes:	1
	Games	2
E.	**What methods do you use?**	
	Guided conversation:	2
	Drills/repetition:	2
	Groupwork:	3
	Visits field and talks to other personnel at site:	1
	Community field trips:	1

[a] Note: Multiple responses from respondents.

Exhibit 7 shows such a variety of instructional emphasis and approach that it is difficult to generalize from. Based on instructors' own reports, worksite literacy often turned into lifeskills based approaches. Instructor sensed that "lifeskills" was what the learners wanted. The program provided latitude for instructors to both take into account and specifically address learners' expressed interests. However, the program provided no vehicle to assist learners in thinking creatively about which skills they might ultimately need to achieve their long-term personal and occupational goals. Enthusiastic instructors going their own way was encouraged more than adoption of a set of specific curriculum standards and approaches. This is beneficial in the sense that it can help an instructor feel empowered, take charge, and implement the kind of program he or she feels is most effective for learners in that class. However, a side effect of this approach can be such diversity that the program implemented is really multiple programs; and some may not reflect the principles on which the Program was established. There is an example of that here. One teacher stated that she was not teaching her students English because they really did not need it on the job; she was focusing on some of the basic skills, and instructing in Spanish. This approach seemed quite at odds with the goals of the Program, either as stated in the proposal or generally implemented, and weakens the impact of the Program. Moreover, while it may have reflected learners' interests at one point in time, it did not seem to provide that vehicle for working with learners to think creatively about how the course might be useful for them, (or the skills they learned in the course might be useful for them).

Implications from this finding relate to the Program's ability to enhance program impact, and to understand if specific objectives are met. With the curriculum left to the discretion of the instructor, no standards for achievement were set that addressed learner or employer needs. Without knowing the characteristics of the program being implemented, or standards for achievement, it is difficult either identify or enhance outcomes from it. As one student put it (see Appendix A, In-Class Assignment), 'This program needs a set of core objectives.' This finding strongly indicates:

- Specific objectives of the Program should be designed to be meaningful to learners, employers, and instructional personnel.
- Specific objectives of the Program should be designed taking into account other programs to which learners might aspire or in which they might participate.
- Specific objectives of the Program should be designed to permit follow-up of instruction either in the same or other settings.

At issue, in part, is teacher and program accountability. In order for the program to make the best use of resources, priority outcomes have to be established and worked toward. Without specific goals and objectives neither the teacher nor the program has to be accountable for outcomes, nor are the outcomes truly measurable.

Because the Program is so short, the lack of a systematic approach is all the more troublesome. Learners said they wanted to undertake new educational programs, to use this program as a stepping stone to others. Yet it is difficult to design a follow-on program (to progress further) from individual idiosyncratic approaches - unless the staff are retained and they document well what they have accomplished with each learner.

Finding 7: Instructors (Teachers and Aides) Wanted More Support and Direction

Sites were spread all over Northern California, and instructional personnel had other jobs during the day. Because of the decentralization of the sites and the nature of rural living, instructional support was difficult to provide. The main means of support and knowledge of what was happening or needed by the instructor was the telephone. The Program Coordinator spoke on a weekly or as needed basis with most of the instructional staff. Instructors completed activity reports, and sometimes these reports were the bases for additional conversations between the Project Coordinator and instructional staff. No group inservice instruction was held, although two

inservices were intended. This was the consequence of the impossibility of coordinating eight or ten schedules over long distance and demanding classloads.

The result of the decentralization of the Program was isolation. While each of the staff expressed they felt supported by the Program Coordinator, they all also expressed a strong need for more direction and resources (see **Appendix A**, Instructor Interview):

- more materials to use with the learners in their classes--books and resource materials,
- successful methods to address the pre-literate adult,
- techniques to successfully manage learners with a wide range of abilities and previous educational experience,
- a real curriculum,
- techniques for motivating students at different levels of educational attainment, and
- teacher effectiveness workshops related to this population of learners.

One aide expressed in an interview that he/she felt they had not yet successfully addressed how to work with the pre-literate adult. He was not alone. Others felt frustration with how to integrate the more advanced learner in the class. If any student tended to drop out, instructors stated it was the more advanced student. Instructors wanted to be successful and were struggling to address these issues. They wanted help. Indeed the problems they experience are common among programs for farmworkers as well as other population subgroups. Others too have found that they cannot be handled successfully for the program on a piecemeal basis. Expecting teachers to provide or invent all their own materials is negating the utility of having a Program focusing on farmworkers literacy needs.

Another area in which instructors said they wanted help was when asked if they coordinated with other service agencies in the area. Generally the answer was "No." Only one of the five instructors said they had done any. Most indicated that they did not know the community in which they taught very well and one said that they did not feel empowered to reach out to the community. They thought it was a good idea, but they wanted help from the Program to get started.

