

**LINCS Region III REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTER  
2009/2010 PARTNER MEETING NOTES**

January 26-27, 2010

InterContinental Mark Hopkins San Francisco

One Nob Hill/999 California Street

**Tuesday , January 26, 2010, Morning Session**

**NIFL and LINCS Update- Noreen Lopez** (Dan Miller was unable to attend but sent info)  
**Improving Adult Reading Instruction for Adults Preparing for the GED**

Judy Alamprese is coordinating a brand new project, Improving Adult Reading Instruction for Adults Preparing for the GED. The project will focus on where and how to set standards for adults to reach college readiness. It will describe the gaps between reading instruction and the demand for instruction. It will address the implications of those gaps. It will include promising practices for enhanced GED reading instruction and practices in post secondary instruction. It will include a review of the literature and case studies of reading instruction practices. The final report will include a cross-case analysis.

**NIFL Update**

NIFL will be closing because it was zeroed out in the house and senate. The funding and activities will be transferred to the USDOE.

**Adult Literacy Directory**

The directory on NIFL's website will be maintained by an entity that has been selected to take the project over. The announcement for the new management will be announced this spring/summer. This resource will continue to be available to programs, learners and tutors.

**Publications**

The publications will be retained as pdfs on a website. They're currently going through all the files, records and publications as required by federal regulations re: record retention. Many of the documents will go to OVAE's knowledge center, the National Library of Education at the USDOE, and the ERIC clearinghouse.

NCFL and/or ProLiteracy may be the repositories of the printed copies of these documents. The early childhood publications are more challenging to find new homes for than the adult materials. If publications have no more printed copies, they won't be reprinted.

**NIFL's Facility**

This will close at the end of July. There will be only skeletal operations from the end of July through the end of September. It is hoped that most of NIFL's functions will have been transferred to OVAE by July.

**Grants for LINCS Resource Centers, Special Collections and Discussion Lists**

The grants have been extended to September 30, 2011. OVAE will issue a new RFP prior to that time to begin new contracts for Oct.1, 2011 and beyond.

L3 is the behind the scenes contractor that supplies the technology for the discussion lists and websites. That contract has also been extended for one year.

OVAE usually uses contracts rather than grants for its projects.

OVAE wants to get a handle on what to keep.

OVAE wants to make a list of all the products and services desired by the field.

The goal is uninterrupted service during and beyond this transition.

**Webcast on Transitions**

The webcast took place the third week of January. It is archived on the NIFL website. It set a new record for the number of people registered for a live webcast. 1128 were registered. 691 participated live. More than 300 questions were submitted to the panel. The archives will have lots of ppts that weren't used in the webcast because they wanted to focus on the live questions. There is a new page on the website with resources for transitions to post secondary education.

In the future, once the NIFL website has had the NIFL brand removed, the LINCS resources will remain.

### **WIA Reauthorization**

The Department of Labor and Department of Education need technical assistance with drafting the senate bill. The plan is for the bill to be drafted by March. Nothing is happening in the house yet.

B. Dann Messier has held meetings across the country to ask the field about its needs. Two weeks ago there was an online discussion on all the NIFL discussion lists on the same topic. The discussions are being summarized and sent to the Assistant Secretary and posted to the website by early February. The discussions are being summarized and sent to the Assistant Secretary and posted to the website by early February.

In January there were over 899 new subscribers to NIFL's 10 discussion lists. There were 203 unique "posters". There are 9200 total subscribers for the discussion lists.

### **COABE Conference**

There will be a LINCS strand at the conference.

### **Resource Collections**

There will now be monthly electronic newsletters being sent by e-mail. The goal is that state level staff will pass along the newsletters to teachers. There are three resource collections. Paul will send the newsletter out the last week of January.

### **Discussion Lists**

There are 3 new discussion lists:

1. Reading and Writing
2. Transitions to Post Secondary Education- (there will be a continuation of the transitions webcast by posting questions that came in from the webcast and answers from panel members)
3. Math and Numeracy

The ASRP is on NIFL's website and helps teachers identify reading needs of learners. There will be special guests on the discussion lists as a joint effort of the ASRP project and the lists.

