

H-6

V. LESSON PLAN ACTIVITY

60 Minutes

A. Prepare for Lesson Planning Activity

10 Minutes

Place participants into groups of two or three based on the scenario selected for the interim assignment.

Refer to H-6 Lesson Plan Format. Briefly review the components of the lesson plan and the strategies they may use.

B. Group Task

50 Minutes

Ask each group to develop a lesson plan for the workplace ESL program based on the scenario they worked on for their home assignment. Ask participants to think about what they want to accomplish with their students and plan a lesson accordingly.

Remind groups to use some of the suggestions presented in class related to lesson content, strategies, and contextualization.

Allow 20 minutes for the activity.

Provide blank transparencies or a flip chart for the presentation. Ask each group to select a presenter or presenters.

Note: Informally monitor progress but do not interrupt the flow of teamwork by bringing extraneous issues to teams.

Ask each group to present its lesson to the larger group. Allow 5 minutes for each presentation. Ask participants to discuss, critique, and identify strategies used and missing components. If there are 6 groups allow a total of 30 minutes.

Note: Be sure that teams know the maximum amount of time available when they are planning their presentations! Also, decide in advance whether it will be possible to make lesson plans (without supplementary materials) available to all participants. This would involve duplicating and disseminating all team lessons. Another way to disseminate is to allow sign-ups for individual lesson plans that can be distributed by a central office or by the lesson designers after the session. Finally, lessons could be put on-line after the session, if staff and time (or volunteers) are available to accomplish this task.

LUNCH

60 Minutes

VI. EVALUATION STRATEGIES

45 Minutes

A. Review evaluation strategies identified in Session 1 and presented by the groups in report back from their interim assignments and lesson plans.

5 Minutes

T-4 Show T-4 (This is the same transparency as T-8 from Session 1. Use as a review of various types of assessments.)

Remind participants that evaluation/assessment is a key component that appears throughout the process of planning, implementing, and evaluating, and that evaluation must be linked to the goals of the program.

B. Meeting the National Reporting System Requirements (NRS)

In selecting evaluation instruments, one must consider the purpose and the audience. For federally funded programs, one of the mandates is the National Reporting System. Programs must provide evaluation data that meets the NRS requirements.

20 Minutes

Ask participants: How many have grappled with the question of how to meet the NRS requirements in the workplace education environment?

Note that this can be difficult in workplace programs.

Discuss how one state handled the challenge in meeting the NRS requirements.

The Ohio Northwest ABLE Resource Center has developed a Workplace Education Model to meet this requirement.

H-7 Direct participants to H-7 "Workplace Education Model" and provide 10 minutes to read the description of the model.

Note: Remind participants that the use of portfolios as a way of monitoring and reporting student progress was mentioned in the review of general evaluation strategies. Further discussion on portfolio assessment can be found in the references in Appendix A.

Show T-5 Characteristics of a Class Uniform Portfolio

T-5 Explain that under the Ohio model, one portfolio would be completed for the entire class rather than an individual portfolio for each student as in a non-workplace program. Discuss the following:

- All learner scores on the standardized pre- and post-tests would be included in the portfolio.
- Outline of the course with specific topics would be included.
- Monitoring class progress would occur through a variety of measures (e.g., length and duration of attendance-85% of the students attended 95% of the time).

Note: If participants are from multiple states, facilitator can ask if this approach could work for them in their state. Why? Why not?

C. Final Summary Report (Presentation)

Part of the evaluation process is a final report that is provided to the funding agency after completion of the program. Show T-6, Final

20 Minutes

Summary Report. The report should include:

1. Aggregated data about student participation (e.g., number of students enrolled, number completing).
2. Pre- and post-test scores by number or letter (e.g., student A, individual student scores should not be included by name).
3. Collective reporting of student progress (e.g., Class Uniform Portfolio).
4. Quotes from supervisors, labor representatives, learners, and other stakeholders as appropriate about experiences.

Tell participants that quotes provide qualitative data about learner progress that is often non-instructional i.e., not related to course content (e.g., supervisor indicates that employee is now asking questions and making fewer errors on the production line; employee is calling in now when sick and following procedures in employee manual).

Documentation of these outcomes helps stakeholders and planning committee members realize the impact of the program beyond changes in test scores. These outcomes are qualitative, not quantitative because they are difficult to quantify. The best way to gather this information is through interviews or surveys.

Student and supervisor evaluations may include these outcomes as part of an observation or reflection.