The implication from this finding is that more direct leadership and teacher support is desired and would be useful if the program is to have an identity. While the support provided by the Program Coordinator was great and truly welcomed, a lot of problems were not brought up in them. In part, some of the "problems" might not have been identified as such. Instructors and Program Managers or Coordinators have different roles and different program concerns; Learners too have different program concerns. Different perspectives are needed to identify problems--the amount of Spanish or English used in class, for example. In order to help the Program grow, these ideas have to be brought into contact with each other. The challenge of how to do it over long distances can, in part, be met with technology: computer and videotape. A monthly newsletter is also a viable channel. This would appraise teachers of information vital to pass on to students as well as provide information on resources for addressing particular problems and where to get hold of them, and profile problems other instructors are meeting.

The need for inservice and these channels suggested for it, however, are secondary to another need: to forge an understanding of key program objectives, barriers to meeting them and approaches for overcoming those barriers. Without this, teachers will stay isolated from a coherent Program identity.

IV. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Summary Overview

Overall, the Evaluation Team found the CHDC Worksite Literacy to be an valuable pioneering effort which is well-regarded by its key constituencies (agricultural employers and farmworkers). The program has a core set of participants (about a third of the learners attended more than 100 hours of class) and has achieved the overall levels of service envisioned in the workplan.

The observed outcomes are that learners are more self-confident in their use of English and are taking initiative in using English both on and off the job. The classes are also observed to be a useful forum for group discussions and for building understanding of skills needed to function successfully in mainstream of U.S. society.

CHDC's priority to date has been logistics -- staffing the program, recruiting participating employers, and extending its employment training expertise into the area of worksite literacy programs. This is understandable and a reasonable prioritization in terms of program administration.

Our overall recommendation is for CHDC to build on the foundations put in place in the 1990-1991 program year to further adapt the solid principles adopted for the current program to the agricultural workplace. Our specific recommendations address the issue areas which require particular attention to insure that the program becomes one which can deliver top-quality education, tailored to meet the unique needs of immigrant farmworkers.

Improvements in program quality and in quality control (throughout the large CHDC service area) will require focused attention not on the broad parameters of the program (i.e. numbers of enrollees, hours of attendance, CASAS scores gains) but rather a systematic effort to confront the challenges of program content and instructional methodology which few educational providers have, to date, confronted seriously.

Current research in adult education strongly suggests that, throughout the field (including adult schools, community colleges, and community-based organizations) the greatest increases in cost-effectiveness will come from a renewed commitment to quality outcomes, even if such efforts require higher costs per partcipant or per instructional hour.

The CHDC program has the potential of becoming a model one and the organization has the resources to invest in the developmental effort required to create a top-quality program. Thus, quality improvement (even if it entails serving less program participants overall) should be the priority for the next stage of program development.

B. Recommendations

1.CHDC should engage in a focused effort to develop a core curriculum designed to meet the characteristic needs of farmworker participants in its workplace literacy program.

The core curriculum should provide a framework to systematically develop the competencies of farmworkers in the workplace literacy environment.

Particular emphasis should be given to the math curriculum, a basic skills area where increased competencies are likely to yield immediate payoffs in the workplace and where teachers are likely to feel least prepared to pursue a structured instructional strategy.

Depending on the specific agricultural worksite, expansion of the communication skills components of the language curriculum may provide a rapid and effective way to increase worker productivity (benefiting participating employers) and providing workers opportunities for upward career

mobility. This is an area where close collaboration with employers to tailor a pre-existing core curriculum to meet their specific needs is most promising.

In developing the ESL/literacy curriculum, CHDC should seek to provide a framework for concurrent development of oral skills, reading ability, and writing ability in English. The focus in developing the language curriculum should be on a richer matrix of life/work skills particularly problem-solving, reference skills, negotiation, and effective use of available resources in an information society (e.g. continuing education, reduced cost programs, consumer information resources).

Development of the core curriculum should also entail development of a resource library of effective materials where CHDC teachers can browse and borrow materials for their classes. Such materials should not consist simply of workbooks and texts but magazine articles, novels, poetry, newspaper clippings of high interest to farmworkers and of appropriate reading difficulty. Such a resource library might also include selected video and film material on life issues and workplace issues (e.g. supervision, career paths).

Development of the core curriculum should draw on the accumulated experience of current workplace literacy teachers. Once the core curriculum is developed, teachers should continue to be encouraged to experiment with build new elements into the curriculum and tailoring materials to the special interests and objectives of their learners (or the specific worksite).

2. CHDC should undertake a more structured approach to involving employers in designing and supporting worksite literacy programs.

The generically positive attitudes held by employers toward CHDC and the worksite literacy program provides the basis for moving to involve employers more deeply in the process of curriculum development and in linking upgraded skills to occupational advancement.