January 26 John Sabatini,

March 22 Reading and Writing Skills of Transitional Learners

April 12 Literacy Development of ESL Beginners

June 21 Reading Patterns and Profiles of adult literacy participants

In the future, OVAE wants more use of social networking sites. NIFL is experimenting with this this year.

Ken Zutter from Nevada commented that Nevada state and federal employees can't access social networking sites from their work computers. Noreen acknowledged that such policies are a challenge for this trend. They may use less popular social networking sites which can be unblocked with less risk. There is no position paper on this. Vicki Prater from the CA DOE suggested that NING may be an option. This is what the CA DOE uses.

### **Fact Sheets**

These are being updated. Some will be up on the website this month. There will be a link off the front page. The goal is to have some adult education fact sheets up by February. The early childhood education fact sheets were the first to go up.

### **Overview of LINCS and the Regional Resource Centers**

**Tim and Beth Ponder**

The website was redesigned and launched during the summer of 2009.

### **Project History**

- During the mid 1990's the regional resource centers each had their own resource collections and sponsored electronic discussion groups.
  - During the first 10 years, the regional resource centers worked with states to provide technology and technical assistance including developing websites for programs and connecting them to the internet.
  - In 2000, there was a shift and the electronic discussion lists and special resource collections became national, rather than regional, initiatives.
  - The focus of the regional resource centers was still on technology.
  - There were originally 4 regional resource centers, then there were 5 and now there are 3 centers.
  - The key piece became working with state partners to build partnerships and share ideas and resources.
  - In 2000, NIFL started focusing on the resource collections and gave separate grants for them. It expanded the electronic discussion lists to include technology, family literacy and workplace literacy.
  - Things became more system-wide rather than regional.
  - In 2006, the focus was on leveraging technology and improving professional development opportunities and to tighten up the special collections.

### **The Foci of LINCS-**

To meet the teaching and learning needs of practitioners, learners and others.

To provide a dissemination system for presenting information

### **New LINCS Framework**

The pieces have been here since the beginning but were silos. During the last three years, there has been an attempt to connect the pieces and connect with states. NIFL is now working with state PD folks.

The discussion lists relate to the special collections now.

There are three resource collections:

- Basic Skills- reading and writing, numeracy and math
  - Program Management- used to be program planning – assessment, LD, program improvement- managed by University of Tennessee
  - Workforce Competitiveness- technology, English Language Acquisition and workplace readiness

There are 10 Discussion Lists- **see ppt slides**

There are now 3 Regional Resource Centers. They're partnering with states to get resources out.

They do the following:

Disseminate resources

Organize trainings and workshops

Assist in using online instructional resources

NIFL's professional development offerings are where all projects interface. The needs assessment of the states a few years ago is an example.

### **Learning to Achieve**

This is NIFL's 5-day LD training. It's an intensive train the trainer training that runs 9 hours a day and includes participants prepping to present the next day.

### **Adult Resources**

NIFL's most popular resources such as Applying Research in Reading Instruction for Adults, Teaching Adults to Read and Research-based Principles for Adult Basic Education Reading

Instruction will still be available to the field.

### **Access to Resources**

[www.nifl.gov](http://www.nifl.gov) and [www.nifl.gov/lincs](http://www.nifl.gov/lincs)

### **Website Tour**

**Understanding and Applying Research in the Classroom**- this is a new online course that NIFL invested a great deal in and hopes will be well used by the field.

### **ASRP**

This is a tool for teachers to create reading profiles of their students. It is coordinated with STAR and focuses on the 4 components of reading. NIFL is working on a training guide for the new ASRP website.

### **LINCS**

This is on the left navigation bar. Jane Miller from the CO DOE remarked that she puts out a monthly advisor and planner for PD and that the LINCS resources are excellent for this.

### **Funding Opportunities**

This is a searchable database that will hopefully be maintained by OVAE.

### **News Items**

This may not be continued by OVAE. The content of the website is still being decided by NIFL and OVAE staff (Dan, Brenda and Cheryl). They'd like to hear from the field. That can be part of this meeting. Regions have different needs and this is a good time to express them.

### **America's Literacy Directory**

This may not be connected to LINCS in the future. Programs can update their information by themselves.