Ask participants to share experiences in learning outcomes not directly related to course content.

5. Recommendations for next steps. (e.g., another 8 week course as a follow-up)

VII. EVALUATION AND WRAP-UP OF SESSION 2

15 Minutes

Again thank participants for their energy, creativity and productivity. Wish them well in their workplace ESL programs.

Tell them you would like them to complete a brief evaluation of the workshop series (2 sessions and interim activity).

Evaluation is, of course, optional. Facilitators may want to use the form in Appendix B, or they may wish to use their own evaluation forms.

End of Session 2

HANDOUT MASTERS FOR SESSION 2

Session 2: Objectives

- Select at least three appropriate instructional strategies for workplace ESL programs
- Develop a lesson plan for a workplace ESL class
- Identify at least three methodologies for workplace ESL program evaluation

Session 2: Agenda

- I. Introduction, Overview, Objectives
- II. Designing Workplace ESOL Programs
- III. Planning Lessons
- IV. Lesson Plan Activity
- V. Developing Generic Course Content and Competencies
- VI. Evaluation Strategies
- VII. Evaluation and Wrap-up of Session 2

Workplace ESL Lesson Content Should Include:

- 1) Realia from workplace (tools & equipment)
- 2) Material, vocabulary, scenarios dealing with life in the workplace, community, and American culture
- 3) Various types of communications needed in the workplace and related content
 - a. Worker/worker
 - b. Manager/worker
 - c. Worker/customer
- 4) Opportunities to work on listening/speaking/writing skills
- 5) Thinking & problem-solving skills
- 6) Linguistic skills

Contextualized Learning

- “Contextualized learning shifts the focus from the acquisition of skills and knowledge to active application of skills and knowledge in realistic situations.”¹
- “Marginally literate adults enrolled in a job-related program made approximately twice the gains in performance on job-related reading tasks than they did on standardized reading tests, which measured generalized reading ability.”²
- “Contextualized instruction demands more hands-on, active learning that stimulates learners to think, act, and apply skills and knowledge as they would in the workplace and in their lives.”³

¹ Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy at Pennsylvania State University, *A Resource for using the Framework for Work-Based Foundation Skills*, Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2000.

² Castaldi, Teresa, *Ethnography and Adult Workplace Literacy Program Design*, ERIC Digest, National Center for ESL Literacy Education, EDO-LE-91-02, April 1991

³ Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy at Penn State., *A Resource for Using the Framework for Work-Based Foundation Skills.*, Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of ABLE State leadership Initiative, PA. 2000

Group A

The Connector no.3 fall/winter '95

This issue of *The Connector* focuses on the hospitality industry with articles on a curriculum framework that saves time in customizing hotel ESL programs; an ESL class that forged links among its learners and their supervisors; and REEP, a highly regarded workplace literacy program. A two-page, annotated bibliography, **ESL Instruction in the Hospitality Industry**, is now available from Ana Romes at the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington, DC. Our next newsletter and annotated bibliography will focus on manufacturing. Please contact us with suggestions for articles or bibliographic resources.

Evolution Workplace ESL Pro

It is almost impossible to discuss workplace ESL in the hospitality industry without, at some point, turning to REEP. The Arlington Education and Employment Program (REEP) is a special program within the Department of Vocational, Career, and Adult Education of the Arlington Public Schools in Virginia. As a forerunner in workplace literacy, REEP conducted four workplace literacy projects (funded by the National Workplace Literacy Program of the U.S. Department of Education) focusing on the hospitality and other service industries. REEP has served over 40 businesses and hundreds of individuals in the Northern Virginia area. Over the years, REEP has evolved in response to its growing maturity as a training program and the needs of its learners and industries. This article provides a picture of that evolution and some of the issues and challenges the program has faced.

Program Purpose and Design

As the workplace program at REEP matured, it moved through four major phases of program purpose and design: basic partnership development, expansion to additional partners, transferral to new industries, and self-sufficiency and independence from federal funds. REEP's first project was a partnership with the Arlington Chamber of Commerce and seven local hotels. Industry-specific, job-related curricula were developed, training resources were identified, and successful strategies for organizing a workplace literacy program were put into place. Finding success with this model, REEP expanded the number of participating local hotels and added a second city (Alexandria) to the partnership with its chamber of commerce, school district, and participating hotels. Thus, REEP became a regional effort meeting the needs of the hotel industry. Next, REEP transferred its model to new industries in the service sector. Working through new partnerships with four trade associations, REEP expanded its training to hospitals, nursing homes, apartment and office building management firms, and convenience stores. The trade associations promoted the concept of workplace literacy programming within their industries and helped reach individual businesses with workplace literacy needs. REEP developed job-related curricula for these new industries and provided training through large numbers of on-site classes. The current phase of REEP's evolution is designed to extend access to workplace training by delivering instruction in a variety of ways, especially those using technology. Now, without the support of federal funds, REEP offers services on a contractual basis.

