

**LITERACY OUTREACH COORDINATION IN
COMMUNITY-BASED LITERACY DEVELOPMENT**

By

DANIELLE HOOGLAND

Integrated Studies Project
submitted to Dr. Derek Briton
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts – Integrated Studies

Athabasca, Alberta

May, 2012

Abstract

Literacy outreach coordinators (LOCs) are vital to the British Columbia Community Literacy Program (CLP), a community-based planning process that addresses local literacy realities. Despite the centrality of literacy outreach coordination in community-based literacy (CBL) development, there is little research on the LOC role specifically and literacy coordination generally.

This research project investigates the roles of LOCs in CBL development in terms of their understandings, approaches, and experiences of CBL and how the aforesaid inform literacy outreach coordination practice. Four LOCs on North Vancouver Island, including myself, were interviewed. The narratives generated from the interviews, in conjunction with an extensive literature review, inform the analysis and discussion in this interpretive, qualitative research report. The narratives are analyzed through narrative analytic, thematic analytic and grounded theory techniques. Narrative analysis integrates time and context in the construction of meaning; thematic analysis involves open coding of data by finding the similarities among the narratives; and grounded theory uses inductive analysis to emerge themes from the data.

Analysis of the data confirmed that LOCs' roles are linked to a continuous, cyclical, and iterative process, which I call the Coordination Wheel.¹ The roles of LOCs, located on the Coordination Wheel, are: (i) representing CBL and informal learning; (ii) reaching out (out/reach); (iii) implementing the Community Literacy Plan; (iv) relationship-building which includes forming relationships, linking formal learning organizations to non-formal learning

¹ The Coordination Wheel connects the LOC roles to four interconnected stages that reside on a cyclical continuum of understanding and practice. Each stage involves both internal (reflective) processes and outward actions.

organizations, and creating networks; and (v) supporting the process of collaboration among people and organizations – which may strengthen relationships but may also shift how organizations are working together.

This research creates a framework for understanding the roles of LOCs and in so doing asserts the importance of literacy outreach coordination. The research also serves to further professionalize the field of CBL by describing the theories and practices that inform literacy outreach coordination.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Introduction.....	5
Literature Review.....	8
Data Collection	19
Data Analysis	20
Discussion.....	24
Conclusion	42
Works Cited	44
Appendix.....	47

Introduction

Literacy outreach coordinators (LOCs) are vital to the British Columbia Community Literacy Program (CLP), a community-based planning process that addresses local literacy realities (Glickman, Anderson, Smythe, Hawkey, & Anderson, 2011). The LOC role was first established through the Literacy Now Community Literacy Program,² launched in 2004 by 2010 Legacies Now Society. Communities across B.C. were given planning funds to support the creation of community literacy task groups³ to assess their community's literacy needs, strengths and opportunities, and to plan how they would take action on local literacy development. Each task group wrote a Community Literacy Plan (CLP) which was submitted to the 2010 Legacies Now Society for implementation funds. At the literacy planning stage, many communities hired facilitators to lead the research and writing of the CLP. At the implementation stage, these facilitators became implementation coordinators. The LOC position, first coined in 2009 at the Read Now BC Provincial Literacy Infrastructure Training,⁴ has since “become critical to the ability of communities to carry out actions that support literacy based on the planning process and to facilitate discussions around collaborations” (Decoda Literacy Solutions, p. 42). Currently (spring, 2012) there are 102 task groups and LOCs representing more than 400 communities in B.C (Ibid., p. 8).

² To clarify, the CLP was the Literacy Now Community Literacy Program. As we are now beyond 2010, it is now referred to as CLP. In the field, these terms are used interchangeably.

³ The task groups are made up of representatives from a variety of community organizations, including libraries, family resource programs, employment agencies, the K-12 system, and literacy organizations.

⁴ The Read Now BC Provincial Literacy Infrastructure Training occurred in Richmond, B.C. in February 2009.

A recent study of the CLP demonstrates that the community literacy planning process has been successful in increasing community collaboration, enhancing coordination, forming partnerships, and working together to reach out and provide rationalized and relevant literacy services in the community (Glickman et al., p. 6). According to Decoda Literacy Solution's⁵ evaluation of the CLP, these collaborations have led to a greater number of community members participating in learning and literacy ("Community Literacy Planning Guide: Working Together for Literacy," 2012, p. 32). For example, in 2006 LOCs reported that 8,472 people (adults and children) participated in literacy programs. In 2009/10, this number rose to 19,172 people participating in literacy programs (Ibid., p. 31).

I am the Comox Valley LOC. I was hired in the fall of 2007 by the Comox Valley literacy task group to facilitate the research and writing of the CLP. In the fall of 2008, the task group was granted three years of implementation funds and I was contracted to coordinate the implementation phase. It is now the spring of 2012 and I am still employed as the LOC to coordinate the planning and implementation of the CLP.

I have experienced the impact of the community literacy planning process in my community. The process has raised literacy awareness, increased community collaboration among literacy stakeholders to address our literacy realities, and increased literacy programs, projects, and events thus increasing the number of participants in learning. In my community and across B.C., there are powerful stories attached to the CLP. The stories are about relationships, reaching out, engagement, learning and community-building.

⁵ Decoda Literacy Solutions is B.C.'s new provincial literacy organization and was formed from Literacy BC and the literacy department of 2010 Legacies Now in the spring of 2011.

This research captures some of these stories as told by LOCs and through their telling, highlights the LOC role and experience within community-literacy development. Specifically, the goal of this research is to further understand the integral role of literacy outreach coordination in CBL development. The leading research question is: What are the roles and experiences of LOCs in CBL development?

To explore and ultimately answer this question, four LOCs, including myself, on North Vancouver Island were interviewed. The interviews focused, first, on who LOCs are and how they are connected to their community; second, on their experience of the CLP in their community; third, on their roles and how they occupy those roles; and fourth, on how LOCs understand and approach literacy and CBL development.

The narratives generated from the interviews, in conjunction with an extensive literature review, inform the analysis and discussion in this interpretive, qualitative research report. The report is organized into five sections: (i) literature review, (ii) data collection, (iii) data analysis, (iv) discussion, and (v) conclusion.

Literature Review

This literature review constitutes an interpretation of the CBL field and its discourse. The selected literature contributes to a comprehensive guide of the territory that LOCs and literacy practitioners currently inhabit in British Columbia. As a guide, the literature review describes the context, concepts, and the actors involved in CBL. The literature review is divided into the following three areas:

1. *Context*: This review examines the Literacy Now Community Literacy Program (CLP) in B.C.
2. *Community-based literacy*: CBL weaves the fields of community development and literacy together. This review initially separates the terms literacy and community development in order to define and describe the various understandings and approaches attached to these concepts.⁶ It then brings the concepts together through the theories that intersect these two fields.
3. *Community literacy coordination*: This review draws from articles and reports that deal with who coordinators are, what their roles are, and how they coordinate their programs.

Context: The Community Literacy Program

The first document a LOC reads to learn about the community literacy planning process is the “Community Literacy Planning Guide” (Trueman, Morrison, Faris, Gadsby, Allan, & VanderWal, 2008). The guide defines literacy and community-based planning; describes the

⁶ Note that I have not included all understandings and approaches to literacy and community development; I have only described those most relevant to the CLPP.

Literacy Now Community Literacy Program (including the principles guiding the initiative and the goals of the initiative); provides a stage-by-stage and step-by-step guide of the initiative (from planning to implementation); and includes on-line resources and an appendix that situates the initiative within a wider setting. The guide also sets the tone for provincial literacy outreach work, identifying the goal of former Premier, Gordon Campbell: “making B.C. the best-educated, most literate jurisdiction on the continent and a global leader in literacy by 2010” (p. i).

Judith Walker (2008) critically analyses the Community Literacy Planning Guide and other policy documents to “unpack the politics of policies” (p. 468). Walker provides the political context of the initiative (in other words, why government funded the initiative as part of its Olympic Legacies Program) and examines the role of literacy and learning in the knowledge economy. She asserts that the current focus on literacy is due to the awareness that to be competitive in the global economy governments must raise and diversify their citizens’ literacy skills and encourage them to engage in lifelong learning (p. 465). Ron Faris (2007) reinforces this notion in his description of the Canadian literacy scene. Faris notes that the economic, social and human costs are too high to not address Canada’s literacy needs (2007, p. ii). Indeed, the C.D. Howe Institute’s research, “Public Investment in Skills: Are Canadian Governments Doing Enough?”, concludes that a one percent rise in adult literacy scores is associated with an eventual 2.5% relative rise in labour productivity and a 1.5% rise in GDP per year (\$18 billion) (Columbe & Tremblay, 2005). Another report, “Addressing Canada’s Literacy Challenge: A Cost/Benefit Analysis,” shows that an investment in literacy provides significant rates of return in economic growth (Murray, McCracken, Willms, Jones, Shillington, & Stucker, 2009).

Given compelling evidence that investment in literacy results in a reduction of poverty, an improvement in health, an increase in community engagement, and a higher standard of living (Alexander, 2007) governments around the world are responding to the call for literacy programs. Walker notes that many provincial, state, and federal governments, including B.C.'s, are pronouncing that they will invest in literacy in order to be more productive, healthy, and wealthy. But this often results in each region vying for a spot at the top, competing with one another to become the most literate jurisdiction. Of course, this contradicts a spirit of dialogue and regional collaboration on literacy (Walker, p. 477).