### **Resource Connections**

There are products and research within each topic. When you click on a resource you get information about that resource. If you click again you get the actual resource. It's a two-step process. All resources are online.

### **Discussion Lists**

They're all now tied to a special collection. The digest of each list can help manage the quantity of postings. The lists are a great resource for information sharing.

All messages are archived after being edited. You can sort by thread and search very specifically.

Events- each discussion list hosts special events. These are also archived. Archives are edited. The moderators send resumes and are interviewed. They're experts in their area of expertise.

### **Resource Center Page**

This gives updates on PD offerings.

The Health Literacy Summits' information is archived here.

There are easy-to-access archived webcasts with transcripts and powerpoints. All ppts except for those from individuals may be used without permission because they're in the public domain. Check with individual ppt authors for special permission.

Videos from archives can be used without permission.

Vicki Prater from the CA DOE commented that now that the CA state budget won't allow employees to travel that webcasts are good despite some technical glitches. People can access missed opportunities and it's easier for the presenter to prepare for. Another participant commented that she's received good feedback from teachers and that they're glad for the opportunities webcasts present, despite the glitches.

## Tuesday, January 26, 2010, Afternoon Session

### States Self Report on the Best and The Worst

#### Alaska-

*Best:* Best: Worked really hard and has moved away from 1 to 1 tutoring and toward classes. Adult Basic Education was given an additional \$250,000 of money from their WIA Title I partners. ABE in Alaska is located in the Department of Labor and Workforce Development.

*Worst:* Commissioner told title one partners that they had to share their set aside money with AE; finally got \$150,000 in title 1 set aside

**New Mexico-** *Best:* able to do marketing and meeting with the legislators; working on websites and student leadership; working on structure for PD (starting with the basics); trying to break into WIBs and have AE representation; Literacy- focusing on the lowest level of students

*Worst:* Served only 4% of students that need help; really hard to have strong PD and professionalism; don't have a lot of online; lack of infrastructure on reservations; need to work on collaboration and on policies; need help to outreach to lowest levels who don't reach 12 hours and make gains

**Colorado-** *Best:* has an integrated PD system that starts with an online teacher PD self-assessment; 8 different categories of AE and 110 different questions; able to sort and determine PD needs statewide; to address teacher needs CO now has a PD Hours system (four strands: self study, collaboration with colleagues, workshops and trainings, PD for credit); credential is now available (about 180 teachers have earned the credential); PD Map (monthly planner)- every month has a theme and is organized by strand; now working on New Teacher Orientation- identified the profiles and resources needed; also working on online self-study course oriented on CO teacher orientation (two gateways- one for guests and one for CO teachers)

*Worst:* difficulty in how PD is counted depended on where it is used (restrictions on self study PD hours for licensing); state director Pam Smith is retiring and they are now looking for a new director

**Arizona-** *Best:* AZ is in the system building process after having built the foundations; now focusing on capacity building- technology integration, DL, PD System; programs have people assigned for certain responsibilities (ETE, PD); programs must spend 10% on approved PD (PD that meets our standards); AZ is beginning to work on teacher standards beginning with ELAA; reframing AE system that front loads the intake and orientation; strength is field based initiatives; even though we will likely lose out state funding, we have fees in place to help offset

*Worst:* governor zeroed out our funding; limitation placed on us in reporting accurately what we accomplish because we don't have longitudinal data; data and follow-up is time intensive and expensive but has to be dealt with

**Utah-** *Best:* Served 27,000 (up 6,000 from year before); has put database in place to capture student data for NRS reports; going to a new competition this year for WIA funds; applicants will have to describe strategies for addressing state's goals for the first time;

*Worst:* Report accused data double dipping (people with GED could go on to get a high school diploma) no longer double dips; facing cuts with legislature this year

**Nevada-** *Best:* State funding is so low that it is unlikely to be cut; looking to do performance based funding; PL communities are really doing well; trained

facilitators this past summer 2009 because several people interested in facilitating PLCs; new assessment training program- looking to use DL to deliver parts of this training

*Worst:* biggest problem is affecting systemic change- diverse delivery system makes it hard to change; challenge will be to look at data differently;

