The *Finding the Teacher Within* Project

Final Report 2003

Valerie Uccellani,
Senior Associate
Global Learning Partners, Inc.

© Global Learning Partners 2003

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 3

Section One 7

I. Introduction 7

i. Background, Purpose, Rationale 8

a) History: How This Project Came About 8

b) What Do We Mean by "Learner-Centered"? 8

c) *Finding the Teacher Within* Project Activities 10

ii. This Report and How to Get What You Need From It 11

Section Two 13

II. Evaluation Findings and Project Discoveries 14

i. Usefulness of the Project 14

ii. Challenges and Concerns about the Project or the Approach 19

iii. Learner-Centered Designs at WIC 24

iv. Educators' Skills, Attitudes, and Use of the Approach 29

v. Preliminary and Anticipated Impact on WIC Participants 36

vi. Impact of the Project on the WIC Community 39

Section Three 43

III. In Closing 43

i. Conclusions and Recommendations 44

ii. Report References 47

iii. Project Members: Credits and Contact Information 50

Executive Summary

Background and Framework

The ***Finding the Teacher Within*** (FTW) **project** can instruct and inspire anyone involved in practical applications of adult learning theory. Through the FTW project, CA-WIC has brought the theory of learner-centered, dialogue education to staff in a variety of local agencies—large, small, urban, rural—throughout the state. Through this project, local agency staff successfully:

- completed **introductory and advanced courses** in dialogue education;
- created or revised **group education sessions for participants** on a range of practical health and nutrition topics;
- led a series of **FTW workshops** for frontline educators to effectively use dialogue-based designs; and
- began to provide valuable **follow-up** through educator observations and in-services.

The ***Finding the Teacher Within*** **workshop** is a three-day learning event—two "workshop" days and one day back in the clinic. During the workshop, educators and their supervisors study **key principles of a learner-centered approach** such as: Respect, Immediacy, Safety, and Engagement (RISE). They also examine **key practices of the approach** such as pausing, affirming, and asking open questions, aimed to raise participants' voices. In the workshop, educators also:

- **experience** a new learner-centered class;
- **examine** how the principles are used; and,
- **get guidance** on how to lead the class effectively.

The workshop closes with rounds of "**teach-backs" and structured feedback** to all learners. On day three, educators teach the new class to WIC participants, do a self-assessment, and get feedback from a "participant observer," with a focus on key principles and practices.

The goal of the broad FTW project builds on past work by throughout the state toward **"learner-centered" education.** It represents a fundamental shift in the way designers (i.e. those who write lesson plans or training curricula) and educators think. The shift puts attention on the learners, rather than the teachers or the "material". In this approach, the guiding question is no longer "What do *I* need to do to *teach*?" but, rather: "What do *they* need to do to *learn*?"

This report **highlights project findings** from the first pilot year (2002 – 2003) of the FTW project. The report pulls together three complementary perspectives:

- **team leaders** from the nine project sites;
- **educators** who participated in the FTW workshops at these sites; and,
- **Global Learning Partners (GLP) mentors.**

GLP's comments are based on our collective years of experience working with organizations devoted to social change through learning.

GLP:

- collaborated with CA-WIC in the design and implementation of this project;
- led courses in dialogue education for the staff, mentored designers; and,
- co-created the FTW learning events for team leaders as well as educators.

CA-WIC appointed a six-person team at the **state level to partner with local agency leaders** from each of the pilot sites. These state partners guided and supported staff at all turns. As of the writing of this report, they are about to embark on a **new wave of FTW—with a new group of agencies**, eager to *make a significant change in the way learning happens at WIC.*

Below is a short summary of findings presented in this report. We encourage you to:

- *visit* the pages of **Section Two** to read more about aspects of this work which **most interest you**;
- *read* the **Conclusions and Recommendations** in **Section Three**; and,
- *review* the **References and Contacts** at the end to request any number of documents that could aid in your own work.

Summary of Findings

Project Usefulness, Challenges, and Concerns

Team leaders and educators seem to agree that all components of the project were useful—for them as well as for their local agency colleagues. Many powerful quotes demonstrate how useful and inspiring the project was for staff. Team leaders most valued: their introductory and advanced design courses, the cross-agency gatherings, and the design support. Educators found great value in the FTW workshop, which seemed to validate them as learners and as teachers. Those who also got follow-up spoke highly of it.

> *We needed a **booster shot to re-energize staff** commitment and enthusiasm towards teaching classes. FTW has been an excellent model for accomplishing this goal.*
>
> *--a team leader*

> *What's useful? All of it – the workshop, observation and follow up – it was all useful. Workshop was very interesting – I learned a lot from co-workers – that they teach and techniques they use. Afterward, I felt more comfortable. I felt like "Hey, I can jump in there!"*
>
> *--a pilot site educator*

The whole concept is great—revamps old traditional method and makes learning more beneficial.

--an educator after the FTW workshop

Team leaders' perception of challenges during the project fall into five major categories—related more to external limitations than to their own personal struggle with designing or teaching. These leaders offer constructive advice to help face these challenges in the future.

- educators used to the "old way";
- competing priorities and not enough "support from on high";
- not enough time to pay necessary attention to the designs, and the feedback/follow up with educators;
- the logistics such as staffing during trainings; and,
- keeping the momentum going.

The educators' perspective is consistent, but with a different emphasis; their concerns center more around design issues than broader implementation issues. For example, they warn designers against being culturally inappropriate in their lesson plans, oversimplifying or complicating the reading/ language used with participants, or creating "scripts" which are too rigid.

On the topic of "**class designs**", team leaders offer the following **four types of advice**—to themselves and to others devoted to learner-centered education.

1. get educators involved in the design;
2. decrease the content;
3. in designing activities, use pictures, try pair work, consider class space, simplify props; and,
4. value field-testing.

Educators' Skills, Attitude, and Use of the Learner-Centered Approach

Team leaders discovered that most educators embraced the principles and practices of this approach; many found parallels with previous trainings and were eager to go further.

> *Staff will approach me and ask for feedback on class experiences they've had. This is new since the FTW project. The implementation of the FTW … has been "refreshing" to our WIC teachers. Staff appreciate the openness between themselves and the class designer(s).*

Clearly, as noted by some of those interviewed, not all educators are as excited about the change as others—primarily for design issues mentioned earlier. Some seem concerned that learner-centered sessions will require too much time from their hectic clinic responsibilities. The educators' own familiarity with the topic, and comfort with the particular "script," influences their comfort with the whole approach.

> *What I found out by asking what they knew and listening, is that some of what I had been telling them they already knew; now I can let them take the lead and add the things that they* don't *know!*

Team leaders and FTW educators both perceive an unfortunate de-emphasis on personal observation, feedback, and follow-up. While the trainers say it is important, most did not complete formal "baseline" observations before the FTW workshop. And, their post-workshop observations were not used as thoroughly as they could have been to inform on-going follow-up sessions with educators. Educators who did receive personal feedback and well-designed in-services were grateful for them.

Participant Response

The FTW project itself was a bit surprised by staff's commentary on participants' early response to the shift in approach. The next FTW project is primed to collect such data in a more comprehensive and systematic way.

> *They interact more not only with the teacher of the class but with each other. Because there is more interaction, even the quiet participants seem to walk away with more.*
>
> *– a team leader*

> *Before they were sitting in rows, now they sit in a horseshoe; now less teacher talking, more teacher listening; more client talking. Before they would come in cross their arms and legs, and stare straight ahead—you knew they didn't want to be there. But now, we start off right away with them participating— sharing about their kids. This gets them excited and interested in the topic.*
>
> *– a clinic educator*

For You

The FTW project has created tools and has tested processes that will be useful to any agency interested in becoming more learner-centered. For example, there are several practical tools built around the RISE principles with which to do:

- Design reviews;
- Educator training,
- Class observations; and,
- Educator feedback sessions.

If you embark on a learner-centered journey, this project sets you up to answer key assessment questions: How well do our new designs apply the principles of adult learning theory? How faithfully do our educators use and innovate around these designs? What project components are giving us our biggest bang for the buck? Which need further attention? In what ways are *we* modeling the principles? How could we model them better? How do our participants respond to more learner-centered designs and teaching?

Section One

I. Introduction

i. Background, Purpose, Rationale

a) History: How This Project Came About

b) What do we Mean By "Learner-Centered?"
- FTW Educators: Trained in Six Learner-Centered Practices
- FTW Lesson Designs: Guided by Four Learner-Centered Principles

c) *Finding the Teacher Within* Project Activities

ii. How to Get What You Need from this Report

i. Background, Purpose, and Rationale

a) History: How This Project Came About

California WIC is committed to revitalizing nutrition education, and named it as a key priority in their 2000 Strategic Plan. In 2001 - 2002, the agency examined many learner-centered strategies with the goal of strengthening staff training and participant group education throughout the state. As part of its efforts, CA-WIC contracted an international, non-profit organization, Global Learning Partners (GLP), to provide courses and mentoring to staff in the Branch office, and in interested local agencies statewide.

By the end of fiscal year 2002, over 233 CA-WIC staff had participated in GLP's introductory course ***Learning to Listen, Learning to Teach***, and over 27 CA-WIC staff had completed ***Advanced Learning Design***. Inspired by their work, many agencies had begun to take it on themselves to:

1) revise their lesson plans (i.e. from "teacher-centered" to "learner-centered");
2) model a dialogue-based, learner-centered approach; and,
3) informally train their paraprofessional teaching staff on the approach.

In order to support, systematize, and encourage this work, CA-WIC developed and field-tested a training program for WNAs and nutritionists entitled *Finding the Teacher Within (FTW).* After successful pilot testing at two agencies, the State decided to offer the FTW program to 5-6 interested agencies. Response to the State's invitation was overwhelming. After a thorough application process, nine agencies – ranging in location, and caseload – committed to the FTW project for one full year (November, 2002 - September, 2003). By participating in FTW, agencies would identify, practice, and integrate a variety of learner-centered principles and practices into their nutrition education program.

For more background of this project see Report References: CA-WIC Project Documents.

b) Purpose and Rationale: What Do We Mean by a "Learner-Centered" Approach?