Center for Applied Linguistics Project in Adult Immigrant Education
<http://www.cal.org/Archive/projects/Mellon.htm> News

Training Options, Curricula, and Learner Assessment

When REEP first began, most training was conducted in on-site classes designed from a literacy analysis of what the workers needed to be able to read, write, and communicate on the job. In addition, workers could use REEP's Adult Learning Center which provided customized job-related materials, as well as flexible scheduling and individual learning plans. A third option was intensive ESL classes offered through REEP at centrally located ESL centers in the county. As over time it became clear that even more flexible access to training at worksites was needed to handle scheduling difficulties and widely varying literacy needs, REEP teamed with Jostens Learning Corporation to establish computer-assisted instructional Learning Corners at four worksites. Based on the INVEST software, an integrated basic skills program for adults, the Learning Corners provided needed flexibility and appealed to workers who might have been hesitant to join a workplace literacy class. Once initial contact was made through the Learning Corner, workers could learn more about other program options. REEP's curriculum development process evolved as well. REEP instructors found that most language minority workers had adequate skills for their current jobs and that a curriculum based on a job task/literacy analysis was not sufficiently broadly based. In response, REEP staff used the SCANS framework to develop a learning hierarchy of skills that were relevant to the learners' needs and taught by the INVEST software. Assessment of such varied activities is a challenge and REEP has used a variety of formal and informal means including a commercially available test (BEST), competency checklists by which teachers rated learners' abilities, learner self-evaluation forms, and supervisors' rating forms. In the future, REEP would like to develop a learner profile that would summarize the learner's accomplishments in the contexts of personal goals and employer's goals, and that would describe how training impacted the learner's life at work, at home, and in the community.

Staff Development

This is perhaps the area of greatest evolution for REEP. Initially, REEP saw an instructor's role in the workplace as essentially the same as that of an instructor in an adult ESL program. But REEP came to understand that, in the workplace, instructors have expanded duties and need new and different knowledge and skills as well as sensitivity to different perspectives. The staff development that resulted helped instructors understand the values and perspectives of the business community, evaluate the impact of their work on non-instructional outcomes, and promote workplace education at the worksite. Working together, workplace instructors gained confidence in what they were doing. These in-sights helped REEP hire, train, support, and evaluate successful workplace instructors. REEP now faces another transition: continuation on a contractual basis without the support of federal funds. It has a great deal of experience to bring to bear on this new challenge.

Inaam Mansoor is Director of REEP. The program can be reached at 2801 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 218, Arlington, VA 22201; 703-358-4200

Group B

The Connector no.3 fall/winter '95

One of the defining characteristics of workplace language training is that instruction is customized according to input from needs assessment procedures. But needs assessment and curriculum design are time-consuming and expensive processes. If curriculum frameworks were made available to workplace language trainers, they could be used to guide site-specific curriculum development so that each training program would not have to “start from scratch.” To ensure authenticity and quality, frameworks must be based on a job task-language analysis (Lomperis, in press) which identifies *key job tasks and related language* using focus groups, dialogue samples, and criteria for determining priority content. From the job task-language analysis, a set of instructional topics is identified to be used as the curriculum framework. An example from the hotel industry is provided below to illustrate this process. The sidebar presents a curriculum framework developed for three hotel departments: housekeeping, food & beverage, and engineering (maintenance). These departments were identified as priorities for language improvement because of the staff’s frequent contact with guests. Job task-language analysis data were collected for each department and a single, overall curriculum framework was developed. The framework is first divided into three broad categories of interaction: *Guest Interaction*, *Co-Worker Interaction*, and *Management Interaction*. Then, each of these categories is sub-divided into work-related topics. Finally, each topic is broken down into specific instances of language use. A work-place ESL teacher in the hospitality industry can use this framework as a checklist to develop customized lessons with much less initial effort.

Guest Interaction

In the first category, *Guest Interaction*, importance is placed on appropriate *Socializing With Guests*, including correct farewells. Because hotel revenue depends on repeat business, the employee must always say something to invite the guest back; not merely “Good-bye,” but rather “Have a safe trip, and come back and see us soon.”