It will be necessary for CHDC to recognize that the traditional literacy audit (based typically on the skills needs of large manufacturing firms) a level of sophistication and attention to personnel issues seldom found in agriculture. CHDC program staff will need, in many cases, to establish dialogue with employers to suggest new and previously unconsidered implications of upgrading employee skills. The process of eliciting from employers their "literacy needs" is a challenging one and cannot be accomplished simply by providing opportunities to comment on the curriculum. Genuine, thoughtful, consideration of learning priorities, skills objectives, and estimation of reasonable expectations are necessary.

It may be useful for CHDC's technical staff to develop handout sheets for employers based on the growing literature on workplace literacy which articulate considerations that employers might give special attention to in developing a "partnership" with CHDC to upgrade employees' literacy.

The experience to date with workplace literacy programs indicates that the most successful programs are those where literacy improvements result in immediate, improvements which directly affect workers' productivity. CHDC might usefully explore with employers, affordable means to recognize and to immediately make use of workers' new competencies and to reward those who successfully upgrade their skills.

3. CHDC should incorporate peer support mechanisms into the program design.

The diversity among program participants with respect to educational levels and learning objectives which make it difficult to use standard curricula in farmworker literacy programs, at the same time, provide a resource which makes it possible to rely extensively on peer support as an important learning mode.

Peer tutoring, small practice groups, "discussion circles", and homework groups are just a small number of the modes by which farmworker learners can be involved in helping their peers. Peer tutors and group leaders can benefit from such involvement if it is recognized that this provides them unique opportunities to develop their self-confidence, their interpersonal skills, and to demonstrate their ability to

work as members of a team. Learners who receive assistance can be assured that their peer tutors will be sympathetic and sensitive to the difficulties of building English language skills or math skills.

An important objective of peer support mechanisms is to extend learning beyond the environment of the classroom into the daily life of the learners. Some approaches derived from family literacy programs and Freirian learning circles may be particularly helpful, given the tightly woven social and economic networks which characterize many farmworker work environments. However, such efforts must, at the same time, recognize the sensitivity of interpersonal relations within these networks and insure that all learners are treated with due respect and insure that peer tutors or group leaders will deserve the trust of their co-learners.

Peer support mechanisms should be understood to include effective utilization of volunteers as instructional aides, as counselors, and in other support roles.

4. CHDC should make the concept of the individualized educational plan a practical instrument for responding meaningfully to the very diverse needs of farmworker adult learners.

It is important to recognize that the vast majority of farmworkers are moving in a very short span of time from a traditional, rural, 19th century social context into a society with a bewildering array of informational transactions -- the "information society" and the "information economy".

The sharp distrinction between "workplace skills" and "life skills" drawn in some workplace environments is, inevitably, a fuzzy one when the workforce consists of immigrant farmworkers as it does in the case of CHDC's clientele. This implies that the program need not choose between one set of learning objectives and another, but tailor learning to meet individual needs, drawing on selected modules of a rich "encyclopedic" curriculum framework.

Characteristically, farmworkers have great difficulty in formulating and implementing viable strategies for occupational movement, but only because the complexity of career movement in the U.S. is completely different from the social processes they are familiar with.

A related difficulty is that farmworkers have few bases for establishing reasonable learning expectations. "How long does it take to learn a new language?", "What are the most common difficulties in learning English", "What course of learning will most rapidly build earning power" are all unspoken questions which are much too seldom articulated either by instructors or learners.

Instructors cannot simply elicit "individualized learning plans" from learners by asking them what they want from a menu of learning opportunities which may be familiar to college-educated U.S.-born students but alien even to the majority of high school students in the U.S. Development of individualized learning plans implies at least a minimal investment in informal dialogue and periodic assessment of learners' progress.

A key program modification required to implement the strategy of individualized education for adults is to devote at least one hour "orientation" counseling session to exploring individual goals, abilities, resources, needs, and to setting reasonable expectations. We recommend, additionally, at least monthly individual sessions of 15-30 min for instructors to discuss with learners their progress, their evolving plans, and their changing support service needs.

CHDC, with its dense network of community linkages, its access to CSBG and JTPA 402 support service funds, and its commitment to employment training is in a unique position to provide adult learners with an "integrated" program of self-development, but only if the counseling/individual plan development activity is given due priority.

Individual attention is particularly critical given the crises of self-confidence which periodically assail farmworkers, given the wide variations in learners' occupational and educational backgrounds, and the

differences in personal aspirations of persons in different family and social contexts (e.g. older men, married women, young, single men).

Given the current educational levels of farmworkers enrolled in CHDC's workplace literacy program, it is clear that few participants will attain all their learning objectives in the course of a six-week program. An extremely high priority program objective should be to build learners' commitment to education and self-confidence to the point where they will continue to make the investments of time and energy needed to achieve meaningful advances. Such investments will, almost inevitably, involve both ongoing self-directed learning and additional program participation (e.g. in community college courses or in employment training programs).

