

Business Culinary Architecture
Computer General Interest
Children Life Sciences Biography
Accounting Finance Mathematics
History Self-Improvement Health
Engineering Graphic Design
Applied Sciences Psychology
Interior Design Biology Chemistry

WILEY BOOK

WILEY

JOSSEY-BASS

PFEIFFER

J.K.LASSER

CAPSTONE

WILEY-LISS

WILEY-VCH

WILEY-INTERSCIENCE



The *Annual Review of Adult Learning and Literacy* is an important part of the Dissemination Initiative of the National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy (NCSALL). NCSALL is a collaborative effort between the Harvard Graduate School of Education and World Education, a nonprofit organization based in Boston. NCSALL's partners include The Center for Literacy Studies at the University of Tennessee, Rutgers University in New Jersey, and Portland State University in Oregon. NCSALL is funded by the Educational Research and Development Centers Program, award number R309B60002, as administered by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Innovation through its National Institute for Postsecondary Education, Libraries, and Lifelong Learning.

NCSALL is pursuing a program of basic and applied research that is meant to improve programs that provide educational services for adults who have low literacy skills, who do not speak English, or who do not have a high school diploma. Ongoing studies include research in the areas of learner motivation, teaching and learning, staff development, and accountability.

The contents of the *Review* do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education, nor are they endorsed by the federal government.

Annual Review of Adult Learning and Literacy

Volume 2

John Comings, Barbara Garner,
Cristine Smith, Editors

— Annual Review
of Adult Learning
and Literacy

Volume 2

A Project of

The National Center for the Study of
Adult Learning and Literacy



JOSSEY-BASS
A Wiley Company
San Francisco

Copyright © 2001 by Jossey-Bass Inc., and the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Jossey-Bass is a registered trademark of Jossey-Bass Inc., A Wiley Company.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise, except as permitted under Sections 107 or 108 of the 1976 United States Copyright Act, without either the prior written permission of the Publisher or authorization through payment of the appropriate per-copy fee to the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, (978) 750-8400, fax (978) 750-4744. Requests to the Publisher for permission should be addressed to the Permissions Department, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158-0012, (212) 850-6011, fax (212) 850-6008, e-mail: permreq@wiley.com.

The material in this publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract number R309B60002. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of the department or any other agency of the U.S. Government.

Jossey-Bass books and products are available through most bookstores. To contact Jossey-Bass directly, call (888) 378-2537, fax to (800) 605-2665, or visit our website at www.josseybass.com.

Substantial discounts on bulk quantities of Jossey-Bass books are available to corporations, professional associations, and other organizations. For details and discount information, contact the special sales department at Jossey-Bass.

ISBN 0-7879-5062-9

ISSN 1527-3970



Manufactured in the United States of America on Lyons Falls Turin Book. This paper is acid-free and 100 percent totally chlorine-free.

FIRST EDITION

HB Printing 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

The Jossey-Bass
Higher and Adult Education Series

Contents

Foreword	xi
<i>Israel Mendoza</i>	
Preface	xv
The Editors	xix
The Contributors	xxi
1 The Year 1999 in Review	1
<i>Dave Speights</i>	
2 Making Sense of Critical Pedagogy in Adult Literacy Education	26
<i>Sophie C. Degener</i>	
3 Research in Writing: Implications for Adult Literacy Education	63
<i>Marilyn K. Gillespie</i>	
4 Time to Reframe Politics and Practices in Correctional Education	111
<i>Stefan LoBuglio</i>	
5 Building Professional Development Systems in Adult Basic Education: Lessons from the Field	151
<i>Alisa Belzer, Cassandra Drennon, Cristine Smith</i>	
6 Adult Learning and Literacy in Canada	189
<i>Linda Shohet</i>	
7 Organizational Development and Its Implications for Adult Basic Education Programs	242
<i>Marcia Drew Hohn</i>	

Resources on Organizational Development <i>Marcia Drew Hohn</i>	255
Name Index	273
Subject Index	279

Foreword

It was in B. Allan Quigley's book *Rethinking Literacy Education* that I remember first seeing the phrase, "Become literate about literacy." As simple and logical as it seems, this thought struck me as very insightful. As the director of adult education in the state of Washington, I understand how important it is to have a vision of what adult education should be if it is to meet the needs of our learners. But until reading Quigley's book, I had not given enough thought to the contribution that research can make to the creation of such a vision and, just as important, to all of the decisions that must be made to realize that vision.