Under *Providing Service*, common job tasks include delivering frequently requested items, such as more shampoo, a refill on coffee, or a new light bulb. Understanding the guest’s request and using formulaic “delivery lines,” such as “Here you go. Will that be all?,” instead of silence, are important language skills for these tasks. An example of a more complex job task from the housekeeping department was a special request from a guest for a rubber sheet for a bed-wetting child. Not only did unfamiliar vocabulary have to be clarified, but a good deal of critical thinking and problem solving was required to come up with two very creative solutions: an old shower curtain and a large, plastic garbage bag, cut open. Examples of complaints from the engineering department involve various fixtures in guest rooms which are not working properly, such as the TV, toilet, or drapery pulls. In these instances, language use includes stating the intention to repair or replace and may even involve arranging a room change. Under *Providing Directions and Information*, three areas surfaced from high frequency inquiries: the immediate area, the larger hotel, and the vicinity and community. Interestingly, it was important to distinguish “immediate area” for different departments. Room attendants have to give directions to ice machines, but not to the nearest ladies’ room. (Guests will use their own bathrooms.)

Center for Applied Linguistics Project in Adult Immigrant Education
<http://www.cal.org/Archive/projects/Mellon.htm> News

Wait staff, on the other hand, will be asked about the nearest restroom and the nearest pay phone in the lobby. Regarding the larger hotel, employees from a given department may need orientation about the locations and services in other departments, such as conference room floors and restaurant hours. At the very least, they must know how to make a referral if they can't answer a question personally. Finally, guests always remember if an engineer fixing their air conditioning can also point out the nearest gas station to refill their rental car on the way back to the airport, or suggest tourist attractions appealing to children.

Co-Worker Interaction

In the second category of interaction, *Co-Worker Interaction*, the topic of *Work Orders* typically includes functions such as stating availability or non-availability for an assignment, reporting work progress, requesting assistance, clarifying instructions, and verifying a change in instructions. In addition to the obvious language functions under *Materials, Tools, and Equipment*, training might also include explaining delays and asking about different items than those mentioned. When *Socializing With Co-Workers*, language use re-quires sensitivity to appropriate registers and the kind of talk that builds rapport.

Management Interaction

In the third category of interaction, *Management Interaction*, many language functions are similar to those in *Co-Worker Interaction*, but involve additional attention to factors such as time expectations, quality expectations, role, status, and culture points. Under *Personnel Policies*, learners may need additional help understanding written information in handbooks or memos, as well as oral presentations. This article has described an example of a curriculum framework for a specific industry. It is hoped that this initiative will encourage other workplace teaching specialists to develop curriculum frameworks for their given industries and to share them with the field at large. In this way, the customizing of materials for workplace language training programs can maintain a standard of quality, while reducing the time and money spent in start-up development.

[Editor's Note: This article is excerpted from a forthcoming, copy-righted publication. Permission to reprint must be obtained from Prentice Hall Regents, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.]

Anne Lomperis, an international consultant based in greater Washington, DC, began her career in workplace language training in the hospitality industry of south Florida in 1982. Her forthcoming book is provisionally titled, Language Training in the Global Marketplace: A Guide for Educators and Corporations. She can be reached at Language Training Designs, 5006 White Flint Drive, Kensington, MD 20895-1035; 301-929-8540; lomperis@netcom.com (Internet).

Group C

Customizing the Curricula or Developing Generic Competencies?

The issue of customizing curricula to the needs of specific worksites is related to the confusion between training and education. As was discussed above, some programs are offering short, discrete courses in such topics as teamwork and accent reduction, and advertise that they will further customize these courses to the specific company that purchases the program.

In California, state funds support a project administered through the California Community Colleges State Chancellor's Office, that funds 10 resource centers serving 100 community colleges throughout the state. These resource centers provide training for community college faculties in workplace education and distance learning technology. The centers also offer specialized courses for practitioners and would-be practitioners of workplace ESL education on such topics as how to do needs assessment and how to market oneself. Further, the resource centers will develop customized courses for companies upon request, as well. (Mission College, 1995).

