

***Impact Study: Ontario Works Participants in School  
Board Literacy and Basic Skills Programs***

Funded by the:

Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities  
and

National Literacy Secretariat

Sponsored by:

**CESBA**

Ontario Association of Adult and Continuing Education School  
Board Administrators: 2003

**Dr. Sharon J. Rich**

Associate Professor

Faculty of Education

University of Western Ontario

### **Purpose and Background**

Ontario Association of Adult and Continuing Education School Board Administrators (CESBA) and the Literacy and Basic Skills (LBS) managers initiated a study to determine the impact of the mandatory participation of Ontario Works (OW) clients in school board literacy and basic skills programs. The study was designed to gather information about:

1. attendance patterns;
2. policies and procedures;
3. impact of OW clients on the financial structure of programs;
4. destinations and goals of the OW learners;
5. impact of the OW influx on administrative functions of LBS managers;
6. the need for professional development of managers and instructors.

### **Research Procedure**

A draft survey was prepared after input from the LBS managers' committee in September. This survey was emailed to the managers' committee for comment and suggestion and changes were made. A third version was presented at the annual Literacy Meeting at the CESBA Fall Conference. Following that December meeting, final revisions to the survey were completed to incorporate the suggestions and concerns raised. In that revision, the number of questions was reduced from 50 to 35. These 35 questions could be broadly assigned to five thematic categories: finances, goals and destination of OW clients, acceptance of OW clients into the classroom, professional development issues and the OW learner. Although several comments were made about the time taken to complete surveys, many managers recognized their value in enabling leadership to provide data for decision-making.

The final question invited respondents to pose any questions that should have been asked but were not included in the survey. These questions became the basis for follow-up interviews with a selected sample of managers from across the province.

### **Rationale for Internet Delivery of the Survey**

Past experience with online surveys indicates that online delivery can facilitate a greater response rate. Contact can be made with key personnel to alert them to the imminent delivery of the survey and those personnel could designate respondents. The immediacy of the online survey, the ability to complete responses and forward them instantly to the source, can contribute to higher rates of return. Follow-up telephone calls when surveys had not been completed ensure an even higher rate of return.

Once the survey had been designed and tested, a mass email was sent to all LBS managers. This email contained survey information including access name and password and provided the deadlines for submitting responses.

There were 41 primary contacts made by email on January 07,2003. Immediately following the first email, three managers contacted the researcher to indicate an issue with access and another four emails were returned. Follow-up telephone calls enabled those who had difficulty accessing the site to gain access and in the other instances new email addresses were provided.

Four, follow-up telephone calls were made to managers who did not respond. In several cases the telephone calls resulted in an improved survey response. In other cases, individuals did not respond to the survey or to the email and telephone prompts. For many managers a common comment at the end of the survey was that the statistics required for survey completion were not readily available.

### **Survey Research**

There are two crucial aspects to consider in survey research. The first is the development of a reliable and valid questionnaire and the second is the sample selection. In this case the questionnaire used was developed in cooperation with the end users. Even with this assistance, the actual implementation revealed issues with two questions that had to be discarded from the survey results because of ambiguous wording.

It should be noted that the biggest potential drawback of surveys is that people are not always willing or able to respond to the questions. Thus what begins as a representative sample does not always remain that way. Differences between respondents and non-respondents can place serious limitations on the generalization of results. Thus it is important to note the response rate of the survey is critical. It is also important to note that survey response rates of over 50% after two follow-up contacts are considered very positive (Girden, 1996).

### **Telephone Interviews**

Interviewing in general can be defined as a conversation with a purpose. The purpose is to gather information (Leedy, 1993; Marshall and Rossman, 1999). Telephone interviews provide an effective way to gather data, especially when the population to be interviewed is in geographically diverse locations (Berg, 2002). When qualitative telephone interviews are conducted, they are best handled through semi structured interview schedule. In this study, 10 managers volunteered to be interviewed. A sample of 4 was selected from these ten so that representation from across the province could be obtained. Detailed notes were taken during the interviews. Interview data was used to provide a backdrop for interpretation of the survey data and is not reported separately in this report in order to maintain confidentiality.