5. CHDC should emphasize evaluation of program outcomes as assessed by employers and learners in relation to specific learning objectives. Unless required by the funding source, use of the CASAS pre-and post-test should be discontinued.

The CASAS does not appear to provide adequate discrimination to measure the wide ranges of competencies possessed by farmworkers entering the program and competencies that must be acquired by farmworkers in CHDC's workplace literacy program. While the CASAS purports to be an "authentic" performance-linked assessment tool, we have serious misgivings about its validity and its relevance.

If priority is, indeed, to be given to the objectives of a) tailoring worksite literacy programs to the needs of individual employers and/or b) tailoring worksite literacy programs to the needs of individual learners, program evaluation should be based on outcome measures meaningful to these two groups. Since "certification" is not an issue in this case, the most relevant and valid measures of program outcomes are likely to be learners and employers' own perceptions regarding the degree to which the program facilitated development of expected (or unexpected) competencies -- at work, at home, and in interactions with U.S. society.

6. CHDC should strengthen its provision of support services to program enrollees

We saw little indication that the workplace literacy programs provided learners with easy access to potentially useful support services, even those available within CHDC itself, not to mention those available from community information and referral networks.

An essential prerequisite for meeting learners' support service needs is to include an inventory of possible support service needs in the initial orientation and learning plan development session. We do not recommend formal procedures to elicit support service needs but simply informal efforts to build rapport and see if any services might facilitate program participants' success in learning. A simple, low-cost assessment model has been developed by California's Adult Education Institute (by Van Wooley) and technical assistance is readily available in using the model.

7. CHDC should conduct at least one orientation/staff development session per cycle as a means of increasing quality control.

The diversity of instructional approaches, learning objectives, and materials which we observed at different worksites suggests that some effort should be made to build instructors' awareness of common program objectives, awareness of available resources, and ability to respond to challenging problems of instructional strategy.

The design of an orientation/staff development session should be weighted heavily toward exchange of information by instructors and aides about the approaches they have found most successful in responding to the instructional problems they have encounted. However, the orientation should also synthesize the commonalities among the problems encountered, an overall learning philosophy which goes beyond rhetoric, and a shared commitment to basic program principles (e.g. individualized learning, ongoing learning, provision of support services, empowerment of farmworkers).

The current provision of program support on a one-to-one basis is, however, an important modality for instructor support and should not be discontinued in lieu of a single orientation but, instead, should provide followup.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW AGENDA

[Note, data are usually presented in the form of: *Response: # who responded*]

Employer

Interview Data

■ **Site Name** ____All 6_____ Date: ___/__/_91_

■ **Respondent Name** _____

■ **Respondent Position** _____

■ **Size of Company: #Managers/Supervisors; #Employees**

By respondent:

Foremen	Supervisors	Employees
1	3	60-120
1		9
2		50
2	4	20-100
1		12-100
2		8-30

■ **Physical layout and relation to instructional space:**

3 classes in lunchrooms; one in mechanic shop; 1 in warehouse; 1 in tasting room;
The 1 in tasting room has to end by wine tasting time (of the year);
Ones in lunch or dining rooms often hot. Group breakout space essentially "outside".

Vineyard Management: 3
Fruit grower: 1
Vegetable grower: 1
Vineyard: 1

■ **Do you know about the literacy program and its goals? What do you think about it**

All knew about goals:
- Thought they were worksite oriented=4
- Thought they were community/life skill oriented=2 (e.g. learn Eng to function in society)

4 clearly found classes more a benefit to workers than site.
- Owners and foremen knew Spanish; even if office staff did not.
- Manual labor not requiring any English skills truly; had avoided problems by marking measurements with "red" line (fill to "here").
- Few jobs above manual labor that workers could aspire to at location.
- Encouraged workers to move "up" (take different job); at same time as mourn loss of good workers--if learned English would leave.

1 had experience with worker unable to read label and poisoning grapes (using weed killer on them).
1 saw it as acculturation (understand needs of worksite better as well as improving interaction with community).

Benefits to site included
- Less need for intervention between worker and life outside work (i.e. doctors' office, form filling, etc., required by outside world.
- Improved interaction between workers and workers-foremen and workers-office.
- Able to read and follow oral directions.