Customizing courses is extremely costly, however, as it requires the work and time of a trained educator. The NWLP required its grantees to customize courses and provided funds for doing so. However, programs operating without this funding reported difficulty in getting companies to agree to pay for customizing time. Some of the service providers interviewed from projects not funded under NWLP, especially private consultants, spoke of having been "burned," that is, having spent unreimbursed hours of work on site observing workers, interviewing supervisors, and collecting printed matter, followed by many more hours of developing a curriculum from this. Some service providers, such as LinguaTec, say they will no longer customize a curriculum for a project unless the business will pay. Others, such as Fairfax County, are still willing to "invest" some of these hours, hoping to get a foot in the door, and perhaps get enough repeat business from a certain company or companies to cover this extra expense. The Pima County Adult Education project's stance on charging for customization falls somewhere in the middle: PCAE tries to load the cost of customization in the charge per instructional hour rather than charge directly for all customization time.

Although the NWLP required that all curricula developed for projects it funded be worksite and job specific, education providers, at final meetings held for all grantees, stressed the need for curricula to be replicable and transferable to other programs and settings (United States Department of Education, 1992). And now, as companies cover larger portions of the costs for instruction, this transferability of curricula may be a necessity. Companies may be reluctant to fund course customization because they often do not know what outcome they want from the ESL instruction. Some programs (REEP's, Pima County's) report that companies often do not really know how they would like the courses to be customized, and when asked, either say they would rather leave it up to the educational provider or say they just want the participants "to be able to speak English."

Burt, M. Workplace ESL Instruction: Interviews From the Field. Washington, D.C. National Center for Literacy Education. P. 23.

How can curricula be both generic and specific? Programs can develop curricula with competencies or instructional objectives that are described in task-based terms such as "students will be able to read a chart" (Peyton & Crandall, 1995). These terms are applicable to work in general, but use language and examples from the specific workplace. For example, instruction on the generic competency "reading charts and schedules" could utilize specific charts, such as work schedules from the individual workplace, to provide the practice (U.S. Department of Education, 1992). Of course, it is the responsibility of the program to make the connection overtly from the lifeskills being learned to their application to the specific workplace and to other aspects of life (e.g., to reading charts in a doctor's office, or reading a bus schedule).

Pima County Adult Education Workplace Education Project has found its generic competencies useful in that they minimize the work needed to customize the curriculum. With written materials such as signs and policy manuals from the individual sites, and with stakeholder interviews and the observations at the worksite, the Workplace Education Project is able to tailor the program to each site. Having offered workplace ESL classes since 1988, the Workplace Education Project has been able to establish a list of generic competencies for the language and literacy needs of the language minority worker. The topics for the competencies were personal information; socializing at work; tools, supplies, equipment, and materials; learning, doing, and teaching the job; working in teams; health and safety on the job; company policy; and performance evaluations. At the Center for Applied Linguistics, Grognet (1996) has also developed a list of generic competencies that include such topics as workplace communications and expectations, company organization and culture, and skills upgrading.

Related to this issue is the current national focus on tying adult education funding to instruction that will prepare learners for the workplace (although not through direct grants to workplace projects). In 1992, the Secretary (of Labor)'s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS) published a list of foundation skills and workplace competencies that all adults need to be successful at the workplace (See Whetzel, 1992, for a discussion of the SCANS skills). Now, with the current welfare reform limiting the participation of public aid recipients in adult basic education and ESL classes, some educators feel that adult ESL programs should address workplace competencies. At the TESOL conference in Orlando in April 1997, at least four presentations dealt specifically with teaching the SCANS skills in adult ESL programs. One of these was given by Fairfax County Adult Education. With a small grant they won from the Center for Applied Linguistics, they are creating lessons for the general ESL curriculum that incorporate the SCANS competencies. Preliminary results show that feedback they are getting from instructors and from learners is valuable from the standpoints of both curriculum development and teacher training.

Lesson Plan Format

Objective	Linguistic Skill/Literacy Skill: Workplace Skills:
Presentation/Introduction of Topic	Materials
Practice	Materials
Application	Materials
Evaluation	Materials

Workplace Education Model

February, 2001¹

The Workplace Education Providers and members of the Workplace Education Indicators Project recommend the adoption of the Workplace Education Model to be used to support those ABLÉ Workplace Education component services offered by local ABLÉ programs.