### **Survey Results**

Thirty-six of the 41 boards contacted completed at least a portion of the survey for a response rate of 87.8% while 5 of the boards contacted (12.2%) did not respond to any part of the survey. The rate of return (87.8%) was excellent. It should be noted that percentages throughout the report are calculated using the 36 respondent figure, even though some boards only completed a very few questions. The remainder of the report highlights key findings from each section of the survey.

### **Cost and Salary Implications**

Questions 3 through 8 and question 40 dealt with various aspects of the cost of adding OW clients to the LBS programs. All of the reporting boards indicated that they had at least some OW clients in their programs. A significant number (51.76%) reported that OW clients accounted for 21-50% of their clientele but only 2 respondents (5.5%) indicated that LBS funding came from Ontario Works. About one quarter of reporting managers (24.99%) noted that the number of LBS students has increased moderately or greatly since the inception of the OW program. About half of those reporting (47.22%) indicate that the increase in numbers of LBS students has been slight. It seems then that Ontario Works has drawn attention to literacy programming for some segments of the population that previously may not have been noticed.

A slight majority of respondents (55.55%) indicated that few new full-time instructors have been added to the LBS staff to serve OW clients and in these instances the numbers added were fewer than three. Another 33.33% indicated that rather than hiring full-time instructors the work load was accommodated by increasing part-time hours and/or adding to the workload of existing staff. This indicates that the existing LBS staff and managers seem determined to accommodate the needs through existing staff. It is important to note also that in addition to increasing part-time hours and adding to existing workloads, managers also reported that they had to either purchase or develop new materials to serve the OW clients. In 69.44% of centres responding managers indicated that materials had to be developed or purchased to support the OW clients. Once again this curriculum development service may add to the levels of stress experienced by both managers and instructors who feel a responsibility to serve all LBS clients.

When new instructors were hired, the salary cost for 66.66 % of them was between 21 and 30 dollars. In terms of administrative costs, most reporting managers (52.77%) indicated that the cost of their time that could be attributed to OW was between 1001 and 5000 dollars. Although the direct costs of the OW clients are not huge in visible financial terms, the human cost in terms of increased hours and stress levels for managers and staff cannot be discounted. Many managers indicated that hours were often not counted and that time that went into OW work at times took away from other program issues that were equally important. The LBS students and OW clients are still being served but the programs themselves may suffer from instructor and manager fatigue.

In other instance managers indicated that since OW was not really an issue within the school district there were few if any cost implications from the program. These managers noted that other concerns as simple as instructor time to develop material for existing clients were more urgent.

### **Goals and Destinations of the OW Learners**

Questions 9 through 16 examined issues related to the goals and destinations of the OW clients themselves. These questions covered a range of issues from who sets the program goals to the reasons for OW clients leaving the programs. It should be noted that many managers suggested that they could not provide answers with certainty to some of the questions because extracting required data from the record-keeping systems was not always easy.

About half of the goals (47.22%) set by OW client are established after negotiation between the OW client and his/her instructor. In these cases the goals were most often a combination of those goals required to fulfill OW obligations and the personal goals of the client for obtaining literacy skills to better function in everyday life. In only 5.55% of the cases was there no agreement noted between OW client goals and those set in conjunction with LBS assessors and caseworkers. Although on the one hand it might seem encouraging to note that in 22.21% of the reported instances, employment is the most significant goal, managers indicated that there are life enhancement aspects of literacy that need to be taken into account. They also suggested that when employment is the main goal that the more aesthetic aspects of literacy and their contribution the quality of life may be ignored.

The category "other" accounts for 19.43% of the goals. In the category "other" were listed the issues of being forced by OW (11.11%), cheques (2.72%) and self confidence (5.5%). It is to be hoped that all clients leave programs with their goals achieved. However, only 7 of the programs reporting (19.44%) indicated that over 51% or more of the clients left because goals had been achieved. In two programs (5.5%) only 1-10% of the OW clients were indicated as achieving their goals.

Of the category “other” only the goal of self confidence seems to have anything to do with the life enhancement goals noted by the managers. It may be that when thinking about OW clients the managers’ perceptions, like that of the clients they serve, are influenced by the nature of the OW program. However, when managers were asked to speculate about the reasons for the relatively low rate of goal achievement, they noted that the nature of not just the OW clients but of the LBS clients in general could account for the rates.