Past experience and research in CA-WIC, as in other WIC programs, have shown that participants value the education that WIC offers. However, participants and WIC staff alike have voiced interest in stronger group education sessions – where participants are more engaged and learning happens more consistently.

Through their work with Global Learning Partners, CA-WIC saw great possibilities in a particular approach to adult learning which is learner-centered and dialogue-based. This approach represents a radical shift in the way lesson plans are created, and in the way teachers teach. The word "radical" comes from the Latin word "root." At the "root" of the approach are the realities and experiences of the learners – their interests, abilities, and needs around the topic at hand.

A basic assumption of this approach is that adults come to all learning experiences with the capacity and the interest to learn. Key features of dialogue-based education, which make it distinct from, but complementary to, other forms of learner-centered education familiar to WIC, include:

- the rigorous use of **achievement-based objectives**;
- the naming of **specific knowledge or skills** to be learned; and,
- the use of **structured dialogue** among learners and teacher(s) before, during, and after the learning event.

Lesson designers follow an iterative process beginning with a thorough description of the learners, and the situation that calls for their learning this topic at this time.

For a fuller understanding of the approach, and the "Seven Steps of Design," see Report References: "The Theory and Practice of Dialogue Education."

The FTW project focused on 4 key principles, and 6 key practices of learner-centered, dialogue-based education. These were chosen as a focus because they resonated most with WIC staff, and were considered important within the WIC context.

FTW Educators: Trained in Six Learner-Centered Practices

Use Open Questions: Questions without set "correct" answers. Often have the words "what" or "how" and "you". Don't feel like the teacher is "fishing" for an answer.

Pause: Waiting at least 5 seconds for a group to answer an open question. Learners may feel shy, or may need time to think about the question before they respond.

Affirm: Praising someone who volunteers an answer. Even if you do not agree with what they say, they will feel respected and you will encourage others to contribute.

Work in Pairs or Groups: Most people often feel more comfortable talking to just one other person than in front of an entire group. This is safer, and gets more people involved in the class at the same time.

Honor Learning Styles – Hear, See, Do: **tell me** and I'll forget; **show me** and I may not remember; **involve me** and I'll understand.

Provide Information: The class gives participants important new content, beyond the knowledge or experience they come in with. But, it does not allow the "material" to overwhelm the learning.

FTW Lesson Designs
Guided by Four Learner-Centered Principles

- **Respectful**: Learners feel important and valued. Adults need to feel respected for who they are, where they've been, and what they know.

- **Immediately Meaningful**: Something that learners feel is helpful in their own lives right now, that they can take back and use right away.

- **Safe**: Learners feel comfortable, confident, and willing to jump in.

- **Engaging**: Learners are involved and participate in their learning. We look for the smiles, conversation, laughter, questions, and movement that let us know our learners are engaged.

c) *Finding the Teacher Within* Project Activities

Twelve FTW program activities were laid out for all agencies before they applied. These were based on WIC's pilot experiences the previous year and GLP's previous experience working with other learner-centered organizations. *As of the writing of this report, all nine original FTW agencies have achieved the following activities*. They:

- Designated a two-three person team responsible for adapting and implementing its agency's own FTW program;

- Enrolled all team members in GLP's *Learning to Listen Learning to Teach* workshop and *Advanced Learning Design* courses;

- Attended four (4) train-the-trainer workshops designed to provide technical assistance and support to all agencies in the program;

- Conducted an orientation meeting for these all staff who would support, influence, or actively participate in the program;

- Created or revised at least 2 lesson plans incorporating LCE principles and practices;

- Used input from teaching staff, participant field tests, and GLP mentors to finalize the plans;

- Conducted a learning needs and resource assessment (LNRA) of their own agency staff who would actively participate in the program. In some cases, they also collected baseline data about teaching skills of staff through observation;

- Co-facilitated with a State trainer at least one ***Finding the Teacher Within*** workshop for up to 20 site supervisors and paraprofessionals;

You may contact CA-WIC for: the full 3-day FTW curriculum, guidelines for learner-centered class observations, a sample of learner-centered "insert" classes, and other materials.

- Observed these same staff one day after the two day workshop of staff using learner-centered principles in group education sessions;
- Provided feedback to staff about the group education sessions they conducted;
- Conducted a series of follow up staff in-services to address questions about using Learner-Centered Education (LCE) techniques and ways to improve skills in using LCE; and,
- Participated in the evaluation of the program, including: telephone interviews with a sample of paraprofessional staff, a written survey of team leaders, and a compilation of follow-up data from teacher observations.

For a list of all documents related to program evaluation including: evaluation framework, Report of Telephone Interviews; Report of Written surveys, and Report of Observation data., see Report References: Evaluation Documents. This report culls from each of those sources.

ii. This Report and How to Get What You Need From It

This report aims to give you as complete a picture as possible, in as few words as possible, of the ***Finding the Teacher Within*** (FTW) Project. We believe that the only way to get a complete picture of anything is to hear and consider many perspectives at once—the combination of which show you the whole.

We offer **three** complementary perspectives around each aspect of this project:

1) Perspective of WIC pilot agency staff (i.e. project trainers and class designers);
2) Perspective of pilot agency educators (paraprofessional staff and their supervisors); and,
3) Perspective of GLP mentors.

The **first** of these perspectives comes from several data sources including:

- Written, end-of-project surveys completed by team leaders from 8 of the 9 pilot sites;
- Written and verbal feedback from team leaders during their four Train-the-Trainer events; and,
- Written feedback from staff of pilot agencies who participated in the *Learning to Listen-Learning to Teach* and/or *Advanced Design* courses offered by GLP.

The **second** perspective comes from the following sources:

- Written feedback from pilot agency educators (paraprofessionals/WNAs) at the end of their FTW workshop; and,
- Individual telephone interviews conducted after the educators' participation in the 3-day (2 +1) FTW workshop and a follow-up meeting.

The **third** perspective – that of GLP adult learning specialist—is peppered throughout this document due to the natural bias we all bring to reading data, organizing it, and writing about it. All effort was made, however, to confine our perspective to the sections of the report marked "The Perspective of GLP".

This report is written to model the approach of the FTW project itself. So, we held to these three fundamental guidelines of learner-centered, dialogue-based education.

1. We **chose content** that seems ***most*** **relevant** to ***most*** readers. *Please call or email us about any aspect of the project of particular interest to you which is not described here. See the "report references" for original sources or full reports of any data we summarized here.*

2. We **organized the findings** and **bolded phrases** in each section so you can jump to what *interests you most now*. Find *highlighted conclusions* for each set of findings in section three.

3. We **posed open questions** at the start of each section so you consider **your own perspective**, and the usefulness of this information *for you*, as you read.

Section Two

II. Evaluation Findings and Project Discoveries

i. Usefulness of the Project

ii. Challenges and Concerns About the Project or the Approach

iii. Learner-Centered Designs at WIC

iv. Educators' Skills, Attitudes, and Use of the Approach

v. Preliminary and Anticipated Impact on WIC Participants

vi. Impact of the Project on the WIC Community

As you read this section, consider:

- *Which FTW components would be most **useful** for your staff? Why?*
- *How are FTW's **challenges and concerns** instructional for you as a project planner?*
- *How do our findings help you as you **design learning-events** for staff or participants?*
- *How might your program build **educators' skills and use** of a learner-centered approach?*
- *What surprises you about the preliminary reaction from **program participants**?*
- *What impact would you hope to see from such a project? How would you **plan for impact**?*

i. Usefulness of the Project

The Perspective of Pilot Agency Staff

In their final project surveys, agency team leaders were asked what they found most useful about the project overall. They also offered recommendations to guide the planning of similar projects in the future.

Firstly, sites found that the overall project had **motivated them and their colleagues** around education at WIC.

> *We needed a **booster shot to re-energize staff** commitment and enthusiasm towards teaching classes. FTW has been an excellent model for accomplishing this goal.*
>
> *Focusing on respect, safety, immediacy, and engagement was a great morale boost for our staff. Just the dialogue alone really worked well with our staff.*
>
> *Many staff valued the work of the State in laying out an overall project plan, and sticking to it. They also valued the **State's support** and **GLP mentoring** throughout the life of the project.*
>
> *[Most useful to me was]… the individual attention to our agency by State staff, their presence at the orientation meeting, and their participation in the three-day training.*
>
> *The timeline was laid out ahead of time. [When you work with other agencies]… just make sure they know going in all the components necessary and to plan for them accordingly.*
>
> *The open and quick relationship with [GLP] regarding lesson plan re-writes…[was] the most valuable mentoring I've had in any aspect of my life for a long time.*
>
> *As we continue with this project, our FTW meeting could focus on class design where agencies bring classes to design and have a GLP mentor available for guidance. This would address my **challenge** of lack of time because time would be providing in an environment where interruptions would be minimal.*
>
> *In a perfect world, how about having [the State and GLP] available ALL the time – perhaps sitting in the corner of my office cheering me on, challenging me, and supporting me! (Just how much would that cost????)*

Team leaders especially valued the project's **training in learner-centered, dialogue education**.

> *For me and my staff, Learning to Listen-Learning to Teach and the Advanced Design worked well. I feel these workshops provided me with the knowledge and confidence to teach others on learner centered principles.*

I appreciate all the support and safety demonstrated to the learners. This is the first training in which I have ever felt safe to share and talk openly about my questions and concerns. Thank you.

[I liked] the requirement that the supervisors of the FTW sites participate in the Learning to Listen, Learning to Teach workshop before the FTW workshop. This is important because it allows the supervisors to give their staff the needed support for the classes.

The three-day workshop was phenomenal—very well written and easy to deliver. FTW workshop was well thought out and easy to present.

Although **design work** (i.e. **lesson plan re-writes**) was a challenge in many ways, this work was also seen as a very useful aspect of the project.