Competition also plays out on an individual level and highlights the tension between raising individual skills (investing in human capital) and building social capital (the building of social networks). Through substantial funding of the Essential Skills Initiative (in 2003), the Government of Canada has given priority to investing in raising individual essential skills to create a more productive workforce.⁷ But such human capital approaches to education and community development (understood as developing the skills, knowledge and experience of an individual), are critiqued by Tara Fenwick (2006) as being “associated with ‘neo-liberal’ policy contexts: market-focused, in which education and lifelong learning are understood to service the economy, privatization and deregulation are promoted to limit barriers to free market exchange of resources, and individuals are viewed as having unlimited choice and opportunity to develop themselves and market their skills broadly” (p. 86). The dominant “federally-driven

⁷ The current nine essential skills are: reading text, document use, numeracy, writing, oral communication, working with others, continuous learning, thinking skills, and computer use. These skills are cited as the “skills needed for work, learning and life” (Human Resources and Skills Development Canada, 2011)

individualistic skills-based conceptualization” of literacy (Ibid., p. 85) may undermine alternative approaches that recognize the cultural, social and educational contexts of literacy.⁸

Ron Faris (2003) conceptualizes a framework in which human capital and social capital are linked. In his “lifelong learning community” framework, social capital is the basis of increased human capital (p. 2). Within this framework, literacy and lifelong learning become an organizing principle and social/cultural goal to mobilize the learning resources of the civic, economic, public, education, and voluntary sectors to enhance social, economic, and environmental conditions (Faris, 2007, p. 4). The Literacy Now Community Literacy Program embraces Faris’ learning community approach and highlights his vision in the community planning guide (p. i-viii). Similarly, Leona Gadsby⁹ advocates that literacy be used as a *strategy* in addressing many of our social inequalities as opposed as understanding literacy as yet another social *issue* that communities need to deal with.

Most recently, Glickman et al., (2011) studied the effectiveness of the CLP as a community development initiative. The study results indicate that the community literacy planning and implementation process has been very effective in supporting participants to increase collaboration, enhance coordination, form partnerships and work together to reach out and provide rationalized and relevant services across their communities. The strength of the CLP is greater community engagement which ensures that community literacy planning is more responsive to community needs. There is also evidence of an improvement of program and service delivery in which access is facilitated and duplication of services is avoided.

⁸ For further examination of these two seemingly polar approaches and understandings of literacy, see Hoogland, “Workplace Literacy in the Comox Valley”, April 2009.

⁹ Leona Gadsby is the Lead Director of Programs and Services at Decoda Literacy Solutions. Gadsby reinforced this notion at the North Island Literacy Gathering (Courtenay, B.C., 2008).

Community-based literacy

a. Literacy

According to the Community Literacy Planning Guide (2008), literacy is defined as “essential cultural, social, and academic practices and understandings that involve not only reading, writing, and mathematics, but also other abilities such as understanding and using languages, music, media, social skills, and civic understanding” (p. 2). This broad definition includes multiple literacies: from early learning and fundamental literacies to citizenship, health, economic, environmental, rural/urban development, social/cultural and digital literacy (Faris, 2007, p. vii).

Paulo Freire posited literacy work as “reading the world” through “problem-posing” learners’ lived experiences and their relations to the world. Literacy for Freire, and other critical theorists (including bell hooks, Peter McLaren, Henry Giroux and others) involves a globalizing practice. “It is a practice that does not only involve technical knowledge, but also world knowledge” (Donaldo Macedo and Freire, 1995). Jennifer Subban (2007) connects critical literacy within a community development perspective which addresses “the relationship between the literacy experiences of individuals and communities and the power relations that govern them” (p. 72).

David Gruenewald (2003) espouses a synthesis of critical pedagogy and place-based education into a critical pedagogy of place, a relevant theory for CBL. According to Gruenewald, “a critical pedagogy of place aims to evaluate the appropriateness of our relationships to each other, and to our socio-ecological places” (p. 7). Gruenewald calls for critical place-based

pedagogies to “reframe and ground today’s tiresome debates over standards in the lived experience of people and the actual social and ecological contexts of our lives” (p. 11).

Ningwakwe George (2010) takes Freire’s quote “reading the world” further and uses the phrase “reading the universe” to reflect the spiritual dimension of learning. George cites the British Columbia Association of Aboriginal Friendship Centres’ definition: “Aboriginal literacy is more than reading and writing. It is the beginning of a cradle to grave process that affirms the world view held by indigenous people and thus empowers the spirit of indigenous people and their families” (p. 9). Wedlidi Speck (2008) describes the importance of cultural literacy through “The Half-Person Story.” Speck’s story tells of how culture, tradition, spirituality and environment, nurtures the (re)creation of the whole person. Cultural literacy, for Speck, “is about achieving esteem, identity, and meaning” (p. 50). Subban (2007) also connects culture to literacy in a framework that acknowledges that culture frames and impacts how we come to understand, know and interact with the world (p. 71).

Literacy is also defined as fundamental skills. The oft cited International Adult Literacy and Skills Survey (2003) is used as a metric of describing levels of literacy. The IALSS measures respondents' proficiency along four skill domains: prose literacy, document literacy, numeracy and problem-solving. Proficiency is then rated on the basis of levels one to five, lowest to highest. In Canada, among adults aged 16 to 65, about 9 million, or 42% scored below Level 3 in prose literacy — the desired threshold for coping with the increasing skill demands of a knowledge society. At least four out of ten adults performed below Level 3 in numeracy (Statistics Canada, 2005). The implication of this survey is that those adults performing below Level 3 need to seek out adult literacy programs to raise their literacy levels. As mentioned previously, the approach of measuring individual skills and using those results to determine a

person's ability to be effective in the "knowledge society" is controversial as it does not consider the ideological underpinnings of what and how knowledge is valued in our society (Fenwick, p. 85).

b. Community development

Community development is defined as both a concept and as a process. As a concept, community development begins with a vision of a community's "ideas, values and ideals" (Hubert Campfens, p. 25). As a process, community development engages "dialogue, exchange, consciousness raising, education, and action aimed at helping the people concerned to build their own version of community" (Jim Ife and Frank Tesoriero, p. 100).

John Friedmann (1987) provides an overview of the intellectual traditions, philosophies and ideologies that inform community development. At the core of each tradition is the problem of linking knowledge to action (Friedmann, p. 74). The traditions relevant for the CLP are: *social reform*, in which the state guides planning practice in order to ensure action is effective and is in the interest of the state; and *social learning*, in which experience is valued as knowledge and validated in practice.¹⁰ Social reform is associated with technical reason and societal guidance, whereas social learning is associated with social transformation. Friedmann stresses that the traditions are neither distinct nor entirely separate. Multiple arteries connect and cross the different planning paths.

¹⁰ Elsewhere, I analyze the Literacy Now Community Literacy Program according to Friedmann's planning traditions and establish that Literacy Now mostly adheres to the social reform tradition while creating opportunities for critical social learning (see Hoogland, "The Intersections of Planning Traditions and Approaches: An Exploration of Planning in Canada World Youth and Literacy Now", June 2009).

Social learning theorists argue that “knowledge or theory is not static; rather, it is forever changing, being part of a dialectical cycle in which existing theory is enriched or modified by the lessons drawn from practice, which in turn are applied in the ongoing process of action” (Campfens, p. 33). Within the social learning tradition are multiple models. Subban (2007) describes four such community development models: community organizing, community economic development, asset based community development, and comprehensive community initiatives and community building initiatives (p. 75). These models are differentiated by their “desired outcomes, their scope of concern, the systems they target for change, their primary constituency, and the role of practitioners” (p. 9). The CLP aligns closest to comprehensive community initiatives. In this model, there is a commitment to strengthening all sectors of the community while addressing the interrelationships among them (social capital). This corresponds to Faris’ learning community approach described previously.

Community development from an Aboriginal perspective uses the medicine wheel to include four concentric circles of development (Darla Souliere and Sanjay Govindaraj, 2003). The inner circle represents the development of the person (with respect to mental, emotional, physical, and spiritual dimensions). The second circle, containing the first, is the development of the family and small groups (with respect to dominant thinking patterns, human relations, physical environment and economy, and cultural and spiritual life). The third circle, encapsulating the first and the second, is the development of the community (with respect to its political and administrative, economic, social and cultural and spiritual life); and the final outermost circle is the development of the global community (Gurr, Pajot, Nobbs, Mailloux, & Archambault, p. 22).

c. Community-based literacy development

Craig McNaughton's (1999) essay on literacy in the community learning context discusses the role of CBL programs within the fields of literacy education and life-long learning. McNaughton's description of CBL programs is "programs of literacy learning generally sponsored outside of formal or traditional institutions of learning (colleges, schools, universities)" (p. 1). To these programs he attaches the small-political persuasion of facilitators and practitioners: "It is the small-p political perspective that is perhaps the key distinguishing mark of a community-based literacy program. Literacy workers who are active in CBL programs seem focused intensely on what can be called *social inclusion*" (p. 1). McNaughton describes three specific ways in which CBL programs promote the values and ideas of lifelong learning: (i) they legitimize the *ideas of both non-formal and informal learning*, especially for those adults who have missed out on, and may not be able to retrieve, formal educational opportunities; (ii) they establish the *idea that education is for everyone* without exception; (iii) they prescribe many of the same *ideas of learning and teaching* favoured within the perspective of lifelong learning (p. 5).