Managers noted that for many clients the life context was such that everyday life events could interfere with program and ability to achieve goals. These anecdotal comments were supported by survey results which indicated that most significant reasons cited for OW workers leaving the program were employment (5), drop outs (8) or OTHER (further training, higher education, 5). It should be noted that drop outs were later explained as the result of family health or personal health and child care issues. Employment was cited by 5 managers as reasons for clients leaving the program but the ranking ranged from 1-2 in level of significance. (Note that 1 was the ranking of greatest significance.) Ill health and being asked to leave for disciplinary reason were each cited by three managers and noted as first and sixth in significance. The category, “other” was cited 11 times as a reason for workers leaving the program. These reasons included further training, temporary no-show, personal issues (lack of food, clothing), lack of motivation or other OW opportunities.

The finding that many OW clients left the program without achieving goals is not surprising since 10-60% of all enrollees in adult basic education programs drop out without achieving the goal of improved literacy (Roussy & Hart, 2002). The problem may be further exacerbated in the OW program since many may not have wanted to be in the program initially. Their dropping out may be a resistance to the notion that mandated literacy and schooling contributes to their improved economic and social well-being. As Millar (1998) indicated, many adult literacy learners have ambivalence towards education although they may acknowledge the need for literacy.

Thus it is not surprising that the survey response indicated that 30.55% of the OW clients stayed in the programs between 4-6 months while 66.65% were in the program for between one month and a year. These findings, when considered in conjunction with class size (most classes are over 10 students) and the research indicating student ambivalence, suggest that programs may be longer than the optimum because of client numbers and attitudes.

#### **Classroom Environment and the Learner Context**

In the questions that examined the ease with which OW clients integrated into the classroom with the other LBS students, 58.32% of the managers reported a good fit with others while another 30.55% indicated that

OW clients fit to some extent. No managers reported that there was no integration. However, there were indications that the learning environment had changed with the influx of OW clients since 63.88% of the respondents indicated that the classroom environment had changed. The reasons for the change were increased absenteeism (30.43%), behavioral issues (34.78%) and learner and life skill issues (21.74%) and a scattering of issues related to increased reporting time and decreased lesson pacing (4.3% each). Of the reporting managers, 68.56% noted that an increase in the number of issues affecting learning performance. They went on to note that the changes that affected performance most dramatically were in order of significance: attendance, behavior, mental and physical health issues, social skills and hygiene, lack of motivation, and lack of day care.

### **Administrative Issues**

There is significance to class size when the effectiveness of any remedial program is considered. The literature suggests that to gain maximum benefit, programs should be individualized and indeed managers indicated that LBS programs are tailored to the individual client's needs. Certainly the goal-setting questions in the survey verify that statement. However, it may not always be possible to provide adequate individual attention when class sizes approach 20. Survey results indicate that most classes contain 11-15 students (41.66%) or 6-10 students (30.55%). However, what is worrisome is the 16.66% of classes that are in the 16-20 range. Unfortunately the survey did not contain a query on the class sizes before the inception of the OW program but those managers interviewed indicated that they has made attempts to maintain class sizes while not increasing program costs. What this has meant is that some instructors face more students and the instructors who completed the survey noted that although the class sizes had not increased significantly, the issues surrounding teaching more students had created increased stress.<sup>1</sup>

Most managers (77.77%) spend between one and four hours per week on administrative functions. The types of functions that occupy this administrative time are in order of reported significance: attendance (91.66%), progress reports (83.33%), behavior management (63.88%) and other (27.76%). Most responding managers (69.43%) indicated that the additional time for planning and developing the programs had increased, however, the increase time ranged between 1% -40% with very few (2.77%) represented in the bracket between a 31 and 40% increase. Although nearly half the managers reported a great deal of increased stress (41.66%), another 27.77% indicated that the program had caused them no stress. It may be that in the cases where little stress was reported that the numbers of OW clients were not as high as in areas where the numbers were high. Indeed subsequent interview data confirmed that hypothesis.

On the whole managers feel professionally prepared for their roles with 55.55% reporting that they are moderately or well prepared. When asked about the types of preparation that would be useful to them the

---

<sup>1</sup> Since very few instructors completed the survey and these instructors were all from one area the instructor data has been added to complement areas where their input enriched the study data

following items were highlighted as being important: strategies for handling difficult students, information regarding OW issues, strategies to improve student retention, and finally some assistance with performance based management strategies. Twenty of the 31 respondents to this question had suggestions for the type of professional development that they needed.