*FTW came at a time when we really need **to revitalize nutrition education**. Specifically we had been talking about redoing the Orientation Class for a long time. The FTW project was a great **opportunity to revise this class.***

*Developing, pilot testing, and training the staff on a learner-centered class was (so useful). This process was the "eye opening" and "**eureka, I've found it"** experience.*

*It was very important that input from the staff was obtained during the development of the class. When we unveiled the class to the staff during the FTW, some felt **they had a part in the class development.***

In their written feedback after joint training events, project leaders often commented on the usefulness of design support—they were grateful for it, even if they did not use it as much as they could have, and many were eager to get more (i.e. more formal, structured design time, with feedback).

As a testament to their dedication and enthusiasm, all the agency teams attended every one of the **FTW team-leader trainings** through the year. Team leaders often had suggestions when asked to give feedback at the close of each of these four trainings. Nonetheless, several of them specified these trainings when reflecting on what was valuable in the project overall.

I really enjoyed the trainings at the state. I always left with a huge boost of enthusiasm for the project.

The "train the trainers" sessions were excellent, well organized and informative. They prepared us well to train our own staff and implement the project.

In their written feedback on trainings, staff commented most frequently on the usefulness of: 1) *cross-agency sharing* and learning about others' experiences with project components which they were about to implement; 2) *seeing the principles modeled* in the trainings themselves; and 3) *getting input* from CA-WIC and from GLP mentors.

At the start of this project, team leaders were asked about their greatest concerns for the project. The majority of comments related to **"getting other staff on board" and "getting support from on high."** This concern remained throughout the year. Nonetheless, when asked to look back on the experience, many of them mentioned the usefulness of efforts to make that happen. For example, some found the initial useful.

> *[The orientation] was a good opportunity to not only give the staff a heads up on what was going to happen, but it sent a message that this project was important. What was especially effective was the presence of the State WIC Trainers and our WIC Director.*
>
> *[What I found useful was]...the support from our Program Director all the way down to the Temp Staff. Everyone was willing to give LC classes a try. We had Temp staff participating with FTW training who were not at the NA level of training doing a wonderful job at teaching a breastfeeding class. It was very important to create a welcoming and non-threatening environment when doing the FTW training.*
>
> *Director and Supervisor support is very important so they can be role models for Learner-Centered education, give feed back to staff, and allow staff time to perform LCE stuff.*

The Perspective of the Educators

When asked directly about the usefulness of the FTW project (i.e. orientation, workshop, observation, follow up), **all nineteen educators interviewed reported one or more aspects of the program were useful.** Fifteen felt all components were useful. The workshop was mentioned specifically much more than any other component of the project. Eight of the 19 educators also spoke enthusiastically about the follow-up session. None mentioned the orientation specifically.

> *In the workshop [we] learned how adults learn, how to affirm, add and move on – so you can get control of the discussion back to where you want it. We actually elicited what topics participants wanted to learn and this set the stage for asking them to participate and listening to them I don't think that we would have circulated that survey if we had not gone to this training. I think it was a real positive thing to ask what they would like to learn.*
>
> *What's useful? All of it – the workshop, observation and follow up— it was all useful. Workshop was very interesting—I learned a lot from co-workers— that they teach and techniques they use. Afterward, I felt more comfortable. I felt like "Hey, I can jump in there!"*
>
> *The follow up meeting—we wrote what was useful and hard for people, and then we discussed. I learned what other [educators] felt was hard—like when they had to wait for response it was hard. It wasn't only me! Other people had that situation too. We also tried to make the script shorter—what we needed to cover in 20 minutes is a very short time and a lot of information to give our clients. [The meeting] was useful too because it reminded us about open-ended questions. Some people shared how they get their clients to cooperate: a lot of times it is HOW we ask—if we do closed, not open, questions.*

For a thorough description of the educators' view, see the full report on their telephone interviews,available through CA-WIC.

These 19 educators, interviewed by phone, are a small sample of the hundreds of local agency educators who enjoyed the three-day **FTW workshop**. Workshop feedback forms provide a lot of insight into what this large group of educators found useful. In the feedback, the educators most often commented on the following:

- **safety** principle, and the safety they felt in the workshop;
- **engagement** principle;
- practice of "**affirm, add**, and **move-on**";
- interactive, "**hands-on**" nature of the of the workshop and use of **visuals**;
- opportunity to **practice** a class, **get feedback**, and learn from each other; and,
- use of **open questions**, and **pausing**.

Here are some direct quotes that are representative of the majority of educator comments about **what was useful in the workshop**:

> *It helped show me my weaknesses and gave me tools to help with those weaknesses.*
>
> *I feel more confident in teaching now!*
>
> *I believe that I found everything useful what I learned in these 2 days. Very practical.*
>
> *I like the innovative ways to engage – not just participants but teachers.*
>
> *These two days taught me many skills I can use at work and home.*
>
> *This is one piece in a puzzle that looks better day by day.*

It is clear from their workshop feedback that **being listened to** is clearly an important theme for these educators. Many of them commented that they **liked the way their input was valued and important** during the FTW workshop. And, they said they liked to be heard about the class design; in a few sites staff said that they felt decisions were made about the design without their input and they didn't like that.

> *I suggest you get everyone involved – give input to designate which class.*

When asked what other comments they have about the workshop, **educators were overwhelmingly positive**—the large majority were grateful for the opportunity to learn in this way, and for the trainers' approach (*positive, confident, well-prepared*).

> *I liked the way the trainers used the principles and practices. I really appreciate the energy and enthusiasm [of the trainers].*
>
> *I wish all our trainings [and in-services] were like this one!*
>
> *The whole concept is great—revamps old traditional method and makes learning more beneficial.*

I am glad we're moving to this new style of teaching—looking forward to seeing the agency change it's nutrition education.

The Perspective of GLP

The FTW project components worked toward two powerful streams of change simultaneously:

1. **Build** staff's practical understanding of **learner-centered principles**; and
2. **Design** dialogue-based **learning events** (i.e. staff trainings and participant "classes").

Each of the project components was necessary and useful in bringing about these two, inter-dependent streams of change.

<u>The project **built** staff's practical understanding of the principles.</u>

Despite many competing demands, hundreds of CA-WIC staff successfully completed dialogue education courses through GLP. As one should expect, the principles resonated more with some staff than others. But, in each and every course, GLP discovered WIC staff with a profound yearning for, and a deep understanding of, this approach. Here are just two comments written by GLP instructors after leading courses with WIC pilot site staff.

> *There were so many "aha!" moments. New learnings. Participants were stopping themselves mid-sentence so that closed questions would not grace their lips. They were determined to invoke dialogue by using open questions. Nothing else would do!*
>
> *This group of WIC staff …hung on our every word. They "ate" as if they were at a feast and nothing but delicacies were being served. Because of their insatiable appetite, the buffet table was set generously and the feast never ceased from beginning to end. They came expecting a lot; they received it, and more. They were very perceptive, picked up the theories immediately, and utilized them throughout the course. They said they would never look at learning the same way again.*

WIC staff's individual learning was amplified when many staff from a single agency studied the approach together. They often spoke months later about how useful it had been—not only in their WIC work but also in their personal lives, their volunteer work. It was common to hear staff say that they would never be able to go back to "the old way", and they would not want to.

<u>The project resulted in the **creation of many solid, dialogue-based designs**.</u>

The FTW project supported the creation of learner-centered designs in several ways. Examples of dialogue-based designs (used to teach the theory), and design reviews by mentors (before and after field testing) seem to have been particularly useful for WIC staff. Over the year, they created over 200 designs in the GLP introductory course, and nearly 20 WIC-specific designs in the advanced course. In their designs, we saw evidence of many aspects of the approach such as: learner and teacher safety, visual and kinesthetic learning, relevant content. Before taking the advanced course, staff were asked to report what they had actually been using in their work.

Here is a sample:

> **Needs Assessment**: *I have given needs assessments prior to the recent trainings I have facilitated. I either provided these by having staff complete an assessment and fax back to me or I did it over the phone. The needs assessment was very powerful in helping me to navigate my trainings in a direction that was meaningful and relevant for the learners.*
>
> **Seven Steps of Design**: *I have been using this method to design classes. Using the steps gives direction and guidance and also makes it easier to start the design (decreasing procrastination!).*

The greatest evidence, perhaps, of the usefulness of this project overall for WIC agencies is that staff started thinking in a learner-centered way. As they approached their design work, they often discovered changes WIC needed to make well outside the confines of the learning event itself. For example, several pilot sites discovered that, in order to improve the learning process during "Welcome to WIC," participants need to get their vouchers before the class begins – it builds relevance, engagement, and immediacy of the learning. The system change was quite time consuming—but staff say it was "well worth it!"

ii. Challenges and Concerns about the Project or the Approach

The Perspective of Pilot Agency Staff

During the FTW project, agency team leaders were asked on many occasions what they found most challenging. Their comments are grouped and ordered based on what we heard most frequently and most "loudly". Their recommendations on how to face these challenges are included, when available.

Challenge: Educators are Used to the "Old Way."

> *Staff will resist change, especially when they were doing one type of class (lecturing) for so long.*
>
> *"Teach half the content in twice the time." As the person who designs curriculums this was a challenge. For staff, they often wanted to add more information to the class because they wanted participants to have more information.*
>
> *Teachers perceived the new learning style as "scary". In doing a LNRA, we learned the staff feared using FGD in classes.*
>
> *What I saw as challenging for the staff was that we were teaching them to encourage dialogue by inviting them to share and by using open questions. While some staff liked this technique, for some this was not safe for them as a teacher. For some less skilled teachers, safety for them is hiding behind a script and reading it to them.*

Staff shared several thoughts related to meeting the challenge of working with educators who "do it the old way". For example, they suggested **focusing attention on those staff who have a greater inclination toward the approach**. This is discussed below in the section on educators' skills. They also suggested **patiently and diligently using the approach**, until staff understand it and become more comfortable with it.

> *Model LC principles/practices at staff meeting, staff trainings. Make it the norm!*

Challenge: Competing Priorities and Not Enough "Support from on High."