Suzanne Smythe (2005) also advocates for an integrated, community-building approach to literacy. In what Smythe terms a "whole community approach," the whole community works together to embed literacy and learning into community life (p. 6). In this way, literacy is not the work of just literacy workers, but the work of the community as a whole. Smythe also acknowledges that a holistic understanding of literacy is rooted in indigenous knowledge and practice. She writes: "oral traditions, ways of living on the land, parenting styles and approaches to healing could be seen not as a barrier to literacy or school success, but rather as integral aspects of what it means to be literate in a given community" (p. 27).

Tania Cordoba (2005) reinforces the holistic approach to literacy development. For Cordoba, literacy work must reaffirm Aboriginal identities, cultures and epistemologies (p. 2). This includes: intergenerational transmission of knowledge, embodied learning and performed knowledge, learning through observation (“reading the land”), and learning through dreams and ceremonies (p. 2-4).

Community literacy coordination

Although there is ample literature for literacy practitioners working directly with learners (see the National Adult Literacy Database), there is little research on the LOC role specifically and literacy coordination generally. The literature that deals with the roles and activities of LOCs includes the Community Literacy Planning Guide (Trueman et al., 2008), the District Literacy Planning Guide (2010 Legacies Now, 2008), the Community Literacy Planning Guide: Working Together for Literacy (Decoda Literacy Solutions, 2012), and the research of Glickman et al. on the CLP (2011).

The Community Literacy Planning Guide includes recommended criteria for facilitators of the literacy initiative (LOCs). The list includes: is confident and enthusiastic, enjoys working with people, is able to chair meetings, has effective communication skills, is organized, and is familiar with conflict resolution (p. 18).

The research of Glickman et al. identifies four themes of how the LOC position has enhanced literacy work in the community. These include: networking, outreach, and relationship building; implementation of action plans and administrative support; identification of and response to funding opportunities; and consistent voice and point of contact (p. 46). The most recent Community Literacy Planning Guide (Decoda Literacy Solutions, 2012) also includes a

description of LOC activities. In addition to the aforementioned themes identified by Glickman et al., activities include: providing facilitation and support to the community literacy task group to set strategic direction, including reviewing and updating the CLP and providing data for the online database; supporting literacy program and service providers; working with groups and individuals to facilitate the creation of new or enhanced literacy programs and services; encouraging broad community representation, participation and leadership for literacy; assisting service providers and community members to create collaborative and integrated services; identifying and establishing supportive relationships and networks for literacy work; participating in various community planning and advisory meetings, bringing an understanding about the relationship of literacy to various community concerns; participating in evaluation and measurement strategies for literacy work; and acting as a liaison at the provincial and community levels to ensure that literacy initiatives align with broader national, provincial, regional and community directions (p. 42-43).

Mary Norton (2004) investigates the professional development of coordinators of community adult literacy programs in Alberta. This report gives readers a glimpse of *who* literacy coordinators are. Findings indicate that the literacy coordinators who responded to the study are very well educated (post-secondary degrees and certificates, including Masters' degrees and PhDs); work for 9-10 months a year (mostly part-time); are paid below professional standards; work alone (48%), and work in rural towns and villages (57%). The report also includes an extensive list of coordinator attributes from the ability to see the big picture to the ability to scrounge for resources (p. 77).

Data Collection

Data collection for this project is in the form of non-standardized, qualitative interviews with three selected North Island LOCs, and through the review of secondary sources including regional literacy meeting minutes, district literacy plans, and associated reports.

Although there are 102 LOCs in the province of B.C., I chose to focus on North Vancouver Island, a region within which I live and work. There are fifteen North Island communities which have LOCs, representing six school districts and one college region (North Island College). These communities include: Bella Coola, Bamfield, Port Alberni, West Coast Vancouver Island (Tofino and Ucluelet area), Comox Valley, Hornby Island, Campbell River, Cortes Island, Quadra Island, Sayward, Mt. Waddington area, North Vancouver Island (Port Hardy area), Gold River, Tahsis, and Zeballos.

Of the fifteen North Island LOCs, I chose to interview literacy outreach coordinators from Bella Coola (School District 49), West Coast Vancouver Island (School District 70), and Campbell River (School District 72). The interview participants were selected according to population density, school district, Aboriginal status, the stability and maturity of the Literacy Now initiative, the maturity of the LOC, and the distinguishing characteristics of either the initiative or LOC. The objective of the selection process was to identify communities and LOCs that represent the diversity of North Vancouver Island region and the literacy initiatives and LOCS within that region.

Data Analysis

Prior to breaking down the narratives into themes, the data was analysed as a whole to preserve certain features. These features may be lost if the data is fragmented into categories or themes. The following describes three important features of the data set as a whole. First, each narrative is personal. Each LOC speaks through her own cultural and social lens and thus her experience is embedded within a specific social-cultural context. Second, each narrative occurs at a certain point in time. LOCs have different levels and sets of experiences. The Campbell River LOC has been an LOC for much longer than the Bella Coola LOC, for example. Thus time and the experience time offers is integrated into the construction of meaning (Riley & Hawe, p. 229). Finally, each narrative has been created for the interview. The narratives are produced and shaped through the dialogue and interaction between myself (the researcher) and the interviewee (Spector-Mersel, p. 213). The narratives are then set within the new context of this report.

Following analysis of the data set as a whole, inductive analysis is used to solicit themes from the data. This is consistent with grounded theory data analytic techniques in which themes emerge from the data rather than being imposed onto the data (Bowen, p. 2). Generating the themes involved identifying the LOC experiences that were common among the participants interviewed. Secondary data that reinforced the identified theme was also taken into consideration. The initial themes emerged from key words and phrases found within the narratives. The themes that were related to one another in terms of temporal and/or spatial qualities were then collapsed into categories (see Table 1 for a description of categories). For example, in order to “listen and observe,” the LOC needs to be in a certain place at a certain time (planned or spontaneous). This relates to “outreach” – a role that is part of our title (literacy

outreach coordinator) but not well conceptualized. To draw attention to both words, the word outreach is separated by a forward slash: out/reach. Out/reach and listen/observe are connected because one cannot occur without the other. Therefore, these two themes are conjoined into one category.

Table 1: Roles of LOCs according to themes and categories

Theme	Category	Description
The face of informal learning	The LOC is a representative of CBL.	This role also brings with it an understanding of the importance of informal and non-formal learning as a gateway to formal learning. Thus, behind the “face,” lies a commitment and understanding of social, experiential, community-based learning. The learning philosophy of the LOC (“the face of CBL”) is presented to the community.
Outreach	The LOC out/reaches in community.	This role includes creating opportunities to connect, learn, listen and observe in optimum sites. Thus, the LOC develops a localized understanding and practice of CBL.
Listening and Observing		
Facilitation of task groups and implementation of action plans; administrative (writing reports, funding applications, budget); communication, event planning	The LOC implements the CLP.	This includes a practical part of the LOC role – the research, writing, organizing, administration, etc.
Connecting (linking) -initiatives -people and organizations -resources -programs -communities (regionally)	The LOC builds relationships, networks, and practices community development.	This role is the <i>direct interaction</i> with people, groups, or organizations. Also included here are the ways in which relationships are formed and sustained, and how the LOC knows when her/his strategies have been successful in creating positive, mutual relationships.
Linking formal and non-formal learning organizations		
Building relationships (this refers to how LOCs build relationships and how they know when they have created a positive, mutual relationship)		
Guiding and supporting the community literacy planning process. Also, the LOC “changes the	The LOC guides, supports, and challenges the community literacy planning process.	This role is to support and guide the relationships that have been created. At times, the LOC role is

**conversations” and the way
people/organizations work together**

to challenge the status-quo and
help evolve a way
people/organizations work
together.

Uniquely, these categories are also a process, and are organized according to four interconnected stages that reside on a cyclical continuum of understanding and practice. Each stage involves both internal (reflective) processes and outward action. Thus movements within the processes, which I call the Coordination Wheel,¹¹ are both inward and outward. For example, as the LOC learns where the centres of activity are in her community, the better she can learn to recognize what counts as meaningful exchanges among people. These are fluid processes, layered and deepening over time.

At the first stage,¹² the LOC develops an understanding of CBL practice. This includes research of CBL understandings and approaches (professional development) combined with personal experience of CBL; two aspects of a learning philosophy. This is an internal process, one that involves reading, thinking and reflection. The LOC then creates opportunities to connect, learn, listen and observe the literacy and learning concerns, challenges and opportunities that exist in her/his community (out/reach). Thus, the LOC develops a localized understanding and practice of CBL. This experience is combined with the creation of the CLP, which outlines the ways the community endeavours to meet its community literacy goals.

¹¹ The idea of the Coordination Wheel comes from Margaret Ledwith’s (2005) cycle model for the process of community development (p. 73). The cycle model integrates reflection and action by moving both inward and outward. Ledwith’s stages within the cycle model include: being, thinking (inward), project (action plan), encounter (engaging with the wider community), making sense (at which experience turns into meaning and knowledge), and communication (sharing knowledge and experience with others) (p. 74).

¹² Note that all these stages are interconnected and non-numerical. I’ve numbered them to clarify the order that they may occur.

Implementing the CLP requires that the LOC be involved often with facilitation, administration, and organization.

At the second stage of this theoretical model, the LOC connects, coordinates, and builds relationships. This is where the LOC is a community development practitioner. Moving inward, the LOC reflects upon her/his practice and in so doing generates understandings that may confirm or change her/his practice.