All of the managers responding to the question about instructor preparation (77.76%) indicated that their instructors were at least somewhat prepared to teach the OW clients, thus indicating a great degree of confidence in the personnel working for them. Unfortunately there was a non-response rate of 22.22% for this question, perhaps indicating that managers did not wish to comment on instructor preparation. In terms of instructor response to the question, those who responded noted that they felt at least somewhat prepared but added the general comment that more in-service on literacy skills training is always beneficial. When managers answered the question regarding the types of instructor in-service required, there were clusters of responses around issues related to anger management, counseling and life skills (8), discipline and management (5) and time and preparation (3). It should be noted that other issues that emerged for some included the ways to handle learning disabilities in the classroom. Further there may well be overlap between the ways in which the need for anger management and discipline are related.

Techniques used for communicating with staff about OW issues ranged from memos and staff meetings (22 and 25 responses respectively) while workshops with centre staff and/or with OW caseworkers were reported by one third of the managers. Most managers reported at least some cooperation by the OW personnel in arranging programs and establishing goals, although 19.44% did not respond to the questions and another 2.77% suggested that there was no cooperation. Only 22.22% indicated full cooperation by OW personnel.

### **Discussion and Summary**

There is a sense that increased literacy can bring about improved employment status and enable individuals to participate more fully in the global economy. Yet the present study, like others that have been conducted, indicates that results of such initiatives may be contradictory. For example, in the present study, managers indicated that clients often left the program for personal or family reasons. Similarly, Smith's (1999) examination of welfare-to-work strategies in Manitoba found that although there was a case for long term investment in education and literacy training to assist people in gaining employment personal and family issues had an impact on clients' abilities to sustain program attendance. Thus dropout rates tend to be high in mandated programs and a peculiar cycle of leaving returning to programs began. Malicky and Norman's 1994 study also questioned the sustainability of such programs and found no direct, causal relationship between literacy education and employment. Indeed Malicky and Norman conclude that stakeholders should "question the strong employment focus of literacy programs in order to avoid creating unrealistic expectations and the frustration and disappointment that follow those frustrations." They noted

that the issue of high expectations for improved work conditions exacerbated what is already a cycle of failure.

When taken in conjunction with previous studies that examine similar phenomenon, the situation in Ontario is not surprising. Since the Ontario Works program remains in effect and indeed may bring some clients who may not have come voluntarily into literacy programs what needs to be considered is how to work effectively with the clients without creating undue administrative and instructional stress. Certainly the survey results indicate that although managers and their instructors feel reasonably prepared to work with OW clients, there is also a great deal of time spent on administering the program. Although some administrative tasks are indeed inevitable there are others that may involve time that could be better spent with clients.

Another area that needs to be considered is the ratio of clients to instructors. The results of the present survey indicate that there 16.66% of LBS classes contain between 16-20 students. There is research evidence that suggests that effective remedial programs for delayed readers can have an impact on learner results in three months, provided the program involves intense 1-1 tutoring and occurs every day (Clay, 1998). Other research (NEA, 2003) indicates that class size has an impact on student achievement and for adult learners who may not have had success in a regular school setting, placement in a class of 10-20 may well exacerbate any learning difficulty that may exist. Malicky and Norman (1994) point out that Canadian born adult LBS participants report difficulties with past schooling and home experiences and drop out in greater numbers than immigrants. Since OW clients and LBS students in general may have issues with the traditional school environment, any effort that is directed towards reducing class size and making the LBS experience qualitatively different from a traditional school setting might have a positive impact on student retention and achievement.

The results of the survey with respect to client retention reflect Roussy and Hart's (2002) study of recruitment and retention in literacy and basic skills programs. Roussy and Hart found that financial and job conflict reasons led to clients exiting the programs but, significantly, they suggested that decisions to leave were often not thought out. Managers too commented that many of their clients whether OW or LBS were not reflective about the reasons for being in or leaving the program. Further, both the survey and anecdotal comments indicated that the lack of personal and family support contributes to clients' inability to complete the program with goals achieved.