**Washington-** *Best:* establish a dynamic PD system targeted at figuring out what works with specific populations- using data for program improvement- seems to be able to keep the momentum up; implementation of learning standards by creating a cadre system to keep the momentum going; received a grant from Gates Foundation in three areas two impact AE- transitions in math, open source text books;

*Worst:* have received budget cuts- seen some shrinkage (about 3% reduction in services despite more enrollment); seeing more people making some progress but less level gains; money has been cut for travel, etc. which impacts PD; at the state level people are stretched across lots of responsibilities so the emphasis on PD is not as strong; facing another 6% cut which will probably hit AE deeper

**South Dakota-** *Best:* offer new teacher training 3x per year- all teachers must attend within 6 months of hire date- follow-up survey; intermediate teacher training – STAR with national trainer (2 F2F and then online)- this has increased reading levels of students; want more training in ESL field; participating in Leadership Excellence Academy (LEA) which is very well received; got incentive money to do demonstration grants (will post project summaries on website in May); summer institute each year (available to all staff- 80% are required to attend);

*Worst:* still trying to transition to managed enrollment (about 65% there); programs are so spread apart and need DL but students don't have the access needed- struggling with how to implement DL and PD on how to do it effectively;

**Wyoming-** *Best:* slowly going toward performance based funding; great at cooperating and sharing resources; receiving a substantial amount of money tying education to jobs; state director has been there two years so hopeful that there is now some continuity

*Worst:* ABE is the unwanted stepchild- gets moved from one agency to another; turnover on the state level; ABE directors want local control but the money is not local; a lot of upheaval regarding assessment practices; 95,000 (25% of pop) under-education/under-employed; only serving a very small %; very little money in staff development- no embedded PD system;

**Hawaii-** *Best:* serve about 75,000 adults; pleased with GED results- 95% of GED students graduated last year;

*Worst:* A new adult education state director who oversees a myriad of other programs such as summer school, student services, library service, technology, etc.

**North Dakota-** *Best:* surplus in state budget so able to make up the loss of federal dollars; just completed an online survey on PD needs (very well received with 80% staff completed)- 3 priorities- technology, use of data, and special needs; all programs are well equipped technologically and with Internet and computers so able to provide DL; in process of developing a longitudinal data warehouse- looking at how to make best

*Worst:* decrease in federal dollars;

**Nebraska-** *Best:* met performance goals so should get incentive money; successful transition to BEST Plus; working toward managed enrollment and making progress; moving toward performance based funding; require programs to apply for PD money each year;

*Worst:* lost 10% of federal funding plus lost state funding; programs have had to close classes; new assessment policy has created a huge struggle; part-time nature of program is an issue- lose good teachers who need full time with benefits; need money to do additional classes to initiate transitions

**Idaho-** *Best:* adopted a regional PD advisory board- made great strides; adopted PD standards; created a multi-tiered PD plan (tier for new people, tier for 2<sup>nd</sup> year people, tier for 3 + people) which has been well received; adopted curriculum standards in math and reading (working on writing)

*Worst:* funding issues (AE and partners) affect services

**California-** *Best:* looking at funding issues as a time to change (no rules); looking for opportunities; rethinking how business is done- strategic planning process; OTAN and CALPRO and CASAS- lots of PD opportunities; STAR state; gone through Learning to Achieve; NING website; since ADA-based funding is gone, now looking at using some hours for PD;

*Worst:* K-12 can take all of AE's money; making lemonade out of lemons- only 8 programs have closed;

**Tuesday, January 26, 2010, Afternoon Session**  
Small Group Reports

**Group 1**

**Most pressing needs:** Inter-cultural development; NRS guidelines; GEDTS and OVAE policies; learning disabilities; employability skills and retention; more guidance to develop a LD policy (how to address the needs of those with LD); literacy: pre-career tech, financial and health; have LINCS provide content specific PD to complement what the state is doing (could they tweak some of the information...would like to vet some of the things before committing); provide some foundations in basics; build a cadre of math and numeracy instruction for both ABE and ESL; online learning- building online curriculum; teaching reading and writing to adult ELLs

**Would like NIFL/OVAE to address future PD:** is NIFL going to assess what the states need and address the underlying individual needs? Customization- based not just on numbers but on budgets (e.g., not the same for large states and smaller states, rural vs urban); special collections- could they be organized to be the best of the best or grouped into categories for quicker/easier access? Could there be more online/hybrid training at different times vs F2F (asynchronous training)? States can be cohorts (size, location, etc.)