It is easy enough to envision a future in which all adults who need basic skills will have access to the means of obtaining them. It is much harder to make the decisions necessary to achieve that vision now, when we have enough resources to serve only 8 percent of those who need basic skills. It is not easy to decide who will constitute the 8 percent we teach and thus who will be among the 92 percent whom we do not teach. What, then, is the most appropriate strategy of instruction for those who will be taught, and what makes us so sure it will truly work? What kinds of organizations can best implement the desired strategy and achieve the intended outcomes, and what kind of staff development is needed for the teachers in those organizations to do the work that is necessary?

With unlimited resources, a state could try two or three or even four totally different widespread strategies, as well as hybrids of each. The reality of limited resources does not allow for that. A very balanced and meager approach is usually all that is allowed.

It is tempting to make decisions based on anecdote or under the influence of political pressure, grabbing the short-term flavors of the month or year. Nonetheless, no matter what the level of resources is, the hard decisions must be made, and they must be made on some basis of need, capacity, and research.

The fact that every decision has a fiscal impact causes us to wonder regularly whether each decision was the best investment. Just as often, it is hard to tell if each decision we make will serve to support the intended goal or if some are disconnected from the whole. One thing we do seem to be sure of is best practices. We regularly talk about how important it is to promote and fund best practices. Best practices in instruction, staff development, learner involvement, and marketing are all considered very desirable. But how do we really know what a best practice is? Is it the most widely practiced? Is it the newest idea? Does it require the least amount of investment in the most learners—or the most investment in the least number of learners? Do short-term gains by our learners become the foundation for long-term success over a lifetime, or are they just symptoms of giving in to short-term solutions?

Quality research is necessary to guide our decision making. I will not claim that I can offer a definitive description of what constitutes quality research, but I can say that from my perspective, it must be both academically rigorous and user friendly—to learners, teachers, program administrators, and policymakers. It must resonate with the general population as much as it does with those of us in the field of adult learning and literacy. Our vision of the future and all of the decisions made in support of it will be acceptable to our stakeholders and all concerned citizens only if it is based on quality research.

We live in a complicated and constantly changing world that requires us all to embrace lifelong learning. For me, lifelong learning includes becoming literate about literacy using a curriculum that includes research—conducted not by K–12 researchers, not by the Department of Labor, not by any other party whose purpose is not specifically for the benefit of adult basic skills. Too often we learn something as a by-product of someone else’s research. What we need is research designed with the specific intention of improving adult basics skills. And that research should be nationally based, conducted by adult literacy researchers for adult literacy learners, teachers, administrators, and policymakers.

In its infancy, the National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy declared its commitment to ensure “that research informs practice, that practice informs research, and that policy is linked to both.” The *Annual Review of Adult Learning and Literacy* is a testament

to this commitment. It demonstrates how research can improve practice and provide a sound framework for making the most difficult decisions. I am confident you will agree that the *Review*, in only its second year, has become an important part of the curriculum for those of us in adult basic education trying to become literate about literacy.

ISRAEL MENDOZA
Director
Washington State Board for
Community and Technical Colleges
Office of Adult Literacy

Preface

The National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy and Jossey-Bass are pleased to publish this second volume of the *Annual Review of Adult Learning and Literacy*. With this volume, we move closer to our goal of establishing a journal of record for the field of adult learning and literacy, with articles that review the literature and present best practices on key issues. The audience we have in mind for the *Review* includes policymakers, scholars, and practitioners who are dedicated to improving the quality of practice in adult basic education (ABE), adult English for speakers of other languages (ESOL), and adult secondary education (ASE) programs.

This second volume continues the format used in the first volume by beginning with a review of significant developments in the field during the year (in this case, 1999) and by including a chapter describing the adult literacy system of another country (here, Canada) and an annotated bibliography on a broad topic of current interest to the field (here, organizational development). We also continue a topical strand: In Volume One, we presented an article about the research on reading instruction and its applicability to adult students; in this second volume, we present an article on the applicability of research on writing instruction for adults.

In the foreword, Israel Mendoza, the adult basic education director for the state of Washington, talks about the importance of research in helping to make his vision of a quality system of adult basic education a reality. In his view, quality research is critical to making good decisions in a field where resources are scarce. Research is required, he says, if we are to become what educator B. Allan Quigley calls “literate about literacy,” thereby learning the best way to serve adult students.

In Chapter One, “The Year 1999 in Review,” Dave Speights outlines the federal funding initiatives for programs concerning adult literacy, key developments in policy, and major research activities during the

year. Events such as the Summit on Twenty-First Century Skills for Twenty-First Century Jobs and preparations for the National Literacy Summit are covered. Speights also discusses the impact of the Workforce Investment Act, which began to be felt at the state and local level during the year.