## References

- Clay, M. (1999). *By different paths to common outcomes*. Portland, ME. Stenhouse Publishers.
- Malicky, G. & Norman, C.A.(1994). Participation patterns in adult literacy programs. *Adult Basic Education*. 4, 3, 144-156.
- Malicky, G. & Norman, C.A.(1994). Participation in adult literacy programs and employment. *Journal of Reading*. 3, 2, 122-127.
- National Education Association (2003). Position paper on class size. <http://www.nea.org/lac/size/>
- Millar, R. (1998). *Ambivalent learning: Adult learners confronting the emancipation myth of literacy*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. St Paul, Minnesota: University of St Thomas.
- Roussy, Y. and Hart, D (2002). *Seeing the need: Meeting the need: A report on recruitment and retention issues in literacy and basic skills programs*. Toronto, ON: Ontario Literacy Coalition.
- Smith, J. (1999). *Literacy, welfare and work: Longitudinal research project: Final Report and recommendations*. Brandon, Manitoba. The Coalition of Brandon Literacy Services.

## Individual Question Responses

### Demographic Information

1&2. Select the name of your board from the drop down menu. Thirty-six of the 41 boards responded to at least some of the questions although only 34 boards listed contact people for the programs. The Boards responding and the indicated contact people noted are listed in the Table 1.

Table 1: Responding Boards and Listed Contact Numbers

<b>Board Name</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>E-Mail</b>	<b>Telephone</b>
Algoma District School Board	RonPrickett	pricker@adsb.on.ca	(705)945-7214
Algonquin and Lakeshore Catholic District School Board	Linda Lott	lott@alcdsb.edu.on.ca	613-544-3361
Avon Maitland District School Board	Susan McKee	Susan_McKee@fcmail.avonmaitland.on.ca	(519) 527-0111 ext.235
District School Board of Niagara	Shirley Henley	shirley.henley@dsbn.edu.on.ca	905-641-2929 x 4172
District School Board Ontario North East	No contact listed		
Durham Catholic District School Board	Judy Cole	john.cole@sympatico.ca; judycole47@hotmail.com	905.728.7853
Durham District School Board	Karen Burwell	burwell_karen@durham.edu.on.ca	905-440-4507
English-language #38 Catholic District School Board	Bill Neville	b.neville@ldcsb.on.ca	519-659-1224
Grand Erie District School Board	Betty Anne Jackson	jacksoe@gedsb.net	519-759-2658
Greater Essex County District School Board	Karen Sklash,	Karen_Sklash@gecdsb.on.ca	253-5006
Halton Catholic District School Board	No contact listed		
Halton District School Board	No contact listed		
Hamilton-Wentworth Catholic District School Board	Bob Baldin	baldinr@ms.hwcdsb.edu.on.ca	905-526-9510
Huron-Superior Catholic District School Board	Patricia Whyte	pbwhyte@thecentre.on.ca	906-333-3499
Lakehead District School Board	Linda DePiero	ldepiero@lhbe.edu.on.ca	1-807-623-2201
Lambton Kent District School Board	Darlene Ceci-Laws	cecida@lkdsb.net	(519) 383-8787
Limestone District School Board	Laurie Preston	prestonl@limestone.on.ca	613-542-7369
Near North District School Board	Todd Andrews	todd@nutritionclub.ca	705.472.5711
Niagara Catholic District School Board	Larry Dolan	larry.dolan@ncdsb.com	905 682 3360
Nipissing-Parry	Mary Kolz	mkolz@npsc.edu.on.ca	705-472-7771