**What more can NIFL/OVAE do:** Continue to help us...please be there! Advocate for adult education services. We do not want to emphasize or focus on just the community college program; encourage community colleges/technical schools to develop cooperation with adult education programs.

**Group 2**

**Region III Offerings:** we need LINCS to continue to provide the range of services currently offered at a regional level; good topics, high quality; need more evidence-based writing andragogy (Reading & Writing is heavy on Reading); there needs to be more concern for the adult learner who is not in the workforce or GED track

**Most pressing needs:** Reading and Writing; writing needs to be beyond GED essay- need both academic and non-academic; targeted math for both the lowest end (numeracy) and highest end (algebra and geometry); more offerings that address one-to-one instruction in addition to class-based instruction; characteristics of adult learners (and technological comfort of younger adult learners); offerings on best practices and evidence-based rather than only research-based; offer a DL PD model that is not high-speed Internet dependent for rural communities;

**Would like NIFL/OVAE to address future PD:** provide financial support for F2F and hybrid PD for sustained job-embedded PD over time (could be multi state); provide offerings that address multiple delivery systems such as volunteer based, CBOs, corrections, etc. (not just classroom/academic); need to address pre-literate ESL population;

**What more can NIFL/OVAE do:** emphasis on corrections; recruitment and retention of basic/lowest-level literacy students; advocacy campaign- make literacy a household issue like it was in the 70s and 80s; PD on instructional strategies for corrections education

**Group 3**

**Region III Offerings:** would like testimonials from states that have used trainings; LINCS offerings are customizable (hopefully); can request a certain trainer; trainer bios/background; STAR training- CA has seen some good results

**Most pressing needs:** work on evidence-based writing strategies/skills needed for transitions- adult, not k-12; support cutting-edge research and innovations; trainings need to have lots of practical application with specific strategies

**Would like NIFL/OVAE to address future PD:** other topics- how to mentor; soft skills for the workplace; integrating soft skills; technology training for instructors; smaller technologies

(iPhone, pod casts, etc.); where should Adult Ed end before student continues on to college and continuing education

**What more can NIFL/OVAE do:** help states to find out student outcomes from their interventions; could OVAE provide funding for research/practitioner research?

**Group 4**

**Region III Offerings:** Reading, special collections, social networking session; Regional centers are closer to us and know our needs- they can customize for us

**Most pressing needs:** need training in how to put together an effective PD plan (road map); how to use technology to deliver instruction (what's available and how to use for students and teachers); extend the learning on initial F2F w/ technology follow up trainings online;

**Would like NIFL/OVAE to address future PD:** instruction on how to use NIFL materials in the classroom (research to practice for teachers)

**What more can NIFL/OVAE do:** Teaching reading to adult ELL both literacy and higher level students

**Group 5**

**Region III Offerings:** problem with paying teachers to attend long term meeting due to budget cuts; how to teach our teachers to do statistical correlations to demonstrate that NIFL/LINCS PD offerings benefit instruction;

**Most pressing needs:** data analysis (understand the data behind the training); pre-conference for states to prepare for Partners Meeting

**Would like NIFL/OVAE to address future PD:** A regional area director to oversee PD states' needs especially since LINCS gives rural states a voice to be heard

**What more can NIFL/OVAE do:** regional trainings rather than state trainings

**Group 6**

**Region III Offerings:** Don't have money to bring everyone together in the state

**Most pressing needs:** transition, workforce, learning disabilities

**Would like NIFL/OVAE to address future PD:** would like to see a comprehensive career path; more basic training in the basics