In Chapter Two, Sophie Degener discusses critical theory and its application to the pedagogy used in adult basic education programs. She first provides a brief history and definition of critical pedagogy and then presents a theoretical framework for applying critical pedagogy to ABE programs. Degener argues that defining a program as solely critical or noncritical is not helpful, since programs more accurately fall on a continuum between the two. She suggests that programs could evolve toward adopting a more critical pedagogy, to varying degrees, in one or more of their program components: philosophy, structure, curriculum, teacher development, teacher-student relationship, and evaluation.

As a follow-up to the chapter on reading instruction for adults in Volume One of the *Review*, Marilyn Gillespie summarizes the research on writing instruction in Chapter Three. She traces the history of writing research with a variety of learners—children in the K–12 system, college students who are classified as “basic” writers, second-language learners, and adult literacy learners—focusing on issues and trends of most interest to adult literacy educators. She then discusses what these trends mean for the field of adult literacy, where educational approaches based on writing research are still relatively rare. Through examples she shows how a growing number of practitioners are beginning to integrate the teaching of writing more fully into their classes with adult students and then makes an argument for five actions that would promote improvements in writing instruction: a research agenda for studying composition in adult literacy contexts, funding for professional development of practitioners around integrating writing into the program and classroom, research on innovative tools for assessing the writing progress, policies to help students in General Educational Development (GED) classes prepare for the writing demands of postsecondary education, and better dissemination of writing by and for adult learners.

In Chapter Four, Stefan LoBuglio discusses the politics and practices of educational programs for adults in correctional facilities. LoBuglio argues that the politics of such programs, and the resulting reduction in funding for them, is related to the reaction of political leaders to

public opinion about whether the primary purpose of imprisonment is to keep dangerous individuals off the street or to rehabilitate them. He also describes several innovative correctional education programs, including programs in which the quality of the education has been improved as a result of the influence of larger goals for educational reform and accountability efforts. He advocates further research on the extent to which education may reduce recidivism rates and calls for a survey of best practices in correctional education programs.

Professional development for practitioners is a key issue for state adult basic education systems. In Chapter Five, Alisa Belzer, Cassandra Drennon, and Cristine Smith provide an overview of the challenges facing state-level professional development systems. They profile the professional development systems in five states according to characteristics such as scope, cooperative leadership, coherence, and accessibility. Among the challenges common to the five states featured is the call for professional development staff to meet the needs of practitioners on the one hand and policymakers on the other, needs that are sometimes at odds with each other. The authors believe that professional development staff in different states need more opportunities to share information about their systems and about how to plan and deliver effective professional development activities that meet the needs of a mostly part-time and underpaid workforce.

In Chapter Six, Linda Shohet describes the Canadian system of adult literacy, highlighting the history of its development within a complicated cultural history of four groups: Anglo-Saxon, French, and Native cultures, and more recent immigrants from a range of countries. She describes the various organizations that have played a role in the development of services for adult learners as well as the political events that have influenced the funding of such services. Her overview of the challenges facing the Canadian adult literacy system—defining literacy, integrating new technology, professionalizing practitioners, shifting investments to workplace and family literacy programs, establishing partnerships, providing literacy for non-English or non-French speakers, and sustaining the system—reveals important differences and similarities in the challenges facing the Canadian and U.S. ABE and literacy systems.

In Chapter Seven, Marcia Drew Hohn gives us a history of organizational development theory and then provides key resources in an annotated bibliography that will be of interest to those engaged in ABE program improvement.

As the *Review* goes to press, the summit process described by Dave Speights in Chapter One is gaining momentum with the publication of *From the Margins to the Mainstream: An Action Agenda for Literacy*. Over the next year, summit organizers will make efforts to engage practitioners and policymakers at all levels to take action to make the agenda come to life. As the field progresses in its effort to secure greater resources, improvements in quality, and increases in access to services for adult learners, we hope that the *Review* will continue to be a valuable resource for those working in the field.

JOHN COMINGS
BARBARA GARNER
CRISTINE SMITH
EDITORS

The Editors

John Comings is the director of the National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy (NCSALL) at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Before coming to Harvard, he spent twelve years as vice president of World Education. Comings worked on adult education programs in Nepal for six years and in Indonesia for two years and has helped design and evaluate adult education programs in several countries in Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean. In the United States, he has served as the director of the State Literacy Resource Center in Massachusetts, assisted in the design of instructor training programs, and directed projects that focused on improving the teaching of math and health in adult education programs. His research and writing have focused on the impact of adult literacy programs on reading ability and life changes such as health and family planning practices, the program factors that lead to that impact, and the issue of persistence in learning in the United States and developing countries.