Sound Catholic District School Board			
Ottawa-Carleton Catholic District School Board	Trudy Lothian	trudy_lothian@occdsb.on.ca	613-224-6281
Ottawa-Carleton District School Board	Irene Blayney	irene_blayney@ocdsb.edu.on.ca	613-239-2287
Peel District School Board	Dalia Taylor	dtaylor@clta.on.ca	905-949-0049, extension 2285
Renfrew County Catholic District School Board	Michele Arbour	marbour@rccdsb.edu.on.ca	613-735-1031
Renfrew County District School Board	Barbara Anderson	andersonb@renfrew.edu.on.ca	6137328740
Simcoe County District School Board	MaryAnne Myers	mmyers@scdsb.on.ca	705-526-8936
Simcoe Muskoka Catholic District School Board	Cheryl P. Bacik	cpbacik@hotmail.com	(705) 725-8360 ext.316
Thames Valley District School Board	Kay Munro	k.munro@tvdsb.on.ca	519-452-2660 ext247
Toronto Catholic District School Board	Susan Lefebvre	susan.lefebvre@tcdsb.org	416-397-6072
Toronto District School Board	Liz D'Andrea-Moore	liz.dandrea-moore@tdsb.on.ca	416-396-3347
Trillium Lakelands District School Board	Ward Levine	ward.levine@tldsب.on.ca	705-324-5280
Upper Canada District School Board	Sandy Dunn	dunns@ucdsb.on.ca	613-342-1127
Upper Grand District School Board	Murray Shannon	murray.shannon@ugdsb.on.ca	519-836-7280 *617
Waterloo Catholic District School Board	Lorri Sauve	lorri.sauve@wcdsb.edu.on.ca	(519) 620-9658
Waterloo Region District School Board	Mary Adamson	mary_adamson@wrdsb.on.ca	519-740-3800
York Region District School Board	Marion Wragge	marion.wragge@yrdsb.edu.on.ca	905 731-9557 x313

3. How are LBS programs funded? (Check all that apply)

Funding Source	Number of Responses	Percentage
Student Fees	5	13.88
Board Sponsored	8	22.22
MCTU	35	97.22
Ontario Works	2	5.5
Other*	2	5.5
No Response	1	2.7

\*Other reported-HRDC and projects and/or partnerships  
(Percentages calculated based on 36 responding boards.)

4: Have you purchased or developed materials to support OW clients?

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage
Yes	25	69.44
No	10	27.77
Unsure	1	2.7
No Response	0	0

5: Have more instructors been hired to support OW clients?

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage
Yes	6	16.66
No	29	80.55
Unsure	0	0
No Response	1	2.7

6. How many new instructors have been hired?

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage
3 or fewer	20	55.55
4 or 5	0	0
6 or more	0	0
Another Choice*	12	33.33
No Response	4	11.11

\*Most indicated that rather than adding additional full time employees, more part time work had been initiated and/or the already employed added to their workload

7. What is the salary cost of new instructors?

Hourly Rate	Number of Responses	Percentage
\$10-15	0	0
\$16-20	2	5.5
\$21-25	11	30.55
\$26-30	13	36.11
More than \$30	7	19.44
No Response	3	8.33

8. What percentage of learners in the program are OW clients?

Percentage Range	Number in the Range	Percentage in the Range
1-10	6	16.66
11-20	2	5.55
21-30	7	19.44
31-40	5	13.88
41-50	7	19.44
51+	6	16.66
No Response	3	8.33

9. What percentage of OW clients seem willing to commit to an LBS program on entry, that is, demonstrate a motivation and willingness to learn?

Percentage Range	Number in the Range	Percentage in the Range
1-10	5	13.88
11-20	3	8.33
21-30	7	19.44
31-40	2	5.55
41-50	6	16.66
51+	10	27.77
No Response	3	8.33

10. What are the goals of OW learners? Rank from 1-3, with 1 as the most significant goal?

Goal	Rank (1-3, 1 is most significant)					
	1		2		3	
	Number reporting	Percentage	Number reporting	Percentage	Number reporting	Percentage
Further Training	3	8.33	4	11.11		
Personal Independence					6	16.66
Employment	6	16.66	2	5.55		
Other (Forced by OW)	4	11.11				
Other (Cheques)	1	2.77				
Other (Self confidence)	2	5.55				
No Response	8	22.22				

11. How are goals set for the OW clients?

Source of Goal Setting	Number Reporting	Percentage Reporting
OW case worker's file	0	0
OW client alone	8	22.22
LBS instructor	2	5.55
OW case worker, client and LBS instructor	7	19.44
OW client and instructor	17	47.22
No Response	2	5.55

12. To what extent is there agreement among caseworkers stated goals for the OW client, the findings of, the LBS assessor and the client's wants?