## Wednesday, January 27, 2010, Morning Session

*How are states doing PD with less money?*

- AZ** - Using iLINC; hybrid- regional F2F then follow-up with webinars; save on travel expenses and time
- AK** – Using GoToMeeting
- WA** – Elluminate; more powerful but more expensive
- Tim** - DimDim
- AK** – Math delivery over Internet
- SD** – LiveMeeting (Microsoft)
- NM** – Webex; very expensive; now using Wimba – free; need voice; needs training prior to use; some disconnected w/ video and audio
- AK** – hybrid model is most effective; bring people in F2F then use web-based
- WA** – elluminate; good for “passive” meeting; if want more experiential, not as good; interactive TV works better for interactive sessions; Elluminate- facilitator needs a lot of training but it is easier for participants
- Max** – Adobe connect; can be used to track minutes so can be used for CEU credits; expensive but is building a training infrastructure; looking at for an investment; can add courses; investment is for the data collection system not the delivery system
- ND** – collaborates with others which have PD \$\$; pool money across programs; joint planning and joint funding; there were some ownership issues at first but they had to find things that they need in common; takes some extra planning time and people had to get over the silo way of thinking;
- AZ** – Google Sites; asynchronous. Other PD spending less \$\$\$?
- CA** – Training of trainers – regional & state; 2 day training, 6 hours of content; integrated facilitation skills. Trying to be more cost effective by having follow-up meetings online
- WA** – tried to have some structural things in place; develop a cadre of teachers that can do training across the state; short day with online follow-up. Also, gives a grant to each college for travel and training expenses rather than reimbursement.
- States Report on PD Offerings**
- CO** – General questions:

1. Can we see expanded agendas of content before deciding on specific sessions?  
Answer- Yes
2. Can state people in CO become trained to do the sessions so they can then do regional trainings? Answer- depends on the session; some yes if there are strong facilitators; others no. Suggestion- come up with a plan to do follow up with the expert using conference calls and other technology because one workshop is not going to do as much; need to come up with a plan to do a series of workshops over time with some activities to extend the learning – these activities can be done at a distance. We need to have some conference calls to plan something that fits what we need.
3. Regarding workshops #22 and #24 (math)...are those done separately or can they be combined? Answer – it is possible to combine...it depends if it can be the same trainer doing both. Suggestions – we would like to know who the trainers are and what their qualifications are before committing to the training.  
Answer – all trainers are vetted.

- CA** – Participated in the Learning to Achieve and still have teachers asking for it...so are planning to do more; interested in the Health Literacy and the PD path; also interested in Writing.
- WA & AZ:** Would like to have the catalog categorized (can suggest a model); would like specific outcomes for each training...”by the end of training, participant will be able to...”; would like data on participation outcomes (how many signed up, how many completed, etc.); would like organization of training get ahead of the curve on adult focused research for pedagogy on writing , listening and speaking for ELL.
- HI** - looking for workforce training and also technology training.
- Paul:** We will have Kathy St. John’s Vocabulary course online using Adobe Connect...this is an experiment.
- NV** – five priorities: Health Literacy for ESL, Transitions, Technology, Reading, Math
- NM** – Reading profiles; would like to see literacy addressed as a social justice issue; more on oral language acquisition.
- SD/ND** – This FY: Differentiated instruction (online); Writing-research based writing instruction; Next FY: Technology in classroom; ELA-teaching reading & writing; Solutions for mathematically challenged learners
- Noreen:** issues regarding the need for everyone to have given written permission for being up on the web
- UT** – going to meet with consortium in Feb.; would like data training; question- do you ever do specific types of training such as a certain method of teaching math? Paul- no, the trainings are based on research...if you know of a specific method that would meet the qualifications of research-based. Materials in the collections must be free and available online.
- CO** – interested in path of PD evaluation (online)
- AK** – looking at doing some sort of Reading training; very expensive to bring people in for one day of training.
- Paul:** Learning to Achieve training will be July 26-30, 2010 in Denver, CO.

**Wednesday, January 27, 2010, Afternoon Session**  
**Meeting PD Needs in Tough Financial Times**

*“What are states doing to provide PD with little or no funding?”*

Organized by states participating so if you want more info you will know to whom to go with questions or clarifications.

**SESSION SUMMARY:** States are facing huge cuts and PD is one of first to go. Most states in Region III have managed to find a creative way to circumvent the higher costs of PD either through technology or partnerships or both. Almost all are using some web-based trainings but many still like face-to-face, if costs can be contained.