> *We haven't had good administrative support… participation in the orientation and the training. Therefore, the higher levels in the Department don't actually understand what this changes in WIC, and why so much training was required.*
>
> *I think that maybe there needs to be another orientation meeting for all WIC staff at the agency so that there is "buy in" from everyone. Then perhaps we could close down clinic or have other sites send staff for staff relief, etc.*
>
> *Work hard to inform administration about what this is, what it will mean to behavior change for clients, and therefore improved health status, and that the cost-benefit ratio is good. Be sure administration has the time to learn about this, and even attend the GLP workshops if possible.*
>
> *Our involvement came when the Department was deeply committed to creating the Bioterrorism Plan, and the Smallpox vaccination clinic plans. This took our supervisors away from our project during the early months (12/02 - 4/03).*

Challenge: Paying necessary attention to the designs, and the feedback/ follow up with educators

> *The time investment is huge!*
>
> *Having time to do observations – we are very short staffed due to county budget crisis. In addition, we are in the middle of converting our CPA's to WNA's and are also training 14 new staff to become WNA's.*
>
> *Our biggest challenge is that we can't carry out all the tasks we had expected to, such as re-writing all of our lesson plans; mentoring the staff closely as classes change; and, bringing this information to the rest of the department and to other agencies*
>
> *Time constraints: time to prepare sections of FTW lesson plans for local agency customization.*

For the most part, team leaders seemed to feel that this kind of design work, and individual attention to educators, is bound to be time-consuming. One suggestion, however, that seemed quite common, was aimed to save on design time.

[I'd recommend] maybe—things we have already discussed—like sharing classes state wide so we don't have to re-invent the wheel every time.

Challenge: The Logistics – staffing during trainings.

A challenge for us was deciding whether or not to close the FTW sites during the FTW workshop. I think most agencies in the FTW project either closed the site or had other sites fill in. Our agency was not able to close down completely nor have other sites help out so we decided to only train a handful of people at two sites. I think that this project would have worked better if the whole site went through the workshop, but they were not able to.

Scheduling training rooms that are functional and because our county reaches so far, planning training for the desert communities is a challenge since we are traveling to do that training. We are able to meet and overcome challenges with everyone working together.

For our agency, probably scheduling staff time out of clinic for 2 days. Currently making this a priority during budget crisis at our agency.

Compress FTW training and focus to one-day sessions and spend most of the time on class development.

Challenge: Keeping the Momentum Going

[This] is the most difficult [now, at the close of the project]. Why? I think having the support from other agencies, the state, and the GLP mentors was a huge asset—when difficult challenges came up, someone was there to help you problem solve the situation. Somehow we've got to figure out how to keep in touch with other agencies to keep that support going and hence, the momentum.

Recommendations included:

Get the web site going.

Keep in close contact with other agencies—I think we all have similar challenges and a great deal can be learned from listening to other agencies.

One site also commented that the project had "a little too much emphasis on group education, when many contacts are 1:1." They suggested "it would be great to link learner-centered principles and practices from classes to individual WIC counseling!"

The Perspective of the Educators

With the exception of design changes (which are addressed in the next section) educators' suggestions around project concerns were limited: two people asked for **more observation feedback** and two others asked for **greater attention to follow-up meetings.** Specifically, they offered these concrete suggestions to make these components more useful:

> Observation: *More criticism from observations*.
>
> Follow up: *Better preparation for follow-up. More time. Attendance by all parties*.

When asked again, from a different angle, about project concerns, seven educators had none; five voiced concern with "maintaining and growing a learner-centered focus; and, four noted the rigid structure of the classes (see quotes below). One was concerned if the "participants are not really comfortable with each other and to share with each other" and one had a design concern (described in the next section on class designs).

> *My concern is quickly expanding it—the approach. If we aren't using it with other classes, it seems like a mixed message. If it's not there in the other regular classes, we get them geared up to participate and not taking advantage.*
>
> *We are so rigid in the structure. I sometimes find I have to improvise to encourage participation. …pairing them up with someone so that they are not uncomfortable when choosing [a partner]. Sometimes they have to stand up and do something… I sometimes add words to help move people more quickly.*
>
> *This project does not work perfectly in every class—depends on group or people. Some people look like not interested. May just want to get out, or already have experience with topic. When we start the classes, we need to see their mood and willingness and adjust accordingly.*

A concern about time also surfaced at various points of the interviews with a few educators. They want to remind us that the need to tend to clients and other hectic clinic responsibilities often keeps them from being able to devote time to classes. They also are concerned that clients themselves don't want to spend too long in a class.

We get more insight into educators' concerns about the project through a review of their feedback forms following the FTW workshop. In a few cases, educators described real set-backs they felt in the FTW workshops where the "insert" class had not yet been field tested, or sufficiently reviewed by educators, prior to the workshop:

> *Have the class more polished—so we spend the time on practicing the principles and techniques rather than on class revisions. A more finished product so we don't have staff new to the techniques learning a class that needs fine-tuning.*
>
> *Roll out a class that's not so emotionally-charged… less tension... and it won't derail us.*
>
> *Give staff more background on the class – not just the purpose but the theory behind these practices – how they came to be.*

Other types of suggestions on the FTW workshop were minimal, and inconsistent. A few recommendations that appeared more than once are:

Have even more interaction/ activities, especially in the afternoon.

More on the difference between this and FGD?

Give everyone the script, and/or some GLP material to read beforehand to be more ready to teach.

More time to review new material before practice teach-backs.

More feedback to improve teaching and to be ready for the day in front of the real participants;

Pull us back together in 1-2 months.

The Perspective of GLP

Celebrate! That's what GLP said when we saw the list of major challenges named by pilot site staff in their third FTW train-the-trainers event (April, 2003). The mere fact that they saw many of these challenges—and generated their own creative, practical, learner-centered ideas around them—was evidence of a major paradigm shift at these sites. Non-administrative challenges feel into two broad categories.

Staff/Educator Issues:

- Dealing with negativity.
- Ensuring a consistent teaching approach.
- Having everyone attend GLP and FTW trainings.
- Finding observation time.

Class Design Issues:

- Letting go of content/trying to decrease amount of information.
- Finding Design Time.
- Ending the Design Process: When is enough, enough already?
- Translating Designs.

GLP created a document "Responding to Challenges" in which we offer our own ideas around each of these challenges. In future projects of this type, it would be very useful to give this list of "anticipated challenges" and ideas for responding early on, so that team leaders can learn from the experiences of their pilot project predecessors. When we examine the challenges faced by most sites, we arrive at the following recommendations for future programs:

Recommendations: Stronger Support for Staff and Educators

1. Help staff *to implement educator observations* before and after the FTW workshops. These observations are needed in order to:

   a) adapt educators' FTW workshop and subsequent in-services;
   b) adjust the designs of "classes";
   c) collect data on educators' use of principles/practices; and, most importantly,
   d) dialogue with the educator to affirm what they are doing well. It would help staff to get:
      - Suggested plans/schedules for observations;
      - A format for brief written notes after observations (i.e. implications for the "class" design and for educator trainings);
      - Higher-level support from WIC; and,
      - Training in how to do the observations effectively, using GLP's learner-centered guidelines.

2. Help staff to *implement effective in-services*, following the FTW.
   - It would help project team leaders to get:
   - More "prototype" in-service designs;
   - Higher-level support to meld FTW in-services with other, broader, in-services;
   - Input from past FTW grads in the design and implementation of in-services; and,
   - More guidance on modeling the principles in staff meetings and supervision. See GLP document "SURE-fire staff meetings" as a starting point for such guidance.

Recommendations: Systematize and Ease the Design Process

Pilot site staff could have been even more effective in staying connected to the learners and the educators during the design process. In other words, they tended to "design from their desks" instead of "getting into the learning room." It would help in the future to:

- Invite teams to propose times for design reviews, and use the pilot's new "design checklist." Offer design teams feedback in writing on their design, with "red flags" for field testing and educator input;
- Provide optional workshops to develop designs and get experienced feedback;
- Formalize the field testing and the input from frontline educators on all designs; and
- Continue to build a "storehouse" of tested, dialogue-based designs which agencies can use as a starting point for their own redesigns around common topics at WIC.

A **final, cross-cutting challenge** which we observed throughout the project was that of competing demands and priorities at the local agency pilot sites. Team leaders said that they did not want this project to be like others they'd witnessed "…yea, we did that… what happened to that?" Instead, they wanted **momentum, sustainability**. The usefulness of their course work did seem to get diluted somewhat by their return to systems and policies which make a learner-centered approach more difficult. For example, it was often difficult for staff to find the time to adequately research learners' needs/ interests, to clarify content and intended outcomes, or to create learning tasks which result in the intended outcome. Working in design teams seemed to make it much easier, and more likely, that staff would set aside design time. In this way, **staff support each other** to make use of what they learned.

iii. **Learner-Centered Designs at WIC**

The Perspective of Pilot Agency Staff

Through their own studies, trial, and error, FTW pilot site team leaders have done valuable research on lesson - designing. At their April gathering, they offered these findings about what works, and what does not. The views stated here are not necessarily shared by all team leaders but represent a general consensus among the group.

5. **Get educators involved in the design.** Input from staff is very valuable, and some are eager to give it. Use educator observations to inform your design.

6. **Decrease the content**. And, if content isn't working, cut it out.

7. In designing activities… **Use pictures** instead of words. **Pair work** works! Consider class **space**. **Simplify props.**

8. **Value field-testing**. Allow time, invite NAs to test it, use drafts and allow for trial runs. Don't laminate.

In their written survey, these staff offered the following insights for others interested in learner-centered design work.

> *The most difficult thing [for our educators] is learning all these new skills and then not having all the classes designed in this way – it dilutes what they've learned when the old method is still being practiced. It would be great if we could have changed all the classes but we did not have the time…*
>
> *Have class designers design all classes using LC P&P. Staff will get mixed messages if a new class is taught using the "old" teaching style.*

They added the following recommendations, based on their experience.

> *Strongly encourage all designers to attend Advanced Learning Design.*
>
> *It's hugely beneficial to share designs to lessen the workload of re-designing so many classes which leaves more time to focus on training staff and follow-up.*
>
> *Try to monitor classes after the workshop to identify problems early and then help the educator individually with it.*
>
> *Another challenge about the class we chose was that many of the staff did not know a lot about shopping for WIC foods. Also, if anyone decides to do this orientation class, I recommend that staff get a thorough training on the WIC foods before the FTW workshop.*

Some sites chose to redesign classes which rely heavily on the system underway at the clinic. During the design process they realized that, in order to maximize the learning, the system would have to change. This complicated their design work significantly.