Degree of Agreement	Number Reporting	Percentage Reporting
None	2	5.55
To some extent	16	44.44
To a moderate extent	14	38.88
To a great extent	1	2.77
A complete match	0	0
No Response	3	8.33

13. Where do most OW clients go when they leave the program? (Percentage averages)

Destination	Average Percentages Reported	Ranges Reported
Workforce	33.96	10-100%
Higher education	30.66	5-75%
Another LBS Class	9	0-28%
Alternative Education Program	9.875	0-25%
Other: Drop Out for various reasons	40	20-60%
Other: Unknown/Lost Contact	15	15-18

14. What percentage of OW clients leave because they have achieved their goals?

Range Indicated	Number reported	Percentage Reporting Range
1-10	2	5.55
11-20	7	19.44
21-30	5	13.88
31-40	5	13.88
41-50	7	19.44
51 or more	7	19.44
No Response	3	8.33

15. For what reasons do OW clients leaving the LBS program?

Reason	Rank (1-6, with 1 as the most frequent reason)					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Employment	2	3				
Ill health						1
Asked to leave for disciplinary reasons	2					1
Re-location of self or family member					1	
Dropped out	2	3	1		1	1
Other: Further training/higher education	2	3				
Other: Temporary no show		1				
Other: Personal issues (no food, clothing)		1	1	1		
Other: Lack of motivation					1	
Other: Other OW opportunities						1

(29 responses)

16. How long do most OW clients stay in the program?

<b>Duration of Stay</b>	<b>Number Reporting</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than a month	0	0
1-3 months	4	11.11
4-6 months	11	30.55
7-9 months	6	16.66
10-12 months	3	8.33
13 or more months	8	22.22
No Response	4	11.11

17. Since the inception of the OW program has the number of LBS students:

<b>Degree of Increase</b>	<b>Number Reporting</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Increased greatly (50%+)	2	5.55
Increased moderately (25-49%)	7	19.44
Increased slightly (5-24%)	17	47.22
Decreased greatly (50% or more)	1	2.77
Decreased moderately (25-49%)	0	0
Decreased slightly (5-20%)	5	13.88
No Response	4	11.11

18. How well do OW clients “fit” with other LBS students?

<b>Degree of Fit</b>	<b>Number Reporting</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Very Well	6	16.66
Quite Well	15	41.66
To Some Extent	11	30.55
Not at All	0	0
No Response	4	11.11

19. If your response was “not at all,” indicate why you think this is true. (No comments recorded.)

20. To what extent has the fit or lack of it changed the learning environment in your program?

<b>Degree of Fit</b>	<b>Number Reporting</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
To some extent	14	38.88
To a moderate extent	9	25.00
Not at All	9	25.00
No Response	4	11.11

21. If you noted a difference in the classroom environment, specify the nature of the change.

There were 23 responses

These responses could be categorized as follows:

Attendance/Absenteeism (7 comments)

Behavioural issues (8 comments)

Learner and life skill issues including hygiene, emotional and physical health 5

Increased time in reporting and decreased lesson pacing (1 comment each)

22. Has there been an increase in the number of issues adversely affecting learning and performance as a result of the presence of OW clients?

Degree of Change	Number Reporting	Percentage
Yes	8	22.22
Some	16	44.44
No	7	19.44
No Response	5	13.88

23. Please identify the challenges that affect your OW clients and their families. Challenges affecting clients and families (from greatest to least impact)

Ranked in order of placement

Attendance (by 10 respondents)

Behaviour (by 6 respondents)

Health issues (mental/physical) (by 6 respondents)

Lack of motivation (by 4 respondents)

Day care (by 2 respondents)

Motivation (by 4 respondents)

Other: Social skills/hygiene (indicated as number 1 by 3 respondents)

No Response (1)

24. Skill Set

Skill	Rank (1-6, with 1 as the weakest skill)					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Reading				1	2	2
Writing					2	2
Listening /Speaking		1			1	1
Mathematical skills			3		1	
Technological skills				2	1	
Soft skills (time management, studying)	1	1	1	3	1	2
No response	8					

25. What are the LBS class sizes in your jurisdictions?

Class Size	Number Reporting	Percentage
1-5	0	0
6-10	11	30.55
11-15	15	41.66
15-20	6	16.66
1-1 tutoring	0	0
No response	4	11.11

26. Hours spent in administration

Number of Hours per week	Number Reporting	Percentage
1-2	15	41.66
3-4	13	36.11
5-8	2	5.55
9-12 (1 day)	4	11.11
2 days per week	0	0