■ **Would you describe your organization for me?**
a. Work in the organization--Description of work & types of tasks:
b. Literacy & numeracy skills which are typical of work tasks:
c. Specific literacy/numeracy skills which are in short supply (and needed):

Counting/Calculation
Counting time required to pull leaves;
Counting # vines in block or # dead vines;
Calculating appropriate amount of pesticide;
Counting number of trays filled per day;
Figuring change due;
Figuring paycheck

Problem solving and calculation
Understanding need for so many boxes of x type;
Communication of lack of understanding of request for so many boxes of x type;
Being able to understand how to mix $x of product.
Understanding how to be more efficient in picking (spending hours at) x grapes
(ie. why did it take so long to prune)
Mix appropriate amount of fertilizer in water

Recordkeeping and counting
Completing spray log, requiring counting of vines and hours
Keeping track of supplies
Supervisors need to do cost accounting

Reading and understanding
Labels
Machine operators to read manuals, understand and communicate problems
Understand safety issues in pesticide and tractor use
Benefit packages
Paycheck deductions

Acculturation and communication
Understanding and communicating with office staff
Communicate with mechanic
Communicating with doctors and local stores (to pick up parts)
Understand and follow directions (when overtime, when not; how much sick leave allowed; calling in when sick)
Understand how to communicate with customers (could deliver wine to different locations; drive a tractor)
Understanding when to make changes in health/benefit plans (as lives change)

Writing, Reading, Understanding, and following directions
Bin tags, with numbers of x amount of vegetables of y type
Bin tags, with weight of fruit
Read labels
Fill out time sheets

■ **How is the literacy program working for you?**

a. Overall attitude toward it; and Why?

1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	
Not Pos					*Very Pos*
		Med			
Responses:			2	4	

b. What did you expect it would do for you? What were your original goals for it?

(Note: Multiple responses from respondent)
Make life easier for them (and reduce requests for help from us): 3
Improve understanding of Vineyard operation and needs: 2
Improve communication between management and employees: 2
Enhance safety: 2
Enhance ability to perform work and life tasks off worksite: 2
Improve English language proficiency/Acculturation for American society/
Get ahead: 2

c. Has it met those goals? How do you know; or What have you noticed as outcomes from it?

(Note: Multiple responses from respondents)
Increased confidence in English: 3
More use of English in office: 4
More communication among workers on tasks: 3
Increased awareness of safety issues: 1
Can look at magazine now and understand: 1
Learner now reports in English: 1

d. What things have surprised you about it (good or bad)?

None: 1
Attendance down: 2
Teacher is so good and well organized: 1
How quickly learning: 1
Targeted teaching methods: 1
Who chose to come and who didn't: 1
Guys who do want to learn are so impatient; don't see progress; negative attitude: 1
Some guys are afraid to make mistakes: 1

e. What outcomes have you noticed from it? (e.g. on participants' performance, communication, attitude, etc.)

(Note: Multiple responses from respondents; same responses as for c)
Increased confidence in English: 3
More use of English in office: 4
More communication among workers on tasks: 3
Increased awareness of safety issues: 1
Can look at magazine now and understand: 1
Learner now reports in English: 1

■ **Specifically, what would make it work better for you (your organization)?**
a. re: Administrative arrangements or scheduling?

Nothing; it's great: 5
Tinkering to improve enrollment: 1
Perhaps 2 hour sessions may be too much: hard on enrollment

b. re: Instructor coordination with you?

Nothing, it's great, very cooperative: 4
Ok, would like more communication with teacher: 1
Heard weird things about teacher: 1

c. re: Content of the course?

Not observed class and can't comment: 2
Observed & Happy with content: 1
Would like more workplace orientation (vocabulary, verbs, phrases): 3

d. re: Relation of skills taught in class to work tasks ? (e.g. comments on materials, exercises, instructional process)
Great; teacher has gone out into site to understand relevant vocabulary to teach: 1
Not yet site specific: 4
Can't say: 1

■ **Specifically, about program participation:**

a. Participant recruitment--how did participants come to participate?
(e.g. Chosen? If so, by whom? Volunteered? If so, how asked?)

Voluntary: paid 1/2 hour of class time: 3
Voluntary, unpaid: 2
Mandated: 1

b. What has been the response to the program (if any) from other -
managers/supervisors

All positive (office manager, mechanic, other employees): 5
Awaiting results, suspended disbelief: 1

employees

No complaints: 4
Diminishing attendance: 2
especially in rain, because they need gas $
not coming to class is infectious

■ **Specifically, about Program improvement:**

a. What do you think would improve program content?

-overall

Class on target: 3
Class should be more specific to workplace: 2
Class going too fast for some students: 1

-how it serves Co's needs

Fine: 2
Class should go longer: 2
Not commented on: 2

b. What do you think would improve program participation?

Nothing, it's going well: 2
Support for rainy days: 1
Pay for participation: 1
Change time of class: 1
Reduce number of days on which class held: 1

c. What are essential features for program success?

(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
Supervisory active support: 4
Rapport with teacher: 1
Flexibility of class structure to accommodate different language levels: 2
Effective teaching methods (encouraging involvement): 1
Class held on site; eager students: 1
Role models among learners who have made it: 3

d. What do you think would improve how the program fits in with your worksite?