At the third stage, the LOC guides and supports ongoing collaboration. The relationships the LOC has created are (ideally) strong enough to sustain challenge and are open to new ways of working together. Conversations within communities are changing and evolving, as are the communities themselves. The aimed-for outcomes are collaborative programs, services and generally greater capacity to meet the literacy needs of the community.

At the fourth stage, the LOC recognizes and celebrates whenever her/his community is working together to meet their literacy goals. When the CLP goals are being reached the community can then consider new literacy goals. The LOC reflects on which collaborative practices worked, how relationships were forged, and what s/he has learned. What does the LOC now know what s/he didn't know before? What needs to be changed? How does this knowledge inform future practice? The cycle begins again.

Discussion

The data analysis indicates that the LOC position is not simply composed of roles; literacy outreach coordination is also a process. Theresa, the West Coast LOC, speaks about literacy and coordination as an evolving process:

Literacy is about evolving, about moving forward. This is the exciting part about being a LOC – you are part of an evolving process. Sometimes it is slow, but things will unfold. You must wait, let things rise to the surface, and then they will connect – trust the process. This work is meaningful because my life and community are evolving.

Given the importance of process, the roles and experiences of LOCs are linked to a continuous, cyclical, and iterative process that I call the Coordination Wheel. As described above, the roles of LOCs, located on the Coordination Wheel, are: (i) representing CBL and informal learning; (ii) reaching out (out/reach); (iii) implementing the CLP; (iv) relationship-building which includes forming relationships, linking formal organizations to non-formal organizations, and creating networks; and (v) supporting the process of collaboration among people and organizations - which may strengthen relationships but also shift how organizations are working together.

I will discuss each of the five LOC roles as part of a process, drawing from the data and existing research and literature. Prior to the discussion, it should be clarified that LOCs do not work in isolation or autonomously. They work on behalf of a task group which includes community representatives who have an interest and/or stake in literacy. Task groups may

include representatives from the school district, post-secondary institution, public library, local government, employment centre, non-formal learning organizations (for example, adult learning centres, women’s resource centres), business, and Aboriginal/First Nations communities. The task groups in this study recognize the “importance of literacy as a community building tool and a strategy for supporting economic, social, health and educational goals” (Decoda Literacy Solutions, p. 37). A literacy outreach coordinator works with a committed group of individuals who support and guide the LOC’s work. Connecting multiple partners and bridging different interests makes the LOC’s work both rich and complex.

A representative of community-based literacy and informal learning

The LOC role is an important one. Linkages. It gives a face to literacy – outside of school. I am not the school. The LOC is the face of informal learning – not attached to the formal learning institutions... If there isn’t a face to informal learning, and all that people see are the faces of the institutions, people might not see options. When we are visible, when we promote community, there are possibilities... LOCs promote social learning, problem solving, decision making, technology – this is where LOCs shine – we show the connection between informal learning and literacy. (Theresa)

The LOCs interviewed concurred that they are the face of informal learning. Other descriptions included being an advocate, an ambassador and a proponent of CBL.¹³ The research

¹³ Interestingly, the terms community-based literacy and informal learning are both used to describe learning that resides in community (as opposed to within a formal learning institution), connects to learners’ interests and personal goals (i.e. is relevant), and is typically social (involving other learners) and experiential (hands-on learning). Although the LOCs did not use the term “non-formal learning,” I use it to differentiate between spontaneous or unintentional learning (informal) and learning that occurs in organized settings but does not necessarily lead to formalised certificates (non-formal).

of Glickman et al. also describes one of the LOC roles as “a consistent voice and point of contact” (p. 46). However, to be the face or contact of these important forms of learning a LOC needs a grounded understanding of informal learning and CBL. As Etienne Wenger (1999) writes: “our perspectives of learning matter: what we think about learning influences where we recognize learning, as well as what we do when we decide that we must do something about it – as individuals, as communities, as organizations” (p. 9). Our understanding of learning (i.e. our theory of learning) informs and guides our actions (or practice).

For LOCs, the construction of their learning theory (located at the first stage on the Coordination Wheel) is informed both by personal experience as well as through professional development. It is also important that a LOC reflect localized understandings and practices of literacy. *Community-based* literacy is described by community members and understood as a collective decision that is considered in terms of how it will impact the community and future generations (Theresa).

The LOCs were asked what literacy and/or learning looks like in their community. Theresa’s response is the following:

West Coast youth planned and organized a youth forum. They needed to learn the protocols of their Nations and thus needed to involve their elders. They organized a feast and thus needed to collect food. They needed to problem solve, make decisions, work together. They wanted to talk about issues, youth issues, and wanted to share them with their elders and community members. They wanted to do this in a traditional way. They had to work on their social skills. They had to work within a budget and they had to use technology to get the word out. [The forum] captured all forms of literacy.

The LOCs spoke to this broad description of literacy: literacy meets personal and social goals and includes the skills people need to participate in their communities. As the Comox Valley LOC, I use the following definition of literacy:

Literacy is the multiple lenses through which to interpret, view, and understand the world and the universe. It brings depth and further understanding to experience. The more literacies one has, the more resources one has to draw from in order to make sense of the world and universe. (Danielle)

I want to emphasize the importance of informal learning which is understood as spontaneous or unintentional learning. “Learning takes place at the supper table, visiting an elder, going for a walk, having a conversation, or when women come together and weave. Learning is about sharing food, sharing stories and knowledge.” (Theresa).

Lifelong learning is also an important term and concept for LOCs. It is the “courage to keep learning” (Tamara, Bella Coola LOC), the “willingness to learn, to try new things” (Theresa), and means “advancing personal knowledge” (Anne, Campbell River LOC). Lifelong learning is also cyclical. The things that you learned at one point in your life might come up again and be reflected upon, reinterpreted, re-digested, with different relevance to your present life. Learning experiences may have more relevance in the future than in the present (Danielle).

Being a representative of CBL also includes an understanding of the importance of informal and non-formal learning as a gateway to formal learning. Below, I discuss how these types of learning are connected and describe the role of the LOC within these learning spheres.

CBL understands that learning is a process of readiness, engagement, and then learning (Decoda Literacy Solutions, p. 29). Decoda describes *readiness* as the initial work of preparing

learners for learning related to life situations. *Engagement* occurs when learners are “involved in their work, persist despite challenges and obstacles, and find satisfaction in accomplishing their work” (Ibid., p. 29). And *learning* is the “successful acquisition and application of new ideas and skills essential for living in and adapting to the society in which we find ourselves” (Ibid, p. 29). The pathway of readiness, engagement, and learning also occurs within a learner’s journey through informal learning to non-formal learning and then to formal learning. Being ready to learn means having a positive learning experience, usually informally, that motivates learners to pursue further learning. Engagement is a “soft” commitment to a non-formal learning program, one that has specified learning outcomes. Finally, the stage of “learning” involves more of a commitment to learning – one that may include timelines, evaluation and assessment.

LOCs play a large role in the readiness stage of learning. Some call it literacy by stealth – embedding learning into a positive, fun experience. LOCs then make the learning part of the informal learning experience explicit. They recognize that learning happens everywhere and draw attention to the fact that one is learning, albeit informally. Theresa offers an example:

In Ahousaht elders and school-aged children and youth were brought together to teach and learn their native language. However, what brought them together was not that they would be studying language, but that they would be sharing food, eating together. It was language learning in an informal, natural setting. (Theresa)

LOCs, or other literacy practitioners, may direct a learner to a path to further their learning. An elder who had a positive experience teaching her language to children might want to further her own literacy abilities by participating in a one-to-one tutoring program, a non-formal program, at the local Adult Learning Centre. The path from the informal to the non-formal is laid

out before her. As her literacy skills and confidence increase, she may eventually want to learn at the local college in a formal learning program. Learning is built on learning. Or as David Livingstone, a leading researcher of informal learning practices, writes: “Our organized systems of schooling and continuing education and training are like big ships in a sea of informal learning. If these education and training ships do not pay increasing attention to the massive amount of outside informal learning, many of them are likely to sink into Titanic irrelevancy” (as cited in Lowe, p. 89). To continue Livingstone’s metaphor, the work of LOCs is located in the sea of informal learning. Craig McNaughton’s (1999) essay on CBL programs substantiates the role of CBL in non-formal learning. McNaughton writes that “CBL programs help fill out the ‘non-formal’ part of the learning spectrum, allowing renewal of the possibility of re-entry to the more formal learning systems and/or the possibility of developing more substantive informal learning” (p. 5). To me the mostly intuitive bridging (noticing, naming, making explicit, and so forth) that takes place within the processes described here is one of the most exciting discoveries of my thesis. Articulating the work of the LOC will strengthen the vital, fluid processes in which they are already involved.

All the LOCs connect with their work on a personal level. Theresa states: “Things have to align with my values and principles in order to do my work. I bring the perspective of possibilities.” In fact, the definition of literacy in the Community Literacy Planning guide and the approach that the Literacy Now Community Literacy Program espoused provoked some LOCs to apply for the job. When Theresa read about the LOC position, she connected her former work, passion, and interests to the position. She was particularly attracted to the Literacy Now Community Literacy Program because it used a broad definition of literacy and gave communities the opportunity to create and evolve their own plans. There is a comfortable

alignment of the philosophy and approach between the provincial literacy organization (Decoda Literacy Solutions) and LOCs. The relationship is not top-down: Decoda offers suggestions and support, but does not dictate how communities should plan and implement CBL. Anne states: “[CBL] is what Decoda does best – supporting community work. Previously literacy was the school district’s responsibility. But community is starting to understand that literacy is their business.” I would add that community is positioning itself to *claim* literacy as their business.