Barbara Garner, director of publications for NCSALL and a senior program officer at World Education, currently edits the NCSALL publication *Focus on Basics*. She has held many different positions in the field of adult basic education, including teacher, staff developer, program administrator, and curriculum writer.

Cristine Smith is NCSALL coordinator and a senior program officer at World Education. Smith coordinates NCSALL's dissemination initiative, is directing a four-year study on adult basic education staff development under NCSALL, and is the national coordinator for NCSALL's Practitioner Dissemination and Research Network. She has worked on staff development issues in the field of adult literacy for twelve years.

The Contributors

Alisa Belzer is assistant professor of adult literacy education at Rutgers University and is currently evaluating the adult basic and literacy education professional development system for the state of Pennsylvania. Previously she was the director of the Pennsylvania Adult Literacy Practitioner Inquiry Network, an inquiry-based professional development initiative. She has done research and program evaluation in areas related to assessment, classroom practice, retention, family literacy, and professional development. She has contributed to *Focus on Basics* and to *Inside/Outside: Teacher Research and Knowledge*, edited by M. Cochran-Smith and S. Lytle, and she is the author of several other publications on adult literacy.

Sophie C. Degener is a researcher for NCSALL's Literacy Practices of Adult Learners Study. She also works as a data analyst for the University of Chicago's Consortium on Chicago School Research. She is working on a doctorate at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, focusing on instructional practices in family literacy programs. During her previous work as an elementary school teacher, she developed and was a teacher for a school-based family literacy program.

Cassandra Drennon is a private educational consultant in Athens, Georgia, providing adult literacy organizations throughout the United States with research, project management, and professional development services. Formerly she was a state-level staff development specialist and led the design and implementation of Virginia's inquiry-based professional development system. She is coauthor with H. A. Fingeret of *Literacy for Life: Adult Learners, New Practices* and has published several articles, book chapters, and resource materials on the topic of practitioner inquiry.

Marilyn K. Gillespie is an educational researcher in adult literacy education at SRI International in Arlington, Virginia. She has conducted research and evaluation studies in the areas of adult literacy English for speakers of other languages, curriculum development for adult basic education, native-language literacy, and the workplace and vocational training needs of adult literacy learners and has produced numerous curriculum materials for adult educators. She was founding director of the Read Write Now Adult Literacy Center in Springfield, Massachusetts, and the former director of the National Clearing House on ESL Literacy. She is also a research team member for the NCSALL staff development study.

Marcia Drew Hohn is director of the Northeast Regional Support of the System for Adult Basic Education Support in Massachusetts. The center is located at Northern Essex Community College, where Hohn has also held positions as director of specialized adult education and training projects, such as the Municipal Management Institute and Transitional Education for Health Careers. She is the author of research reports and articles on organizational change, systems integration, and the integration of health and literacy education, including the National Institute for Literacy Fellowship report *Empowerment Health Education in Adult Literacy*.

Stefan LoBuglio has worked for the past eight years for the Suffolk County Sheriff's Department in Boston, Massachusetts, on programs that prepare incarcerated adults to make the transition to community life successfully. For six years, he directed a comprehensive correctional education program at the Suffolk County House of Correction, one of the largest correctional facilities in New England. This program served more than five hundred inmates daily and offered basic literacy instruction; life skill classes in parenting, health awareness, and career readiness; and college-level courses. LoBuglio, a NCSALL fellow, has presented papers on correctional education at many local, state, and federal conferences and was the plenary session speaker for the North American Conference on Fathers Behind Bars and on the Street. Before working in the field of criminal justice, he was an engineer.

Israel Mendoza is the director of the Office of Adult Literacy for the state of Washington. He was previously the director of policy

development, communications, and legislative activities for the state Employment Security Department, where he worked for more than twenty years. He is a founding member of the state Adult Education Advisory Council and has worked with several governor-appointed boards and councils, including the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, the Governor's Economic Development Cabinet, the Family Independence Program Executive Committee, and the Governor's Timber Team.