> *We changed the flow of dealing with applicants. Before this class was implemented, we started the applicant with an orientation class, sent them to the counselor and then printed their checks. With the new class, we do one-on-one counseling first, print their checks and then group them and teach the class. Grouping them has become very challenging.*
>
> *Another challenge was the insert class that we chose. We decided to use the "Welcome to WIC" class…. This required us to "work out of the box" since now we would have to get the participants enrolled and checks printed before the class so that they could have their own checks. We also had to make sure that we had enough people in the class to make the class interactive. This required us to make adjustments to the appointment schedule.*
>
> *[What made our design hard was] the number of employees involved and starting with the orientation class, which is very complicated. I think if we can make this class learner-centered, we can make any class work.*

These same staff also commented on the fruits of their labor.

> *Participants are enjoying the class [New Orientation] and feeling more "welcomed" to WIC.*
>
> *They are much more involved in the class. They are asking more questions and giving input. They actually have the opportunity to look at their checks before leaving the clinic and ask questions. I have only heard positive feedback.*

For more participant reaction, see the section below: Anticipated Impact on Participants.

The Perspective of Educators

Educators were asked how they feel about the new, learner-centered changes, what has been easy and what has been hard, and what changes they would suggest to the new class designs. **The large majority welcome the design changes that had been made, without reservations.** Specific **design-related changes that many educators find easy** fall into two categories:

> The new designs make it is easier to get people to interact (*it gets people involved quickly and we need that, it reduces burn out from doing the same thing over and over).*
>
> The new designs use visual aids well (which *"keeps educators and participants focused," helps participants understand more, keeps me from having to remember so much."*

Several educators also spoke highly of the **new design process**:

> *It makes it is easier because training and practice were provided ahead of time, we discussed the design and made changes, I can go into more detail now.*

When asked **what changes have been hard**, educators name the following main difficulties, along with **strategies they have been using** around each.

> Difficulty: **Pair/small group work** (i.e. Some are shy with strangers, some feel more comfortable sharing with professionals, they may be afraid their answer will not be right, sometimes they just sit there and don't' want to).
>
> Strategy*: "I ask them to share maybe just a little thing – anything I can find to help them talk with each other."*
>
> Difficulty: **Structure of design** (i.e. it's too rigid, it's a different patter to get used to).
>
> Strategy: *"I will go over and restructure the phrasing to make it more accessible*.
>
> Difficulty: **Props** (i.e. hard to use when Moms are caring for children.)
>
> Strategy: *"I just ask if they'd like to use them (I give them the choice)."*

Two broad design-related concerns emerge from our various lines of questioning: literacy/language and "cultural appropriateness". Another cross-cutting concern is what some of these educators perceive as a requirement to "stick to the script", which keeps them from making adjustments around both the literacy/language issue and the "cultural" issue. When asked what changes they would recommend to the new designs, their suggestions often relate back to these three cross-cutting issues.

> Suggested Change related to literacy/language:
> *More or improved props, models and/or visual aids (easy to read, colorful); more visuals, less words. Simplify or modify wording (too technical), careful not to "dummy down" the language, care to translate into another language.*
>
> Suggested Change related to cultural appropriateness:
> *Allow educators to modify task to make more culturally or contextually relevant.*

The Perspective of GLP

WIC pilot site staff have made great strides in their approach to designing, as noted in the following quote by a GLP course instructor.

> *The group totally grasped the importance of the seven steps, for a superior design. Many reported that by using the seven-step process their designs went smoothly, teaching was crystallized since they knew exactly what their objectives were, and using the approach was a smooth adjustment.*

In fact, when recently invited to compare a sample of their "old" designs to "new" designs, WIC staff themselves were shocked at the improvements they saw.

> *My old design was nothing more than a WHY statement! Now I see it… we just used to explain the problem—but didn't really give participants anything to "work" with to change the situation.*
>
> *Wow. The old designs are full of closed questions—actually 'fishing' questions—like a big long test to see how much they knew, and then correct them if they didn't.*
>
> *There was no safety in those old designs. I can see now that we could just tell them the ways to prevent anemia without having to ask "has anyone been told they are anemic? What could people do to prevent it?"*

These insights are marvelous. They reveal a profound understanding of the philosophy behind a learner-centered, dialogue-based approach. However, we also witnessed a general tendency among WIC staff to internalize the practices over the principles. For example, pilot site "insert" classes were often heavy on kinesthetic techniques, even if such techniques were inappropriate for WIC participants or typical WIC "classrooms." Staff's devotion to practices over principles has led to some misconceptions during the FTW project. For example, we have heard educators say that a problem with the approach is the pair work. True, pair work is a hallmark of the approach; it helps people to find personal meaning in the content (relevance) and to feel connected to the learning process (engagement). But, the approach isn't as much about "pair work" as it is about *relevance* and *engagement*. Similarly, we have heard educators express concern about literacy—assuming that the approach requires learners to read aloud or to write on sticky notes. But, in fact, such learner characteristics would direct a good designer to alternative methods for visual learning and dialogue.

In order to combat a focus on practices over principles, GLP made significant adjustments in the advanced design course for this group. We grounded feedback in theory, we showed the principles in action in WIC designs, we examined all WHY statements so that they told a story upon which the entire design could rest. In the future, we recommend more of this so that all staff appreciate the need to ground designs in a deep understanding of the learners, and educators – their needs and strengths, their realities, and their preferences.

At the start of this project, we saw inappropriate attention to content in the WIC designs – either too much content (i.e. too much information crammed into a short learning time) and/or too

little practical content (i.e. not enough clear tips or resources provided to participants on the topic). Over time, we saw a significant improvement in this aspect of the WIC designs. See the compendium of designs, available at CA-WIC, for examples of designs with focused, useful content.

The FTW project began to create a cadre of WIC staff who design quite well, keeping the principles in mind. This cadre should continue to build their understanding, and to offer guidance – through examples – to other staff in the future.

iv. Educators' Skill, Attitudes, and Use of the Approach

The Perspective of Pilot Agency Staff

Team leaders found that, overall, their educators embraced this learner-centered, dialogue approach, and were eager to get feedback on their teaching in this way.

Trainers' commented extensively on **changes they saw in educators' attitudes during, and after, the FTW workshops.**

> *Staff will approach me and ask for feedback on class experiences they've had. This is new since the FTW project. The implementation of the FTW seemed to boost morale and has been "refreshing" to our WIC teachers. Staff appreciate the openness between themselves and the class designer(s).*
>
> *It was a huge morale boost for our staff. They felt valued as we performed our LNRAs and supported them through the roll out of the first class.*
>
> *For those who went through the FTW workshop, I can see that they feel good about their teaching and that they feel they are making a difference.*
>
> *[I see] positive energy in all our classes. A commitment from our Nutrition Assistants to give quality class presentations.*
>
> *Everyone seems more enthusiastic about teaching. The NAs approach us more often to give feedback how a class is going.*
>
> *All staff, no matter what their comfort level for teaching classes, has improved. They feel more confident and enjoy teaching.*
>
> *They have been enthusiastic, but the changes are subtle.*
>
> *This is 100% turnaround from what was done at our agency. The educators are excited about the changes.*

Good attitude, although I'm not sure they would tell you that they've personally made big changes in their approach to people.

The time spent to explain and practice the skills have allowed them to commit themselves to the curriculum and to teach it the way it was designed.

The staff really seems to enjoy this way of teaching/designing – makes the time go faster for them (unless it's an unusually quiet class). They realize that silence is okay and they look forward to feedback.

Staff were asked their opinion on what keeps certain educators from using the approach. Here is a sample of their thoughts on **what is and what could be**. Their most common comments were related to "Not enough support."

They don't get mentored, so if they are deviating from the lesson plan, or taking too much control in a 1:1, we aren't there to help.

Limited time to reinforce. Some educators still need more observations than what is… to help them improve.

We need reminders, follow-ups and support from trainers to continue the excitement.

Having more time to spend with those who struggle would be beneficial – most really shine when they are listen to and supported.

Plan to find a way to closely monitor struggling staff.

Other barriers mentioned include **language skills** (staff or clients), **space constraints** for having very active classes, and **lack of staff coverage** so that they have time to effectively teach the classes.

Despite definite shifts, team leaders continue to mention **resistance to change** as a barrier to educators' use of the approach.

Some staff have 'hard-to-change habits, traits'—didactic teaching, shyness.

Team leaders were asked which educators are most likely to embrace the approach and do well with it. There was a striking similarity across their privately-collected comments regarding **characteristics of educators "successful" with a learner-centered approach**. These educators:

- Are open to change and able to think "outside the box". Appreciate feedback.
- Have worked for WIC a shorter amount of time. Usually they were the staff with less experience.

- Are very comfortable with the material. They are not afraid of the questions participants will ask when given the opportunity. They like using the props and are confident with class topic.
- Already have confidence in teaching setting, and are interested in growth. Are staff who are innately more at ease in front of others.

Based on these insights about educators, one team leader suggested: "Consider some training that deals more with self-confidence building or just for fun a makeover session. Sometimes I think some of the people don't like to get up in front of others because they don't feel good about themselves." Others suggested: "Reinforce what the experienced staff are already doing well and get them to 'buy in' before the training starts."

When asked to quantify their perception, most (10) team leaders said that educators value FTW LCE principles and practices **a lot more *now* than *before* the FTW project. Two team leader said that educators seem to "**value FTW LCE principles and practices **a little bit more *now* than *before* the FTW project."**

While there was significant change seen in attitude, there was slightly less change seen in skill. Most team leaders (seven) perceived that educators' improved their skills 'a lot'; five leaders felt that educators' skills improved 'a little'. They gave these comments to explain their quantified responses about skill changes.