Out/reach

My role as an LOC is to listen, to hear what is being said and what is not being said. I observe. I watch and learn to read the looks on people’s faces. I also am aware of what I choose to see and not see. I attend meetings, I refer, I do talk, but most important is to listen. I support ideas. I coordinate, I work in partnership, sometimes I instigate, come up with ideas, pose questions. I listen to the hopes and dreams. (Theresa)

All LOCs interviewed mentioned the importance of being *out* in the community in order to listen and observe. Anne states: “there is a huge need out there, but it is *out there*.” Reaching out to community, to organizations, and to learners, requires that LOCs attend community meetings, meet with community-based organizations, meet with formal learning institutions, and connect with learners themselves.

LOCs use different avenues to out/reach. Some communities have interagency meetings in which community partners come together to discuss needs and opportunities in a particular area such as early childhood development or youth frontline services. Some remote communities, on the West Coast for example, use the Coastal Family Resource Coalition (referred to as the

Coalition) meetings to discuss current issues within those communities. These meetings are also an opportunity to share resources.

It was through out/reach that Theresa learned the importance of creating a literacy plan as a dual-language plan in which implementation of the plan is both in English and Nuuchahnulth.

The orality of language is particularly important as many of the stories and traditions are passed down orally from elders to youth and children. For example, at Ucluelet Secondary School, the elders are involved in speaking and teaching the language to the children. There is also an adult language class at the Du Quah gallery. At Hot Springs Cove, elders are involved in the school and speak and teach the language to students.

Anne spoke of the importance of listening in order to learn what she, as a LOC, can offer. Anne shares contacts, resources (such as books or curriculum), and expertise with different groups and organizations. “For example, at the Aboriginal Early Years table, they created a book. But they needed a publisher – and I connected them with one. That was all they needed from me.”

The research of Glickman et al. describes the LOC’s role in reaching out to the community. It is reflected in the number of community tables/regularly scheduled meetings they attend (excluding literacy task group meetings). Eighteen B.C. regions reported that the average number of community meetings attended by LOCs is 42 per year. This shows the incredibly committed (and complex) work that many LOCs do. Included in this count are meetings with school districts, library boards, Ready Set Learn, parent advisory committees, teachers, and other community groups and service providers (Glickman et al., p. 46). Decoda Literacy Solutions also

claim that LOCs attended 624 committee meetings (in 2009/10) as compared to 175 in 2006 (p. 32).

LOCs don't necessarily conduct out/reach strictly during LOC work hours. The interviewed LOCs are active members of their communities and sit on multiple boards, volunteer in various capacities, and work different jobs. Tamara calls it "double layering": adding a layer to the relationship by connecting to others in different ways.

It is also through observing and listening to her/his community that a LOC learns cultural and social protocol for her/his community as a whole, and for the social/cultural groups within the community. This is incredibly important as relationships are built on trust and respect. Although a LOC is part of the community, for certain groups, s/he is an outsider. When Tamara arrived in Bella Coola she was invited to attend a potlatch. "Some First Nations took the time and initiative to show me how respect is shown in their culture... I was provided with culturally relevant knowledge that would increase my chance of success and enjoyment in those communities."

Community Literacy Plan implementation

The third LOC role is practical but also involves process. It includes researching, writing, organizing, administering, and facilitating. This role is also supported by the research of Glickman et al. which mentions "implementation of action plans and administrative support" and "identification and response to funding applications" (p. 46). This role varies from community to community depending on the size of the community and whether or not the LOC is attached to an organization that fulfills some of these responsibilities. For example, a LOC may not be required to manage the budget or seek additional funds if there is an Executive Director who assumes those roles.

However, all LOCs are required to work with their school district representative on the District Literacy Plan (DLP), which is submitted to the Ministry of Education in July of each year.¹⁴ DLPs serve to align literacy initiatives and programs within a community in order to reflect how the community, as a whole, addresses literacy. According to the District Literacy Planning Guide, the “DLP is a statement of commitment by a school district to work with community partners to improve literacy locally – all part of ongoing community development” (2010 Legacies Now, p. 1).

For many LOCs, the DLP is more than a document that reflects CBL planning; the DLP is a means through which the school district and community come together. The DLP also serves to bring communities within one school district together. Many communities may exist within one school district but because of geographical, social or cultural differences, or lack of a LOC to bring them together, they remain isolated from one another. LOCs can greatly assist in connecting communities through literacy planning. The creation of the DLP weaves communities’ literacy stories together. It is also an avenue of communicating the strengths and needs of different communities in terms of literacy resources and programs. When one community articulates the need for a particular literacy resource, another community can come forward and offer or share resources. The West Coast is a region where this exchange often occurs.

The West Coast includes two municipalities and six First Nations. Three of the First Nations are only accessible by boat or air. Services are limited and may be inaccessible to the remote communities. Thus communities must share. They pool together their knowledge, wisdom and resources. No one works in isolation – everyone must work

¹⁴ In most communities, the district literacy plan is the CLP.

together or they are left out. People count on other people. Communities count on other communities. On the West Coast, it's a way of life socially to know that you count on other people to help you. You might have a small pocket of money, combined with other small pockets of money, you can do something – a youth forum, good food boxes, for example. (Theresa)

For Anne, the DLP is a unifying document for all the communities that exist within the Campbell River school district. When Anne was given the task of writing the DLP, she realized that she could not reflect what was occurring within the entire district, which includes Cortez Island, Quadra Island and Sayward. Thus, Anne brought the Literacy Now Community Literacy Program to these communities and they wrote their own literacy plans. Anne now brings the plans and reports of each of these communities together through the DLP.

Relationship-building, networking, community development practice

Everything, everything, everything is about relationships. (Anne)

Relationship-building is such an obvious role for community workers that how we build and nurture relationships is taken for granted. Indeed, all LOC roles involve building connections and networks. For the purposes of this study, I differentiate this role from the others by discussing the role as the *direct interaction* with people, groups or organizations. The relationship may be individual-individual, individual-group, group-organization et cetera. It also includes the relationship between informal learning, which typically occurs in the community; and formal learning, which typically occurs in formal learning institutions. The LOCs interviewed also speak to how relationships are formed, sustained, and how they know when they have created a positive, mutual relationship.

Forming Relationships

When Anne meets with communities or organizations, she always brings something to offer, whether it is expertise, contacts, information, resources, or time. Although it is rarely money, at one point task groups received funds to build websites. Anne brought the funds to the Campbell River Community Literacy Agency (CRCLA) and offered to build a website that served both the CRCLA and the Campbell River Literacy Now initiative. The creation of the website opened doors to future collaborations between the CRCLA and Literacy Now.

Anne also knows when to step aside. “A good example is a grant came up and we (Literacy Now) wanted to apply for it. We did some leg work but when we met with Family Services they told us that they were applying for the grant. We said: Perfect, but could you include [some of our ideas that would support your application]? They said: Absolutely.”

Some relationships are created naturally and some take a little more work. Differences in personality, approaches and understandings may hinder relationship building. The timing might just not be right also. Anne states:

One thing that you have to accept as a LOC is that the timing isn't right and as much as you want something to happen, it won't until all the stars align. It is very frustrating because it seems to take forever... and because community work is so dependent on writing for grants to keep yourself going, it makes people want to hide their work rather than join their work together.

Another challenge is the changeover in staff within schools and organizations. Re-establishing relationships with people and organizations take a lot of time and energy. As Anne

frankly states: “This is the slowest work on the planet. It is like molasses. It takes lots of listening, and talking, and listening, listening, and listening.”

One reason the LOCs interviewed are successful in creating and nurturing relationship is because they are committed to their communities. This commitment and love does not go unnoticed by their colleagues and fellow community members. Tamara spoke passionately about the beauty of Bella Coola. “I get excited about how beautiful this place is – I talk about doing these great hikes up the mountain... I’m just so jazzed about it. People can tell I genuinely love this place.” She has a similar affection for the people: “You know everyone in town, in the grocery store, in the co-op restaurant. The server at the restaurant knows I drink lemon tea. There are beautiful personal connections – people take care of each other. If you are on the side of the road – people stop for you. I will stop for others.” Tamara, who works at the New Leaf Learning Centre, knew that she was building relationships with learners, when they would come in to the Centre to visit her. “They would bring their families in just to say hi. This is when I knew I was making connections.”

Both Tamara and Theresa, who work closely with the First Nations in their communities, know they have been accepted into community when humour is used with them. Theresa says: “Their humour is a gift. They are genuine. There is always a teaching and an explanation. You leave there and you feel like you have been gifted, you feel so honoured.”