(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
CHDC has been great: 2
Enhance workplace orientation of class: 2
Recruit more people from surrounding farms for classes: 1
Can't say: 1

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW AGENDA

[Note, data are usually presented in the form of: *Response: # who responded*]

Instructor

Interview Data

■ **Respondent Name** ALL_____ Date: ___/__/_91_

■ **Site** All 6 (1 teacher taught 2 sites
Queried and reported separately here)_____

■ **Respondent Position** 5 Teachers and 6 Aides_____
All but 1 (very small) site had aides. Generally there were 2 aides plus the teacher

■ **# Learners in Class** _____
8: 1 respondent
9: 2
15: 1
16: 2

■ **Description of Classroom site:**

Lunch/dining room: 3 - Rooms with tables, holding 50 people (in crowded conditions) but with limited break-out space for groups. Ventilation (air and heat) generally an issue.
Warehouse building: 1 - Large space, heating a problem
Mechanics' shop area: 1 - Large, well-heated but sometimes cluttered area & dirty space
Tasting room: 1 - only available at particular time of year

■ **Background**

a. Instructors Previous experience in-
adult education:
(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
ESL: 3
HomeVisits/Adult Development: 1
MiniCorps: 1
Aikido: 1
Dance: 1

literacy development: No: 6

worksite-based programs: No: 6

other relevant:
Similar work experience: 2
Lived in Mexico: 1
Training in wellbeing for adults: 1

b. Credentialed in teaching-
Yes: 1
TESOL Certificate: 2
No: 3

■ **How did you come to work in this program?**

a. What information did you have about it?
Ad: 2
Personal contact with CHDC representative: 4

b. Has it been as you expected--or how different?
More fun: 2
Same as expected: 1
Range of abilities larger: 1
Learners less expressive, more demanding: 1
Extent of illiteracy greater: 1

c. Would you describe your program to me:
What are your particular objectives at the site?
(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
Lifeskills: 6
Reading: 4
Writing: 3
Self-esteem: 2
Capture ideas in written or spoken communication: 1
Being able to respond in oral communication: 1
Dictionary use: 1
Map reading: 1
Workplace English: 1
Complete reports: 1

What activities do you do?
(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
Grammar: 3
Vocabulary: 3
Pronunciation: 2
Language pattern practice: 2
Conversation: 2
US Culture: 2
Games: 2
Tapes: 1
Listening: 1

What materials do you use?
(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
CHDC's black binder & materials: 6
Tools at site: 2
Newspapers and magazines: 3
Community-related tools (menu, etc): 2
Tapes: 1

How do you try to accomplish your objectives?
(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
Guided conversation: 2
Drills/repetition: 2
Groupwork: 3
Talks to field and other personnel at site: 1
Community field trips: 1

What topics are focused on during instruction (life skills/workskills)?
(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
Life skills: 5
Work skills: 2
Car parts, parts of the body, money, applying for a job, interviews, places, numbers.

What elements of ESL do you emphasize more or less (e.g. vocabulary, syntax, written, oral, conversational)?
Vocabulary and oral conversation: 5
Grammar: 1

d. How much orientation to program issues and support for the program have you obtained:

-from the employer:
Good communication about site needs: 1
Silent noticing: 2
No program issues identified: 3

-from CHDC:
Materials provided by CHDC: 6
Site visits: 2
No real curriculum: 2

-from the learners:
Treated with respect and general support: 4
Gone to class even when there wasn't work: 1
Aren't expressive: 1

■ **Specifically, what are the strengths of the program at this site?**

a. Relation to the Employer (e.g. support, or employee incentives)?
(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
Pay 1/2 hour of instruction: 3
Employer supportive: 3
Released time: 1
No pay: 1
Nice space with air/conditioner: 1

b. What are you proud of in your instruction, materials, and/or work with learners?
(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
Drawing out shy learners/Boosting self-esteem/Learner eagerness: 3
Learner rapport: 2
Students learning of English: 2
Meeting class requirements for multi-level instruction: 1
Teaching effectiveness with mime and drawing: 1

c. What types of outcomes from (your work in) the program have you noticed?
(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
Confidence has increased: 5
Involvement in class has increased: 3
Vocabulary has increased: 2
Conversational ability has increased: 2
Knowledge of alphabet has increased: 1
Pronunciation has increased: 1
Friendships cemented: 1
Knowledge about relevant issues has increased (e.g. water use): 1

e. Other?