No response	2	5.55
-------------	---	------

27. Specify the nature of the administrative functions for the OW clients. Check all that apply.

Administrative Function	Number Reporting	Percentage
Attendance reporting	33	91.66
Reporting progress	30	83.33
Management of behaviour	23	63.88
Other (stat reports)	1	2.77
Other (letters)	3	8.33
Other (meetings, calls)	3	8.33
No response	3	8.33

28. To what degree has planning and developing curriculum changed because of the OW clients?

Degree of Change	Number Reporting	Percentage
To some extent	15	41.66
To a moderate extent	9	25.00
Not at all	4	11.11
No response	8	22.22

29. How much time has been added to planning and developing the program by the inclusion of OW clients?

Range Indicated	Number reporting	Percentage Reporting Range
No additional time	5	13.88
1-10%	9	25.00
11-20%	7	19.44
21-30%	8	22.22
31-40%	1	2.77
41-50%	0	0
51% or greater	0	0
No Response	6	16.66

30. To what extent have you experienced professional stress because of the addition of OW clients to your program?

Degree of Stress	Number Reporting	Percentage
To a great extent	15	41.66
To a moderate extent	6	16.66
Not at all	10	27.77
No Response	1	2.77

31. How professionally prepared are you as a manager to cope with the added dimension of the OW clients?

Degree of Preparation	Number Reporting	Percentage
Very prepared	8	22.22
Moderately prepared	12	33.33

Somewhat prepared	7	19.44
Not prepared	0	0
No response	9	25.00

32. What types of professional training that would help you to adequately serve this clientele?

Total number of responses to this question was 18 divided as indicated below:

8 responses related to training for handling difficult students, anger management

2 responses related to strategies to improve retention

1 asked for performance based-management strategies

7 made comments related to OW issues and understanding various roles (20 comments were made)

33. How professionally prepared are your instructors to cope with the added dimension of the OW client?

Degree of Preparation	Number Reporting	Percentage
Very prepared	5	13.88
Moderately prepared	11	30.55
Somewhat prepared	12	33.33
Not prepared	0	0
No response	8	22.22

34. What types of professional preparation is needed for your instructors?

There were 26 responses to this question, divided as indicated below:

Cluster of responses around anger management, counseling, life skills (7-8)

Cluster of responses related to best practices in discipline, management (5)

PD related to learning disabilities (2)

Skills training in place (1)

Do not need skills training but need to have time and preparation issues for instructors (3)

35. How does your school district understand OW testing?

There were 16 responses to this question. The responses were categorized as indicated below:

They are not really aware (5)

It is not in the board's interest to know to as long as we take care of it, it is fine. (3)

Mixed messages from different groups (3)

Local committees and contacts are excellent and help us do the job we have to do (5)

36. Does your local OW agency have the same understanding of literacy testing as your board?

Understanding between OW and local board (match)

Extent of Mutual Understanding	Number Reporting	Percentage
Some	13	36.11
None	4	11.11
Not exactly	12	33.33
No response	7	19.44

37. In what ways have you communicated the requirements for OW clients to your instructors? Check all that apply and add any additional items.

Technique	Number Reporting
-----------	------------------

Information Memos	22
Staff Meetings	25
Workshops with centre staff only	11
Workshops including or organized by OW caseworkers	12
Brochures	10
Conferences	7
Other: Professional development days	3
Other: email directed to OW by instructor and OW literacy initiative team	3
Other: Intake meetings	2

38. To what extent is there cooperation by OW personnel with you on key issues?

Extent of Cooperation	Number Reporting	Percentage
To a full extent	8	22.22
To a moderate extent	10	27.77
To some extent	9	25.00
Not at all	1	2.77
No response	7	19.44

39. How much additional time do you estimate spending on OW issues?

Amount of Time	Number Reporting	Percentage
No additional time	0	0
1-10% more time	6	16.66
11-20% more time	7	19.44
21-30% more time	4	11.11
31-40% more time	5	13.88
41% or more	6	16.66
No response	7	19.44

40. Given your rate of pay and the time committed to OW clients, what costs can be attributed to OW?

Cost	Number Reporting	Percentage
Less than \$1 000	7	19.44
\$1 001-5 000	12	33.33
\$5 001-10 000	8	22.22
\$ 10 000 or more	1	2.77
No response	8	22.22