Linking the formal to the informal

Building relationships, along with networking and outreach, is the predominant role of LOCs according to Glickman et al. (p. 46). This is how LOCs *do* community development. There is a concentration on building the social capital of community in order to meet the needs

of the community. Interestingly, for the LOCs in my study, building relationships links being together formally (e.g. meetings) with being together informally (e.g. socially). Theresa expands this idea:

For example, when the Coalition meets in Ahousaht, we travel together (informally), we have our meeting (formally), and then we share food together (informally). And it works in a circle – not linear – back and forth and back and forth. Actually it's more of a figure eight laid on its side with the formal parts of the relationship only a small part of what it means to be together. In fact, the figure eight could represent the learning community – all linked and interconnected.¹⁵

LOCs also become a liaison between community learning organizations and formal learning institutions; they facilitate the relationship between these two groups. There are challenges to this relationship. Judith Walker's article (2008) highlights a few of the tensions between the formal and community-based learning organizations. She quotes one of her respondents who is hostile to the Literacy Now Community Literacy Program (and LOCs by extension):

All of that [Literacy Now] is being run out of the Ministry of Education, and to all intents and purposes, it has had zero impact on the post-secondary system. 'Let's get away from paying people living wages to do this and let's ignore the fact that there's a body of knowledge and use a community of volunteers.' What I see there is a deliberate attempt

¹⁵ Learning is like this as well. The formal part of learning (the junction of the figure 8) brings the breadth of informal learning to a point where it then expands to other areas of informal learning. The cycle is not broken.

to deprofessionalize... the college system has not been consulted on any issues of literacy at all. (Walker, p. 471)

Although relations between colleges and LOCs vary from community to community, the Comox Valley is an exemplar of a reciprocal relationship that benefits both parties. The college, in fact, is an ambassador of CBL organizations as most of their learners begin their learning journey in community-based organizations. The Adult Learning Centre, for example, supports learners' transition between their non-formal learning program to a more formalized program by helping students with the college assessments, registration, and course and program information. The LOC supports the organizations by investigating the barriers to learning programs and brings partners together to strategize about how to reduce barriers. In the Comox Valley, for example, one of the barriers to accessing the college was the distance of the college from town, as well as the cost of the assessment (approximately \$40). Thus, a third community-based partner, the local employment agency, provides the space and funds for the college to offer free assessments in town. It's about finding "joined-up solutions to joined-up issues"¹⁶.

Creating networks

LOCs may work with pre-existing networks to implement their literacy plan, such as Theresa's involvement with the Coalition. Some LOCs are instrumental in reducing the number of committees if the same community partners are attending multiple meetings together. According to Anne, Campbell River has reduced their early childhood development tables from five tables to one. "We were always in meetings - [we realized] is anyone actually doing anything for the kids? It was a 3-4 year process of scaling down our meetings."

¹⁶ Anne Docherty, Storyteller's Foundation, Hazelton, B.C., is recognized as coining this phrase. It is quoted in the District Literacy Planning Guide (2010 Legacies Now, p. 5).

In some cases, LOCs create networks or committees that are focused on addressing a specific literacy. The Comox Valley task group struggled with how to fund their two identified priorities within their plan: (i) to provide or enhance literacy and learning opportunities for young adults in transition into adulthood, post-secondary education and the workplace; and (ii) to provide or enhance literacy and learning opportunities for isolated and vulnerable families and parents (family literacy). Committed to building community networks, the task group decided to invite partners together to address each literacy priority. The Comox Valley task group call this process “co-development” in which a group of stakeholders work together cooperatively and collaboratively to make decisions on the action(s) that best address the literacy priority. The co-development process has generated two committees: the Essential Skills Partnership and the Family Literacy Outreach Committee. Each of these committees has hired coordinators who are instrumental in implementing the action ideas that their respective committees generate in response to community needs. Therefore the task group is building the capacity to address specific literacy realities that exist within the community, as well as build the social networks that can cooperatively tackle issues and opportunities that exist and may arise within the community.

Guides a “change the conversation” and the way we work together

Once relationships have been formed and built through trust and reciprocity, a LOC may “change the conversation” and challenge the “status-quo” and the way people/organizations work together. Anne gives a good example of how the Literacy Now Community Literacy Program has changed the conversation among organizations:

Campbell River has a culture of working together. They were in their silos but they did talk. A conversation might be: “you can’t apply for that grant because I am already doing

something on this day, and you can't have that because that's mine." Whereas now it is: "Oh – you are applying for that grant? Can I write you a letter of support? Oh, I found this grant and I think you should apply for it." It has taken ten to twelve years.

There are other shifts too. Many LOCs want to change the "status quo," challenge the norm, and change the system. The degree to which LOCs create or participate in such shifts varies from community to community and from LOC to LOC. A literacy outreach coordinator that is not attached to a particular organization and who has an established presence in the community, such as Anne, may be more inclined to challenge organizations and the "system" than a LOC who has not been in her/his position or community for very long and who is accountable to supervisors.

The work of the LOC is also influenced by those who are participating in the task group. CBL is most valuable when there is diverse community representation at the table. As Linda Flowers (2008) points out, community literacy "does its work by widening the circle and constructing an even more public dialogue across differences of culture, class, discourse, race, gender and power shaped by the explicit goals of discover and change" (p. 19). This raises an important question: Is the task group representative of the community as-a-whole? Glickman et al. found that some communities lack representation from certain groups such as the poor, youth, seniors, First Nations communities and immigrants (p. 70). In many cases, it is the LOC who must first out/reach and build relationships with these different groups, prior to encouraging their participation in a group that is predominantly occupied, understandably, by representatives of the education and non-profit sectors.

In all the aforementioned roles, the LOC seeks to empower her/his community to cooperatively and collaboratively address the community's literacy realities. Anne Toomey

(2009) describes four community development agent roles: catalyst, ally, facilitator and advocate. Interestingly, Toomey's roles also correspond to the roles described in this paper. The LOC is a catalyst who sparks new ideas or actions using gathered (through out/reach) information, perspectives, and knowledge (Toomey, p. 9). The LOC is an ally to learning organizations and may assist with tasks and duties such as fundraising or research (Ibid., p. 10). The LOC brings people together (through networking and relationship-building) and facilitates mutual dialogue across difference (Ibid., p. 10). Finally, the LOC is an advocate by bringing literacy into a larger arena for broader change (Ibid., p. 12).

Conclusion

The study of literacy outreach coordination offers a much needed understanding of LOC roles and experiences. As I have shown, articulating the roles of the LOC can result in better understanding but also in moving toward formal recognition of these roles. The Coordination Wheel, described in this report, connects the LOC roles to a cyclical process. The process involves inward and outward movements. The inward movement reflects the LOC's understandings, experiences and reflections. The outward movement reflects the LOC's (inter)actions in community. Both the inward and outward movements align when the community is positively and cooperatively working together to address their literacy realities. A literacy outreach coordinator, guided and supported by her/his task group, could be compared to a motor in a vehicle. The motor, once started, allows other vehicle components to operate: the transmission, the carburettor, the radiator, the brakes, the radio, et cetera. All we see on the road, however, is the vehicle itself, heading toward a certain destination. The motor and all its related operating parts are hidden.

British Columbia is charting new territory as literacy leaders, practitioners, and learners work to understand, approach, and address B.C.'s literacy realities. This report draws attention to the LOC position as a motor of developing literacy in communities across B.C. It establishes that the work of LOCs is informed by localized understandings and experiences of literacy and community-development. By probing deeper into the theories and practices of LOCs, the LOC profession receives a foundation on which to develop and evolve.

The research of Glickman et al. concludes that the CLP is an important model for “creating partnerships and broadening community engagement around literacy and learning

opportunities in communities” (p. 106). LOCs are part of this model and therefore have an important role in its development. LOCs can contribute to increasing the body of CBL development knowledge through participatory action research, writing up literacy projects for publication in books and journals, sharing practices at conferences and gatherings, and storytelling.

Recognizing the importance of the roles and experiences of the LOCs and creating policy and role descriptions that can help LOCs fulfill their mandates is an important step to achieving greater literacy in all (and not just some) B.C. communities. Dr. Seuss wrote: “The more that you read, the more things you will know. The more that you learn, the more places you'll go” (Seuss, 1978). B.C. communities can go far in developing the capacity required to increase literacy levels across the province. In fact, the goal of former B.C. Premier, Gordon Campbell, to make B.C. the best-educated, most literate jurisdiction on the continent and a global leader in literacy might not be such a lofty goal after all.

Works Cited

- Alexander, C. (2007). *Literacy matters: A call for action*. Toronto: TD Bank Financial Group.
- Bowen, G. (2006). Grounded theory and sensitizing concepts. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5 (3), 1-9.
- Campfens, H. (1997). *Community development around the world: Practice, theory, research, training*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press Incorporated.
- Columbe, S., & Tremblay, J. (2005). *Public investment in skills: Are Canadian governments doing enough?* Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute.
- Cordoba, T. (2005). Aboriginal literacy and education: A wholistic perspective that embraces intergenerational knowledge. *First Nations, First Thoughts conference*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.
- Decoda Literacy Solutions. (2012). *Community literacy planning guide: Working together for literacy*. Vancouver, B.C.: Decoda Literacy Solutions.
- Faris, R. (2003, Winter). Learning community by community: Preparing for a knowledge-based society. *Education Canada*, 1-5.
- Faris, R. (2007). Appendix: The purposes of literacy in a knowledge-based society - Lifelong learning for all. In Le Clair, B., Trueman, C., Morrison, F., Faris, R., & Gadsby, L., *Community Literacy Planning Guide*. (pp. i -viii). Vancouver, B.C.: 2010 Legacies Now.
- Fenwick, T. (2006, May 27). Proceedings from the Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education conference: *Control, contradiction and ambivalence: Skill initiatives in Canada*. Retrieved from <http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/CASAE/cnf2006/cnf2006.html>
- Flowers, L. (2008). *Community literacy and the rhetoric of public engagement*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.
- Friedmann, J. (1987). *Planning in the public domain: From knowledge to action*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- George, N. (2010). *A new vision: Guiding Aboriginal literacy*. Owen Sound, Ontario: Ningwakwe Learning Press.
- Glickman, V., Anderson, J., Smythe, S., Hawkey, C., & Anderson, A. (2011). *Literacy Now and district literacy initiatives: Connecting loosely coupled formal and informal services*. Vancouver: N.p.