➤ **Rationale for Recommendation:**

Basic Premises:

- ✓ Workplace Education is defined in the Workplace Education Resource Guide as, “Education Services offered in collaboration with business, industry, government, and/or labor for the purpose of improving the productivity of the workforce through improvement of literacy skills.
- ✓ Education Services include those activities designed to improve the work-related basic education and literacy skill levels of workers that are offered to business, industry, government, and/or labor by an Ohio Department of Education-funded ABLÉ service government, and/or labor by an Ohio Department of Education-funded ABLÉ service provider. Such services seek to increase an individual’s ability to “read, write, and speak in English, compute, and solve problems at levels of proficiency necessary to function on the job...” (Adult Education and Family Literacy Act: Section 203(12).) These services would parallel similar services provided by any ABLÉ program to individuals seeking assistance with basic skills, ESL, family literacy, or the GED preparation. The workplace education services have the added feature of being conducted within the context of the workplace.

Considerations:

- Without the adoption of this alternative model, many ABLÉ workplace programs will be unable to count people for whom they provide basic skills instruction.
- These ABLÉ programs will continue to provide basic skills instruction whether or not the Workplace Education Model is approved; however, these students can not be enrolled through the ABLÉ delivery system.
 - ✓ Since the Workforce Investment Act focuses its attention on workforce development, it would appear vital to have these people counted as ABLÉ students.
 - ✓ Since students enrolled through workplace education programs can be more readily tracked, the follow-up for retaining a job or getting a promotion would be much easier to accomplish.
 - ✓ Since students enrolled through workplace education programs are likely to be retained throughout the course, a standardized pre- and post-assessment **will be**

¹ Note: Created by: Northwest ABLÉ Resource Center. (2001) *Ohio Workplace Education Resource Guide*. Toledo, OH: Owens State Community College.

administered. Therefore, the use of the Uniform Portfolio System for individual students would not be a requirement for this group. However, a **CLASS UNIFORM PORTFOLIO** is required using the following components of the Workplace Education Model:

- Standardized Assessments,
- Course Learning Plan, and
- Monitoring Class Progress.

✓ (Those few who would not complete, would be marked as “progressing” within a level.)

- Since the workplace programs using this model have specific time limitations and the collaborative partner may be assisting with the costs of the course, the use of all components of the Student Experience Model hinder the time and efficiency which is essential with workplace education, e.g. UPS management.
- Since workplace education programs are designed to meet specific, defined educational needs of employees, the Workplace Education Model serves them better than the current ABLE Student Experience Model. (Those individuals requiring more special assistance will be monitored and referred to a regular ABLE program. At this point, the student’s participation in ABLE would be fully documented through the Student Experience Model.)
- **Benefits to ABLE**
 - ✓ Ohio ABLE Workplace Programs would be carrying out the mandate and intent of the WIA, Title II, AEFL.
 - ✓ There would be a heightened degree of professionalism and cooperation among ABLE workplace programs and the collaborative business, industry, government, and/or labor partners.
 - ✓ ABLE workplace programs would be more visible outside the ABLE delivery system because of the collaborative nature of workplace education offered through ABLE.
 - ✓ Workplace Education providers would be able to count more of the students for whom they provide basic skills instruction for a minimum of twelve (12) contact hours.
 - ✓ The Career-Technical and Adult Education Office of the Ohio Department of Education would realize increased numbers of students receiving ABLE services.
 - ✓ The increased number of students would contribute to the ability of Ohio ABLE to meet its Core Indicators of Performance Goals as listed in the FY 2000-2004 State Plan.

TRANSPARENCY MASTERS FOR
SESSION 2

Session 2: Objectives

By the end of this session, participants will be able to:

1. Select at least three appropriate instructional strategies for workplace ESL programs
2. Develop a lesson plan for a workplace ESL class
3. Identify at least three methodologies for workplace ESL program evaluation

Session 2: Agenda

- I. Introduction, Overview, Objectives
- II. Designing Workplace ESOL Programs
- III. Planning Lessons
- IV. Lesson Plan Activity
- V. Developing Generic Course Content and Competencies
- VI. Evaluation Strategies
- VII. Evaluation and Wrap-up of Session 2

Workplace ESL Lesson Content Includes:

- Realia
- Material, vocabulary, scenarios dealing with life in the workplace, community, and American culture
- Various types of communications needed in the workplace and related content
- Opportunities to work on listening/speaking/writing skills
- Thinking and problem-solving skills
- Linguistic skills

Formal And Informal Workplace ESL Assessments

Formal/Standardized Tests:

BEST (Basic English Skills Test)
www.cal.org/BEST/

CASAS (Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System) www.ccasas.org/

Informal:

Learner self-evaluation forms

Performance-based (skills/tasks)

Learner profile: developed by instructor or in partnership with student (may be in narrative form)