Linda Shohet is the founder and director of the Center for Literacy of Quebec, an independent resource, research, and training center located at Dawson College in Montreal. Since 1984 she has worked in the field of school-based and adult literacy, editing *Literacy Across the Curriculum/Media Focus*, an international newsletter, and presenting frequently at conferences. She has recently focused on the area of health and literacy, for which the Center for Literacy won the 2000 Weiler Award, a national award recognizing commitment to social justice in Canada. She has contributed book chapters on women's ways of learning and on British models of basic skills training in the workplace and sits on several national boards and advisory bodies related to literacy, technology, and workforce education. Shohet is a faculty member in the English Department at Dawson College, where she worked for many years with underprepared students in need of basic skills support.

Dave Speights is the founding editor of *Report on Literacy Programs*, the only independent newsletter devoted to adult and family literacy. He is also editor of *Report on Education of the Disadvantaged*, a newsletter devoted to education programs for low-income children. He is a career journalist who has worked in Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, and Atlanta and on the Navajo Indian Reservation. His work has appeared in *Congressional Quarterly* and on National Public Radio.

The Year 1999 in Review

Dave Speights

From the perspective of the field of adult literacy, the year 1999 is best seen not as the penultimate year of the millennium but as the year bookended by the reauthorization of the National Literacy Act in late 1998 and the National Literacy Summit of early 2000. Both of those events represent a huge milestone, and 1999 may be regarded as the time when people in the field were preoccupied by reacting to the former and preparing for the latter.

The new Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, which was technically Title II of the Workforce Investment Act, mandated controversial new student performance measures for all federally funded programs and required all states to rewrite their adult education plans. The performance measures focused on job readiness rather than more holistic concerns, a fact that continues to outrage many people in the field.

Given this context, the National Literacy Summit, planned for years as a means to develop a consensus about how best to move the field forward, also came to be regarded as an opportunity for adult educators to respond to Washington and tell the politicians and bureaucrats how to get it right. It remains to be seen if the powers that be will heed the manifesto.

There were also a number of relatively routine but nevertheless significant developments in 1999, and that is where this overview begins. Federal funding for adult literacy-related programs is covered first, then developments in policy, then research activities, and, finally, events such as the National Literacy Summit and the Summit on Twenty-First Century Skills for Twenty-First Century Jobs hosted by Vice President Al Gore.

FEDERAL FUNDING

After six years in office, the Clinton administration embraced the adult literacy cause in early 1999 with a level of public commitment not seen since Barbara Bush was first lady. In his State of the Union speech on January 19, President Clinton called for “a dramatic increase in federal support for adult literacy.” Separately, he said his budget proposal for fiscal 2000 would “significantly” expand federal efforts to help immigrants learn English and learn about democracy.

Clinton’s Budget

As promised, Clinton’s budget proposal for fiscal year 2000 called for massive funding increases for adult literacy programs. He wanted to increase adult education state grants by 28 percent and the overall adult education budget by 49.4 percent. “The income gap . . . is largely a skills gap,” Clinton said on January 28, as he announced his new literacy and job training initiatives. “We’ve closed the budget deficit, now we’ve got to close the skills deficit. We cannot have the earnings gap in America—the income gap—get bigger because we didn’t make the skills gap smaller. Now is the time to do it. We will never have a better time.”

The first item on his list of specific proposals was “a national campaign to dramatically increase our efforts at adult basic education and family literacy, to help the millions and millions of adults who struggle with basic reading or math.” The budget President Clinton submitted to Congress included the following programs:

- *Reading Excellence Act (America Reads)*. This initiative was approved by Congress in October 1998 and had an appropriation of \$260 million for fiscal year (FY) 1999. It provides states with competitive three-year grants for reading partnerships; states will then make subgrants to local partnerships that must include family literacy pro-

grams. Clinton's \$286 million request for FY2000 would allow twenty-two to twenty-four additional state grants and would more than double the number of children served to almost 1.1 million.

- *Adult education state grants.* Clinton requested \$468 million, an increase of \$103 million over the FY1999. The administration said part of the requested increase would be used for "a strengthened emphasis on program accountability," as called for in the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act of 1998. The administration also considered this proposed increase as part of a so-called Hispanic initiative, which included several K-12 programs, such as bilingual education and emergency immigrant education. The U.S. Department of Education (DOE) said the spending increase in adult education would be "aimed primarily at expanding state efforts to help immigrant and other limited-English-proficient adults, including Hispanics, to learn English and make a successful entry into the workforce and the mainstream of society."