> *I have observed them using more principles in their classes and one-on-one counseling. As a group, they all increased their knowledge, expertise, and understanding of principles.*
>
> *Most of them are becoming better teachers.*
>
> *Some have made some big changes – listening more. Some still resort to the old method. It's difficult because they have to go back and forth between learner-centered and lecture format.*
>
> *It was substantial for some, minor for others.*
>
> *They're about 1/2 old, 1/2 new yet, still improving with guided practice.*
>
> *[We had a] high level of experience of the WNAs and their background in FGD already. Most of our classes in the past few years have been designed to include learners in a task, so they had taken the first step.*
>
> *We had already been using many of the techniques but I think the staff now have a greater appreciation for the format of a lesson plan and need to follow a sequence to maximize the learning.*
>
> *I answered 'a little' because they did know some of the principles. The biggest challenge is having them slow down when classes get big and hectic. They revert back to old ways when hurried for time.*

Specific skill sets in which leaders saw improvement included the following: *Increasing focus on letting participants activate their voices, movement toward more Open-ended Question's, increased appreciation of interactive activities,* and *increased feedback on design.*

Team leaders offer the following recommendations related to **building educators' skills**.

> *I would change the staff training to emphasize even more, that it is the way we phrase questions, and create follow-up questions, that opens up the door for participants' involvement. Some of our staff felt, "it's what we are already doing", and I feel they didn't see that they have a way to go to really open up an interview.*
>
> *Increased mentoring and constructive feedback, structured exercises (maybe one week focus on Open Ended Question's, and report back to mentor, next week focus on pairing – observing and discussing observations with mentor, etc).*
>
> *Provide additional training on the topic. Giving them enough resources and teaching them how to deal with unfamiliar questions.*
>
> *Do more observations and feedback. Spend more time with them by coaching them!*

The Perspective of the Educators Themselves

In an effort to get a true sense of the **educators' attitude toward the approach**, they were asked how they would feel about using learner-centered principles and practices in other classes (beside the one they were trained on in FTW). Sixteen (16) out of nineteen educators interviewed said **yes, it's a good idea.** In fact, six of these have already started making changes in other classes, on their own. Two individuals said it's a **"good idea but" or "maybe a good idea."** Both indicated as long as **literacy and time issues** were addressed, they were all for it. One person said it's not a good idea because "it takes up too much time and people don't come here to interact and meet friends." Although only one interviewee was vocal about her deep reservations, others recognized that "not everyone is as excited" as they are.

Most educators said they find the changes easy, although they could also name a few that are hard. Here's a range of responses, which educators mentioned more than once.

> *I just love the way the new class is taught.*
>
> *Pausing – it's hard to remember.*
>
> *Asking people to participate is hard – I was afraid they wouldn't.*
>
> *There's all this information to be shared.*

Even those who find some changes difficult noticed **their own growth**.

> *I am learning to do it (sit) and am finding that I'm more relaxed by doing it.*
>
> *Wow – it was just a matter of asking and having it open for discussion!*

[Silence] happens mostly at the beginning of class and gets better as it goes on. As I talk, someone will share something and then they all loosen up.

[When they don't stay on track], I remember what to do – affirm, add and move on!

In their interviews, some educators' comments show that they have a **deep understanding of the philosophy behind this approach.**

What I found out by asking what they knew and listening, is that some of what I had been telling them they already knew; now I can let them take the lead and add the things that they don't know!

It's easier to remember the information in using this …method—it's easier- more fun and non-threatening. You are not imposing—you know—"You have to breastfeed." Another thing it's presented in a way that the learner sees it is something they can do. You are discussing the myths and truths—they know what is true or not---all the things I thought are maybe not true.

When asked how they feel about using more learner-centered education in their other classes, educators' responses were **overwhelmingly positive**, and were often voiced from the perspective of the WIC clients.

I want to do it – it's working!

It's more interesting for me, and for the clients – even those who have taken the classes before.

We need to keep this going – both asking participants what they'd like to learn and designing for them.

Before we did get out in time but sometimes it was too soon—no questions or interest. The way we're doing it now they are expressing their questions and adding comments.

As an indicator of skill change, of the nineteen people interviewed, all reported **changes in the way they taught this class** now as compared to before, regardless of whether they liked the changes. Even the one person seeming to be the least comfortable with changes named several changes in her teaching.

Everything is different-- there's a lot more information that we are asking the clients to share with us and we return back to them. I was never fully trained to do the GI class. In the past I was never really trained to do this class, I just read information off of the pamphlet we were given.

Educators were asked to comment on what their classes were like before the change, and to describe what these same classes are like now. Below is a table highlighting their comments about the way they see the classes now, and how most educators feel about these changes.

What classes look like now *(Specific responses are grouped by interviewer according to the context and intent of the comment.)*	**How the majority feel about these changes**
more engaging (18 responses total)	"If they enjoy the topic and how it is taught, they will participate."
more respectful (7 responses total)	"Focus is so much more on them, and not on what we know."
more hear, see, and do (17 responses total)	"Parents are asking more questions because of the way we are presenting the information (– with visuals)."
more safe (16 responses total)	"You get them into the class in a gentle, non-threatening way – give them the space for thinking and to relax."
work in pairs (9 responses total)	"There's a part in the class where they have to sit down and ask each other a question. It's nice they get to talk to one another."
provides information (6 responses)	"More informative . Some people have been here year after year – it's good to give them something different."

A few of the educators interviewed offered valid, experience-based concerns about the changes. Three people shared concerns on the following:

- **the information may be inaccurate, irrelevant, or inadequate**.
- **the participant may not feel safe or respected** (i.e. "not everybody feels comfortable in small groups or talking about their baby.")

The Perspective of GLP

CA-WIC's frontline educators are an extremely talented and committed group–perhaps even more so than senior staff and designers recognize. For example, when FTW graduates are asked for their perspective on new class designs, they often connect their comments to the principles of **respect**, **safety**, or **engagement**. Some new designs were weaker than others, and educators seem rather insightful about this. Even if they didn't explain their "criticism" in terms of adult learning theory, their comments often pointed to a problem in the design.

Most educators (not all) seem to prefer to deviate from a "script" when teaching. Their ability to do this effectively seems to depend on how well they know the content, how much time they had to study or practice the "script" before teaching, and how much confidence they have with WIC participants.

Knowing the Content

Educators need badly to learn the content thoroughly so that they can feel **safe** in the classroom, and respond to questions. This is especially important in a dialogue-based design because of how it invites questions. Therefore, in the future, several strategies might be needed to boost educators' mastery of the content including: background reading attached to designs, nutritionist mentoring around "topics of the month," and/or great attention to "technical content" during in-services when new classes are "presented." The FTW pilot experience suggests that staff would welcome each of these strategies.

Practice Teaching

Educators need and want more time to examine new designs, and to practice them if possible, before bringing them to participants. This ought to be built into the regular routine at local agencies. Teaching in a dialogue-approach is especially difficult for those who have spent many years learning and teaching in a different way. Give existing staff time to practice 'this new way.' Also, over the years, WIC may want to try recruiting new staff with an affinity for this approach, and free some existing staff from the responsibility of group education.

Educator Confidence

One basic premise of the FTW project was that "educators often feel uncomfortable trying to implement classes designed with learner-centered principles and practices if they don't understand the principles. They also feel uncomfortable if they don't have a chance to experience learner-centered principles as a learner, then practice them as a teacher." The FTW workshop clearly helped to build confidence and comfort among educators by giving them a chance to experience, and to practice.

Educators as Our Teachers

One must be careful when reflecting on the findings about educator attitudes and skills on the previous pages. Many of the FTW pilot sites had implemented projects in which staff got skills such as open questions, pausing, and affirming. We could never fully tease out the effect of FTW from the effect of previous efforts. Nor do we need to. The goal, instead, is to constantly build on what has come before. We know now that CA-WIC has a number of paraprofessional educators whose perspective is highly valuable. They allow us to build new theory based on their experiences, get their voices in future design work, document struggles with the approach, and use what is learned to teach others.

v. Preliminary and Anticipated Impact on WIC Participants

The Perspective of Pilot Agency Staff

Although participants weren't interviewed directly, anecdotal data emerged which suggests a very positive response by participants to the approach, and more confidence on the part of staff that participants are learning.

General impressions by pilot staff include:

> *Clients seem to really enjoy the classes – happy faces. But some do struggle with having to get up and engaging with others.*
>
> *They enjoy the classes more, interact more and feel more welcomed.*
>
> *They really liked the involvement in our "pilot" class, and they liked the FCE class which utilizes LCE that we are doing right now.*
>
> *Participants have enjoyed the class. They are asking more questions.*
>
> *They interact more not only with the teacher of the class but with each other. Because there is more interaction, even the quiet participants seems to walk away with more.*
>
> *Once they get the idea of the "doing" activities, they like the hands-on approach. There's less day dreaming or tuning out by participants. They leave energized.*

Some particularly memorable comments have struck a chord:

> *One participant said to me, "I really enjoyed the class, it beats watching a videotape!"*
>
> *One participant appreciated the pace of the class. "The time just flew by."*

The Perspective of Educators

Educators were asked how useful, or not useful, this project seems for WIC participants. All 19 named some useful aspects for participants, specifically in the ways that the new approach increases participation and gives useful information. They also mentioned how the approach is more friendly (i.e. they are learning what they want to learn), more hands-on (i.e. The use of a shopping guide in class), and easier (i.e. it is easier to remember the information using this method.)

While most educators found it "all useful," seven educators also named aspects that are not useful for participants, primarily related to sharing and to literacy.

> *Every culture has differences. Chinese (especially newly immigrated) are not open to sharing information with another one.*

Sometimes wording – depending on the curriculum. We need to be careful about the language – sometimes too low (it can offend people… the only reason they qualify is that they are going to school) and sometimes too high (some people have limited education).