Program developed: checklists, learner-generated log, portfolios

Characteristics of a Class Uniform Portfolio

Sample evaluation strategy for Workplace ESL classes to meet NRS requirements

Components of the Class Uniform Portfolio include:

- Standardized pre- and post-assessments
- Course Learning Plan
- Monitoring Class Progress

Rationale for this model:

- Workplace education programs are designed to meet specific, defined educational needs of employees
- The students will begin and end at the same time
- Meets mandate and intent of the WIA, Title II, AEFL

Final Summary Report

- Aggregate data about student participation, i.e. number of students enrolled, number completing
- Pre and post-test scores by number or letter i.e., Student A (Individual student scores should not be included by name)
- Collective reporting of student progress, i.e. Class Uniform Portfolio
- Quotes from supervisors and participants about experiences
- Recommendations for next steps

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

REFERENCES

- Burt, M., and Saccomano, M.(1995). *Evaluating Workplace ESL Instructional Programs*. ERIC Digest. Washington, D.C.: National Center for ESL Literacy Education Center for Applied Linguistics . (EDO-LE-95-07)
- Burt, M. (1995). *Selling Workplace ESL Instructional Programs*. ERIC Digest. Washington, D.C.: National Center for ESL Literacy Education, Center for Applied Linguistics . (EDO-LE-96-01)
- Burt, M. (1997). *Workplace ESL Instruction: Interviews from the Field*, ERIC Washington, D.C.: Clearinghouse for ESL Literacy Education.
- Castaldi, T. (1992, April). *Ethnography and Adult Workplace Literacy Program Design*, ERIC Digest, National Center for ESL Literacy Education . (EDO-LE-91-02)
- Carnevale, Anthony P., Gainer, Leila J., Meltzer, Ann S. (1990). *Workplace Basics Training Manual*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Crocker, J., Sherman, R., Tibbetts, J., and Dlott, M.(May 2002). *Workplace Readiness Guide*, Washington, D.C.: American Institutes for Research .
- Cunningham Florez, M.A., and Burt, M. (2001, October). *Beginning to Work with Adult English Language Learners: Some Considerations*, ERIC Q. & A., Washington, D.C.: National Center for ESL Literacy Education.
- Grognet, A.G. (1996). "Q & A Planning, Implementing, and Evaluating Workplace ELS Programs. ERIC, Washington, D.C.; National Center for ESL Literacy Education (NCLE).
- Imel, S and Kerka, S. (1992). *Workplace Literacy: A Guide to the Literature and Resources*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, & Vocational Education, Inf. Series # 352, Center for Education and Training for Employment, The Ohio State University.
- Isserlis, J. (1991, October). *Workplace Literacy Programs for Nonnative English Speakers*, ERIC Digest, Washington, D.C.: National Center for ESL Literacy Education
- Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy at Pennsylvania State University. (2000). *A Resource for using the Framework for Work-Based Foundation Skills*, Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of ABLE State Leadership Initiative.
- Kirby, M. (1989), *Perspectives on Organizing a Workplace Literacy Program*. Arlington, VA: Arlington County Public schools, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. (ED 313927)

Mansoor, I. (1993). *REEP Federal Workplace Literacy Project. March 1, 1991 – February 28, 1993.* Arlington, VA.: Arlington County Public Schools. U.S. Department of Education. (ED 363 146)

Maryland State Department of Education , Metropolitan Baltimore Council AFL-CIO Unions. (1997). *Portfolio Assessment, Celebrating Achievement in Workplace Education*, Baltimore, MD: Labor Education Achievement Program (LEAP).

McGroarty, M. & Scott, S. (1993, October). *Workplace ESL Instruction: Varieties and Constraints.* ERIC Digest, National Clearinghouse on Literacy Education. EDO-LE-93-07

Mikulecky, L. & Lloyd, P. (1993, February). *The Impact of Workplace Literacy Programs: A New Model For Evaluating the Impact of Workplace Literacy Programs.* National Center of Adult Literacy University of Pennsylvania: Philadelphia, PA. Technical Report TR 93-1.

National Alliance of Business. (2001, Spring) *Workforce Economics.* 7(1).