- *National leadership activities.* These are evaluation, technical assistance, and demonstration programs run by the DOE's Division of Adult Education and Literacy. The administration wanted to increase funding more than seven-fold, from \$14 million to \$101 million, to finance several new initiatives. Common Ground Partnership grants to states and localities significantly affected by immigration were to receive \$70 million. The grants (another part of the Hispanic initiative) would support demonstration programs providing young adult immigrants and other participants with English literacy and life skills instruction and information about the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. An allocation of \$23 million was proposed for discretionary grants to help states and private sector partners increase access to technology for adult education instruction. There would be forty pilot projects. The amount of \$2 million was proposed for a High Skills Communities Campaign that would help selected states and local communities promote adult literacy and lifelong learning and measure progress in both areas. According to the DOE, these assessments would allow schools and employers "to determine if individuals have the literacy skills needed for available jobs."

- *Community-based technology centers.* President Clinton requested an increase from \$10 million in FY1999 to \$65 million in FY2000. This program, one of a dozen technology programs run by the DOE, makes grants to public housing facilities, community centers, libraries, and other community-based programs to make technology available to poor people in urban and rural areas. Grantees provide access to

programs for preschool, family literacy, after school, adult education, and English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) as well as to on-line databases with job listings. The additional \$55 million requested would increase the number of such grants from forty to three hundred.

- *Twenty-First Century Community Learning Centers.* President Clinton proposed to triple funding for this school-based program, from \$200 million to \$600 million, enough to provide school districts with about two thousand new grants. These centers are primarily intended to provide after-school, weekend, and summer academic and recreational services for K–12 students, but in many cases they also provide parents with educational, job training, and job placement services.

National Coalition Lobbying Efforts

By March, all twenty-eight sustaining (voting) members of the National Coalition for Literacy (NCL) agreed to ask Congress to provide more funds than the Clinton administration requested. They agreed to lobby for the following amounts: \$286 million for the Reading Excellence Act (America Reads); \$568 million for state grants, “a critical first step toward a five-year goal of \$1 billion”; \$116 million for “national leadership” activities sponsored by the DOE’s Division of Adult Education and Literacy; \$7 million for the National Institute for Literacy (NIFL); and \$145 million for the Even Start Family Literacy program (the same amount Clinton proposed).

Campaign for Even Start

In May, Congressman William Goodling (R-Pennsylvania), legislative father of Even Start, said he would ask his colleagues to increase the program’s annual appropriation from the FY1999 level of \$135 million to \$500 million for FY2000. Goodling made the announcement at an oversight hearing on Even Start before the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, which he chaired. The friendly witnesses included Sharon Darling, president of the National Center for Family Literacy (NCFL), and Andy Hartman, director of the National Institute for Literacy.

A \$500 million appropriation would have been larger than the entire FY1999 appropriation for adult literacy programs (\$385 million), but it would still have been dwarfed by the \$4.7 billion appropriation for

Head Start, which, like Even Start, is an intergenerational program. Even Start served about 31,000 families in 1999 (up from 2,500 in 1989), whereas Head Start served 800,000.

Although Goodling's committee had a direct role in the pending reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which authorizes Even Start, the committee had no direct control over appropriations. Few observers expected the House and Senate appropriations committees to grant Goodling's request, and they did not.

Capacity-Building Grants

Volunteer and community-based organizations within the NCL lobbied Congress to include a new \$15 million set-aside for themselves within the adult education budget. The money was to be earmarked for "institutional support," or capacity building. It would have allowed groups such as Literacy Volunteers of America, Laubach Literacy, and the National Alliance of Urban Literacy Coalitions to do such things as mount professional development efforts and gather data on the performance of their local affiliates. The money would not have provided grants for local affiliates, but it had the potential to help them claim a larger share of federal grant money in the future.

Since the passage of the National Literacy Act of 1991, volunteer and other community-based literacy groups have been guaranteed "direct and equitable access" to federal adult education funds, but by 1999 they were still receiving only a fraction of the federal pass-through funds doled out by state education officials. Those officials often said that local volunteer organizations did not receive funding because they could not demonstrate their professionalism or prove their effectiveness. But neither the local organizations nor their national umbrella organizations had the resources to upgrade tutor training significantly or conduct the kind of data gathering needed to demonstrate success. They argued that that was why they needed the \$15 million set-aside. In the end, congressional appropriators would not be swayed by such arguments. The Republicans, who controlled Congress, had made it common practice to abolish existing set-asides and earmarks, and most of them were disinclined to create a new one.

By October, the NCL had given up on its drive for funding levels higher than Clinton's requested amounts, as well as its request for \$15 million in new capacity-building funds.