- Gruenewald, D. (2003, May). The best of both worlds: A critical pedagogy of place. *Educational Researcher*, 32, (4), 3-12.
- Gurr, J., Pajot, M., Nobbs, D., Mailloux, L., & Archambault, D. (2008). *Breaking the links between poverty and violence against women*. Ottawa: Public Health Agency of Canada.
- Hoogland, D. (April 2009). *Workplace literacy in the Comox Valley*. Courtenay, B.C.: N.p.
- Hoogland, D. (June 2009). *The intersections of planning traditions and approaches: An exploration of planning in Canada World Youth and Literacy Now*. Courtenay, B.C.: N.p.
- Human Resources and Skills Development Canada. (2011, October 24). *Literacy and Essential Skills*. Retrieved <http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/workplaceskills/LES/index.shtml>
- Ife, J., & Tesoriero, F. (2006). *Community development: Community-based alternatives in an age of globalisation (3rd Ed.)*. Australia: Pearson Education Australia.
- Ledwith, M. (2005). *Community development: A critical approach*. Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.
- Lowe, G. S. (2000). *The quality of work: A people-centred agenda*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Macedo, D., & Freire, P. (1995). A Dialogue: Culture, language, and race. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65 (3), 377-402.
- McNaughton, C. (1999). *Literacy in the community learning context*. Retrieved from National Adult Literacy Database.
- Murray, S., McCracken, M., Willms, D., Jones, S., Shillington, R., & Stucker, J. (2009). *Addressing Canada's literacy challenge: A cost/benefit analysis*. Ottawa: DataAngel Policy Research Inc.
- Norton, M. (2004). *Growing our way: A Report on the professional development project*. Calgary, AB: Literacy Alberta
- Riley, T., & Hawe, P. (2005). Narrative theory analysis. *Health Education Research* 2 (2), 227-239.
- Seuss, D. (1978). *I can read with my eyes shut!* New York: Random House .
- Smythe, S. (2005). *Learning from the Weaving Literacy Project: A report on the process and outcomes of the Weaving Literacy Project*. Ottawa: Canadian Association of Family Resource Programs.

- Souliere, D., & Govindaraj, S. E. (Ed.) (2004, August). *Community Engagement and the Medicine Wheel*. Kitchener, Ontario: Opportunities Waterloo Region.
- Speck, W. (2008). Wachiay Friendship Centre: Integrated cultural literacy action plan project. In Hoogland, D, *Comox Valley community literacy plan* (pp. 46-53). Courtenay, BC: Comox Valley Literacy Now.
- Spector-Mersel, G. (2010). Narrative Research: Time for a paradigm. *Narrative Inquiry* 20 (1), 204-224.
- Statistics Canada. (2005, November 9). *The Daily: International adult literacy and skills survey*. Retrieved <http://www.statcan.gc.ca>
- Subban, J. (2007). Adult literacy education and community development. *Journal of Community Practice*, (15) 1, 67-90. doi:10.1300/J125v15n01_04
- Toomey, A. (2009). Empowerment and disempowerment in community development practice: Eight roles practitioners play. *Community Development Journal*, 1-15. doi:10.1093/cdj/bsp060
- Trueman, C., Morrison, F., Faris, R., Gadsby, L., Allan, N., & Vander Wal, N (Eds.) (2008). *Community Literacy Planning Guide*. Vancouver, B.C.: 2010 Legacies Now.
- 2010 Legacies Now. (2008). *District literacy planning guide*. Vancouver: Province of British Columbia.
- Walker, J. (2008). Going for gold in 2010: an analysis of British Columbia's literacy goal. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 27 (4), 463-482. doi:10.1080/02601370802051462
- Wenger, E. (1999). Introduction: A social theory of learning. In E. Wenger, *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity* (pp. 3-17). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix: Research Ethics Application and Approval



MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 12, 2012

TO: Danielle Hoogland

COPY: Derek Briton (Research Supervisor)
Janice Green, Secretary, Research Ethics Board

FROM: Dr. Simon Nuttgens, Chair, Research Ethics Board

SUBJECT: **Ethics Proposal #11-61 “Literacy outreach coordination in community based literacy development”**

Thank you for your revised application submitted on December 22, arising from the “Conditional Approval” decision dated December 14, 2011. Your cooperation in revising and furnishing additional information requested was greatly appreciated.

On behalf of the Athabasca University Research Ethics Board (AU REB), I reviewed the resubmission, and am pleased to advise that this project has been granted **FULL APPROVAL** on ethical grounds.

The approval for this study “as presented” is **valid from the date of this memo for a period of 12 months**. If necessary extension of approval can be requested by completing and submitting an ‘Interim’ Ethics Progress Report one month prior to expiry of the existing approval.

A **Final Ethics Progress Report** (form) is to be submitted when the research project is completed. Progress reporting forms are available online at <http://www.athabascau.ca/research/ethics/>.

As you progress with implementation of the proposal, if you need to make any changes or modifications please forward this information to the Research Ethics Board as soon as possible. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact rebsec@athabascau.ca

Participant Recruitment Letter

January 12, 2012

Dear Campbell River Literacy Outreach Coordinator,

I am an Athabasca University graduate student in the Masters of Integrated Studies (MAIS) program. I am also the Comox Valley Literacy Outreach Coordinator. In order to fulfill my graduate requirements for a MAIS degree, I will be carrying out a research project on literacy outreach coordination.

In order to understand literacy coordination more broadly (rather than according to my own experience), I am inviting you, as an LOC in the North Vancouver Island region, to participate in my research. I am selecting three North Vancouver Island communities who differ in their maturity of the Literacy Now initiative, and who are different enough from one another (in terms of demographics and cultural communities represented). The benefit of participating in this research includes a more in depth understanding of literacy outreach coordination. The research also hopes to further professionalize the field of community-based literacy.

To gather information on your experience of literacy coordination, I would like to conduct an interview either by phone or ideally, in person. We would set up an interview time (and location, if required) by email. The interview will take approximately one and a half hours. Prior to the interview I will email you the list of interview questions. Normal ethical standards of anonymity and confidentiality will be maintained and the data will be synthesized as part of the final research report.

If you are interested and available to participate in this research, I will send you a letter of information regarding the research aims and process. Furthermore, if you are agreeable to participating, I would ask that the organization that employs or contracts you will consent to your involvement in this research. I will send your organization a letter of support that they would read, sign, and return to me.

I look forward to your response via email as to whether or not you are willing to be a participant in this research. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me. My phone number is xxx-xxx-xxxx and my email is dhoogland@shaw.ca

Respectfully,

Danielle

Letter of Information and Informed Consent

Re: *Literacy outreach coordination in community based literacy development*

I, Danielle Hoogland, am an Athabasca University graduate student in the Masters of Integrated Studies (MAIS) program. I am also the Comox Valley Literacy Outreach Coordinator. In order to fulfill my graduate requirements for a MAIS degree, I will be carrying out a research project on literacy outreach coordination.

Literacy outreach coordinators (LOCs) are central and vital to the Literacy Now initiative, a community-based planning process that addresses local literacy realities. Through my research I intend to explore the North Vancouver Island LOC role in community based literacy development and how this position cultivates change in communities working together to increase literacy levels. Through my research I will explore the following questions:

- What roles do LOCs have in community-based literacy development?
- How do LOCs understand their role in the community-literacy planning process?
- What community development and learning theories guide LOCs' practice?
- What experiences, knowledge, and understandings do LOCs bring to their practice?
- How do these understandings shape their work?
- What attributes or characteristics make LOCs good at what they do?
- Who are LOCs? (in terms of demographics including gender and age)
- What is the environment (including social, political, educational, economical context) within which North Vancouver Island LOCs work?
- What strategies do LOCs use to connect community stakeholders in literacy?
- How do LOCs build capacity within their communities to address local literacy realities?
- What stories do LOCs carry with them in doing their work? (stories which create meaning in their work)
- What do LOCs value about community-based literacy work?
- How do LOCs understand and manage the relationship between formal learning organisations (school districts and college) and non-formal organisations (adult literacy centres, aboriginal centres)?

The study involves researching my own journals, notes, and meeting minutes; investigating secondary literature on literacy coordination; and interviewing three North Island literacy outreach coordinators about their experience, knowledge and understanding of their work. I will also be using publically available district literacy plans and reports to link literacy outreach coordination to literacy outcomes in your community. I will also use the publically available North Island Regional Meeting minutes (2008 and 2011) to investigate common practices, understandings and experiences among LOCs. My aim of this research project is to further understand the integral role of coordination in community-based literacy development.

In order to understand literacy coordination more broadly (rather than according to my own experience), I am inviting you, as an LOC in the North Vancouver Island region, to participate in my research. I am selecting three North Vancouver Island communities who differ in their maturity of the Literacy Now initiative, and who are different enough from one another (in terms of demographics and cultural communities represented). I will initially ask LOCs from Campbell River, Westcoast Vancouver Island, and Bella Coola to participate. Should any of these LOCs refuse to participate, I will ask a community of similar size and whose involvement in the Literacy Now initiative follows a similar timeline.