**AZ** held annual state meeting in past but to conserve money is holding Regional Institutes of 1 day only; bring together attendees and follow-up electronically with **ILINCS**. Have 3-4, 1½ hr sessions over the year. Need 3 staff for each session: Presenter, facilitator, someone on phone to handle tech problems. Can use **GOTOMEETING** (inexpensive and even cheaper if pay by year) for directors and use with teachers for PD and follow up to PD.

Also likes **Googlesite** and it is free to all who have a Google account.

**AK** uses **GOTOMEETING** and no need for an administrator makes it attractive. Believes first meeting it is important to train; then can use web-based after.

Provides math delivery over the net using **WAYCOM**. Only \$85; bamboo pen and touch/use for PD in classroom/then teacher uses **GOTOMEETING** to check in. Makes math interactive.

**WA** uses **ELLUMINATE** for PD and for followup. More powerful but more expensive. Good for “passive” meeting. If want more experiential, not as good. Interactive TV good or better for experiential. However with Interactive TV:

- Need facilitator at each site
  - Handouts should be color coded/electronic/numbered in order used
  - Descriptions of manipulatives
  - Takes time and cost to set up initially
  - Follow up with PowerPoint or ELMO

Reduced funding for face-to-face training so using “cadre” teachers who have been trained to go to locals to train (train the trainers approach). Follow-up on half days (so trainees don’t have to stay overnight) and online. Each site is given a grant for PD travel and can choose what/who locally from a provided “list.” (one comment from group was that sometimes when do a regional or state training just passing the costs down to the locals anyway in time/travel/pay)

**Tim (RRC I)** likes **dimdim**. Free up to 20 users. Then small cost

**SD** uses Microsoft’s **LIVEMEETING**

**NM** likes **webex** but it is very expensive. Recommends **WIMBA**. It is free, but you need voice, camera, headset/or can use long distance phone. **WIMBA** needs training prior to use and there is some disconnect with video & audio

**REGISTRATION** must be carefully set up and controlled. Need **sign in** sheet for each site and **evaluation** form for each site. These can be paper-based or electronic.

**NV** pays 5 cents per minute to use phone meetings. Some opt out because of the tech hurdles.

**MAX, RRCIII** likes **CEU** credits as incentives, but you need to track very carefully if using these. Likes **AdobeConnect** as a delivery system and it provides an infrastructure that continues. Initially is expensive (\$15,000 for 100 concurrent licenses) but this is a system and a long term investment tool.

**ND collaborates** with others who do have PD funds. They pool PD dollars across programs. Requires joint planning and funding; initially some ownership issues arose. Hosts a joint fall

conferences of all providers. Does require some extra planning time. Have their own system **IVAN** which is interactive TV/video and available to all providers in the state.

**CA** likes the **training of trainers** approach, using regional and state trainings. Now do 2 days/1 time a year face-to-face/interactive training. Hosted by a local agency. Also blended face-to-face and on-line.

### Links and Resources

- **Adobe Connect** - <http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobatconnectpro/>
- **Calpro** - <http://www.calpro-online.org/>
- **DIMDIM** - <http://www.dimdim.com/>
- **Illuminate** - <http://www.illuminate.com/>
- **Goodling institute** - <http://www.ed.psu.edu/goodlinginstitute/>
- **Google docs /aps** - <http://www.google.com/apps/intl/en/business/index.html>
- **Gotomeeting** - <https://www2.gotomeeting.com>
- **Live Meeting** - <http://office.microsoft.com/en-us/livemeeting/default.aspx>
- **NING** - <http://www.ning.com/>
- **Ovae** - <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ovae/index.html>
- **ProLiteracy** - <http://www.proliteracy.org>
- **USA Learns** - <http://www.usalearns.org/>
- **Wacom** (bamboo tablet)- [http://www.wacom.com/bamboo/bamboo\\_fun.php](http://www.wacom.com/bamboo/bamboo_fun.php)
- **WIA** - <http://www.doleta.gov/Programs/>
- **Wimba** - <http://www.wimba.com/>