■ **Specifically, what problems have you faced; what do you see as program weaknesses, and what can be done about them?**

a. re: Site (e.g. support, employee incentives, coordination with supervisors)
(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
None: 2
Location difficult: 2
Transportation support for workers at Nelson on rainy days: 1
More employer involvement on personal basis: 1

b. re: Specific learner needs and instruction (e.g. issues related to instructional focus, available materials or resources, relating the class to worksite and learner concerns, class composition)
(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
More books needed: 6
Range of learners in class: 6
More visuals: 1
More books specifically targeted for illiterate in both languages

c. re: Outcomes?--getting the outcomes you want, given the class structure and setting.
(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
None: 2
Range of learner abilities in class: 4
New people keep joining: 1
Advanced learners tend to drop out: 2

d. re: CHDC Administrative support and Instructional support?
(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
None: 2
Not enough materials: 6
especially for illiterate in both languages (2)
especially for the range of learners in class (2)
including basic tests and supplementary materials (6)
Training workshops: 5
specially targeted to work with illiterate in both languages (1)
specially targeted to working with range of learners in class (2)
Break classes into levels: 3
Behavioral objectives/curriculum for what should cover by end: 2

e. re: Coordinating with other service agencies?
Hasn't done any, doesn't know of agencies in areas: 5
Doesn't have legitimacy to do outreach/coordination (1)
Needs list of agencies (3)
Would like to know more about what facing learners in society (1)
Writers' Library: 1

f. What would be priorities for improvement of the program?
(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
Separate classes for beginning and advanced learners: 3
Extend length of programs: 4
Limit open enrollment: 1
Provide equipment and money for fieldtrips: 1

g. How is your overall attitude toward the program?

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not Pos						*Very Pos*
Responses:			*Med* 1	3	2	

■ **Would you work in this program again (or another program like this)?**

a. Yes or No; Why?
General yes: 4
Yes, depending on place/attitude of learners: 1
No, Learners not motivated: 1

b. What do you see as realistic goals for a next course (series of classes) at this site?
(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
No comment: 2
More group conversation/basic conversation: 2
Fill out applications: 1
Read a menu: 1
Interview with manager: 1
Know basic work vocabulary in English: 1
Build learner confidence in oral English ability in lifeskills: 1
Covering other tenses: 1
Financial support from worksite & CHDC: 1

c. What sorts of support can you see that you would have benefited from?
(Note: Multiple responses from respondents.)
Teacher effectiveness training: 3
re motivation for learning (1)
Response to need for single level classes: 1
Materials workshop/resource center: 2
access to clip art & computer

d. How adequate do you feel your instructional approach was for these learners; and Why?

- *Approach*:

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not Pos						*Very Pos*
Responses:			*Med* 2	4		

- *Materials*:

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not Pos						*Very Pos*
Responses:		2	*Med*	1	3	

- *Physical instructional space*:

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not Pos						*Very Pos*
Responses:		1	*Med* 2	2	1	

- *Other (What?: AIDES, only 1 teacher rated them)*:

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not Pos						*Very Pos*
Responses:			*Med*		1	

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW AGENDA

[Note, data are usually presented in the form of: *Response: # who responded*]

Learner

Interview Data

■ Respondent Name _____SUMMARY (N=30)_____
■ Site _____ALL 6_____
■ Respondent Position _____

■ **How did you come to participate in this program?**

Volunteer: 23
Encouraged Volunteer: 9

■ **How do you like it?**

a. Overall

	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	
Not Pos						*Very Pos*
Responses:				10	19	

b. What do you like best about the classes?

(Note: Multiple answers recorded)
General: 7
Conversation: 11
Topic Areas--
Vocabulary: 6
Pronunciation: 4
Writing: 3
Reading: 3
Practical Nature: 8
Teacher and teachers' style: 3

c. What do you like least?

Nothing; Like it all: 21
Teachers' Style: 1
Emphasis on Advanced Numbers (100,000): 3
Wants more Spanish in class: 1
Level inappropriate; feel out of place: 6
Coordination about whether class will happen: 1

■ **Specifically, how has it:**

a. fit in with your work schedule?

Fine: 25
Schedule unpredictable: 3
Too many obligations: 2

b. been finding time to study and use English outside of class?

No: 5
Yes, a little: 25
(Multiple responses recorded from same respondent)
Little--only odd moments (does homework): 18
Uses English in stores, with doctor: 6
Studies: 5
TV in English more often: 3
Uses English at work with secretary: 2
English cassettes: 2
Jokes with other employees: 1
Talks with Mayordomo: 1

c. helped you get a better job or more work? (i.e. better work assignments, promoted or more work during the year?)
Not yet: 29
Not possible (at highest level): 1
Understands boss more: 3

d. other?

■ **Would you tell a friend to take a class like this?**
a. Yes No; Why?
No: 1 (Shouldn't push)
Yes: 29,
(Multiple responses recorded for same respondent)
To find work: 11
To find better job than farmwork: 15
To function in America: 18
To get ahead on this job: 5
To fill out applications: 2

b. Would you take another class like it yourself?
What type of class would it be (i.e. what topics should it cover or how should it be focused)?