To gather information on your experience of literacy coordination, I would like to conduct an interview either by phone or ideally, in person. We would set up an interview time (and location, if required) by email. The interview will take approximately one and a half to two hours. Prior to the interview I will email you the list of interview questions. These questions are only a guide. You are not obliged to answer any questions that you find objectionable or which make you feel uncomfortable. During the interview, I will be taking notes. Following the interview, I will transcribe my notes into a word document on my computer. Computer notes will be password-protected on my home computer. Once transcribed, I will email you the notes for you to review. You may make any changes (additions, clarifications, or omissions) on the word document. This review may take up to a half an hour. I will then use the final document as data for research analysis.

There are no known risks in participating in this research. The benefits include a more in depth understanding of literacy outreach coordination. The research also hopes to further professionalize the field of community-based literacy. There will be no remuneration offered to participants.

Your participation is voluntary and can be withdrawn at any time with no negative consequences. If you choose to withdraw your participation, all notes will be destroyed (handwritten notes) or deleted (computer notes). I will be asking for your permission to take notes of our interview on the consent form.

The identities of all those who participate in the study will be kept confidential. There will be no identifying information used in the final research report unless you have given permission to do so (as quotes, for example). Only I will have access to identifying information. Please note that because you are a member of a small professional North Island LOC group (there is a total of 15 North Island LOCs), your identification may be possible depending on the familiarity of other LOCs to your remarks and work.

In order to ensure confidentiality beyond the LOC group, and to ensure any quotes in reporting and publication will not identify your location thereby identifying you as an LOC, I will not connect your quotes to your location. If you use location as part of your quote, I will anonymize your location by using codes for your location. For example, your location will be coded "Community A". Only my research supervisor and I will have access to the data key which connects you to your location.

To ensure your confidentiality, I will provide you a draft transcript for your approval. Any quotes that you deem identifiable will be anonymized to ensure that location and situations are not identifiable.

All electronic research data including anonymized transcripts and data keys will be archived as computer word documents in separate files on my home computer hard drive by June 30th, 2012. These documents will be password protected and stored indefinitely for possible future research analysis. All hand written field notes and other hard copy documentation will be destroyed by shredding by June 30th, 2012. All emails and digital correspondence will be deleted from my computer by June 30th, 2012.

This research may be published and/or presented. Those who may have access to this research include: other literacy outreach practitioners, Decoda Literacy Solutions, and literacy task groups. The existence of the research will also be listed as an abstract, available online through the Athabasca University Digital Thesis and Project Room (DTPR), and the final research paper will be publicly available.

If you have any further questions or want clarification regarding this research or your participation, please contact:

Researcher: Danielle Hoogland, dhoogland@shaw.ca, xxx-xxx-xxxx

Research Supervisor: Derek Briton, dbriton@athabascau.ca

The Athabasca University Research Ethics Board has reviewed this research study and may be reached by e-mailing rebsec@athabascau.ca or calling 1-780-675-6718 if you have questions or comments about your treatment as a participant.

CONSENT:

I have read this Letter of Information and have had any questions answered to my satisfaction, and I will keep a copy of this letter for my records. My signature below is meant to confirm that:

- I understand the expectations and requirements of my participation in the research;
- I understand the provisions around confidentiality and anonymity;
- I understand that my participation is voluntary, and that I am free to withdraw at any time with no negative consequences;
- I am aware that I may contact someone in addition to the researcher if I have any questions, concerns or complaints about the research procedures.

Print Participant Name: _____ Date: _____

Participant Signature: _____

By initialing the statement below,

____ I am granting permission for the researcher to use a tape recorder (and/or)

____ I am granting permission for the researcher to connect my name to quotes published in the final report.

Organization support for research

Campbell River Literacy Now

January 15, 2012

Athabasca University Research Ethics Board

RE: Literacy outreach coordination in community based literacy development – Support for Research

To Whom It May Concern:

Danielle Hoogland has explained the purpose of the research project is to study the role of community-based literacy outreach coordination in selected North Vancouver Island communities, Campbell River being one of them. The study will involve contacting the Campbell River Literacy Outreach Coordinator who is employed or contracted through our organization and inviting her to be interviewed in Campbell River in January 2012, at a time and location that is convenient to her.

We understand that the results of the research will be available from Danielle Hoogland, but individual participant information and organization data will not be published, and results of the research will be aggregated in such a way that individuals will not be identifiable. However, our organization hereby gives permission to the researcher to identify the organization in any publication arising from the research.

In return for the organization's support of the research, the organization will receive a copy of the final research report.

By signature below, the organization acknowledges the social value of the research undertaking, and at the same time recognizes the ultimate importance of freedom of individuals to make an informed decision to choose, or not to choose, to participate in human research. The organization promises to avoid coercing or exerting pressure on its literacy outreach coordinator to participate in the study, and agrees to employ only methods of data gathering that are provided and supervised by the researcher.

Signature of Literacy Task Group Member Date

Name: _____

Position: _____

Email: _____

Phone: _____

North Island LOCs - Interview Guide

Introduction

Thank you for participating in this interview. This research is part of my final project (MAIS 701) required to complete my Masters of Arts in Integrated Studies (MAIS) Program. I anticipate that the interview will take approximately one hour and a half.

As indicated in the notice you received, the objective of this research is to explore how literacy outreach coordination builds the capacity of communities to address their literacy realities. The methods that are being used to complete this project are 1) a review of documentation and literature on Literacy Now and literacy coordination and 2) interviews with North Island Literacy Outreach Coordinators.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. I will ensure that the information collected is accurately recorded and used. The information you provide will be used only for research purposes. All data collected will be archived on my password protected hard drive by June 30th, 2012. The archived data will not be personally identifiable and that it will be kept indefinitely for possible future research purposes.

Also, the questions below are a guide to our conversation. I am seeking descriptions and understandings rather than facts and definitions. The interview will be a dialogue in which I will be an active participant. I will share my understandings and descriptions, if asked. Also, I am seeking stories which I will use to explore the LOC position. Any anecdotes, experiences, and stories that you are willing to share about your work as an LOC is valuable.

Do you have any questions or concerns before we start the interview?

Interview questions for NI LOCS:

Part 1: LOC information

1. Name:
2. Gender:
3. Age: Between 20-29; 30-39; 40-49; 50-59; 60-69
4. Community:
5. How long have you been part of this community?
6. What stage/year of the community-based literacy initiative (initially Literacy Now initiative) are you at?
7. How long have you been an LOC?
8. How many hours do you work each week?
9. If your LOC position is only one part of your work, what other work do you do?

Part 2: Context (*These questions are not posed in order to find facts but are posed to obtain narrative descriptions of the community. I, as an LOC, will answer the questions myself as an example of the descriptions I am seeking. The questions will be addressed in dialogue of our respective communities.*)

1. Please describe the social-cultural context of your community.

2. Please describe the political context of your community.
3. Please describe the economical and labour market context of you community.
4. Please describe the environmental (including rural/urban realities) of your community.
5. Has the Literacy Now initiative and your role been well received in your community? If so, why? If not, why?

Part 3: Looking at the concepts in our field (*These questions are not posed in order to obtain definitions but are posed to obtain understandings of the concepts. As in Part 2, I will be involved in this dialogue and am happy to share my understandings of these concepts*).

1. How do you understand literacy?
2. How do you understand lifelong learning?
3. How do you understand human and social capital?
4. How do you understand learning communities?
5. How do you understand essential skills?
6. How do you understand community of practice?
7. How do you understand community development?
8. How do you understand community based literacy?

Part 4: Looking at our roles in community-based literacy planning and implementation:

1. What drew you to this job?
2. What is your role in community-based literacy? (i.e. what do you do?)
3. What skills and abilities do you draw from to do your work? (eg. Organization, facilitation, public speaking, research, writing reports, administration, etc.)
4. What education, knowledge and experience contribute to your ability to do your job? (eg. Formal or non-formal learning credentials, previous work experience, etc.)
5. What skills, abilities, understandings or knowledge would help you do your work (eg. Social media skills, adult education knowledge or experience, a better understanding of Aboriginal realities)
6. What strategies do you use to connect community stakeholders in literacy?
7. How do you think you are building capacity in your community to address literacy realities? Do you have a story that reflects this?
8. Can you describe the relationship between formal learning organizations and non-formal learning organizations? (i.e. are they working together?)
9. What is your relationship with both formal and non-formal learning organizations?
10. Why is the role of LOC important?
11. Do you feel that your community is becoming more literate?
12. Who do you think benefits most from this initiative?

Part 5: Philosophies of literacy, learning and community

1. Please describe your community to me. Include what you love about it and what challenges you about it.

2. What do you value about literacy and community development work?
3. What do you value about the role you have in your community?
4. Do you feel that you are able to guide, challenge, or direct the initiative according to your understandings of community based literacy?
5. What is your learning philosophy?
6. Are there educational theories that you follow? (i.e. critical education, learner-centered, etc.)
7. Is there a community that is practicing the kind of community-based literacy approaches that you would like to see in your own community? If so, what are those approaches?
8. What stories do you carry with you in your work?
9. Without giving me a name, is there a person who has mentored you in your work? How has that person guided you?
10. How could your position be further shaped in relation to your community work? What are your hopes for the LOC position?

Thank you for your participation!

Respectfully,

Danielle Hoogland