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education (1999). *State-administered adult education program 1998 enrollment.* Washington, DC: Author

Manuals for Workplace Language Training

Bradley, C.H., Killian, P.A. & Friedenberg, J.E. (1990) *Employment training for limited English proficient individuals: A manual for program development.* Columbus, OH.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education (ED 320 392)

Cook, C. & Godley, V. (1989). *Workplace literacy: A curriculum development guide.* Wilmington, MA: Cambodian Mutual Assistance Association of Greater Lowell, MA (ED 329 132)

Northwest ABLE Resource Center. (2001) *Ohio Workplace Education Resource Guide.* Toledo, OH.: Owens State Community College.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTOR READINESS*

CATEGORY			PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDED	RESOURCES NEEDED (WHO, WHAT, HOW)	TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION
	YES	NO			
1.0 Context: Does the program have instructional staff who:					
1.1. Are aware of the workplace culture (e.g., management structure, company expectations)? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
1.2. Recognize the politics of the workplace including labor and management issues? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
1.3. Are sensitive to diverse populations in non-traditional settings? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
1.4. Are aware of the effects of change on the workplace (e.g., economic, demographic, organizational)? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
1.5. Are sensitive to demands and responsibilities of adults in the workplace? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					

*Note: From Crocker, J. Sherman, R., Tibbetts, J., and Dlott, M. (2001) *Workplace Readiness Guide*, Washington, D.C.: American Institutes for Research. *An Introduction to Workplace ESL*

CATEGORY			PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDED	RESOURCES NEEDED (WHO, WHAT, HOW)	TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION
1.6. Are aware of the issues surrounding workplace safety and security? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
1.7. Recognize the differences between employer and employee needs and expectations? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
2.0. RESOURCES: Does the program have instructional staff who:					
2.1. Use a variety of resources to enhance workplace instruction (e.g. realia and human resources)? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
2.2. Integrate current media and technology as a tool for instruction? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
3.0. INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE: Does the program have instructional staff who:					
3.1. Are skilled in teaching basic skills including thinking skills, problems solving and decision-making? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					

CATEGORY			PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDED	RESOURCES NEEDED (WHO, WHAT, HOW)	TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION
3.2. Have experience working in non-traditional educational settings? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
3.3. Have experience teaching in a workplace setting? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
3.4. Are able to customize curriculum and resource materials to meet the needs of the specific target audiences? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
3.5. Are able to adapt instructional practices to meet the needs of the workplace? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
3.6. Are able to use appropriate instructional strategies for adults in non-traditional settings with special needs? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
3.7. Adapt the physical and interpersonal climate to make it conducive to learning in a non-traditional educational setting (e.g. rapport, cultural sensitivity)? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					

CATEGORY			PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDED	RESOURCES NEEDED (WHO, WHAT, HOW)	TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION
3.8. Provide frequent and varied opportunities to apply learning to the workplace setting? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
4.0. COLLABORATION: Does the program have instructional staff who:					
4.1. Interact well with staff from professional organizations? (eg. CBO, government agencies, not-for-profits) Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
4.2. Participate as a team member in non-educational settings? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
5.0. ASSESSMENT & EVALUATION: Does the program have instructional staff who:					
5.1. Are able to determine skills and skill levels needed in non-traditional settings? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
5.2. Are able to assess existing skills and knowledge in nontraditional settings? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					

CATEGORY			PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDED	RESOURCES NEEDED (WHO, WHAT, HOW)	TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION
5.3. Are able to determine gaps in skills and knowledge and provide appropriate instruction? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
5.4. Are able to prepare and disseminate information on student progress? Evidence: _____ _____ _____					
5.5. Are aware of confidentiality issues related to employer/employee communications Evidence: _____ _____ _____					

APPENDIX C: WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

Evaluation of Introduction to ESL in the Workplace Workshop Series

Please check your primary role: Instructor _____ Coordinator or Administrator _____

Indicate your geographical location: Rural _____ Suburban _____ Urban _____

For the following questions, please circle the number that best describes your evaluation.

	Extremely 4	Very Much 3	Somewhat 2	Not at All 1
1. Thinking back on the 3 main reasons you wanted to attend this workshop series, how satisfied are you with the results?	4	3	2	1
2. To what extent did you increase your understanding of unique characteristics of workplace ESL programs?	4	3	2	1
3. To what extent did you increase your understanding of the basics of planning, implementing, and evaluating a workplace ESL program?	4	3	2	1
4. To what extent do you think you can now plan lessons for a workplace ESL program?	4	3	2	1
5. On a scale of 1 - 4, how would you rate this workshop series?	4	3	2	1

Comments: _____

What additional skills and knowledge would you need to effectively implement an ESL in the workplace program?