No: 2
Maybe: 11 (Too tired, transportation problems)
Yes: 17,
(Multiple responses recorded for same respondent)
Trade skills (Mechanic, Carpentry, Welding, Tractor driving): 13
English/ESL: 12

■ **Personal background?**
a. Have you taken other classes like this before--Where, what kind of classes?
(In the U.S. or in another country?)

No: 12
Yes: 18,
(Multiple responses recorded for same respondent)
Yes at this or another worksite: 8
Yes, outside of work in US: 15

b. Educational background?
None: 4
1-2nd: 3
3rd-5th: 11
6th: 7
7-9th: 4
13th: 1

c. Age?

16-18: 2	31-35: 3	51-60: 1
20-25: 3	36-40: 6	61-70: 1
26-30: 6	41-50: 8	

d. Married?
No: 6
Yes: 24

IF YES, Is your family living in the U.S.?
No: 6
Yes: 18

e. Ethnicity, Country of origin, State of origin

Durango:	1	Michoacan:	9	D.F.:	1
Guanajuato:	9	Morelos:	1		
Jalisco:	7	Zacatecas:	2		

■ **In order to make this program better, we may want to talk with you further about the program. Would this be possible?**

____Yes: 100%
Best Place to reach me is: Worksite
Address _____
City, State _____
Phone _____

____No or not possible

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW AGENDA

[Note, data are usually presented in the form of: *Response: # who responded*]

In-Class Assignment

Interview Data (Optional)

■ Respondent Name _____ Date: __/__/ 91

■ Site _____

■ Respondent Position _____

■ Address _____

■ Phone _____

■ **How did the class help you, either with work or with life outside work?**

General
Great: 10
Communicate with friends and Americans: 7
A few more phrases in English: 5
Better life in general: 3
Not ashamed to use English now and improved confidence: 4
Access to teacher and new people: 2
Say what want to say: 1
Location critical: 1

Helped with work
General communication at work: 8
Buy things required for work: 5
Understand boss or supervisor: 4
Names of tools: 2
Numbers: 1
(Anticipated ability to) Read labels: 1
(Anticipated ability to) Obtain other work (or work in addition) 8

Helped with life in community
Purchasing at stores or dealing with postoffice and other agencies: 26
Consumerism - understanding what they say at stores: 1
Dealing with money: 1
Identifying colors: 1

Helped with learning English specifically
Vocabulary: 4
Pronunciation: 2
Colors: 1

■ **How could the class have helped you more?**

General
Great, can't say a thing: 10
Longer class, or another class after this one ends: 17
Help find other appropriate classes: 3
Alternate class days: 1

Educational emphasis
More on vocabulary: 3
More on reading: 2
More on pronunciation: 2
More on writing: 1

Teaching Approach
Go more slowly: 1
Set clear objectives, follow them, and show learner where "they" are with respect to them: 1

Teaching methods and activities
Practice dialogues more often: 1
Practice reading, writing and test-taking more often: 2
Likes Spanish explanation, wants to hear vocabulary in Spanish first: 2
Write letters more often: 1

Supplies
More flash cards and props: 3
Make books available for them to practice reading: 1

APPENDIX B: Pre and Post CASAS Scores

[Note, letters indicate particular form; No letter denotes form A]

COMP		READ		MATH	
PRE/POST		PRE/POST		PRE/POST	
198	195	203	202	207	209
175		170		180	
210	208C	204	208B	207	
179	191	202	194B	194	207
179		170			207
210	210	184	202	207	207
201	180	173	202B	204	207B
210	219B	202	224B	207	227B
202		192		200	216B
210		202			
204		202			
198		202			
210		202		207	
210		202		207	
208		202		200	
204		202			
202	212	199	202		
210		209		207	
191		196			
188		202		196	
210		224b		207	
196		192		194	
208	218	224b	207	207	
185		190		180	
196	208	190	202	207	
210		224b		207	
	204	186	202	202	
210		190		188	
193		196			
202	218	202	216	220	
173		202		198	
	198		172	207	
199	218	210	216	207	218
210		202	224		
210		196			
210	218b	224b	224b	207	218b
199		194			
	214b		224b	227b	
193		199			
202	214	202	224	215	
201		202			
193B		202	224b	207	207
208B		202	220b	207	220B
218B	215C	202	202	195	207
218B		202	218B	218B	
	210			207	
196		196		207	

APPENDIX B: Pre and Post CASAS Scores

[Note, letters indicate particular form; No letter denotes form A]

COMP		READ		MATH	
PRE/POST		PRE/POST		PRE/POST	
218B	226C	202	224B	222B	
205B		202	220B	207	209B
201		202		207	
		202		207	207
207b				207	
204b		204		207	
199		196		207	
214B	223C	196	213B	207	216B
218B	226C	224	224B	207	227B
195B		202		200	207A
				180	
195	204	202	224B	195	207
205b		186	222b	207	
201		202	222B	184	
218B	226C	202	224B		222B
218B		202		188	
192	210	177		188	204