Below are a series of **direct quotes from educators'** telephone interviews about changes they see and envision in **participants' response to the approach.**

- *They were more flexible in the class… less stressed, not as impatient, not in a rush. They wanted more. They were learning, they were excited. Very motivated—at the same time they were having fun and learning!! I love it – the class was too short. If you came this year you would hear more people talking, more talking, and see more activities and people involved.*

- *Before they were sitting in rows, now they sit in a horseshoe; now less teacher talking, more teacher listening; more client talking. Before they would come in cross their arms and legs, and stare straight ahead- you knew they didn't want to be there. But now, we start off right away with them participating—sharing about their kids. This gets them excited and interested in the topic.*

- *See and hear. You would see how to use your vouchers. They were actually looking at me with interest; they would be asking questions as opposed to just sitting in their chair—fiddling in their chair—when their facial expression would be "look I just came here for my check".*

- *Faces now—they look at me like they appreciate me, and remember that I taught them this class. Smiling— and they are looking at me and waiting to see what I am going to say next. I used to want to hurry and rush this thing cause maybe I am boring this person.*

- *The props also make it easy. It's hands-on—they have the shopping guide in their hand—they do exactly what they are going to do in the store.*

- *They are learning what they want to learn. They are asking more questions than they asked before. Very useful—it so much more friendly to them.*

- *You… see more information given out in a better way. Like when we are explaining the extra benefits—we show them visually. On one side we show what formula has and on the breast milk side we have 4 plus many extra blocks of what breast milk has. I show this and they say wow- breast milk has a lot more than formula.*

- *They are more attentive, more willing to participate. Now, some people even ask, "Okay when do I get my next class?" They want to know what the next topic is about! People are matching up with one another. There are many people here that don't have people to socialize with. Now they are working with partners and having a friend to talk with and it makes them feel good about themselves. Some even exchange numbers--I have seen them do this. They take the information home; it helps them with their kids and even with their husbands.*

- *Being more involved in the class—wanting to tell their view how they feel about whatever you are talking about in class. Before clients would just sit and act like they couldn't wait to get out of the class— they are looking like, "Oh my goodness-is she going to pick me in a minute?" Whatever subject I'm on—they are talking more, asking more questions. I'm getting more smiles now than I used to get. I think some of that might because I am more relaxed, so I am presenting my class differently. I am smiling and more relaxed.*

- *Participation. More reading of the pamphlet and once they have read it they HAVE questions. All of them actually open the pamphlet and actually get to participate. I didn't read the back before. Before we would review, but they weren't actually participating in the class, they were just there.*

- *You would hear participants talking; you would hear a lot of questions from participants and a lot of okay silences. You'd see a lot less aggravated people. People used to dread teaching, where as now with participants getting involved—it took a load off! And with the teaching rotation, people are more willing to do it now it's taking much of that burden off.*

The GLP Perspective

CA-WIC smartly resisted pressure to focus this first pilot project assessment on participants themselves. Experience suggests that such a focus would have been premature—first we needed to make sure that: 1) the designs are learner-centered and 2) educators are skilled in their use of the new designs. No change can be seen among participants unless both of these are in place.

Anecdotal evidence from participants is quite inspiring. Participants seem to react well to the new approach – they find it more engaging, more interesting, and more useful. This suggests that both the designs, and the educators' skills, were sufficiently strong to make an impact on the learners. Therefore, we suggest that formal assessments of participants could now be implemented, with the following three caveats.

- Select a subset of the nine pilot sites where there is agency—wide support and a strong lead team;

- Make sure all "classes" are redesigned so that educators don't flip-flop between teacher-centered and learner-centered designs.

- Observe all educators' whose classes will be included in the participant assessment.

A more formal participant assessment could collect data on all three levels: participant reaction, participant learning, and participant transfer. The beauty of this approach is that learning and transfer indicators are built directly into the designs (i.e. in the achievement-objectives and learning tasks). Using each new design, participants can be asked very specifically about their intent to "transfer" their learning beyond the walls of WIC.

The FTW project, like all efforts to strengthen learning, faced limitations inherent in the system. For example, group sessions are short – no more than 25 minutes typically. And, since sessions are free-standing (rather than taken in a series), there is little opportunity to continue dialogue, build learning, or assess transfer by participants over time. This was frustrating for both designers and for educators. But, most seem to accept it as a workable limitation. They believe that their work can have impact on participants even with these limitations. Preliminary findings suggest that they are right!

vi. Impact of the Project on the WIC Community

Pilot Agency Staff who participated in the project reflected on the **impact of the project on them and their colleagues.**

- *Thank You Thank You Thank You for the opportunity to be part of this project! It was truly the best "work" experience I have ever had!*
- *I greatly appreciate all the innovative, hard work that the state team has dedicated through this project for making California WIC a model in nutrition education.*
- *Thank you for including our agency in this project. Although it is a time-consuming project, it is well worth it!*
- *This has been a good project. Unfortunately we are struggling with staff changes and budget issues right now which has made us unable to focus on this right now. This staff training will be put to great use in the writing of curriculum and the implementation of it in the future.*
- *This is an excellent project, and I will continue to use the techniques and skills in my own work. I will work to mentor our staff to also utilize more Learner-Centerd Education techniques if I can get more staff time. It is a big shift from even the way we have been working with clients, and it requires a lot of reinforcement and follow-up. This will go on for years if I have anything in to do with it. I would like to see this offered to PHNs and the Head Start and Family Resource Project paraprofessionals. If we could get a grant to do that, WOW!*
- *This has been a revolution in the educational process of the WIC clients. We could never go back to just showing a video again.*
- *In other companies I've worked for when I've attended conferences, trainings, etc., even though we're 'off the clock' there were social activities scheduled (or recommended) so you had an opportunity to get to know others in the group on a personal level. This really helped when I got back to my office and was stuck on something—I felt more comfortable calling someone that I met at a training/conference that I formed a connection with.*

Local agency staff's eagerness to influence the broader WIC community helped to give birth to the FTW project. Here is one such quote, in 2001, from a future member of an FTW pilot site:

The highlight of the course was its immediacy and intensity. The focus activity was always what's happening NEXT on doing and APPLYING… I would love to see this course taught to paraprofessionals.

Pilot site staff who participated in GLP courses during the project describe significant changes in them, which they often say are going to impact their work in a deep and permanent way. Many say they plan to bring their learning to the broader WIC community, and hope that the community shows support.

I was very excited about this process. It is allowing me to re-evaluate how I work with professionals as well as co-workers. I am more aware of dialogue possibilities all around me. It will take a while to see "impact" but it will come for WIC.

I am glad that I got the opportunity to attend the course. I am very happy that GLP and WIC are working together to revitalize courses. I think it will be even better as we get more buy-in from all levels of WIC. Sometimes, I feel as if we are alone on the "GLP boat" other than when we come to these trainings.

Perspective of GLP

One of CA-WIC's stated goals for the FTW project was "to create a philosophical shift within agencies to fully adopt learner-centered education." What are the signs of a philosophical shift? Below are quotes from two GLP Associates who observed such a shift at an organizational level, as noted in emails April, 2003.

They are reporting wonderful things from the various sites with a couple still sputtering a bit. I really want to report that they are using the language and principles effectively in their meeting itself. They all see to be carrying lots of energy… and are asking really pointed and meaningful questions… I was proud to hear them and to watch their commitment to this work. [One State branch partner] announced today that a participant, who came to the FTW questioning the direction of his work, said at the end of the workshop, "I found my teacher within!!!

--Peter Perkins, Five Dimensions.

Friends – I was so impressed… with the group of WIC folks who attended the session I led at the CA WIC Conference in San Diego. …The first thing that struck me was the extent to which participants had 'internalized' the learner-centered approach. Not only was the "language" understood, but there was a clear sense that people were looking for ways to go beyond seeing changes in education design to providing support to frontline staff to assure continuous quality improvement. I was also struck by participants' desire to create accountability for improved education throughout their entire organization--with everyone finding their role in promoting learner-centered education. I know that WIC folks face many time constraints and have made a valiant effort to begin to think about and design education sessions in a new way. It seems that they are already looking beyond design issues to consider ways to create a supportive environment so that these changes "stick". Their willingness to think about what must logically come

next--promoting change through supportive supervision and organizational learning--was an encouragement to me. Thanks for the opportunity to exchange ideas with them. All the best.

-- *Robb Davis, Freedom from Hunger International*

These inspiring comments were tempered by the reality we saw in a few of the agencies where uncertainty about the future, extreme budget cut-backs, and other "front burner" items were of concern to team leaders.

What we are really hoping for to be sustainable is an attitude change—one that speaks loudly to staff and clients—one that can even supercede a telling mode of teaching. One that says to clients—we are interested in you and your learning.

Change is often so connected to the 'energy people'. But, when those people get buried with other concerns, who picks up the torch?

It raises several research questions: What is the impact of the key players on the organization—the ones who say YES... is it their enthusiasm that folks want to be a part of ? What happens when those original key players aren't in that same position? What does it take for the change to stick even without them or without funding? What kind of [learning environment] can be nurtured that is impervious to such changes?

– Joye Norris, Learning by Dialogue, June 2003.

Many pilot site staff (other than just the team leaders) participated in a total of 10 different GLP courses—seven "Learning to Listen," and three 'Advanced Design" courses. GLP leaders noted an enormous amount of dedication, learning, and skill-building among these staff. They are creating organizational change.

Recently, we have begun to see concrete examples of how CA-WIC is bringing the approach well beyond the scope of the FTW project, and giving it the kind of "higher level" support which we know is so critical. For example, decision-makers were very receptive to a recent proposal to modify the nutrition assessment procedure used at local agencies. Several sites (including FTW sites) are field-testing the use of education cards – which change not only the form but also the intent of the procedure. This kind of experiment is a superb example of impact on the WIC community. And, it reinforces a "new way of doing things" for WIC educators as well as WIC participants.

Section Three

III. In Closing

i. **Conclusions and Recommendations**

ii. **Report References**

a) available through CA-WIC
b) available through Global Learning Partners

iii. **Project Members: Credits and Contact Information**

As you read this section, consider:

- *What would **YOU conclude** from the findings on the previous pages? What **implications** does this have for projects you are involved with?*
- *What **references** do you want to see at this point? How could you make use of project references to ease and strengthen your own work?*
- *Who do you want to **contact** to learn more?*

i. Conclusions & Recommendations

What Worked and Why?
What Do We Recommend for Similar Projects in the Future?

CA-WIC *wisely* posed the following question at the start of this FTW project: "How will we know if it 'worked'? In other words, what will we see, hear, or feel to know that CA-WIC is using a learner-centered approach to education?" In December 2003 Dr. Joye Norris, GLP Senior Associate and FTW project mentor, offered the following framework for such questions.

How will we know if it "worked"? We'll see it…	What will we see, hear, or feel when it's truly learner-centered?
…in the environment.	Learning begins at the front desk. The whole environment announces that CA-WIC is an education-oriented organization that grows people. It is inviting; definitely not business as usual.
…in the way questions are asked.	No more right and wrong answers. No more asking what we already know. Instead, teachers give good information and then ask open questions so learners can make something of it for themselves.
…in staff's facilitation skills.	Arrival energy is shifted into learning energy. Safety is set early. Facilitators wait, affirm, and weave.
…in the voices of participants.	Every voice is heard. Partnering or small groups are used when appropriate.
…in the way information is given.	Big visuals, simple props, hands-on work is used when possible – making the new information understandable to everyone, regardless of background.
…in the sequence of the learning.	Participants anchor the topic in their own lives, apply their new knowledge, and have the opportunity to transfer their new learning into their future.
…in the spirit of the room.	It's fun.

Now, one year after it's launching, we can use this framework as a lens to draw conclusions about the FTW project, and to make recommendations for similar projects in the future. Change has happened in each and every one of these areas, in each of the nine project sites, to differing degrees. Below are some insights into why we may have seen more change in some areas than others, and how we might achieve even more of a shift in the future.

The Courses in Dialogue Education worked well because they…

- were continually adapted to the realities of the WIC program.
- emphasized the Who and Why statements of new designs;
- gave all staff a chance (and a challenge) to practice teach a WIC-typical 20 minute session, with feedback.

These courses could have worked even better with…

- More program-specific examples;
- Greater emphasis on principles over "techniques" and,
- Joint attendance by all key players in a local agency.

The quarterly Train the Trainer events worked well because team leaders…

- shared and learned from each others' experiences,
- got prototypes, worksheets, and advice to implement their next steps; and,
- stayed connected with this project amidst other priorities.

These events also provided State/ GLP partners with:

- Continual reality checks;
- Input on each phase of the pilot project roll-out; and,
- Opportunities to question and model the learner-centered approach.

Train the Trainer events could work even better if they…

- give staff more prototype designs especially for their initial orientation);
- offer staff more time for actual design work, with "expert" feedback; and,
- build on the challenges and strategies already named in the pilot FTW project.

The **FTW workshops for Educators** worked well because they gave educators…

- A voice, validation, and an opportunity to feel "heard;"
- Rare opportunities to practice new classes before teaching them;
- Concrete and practical strategies such as "affirm, add, move on,"
- Connection to their supervisors and to each other;
- a theoretical basis for making adjustments to "scripts"; and,
- a framework for giving and getting feedback which they needed badly.

The workshops also gave supervisors:

- a refresher on what they had learned from the introductory GLP course;
- an awareness of hard it is to lead a WIC class; and,
- a less stressful environment in which to hear educators' persistent struggles.

Finally, the FTW educator workshops also gave state and local agency trainers:

- a deeper understanding of principles and practices;
- a healthy suspicion around theory; and,
- a mandate to discover how the principles and practices fit into the reality of a WIC "classroom."

In the future, the **educator workshops could be even stronger if**…

- All supervisors complete the introductory course prior to the workshop;
- All "insert classes" are field tested, with educator input, prior to the FTW workshop;
- Trainers are even better equipped with actual examples of the principles and practices from classes used previously at that site; and,
- More planning goes into day three of the course (observations and feedback for all educators immediately following the close of the workshop).

Many new Learner-Centered Designs were created for WIC participants during this project. The design process, and **final designs, worked well** because many designers:

- Grasped the underlying principles such as: Respect, Immediacy, Safety, Engagement;
- Avoided getting carried away with playful activities in an effort to engage participants;
- Made great use of existing WIC pamphlets and materials;
- Went beyond public health rationale and grasped the realities of WIC participants; and,
- Stayed connected to the field during the design process.

In the future, **designs could be completed more efficiently** (less total time) and more **effectively** (more learner-centered) if staff….

- Spend less time designing at their desk;
- Build on what has already been created, rather than starting from scratch;
- Use the checklists and guidelines created this past year;
- Get input from educators at key junctures of the iterative, stepwise design process;
- Get input from adult learning specialists before and after field testing;
- Field test designs by teaching them and by participating in them; and,
- Resist the temptation to finalize props/ materials until after the design has been taught.

Many educators gained valuable skills and an "energizing boost" from this project. Their statements about participant reaction are particularly impressive because they demonstrate such a high empathy for the WIC participant—the discomfort of being in a "class" that doesn't feel right to you because of your culture-based preferences or your past schooling; or the frustration of coming to a session to learn something new and only getting to "chat with a neighbor." Educators have insight into participants that cannot be lost. They also, of course, have prejudices toward change based on their past experience of how teachers should teach. In the future, we can go even further into distinguishing between educators' perceptions and actual reactions of WIC participants.

This project had an **impact on the WIC community** because it:

- Reached a threshold number of staff in a variety of sites around the state;
- Modeled the approach at meetings and in conferences throughout the year; and,
- Provided staff with mentoring from specialists who have used this approach for many, many years in multiple settings.

Future projects of this sort might have even greater impact overall with more of the following.

- Better matching of "techniques" for different situations (i.e. a relevant lecture with open questions is the most appropriate approach for many learners and situations).

- Intentional application of the principles to supervision and staff meetings.

- Greater support to frontline educators through learner-centered observations, dialogue-based feedback, and group in-services.

- A continual examination of systematized language through a learner-centered lens (i.e. "class", "script" might be replaced with "group session" and "learning design").

In the Big Picture

In large organizations with complex missions, staff and decision-makers often move their attention from one useful framework to another. We recommend that CA-WIC look for ways to keep this learner-centered, dialogue-based effort alive by linking it to other efforts. For example, this approach is very consistent with the FISH philosophy. Some parallels are noted here:

- Make their day (**affirm** what learners say and do).
- Choose Your Attitude (**see learners as capable and interested** in learning).
- Play (**have fun** while teaching).
- Be There (**focus on the learner** over the teaching materials or information).

ii. **Report References**

a) **Available through CA-WIC State Branch Office**

Project Description and Applications for Pilot Sites *(August 2002, August 2003)*

A compendium of **training designs and all working materials** used during the Four Trainings of Pilot Site Teams. These materials include:

- **Project Worksheet**, with detailed timeline and checklist of activities;
- **Project Description** with clear statement of purpose and achievable objectives;
- **Workshop Design** and Teaching guidelines: ***Finding the Teacher Within;***
- Handouts on **Dialogue-based, Learner-centered Education at WIC;**
- ***Twelve Principles of Dialogue-based Learning***; and,
- **Seven Steps of Design.**

Design References

- Checklist for **Learner-Centered Education Lesson Plans;**
- **A Sample Lesson Design** – "Iron In, Anemia Out"; and,
- **Web link to FTW lesson plans: http://www.wicworks.ca.gov/education/nutrition/lessonPlans/lessonPlansIndex.htm#ftw (see lesson plans with "FTW" notation)**

Evaluation Tools

- **Educator Baseline Observation Form;**
- **Educator Post-Workshop Observation Form;**
- **Educator Telephone Survey Tool;**
- **Local Agency Trainer E-mail Survey;** and,
- **FTW Workshop Feedback and Summary Form**

Reports

- **Educator Telephone Survey Report; and**
- **FTW Project Final Summary Report 2003**

b) Report References: Theory and Practice of Dialogue Education available through Global Learning Partners, Inc.

Books

Vella, J. (1994). *Learning to Listen Learning to Teach: The Power of Dialogue in Educating Adults.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

_____(1995). *Training Through Dialogue.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Vella, J. Ed. (2003). *Dialogue Education at Work.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Norris, J. (2003) *From Telling to Teaching*. Myrtle Beach, SC: Learning by Dialogue

Other Readings

Responding to Challenges (Perkins, P. and Uccellani, V.)

Using LCE in Staff Meetings: "SURE-fire meetings" (Uccellani, V.)

Course Descriptions, Course Reports and Course Feedback summaries from WIC Staff

iii. **Project Members: Credits and Contact Information**

Attached is a table of agencies and team leaders for each of the FTW pilot project sites. Below is a list of names and contact information for CA-WIC and for GLP mentors.

CA-WIC FTW Staff

Agency	*State Partner*	*Project Team Members*	
Alameda County	Maurice Robertson	Linda Franklin✠ Sandi Storch✠ Kathleen Willkom	
Northeast Valley Health Corporation (NEVH)	Rita Whitmore	Joy Ahrens✠ Rebeca Pastrana-Sheng✠ Lina Mouradian Marie Coulter	
Riverside County	Rita Whitmore	Felicia Francisco✠ Marla Niffen✠	
Clinica Sierra Vista (CSV)	Mike Elfant	Donna Gibb✠ Ana Sanders	
Community Resource Project (CRP)	Mike Elfant	Janine Marello✠ Nancy Woo✠ Maureen Webb Stephanie Villa Delgado	
Santa Barbara County	Mike Elfant	Penni Powell✠ Delfina Arellano✠ Caro Stinson Connie Logan	
Placer County	Heather Reed	Carolyn Lee✠ (Capy) Hickson ✠ Carrie Lewis Sarah Coolidge	Caroline
Sacramento County	Kim Frinzell	Chris Husing✠ Jane Peterson✠	
San Bernardino County	Kim Frinzell	Lorrie Hinkleman✠ Kathy Van Vleet✠ Heather Blum Jeri Zevenbergen	

Global Learning Partners FTW Consultants

Valerie Uccellani *(report author)*
New Orleans, LA
ph: 504 894-9045
email: val@talk2val.com

Dr. Joye Norris
Myrtle Beach, CA
ph: 843 281-8832
email: DocJN@aol.com

Peter Perkins
Montpelier, VT
ph: 802 223-3664
email: perk5dim@together.net