Andrea Kane [redacted]

Record Type: Record

To: Julie A. Fernandes/OPD/EOP, Cecilia E. Rouse/OPD/EOP

cc:

Subject: Adult Ed/Literacy Update

Have not heard back from Lavinia Limon, but did have a helpful conversation w/ Ann Morse who runs the Immigrant Policy Project for the state and local organizations (NCSL, NGA, NACO etc). She basically confirmed we're on the right track: there is a backlog for ESL, there is no systematic way of providing combined ESL/employment/acculturation services to immigrants who are not refugees and there is a need to do so; look to the refugee program model for the best examples (OR, WI, MD, NY, IL) -- she's digging through her files and sending me more info about these; ESL combined with work is most effective -- either VESL in a classroom or work-based ESL at a job site (she's sending info about a few employers doing this); mixed refugee/non-refugee families are a big issue and the fact that funding is available for refugees but not others is a a problem -- anything we could do to expand services to others would be helpful; some refugee programs have expanded to serve a broader population but $ are always an issue. Some communities do have well-established organizations for new arrivals -- some are mutual assistance associations (self-help, with recent arrivals getting funding to help their country"men" settle), others are organizations such as catholic charities. Other models she mentioned: Lao family community in Minneapolis, OICW in San Jose area, Arlington program that started several years ago w/ Ford Foundation funding to help new arrivals adjust to living in U.s. (particularly focused on housing issues and how to live in an apt in the U.S., e.g. you can't light a fire to cook your food). I'll pass along whatever I get tomorrow.

Anne Morse — Monday

ORR
Why so important that ESL + other civics-type services for success

Work-based
practical

Transitions classes (English classes)

Adults like to learn in context
Contextual learning — workplace
— immigrants (English + Becoming an American)

Q. Delivery system
Educ + HHS have to get together on this (?)

Q. Who currently provides ESL (?)

Q. Do areas that have refugees all have immigrants (?) Q

Q average costs (?)
how many people would be served

Lavinia Q. Do "settlement houses" exist (Voluntary Agencies)

* Examples of what programs are being offered to refugees — Bob

* Data: on demand for ESL
demand for civics / citizenship
Compare programs that
* fastest way to get immig. acclimated is ESL + other services

FY 1999 Adult Education Allocations
Nov. 20, 1998

	STATE	FY 1999 Allocation	
	ALABAMA	$7,493,131	
	ALASKA	645,994	
	ARIZONA	4,732,070	
	ARKANSAS	4,504,331	
1	CALIFORNIA	41,465,645	11%
	COLORADO	3,158,528	
	CONNECTICUT	4,148,698	
	DELAWARE	1,081,141	
4	FLORIDA	19,814,446	5%
10	GEORGIA	10,539,094	3%
	HAWAII	1,432,198	
	IDAHO	1,320,547	
6	ILLINOIS	15,240,308	4%
	INDIANA	7,810,404	
	IOWA	3,191,221	
	KANSAS	2,767,903	
	KENTUCKY	7,283,425	
	LOUISIANA	7,253,261	
	MAINE	1,680,978	
	MARYLAND	6,088,641	
	MASSACHUSETTS	7,078,120	
8	MICHIGAN	11,973,584	3%
	MINNESOTA	4,346,519	
	MISSISSIPPI	4,974,554	
	MISSOURI	7,559,848	
	MONTANA	1,067,641	
	NEBRASKA	1,767,353	
	NEVADA	1,764,219	
	NEW HAMPSHIRE	1,365,765	
11	NEW JERSEY	10,498,943	3%
	NEW MEXICO	2,262,061	
2	NEW YORK	25,790,122	7%
9	NORTH CAROLINA	11,211,914	3%
	NORTH DAKOTA	1,000,568	
7	OHIO	14,574,981	4%
	OKLAHOMA	4,583,310	
	OREGON	3,296,805	
5	PENNSYLVANIA	18,966,470	5%
	RHODE ISLAND	1,825,142	
	SOUTH CAROLINA	6,159,621	
	SOUTH DAKOTA	1,074,426	
	TENNESSEE	9,104,734	
3	TEXAS	25,776,189	7%
	UTAH	1,503,125	
	VERMONT	840,529	
	VIRGINIA	8,754,392	
	WASHINGTON	4,764,515	
	WEST VIRGINIA	3,597,698	
	WISCONSIN	5,830,653	
	WYOMING	652,183	
	DISTR COLUMBIA	1,224,300	
	PUERTO RICO	8,918,376	
	VIRGIN ISLANDS	270,163	
	AMERICAN SAMOA	185,267	
	GUAM	287,758	
	NO. MARIANA IS.	316,295	
	MARSHALL IS.	99,975	
	MICRONESIA	99,975	
	PALAU	99,975	
	US total	365,000,000	

STATE-ADMINISTERED ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAM
1996 ENROLLMENT

STATE or OTHER AREA	1996 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	ABE	ESL	ASE
ALABAMA	54,191	39,232	1,839	13,120
ALASKA	7,147	3,900	1,728	1,519
ARIZONA	56,246	16,183	26,570 47%	13,493
ARKANSAS	43,315	22,103	2,451	18,761
CALIFORNIA	1,291,370	356,651	871,234 70%	63,585
COLORADO	15,458	7,652	5,034	2,772
CONNECTICUT	27,941	5,886	10,784	11,271
DELAWARE	3,956	2,355	1,142	459
DIST. OF COLUMBIA	7,128	2,365	4,369	394
FLORIDA	450,575	161,073	145,934 32%	143,568
GEORGIA	91,845	46,760	17,900	27,185
HAWAII	62,897	19,558	10,180	33,159
IDAHO	10,472	5,721	2,677	2,074
ILLINOIS	99,706	30,092	53,678 54%	15,936
INDIANA	39,886	22,367	4,427	13,072
IOWA	38,810	22,246	5,697	10,867
KANSAS	13,927	6,893	3,651	3,383
KENTUCKY	31,685	22,874	1,306	7,505
LOUISIANA	47,712	25,768	1,997	19,947
MAINE	17,097	6,129	1,196	9,772
MARYLAND	28,479	11,157	8,603	8,818
MASSACHUSETTS	13,295	4,174	6,531	2,590
MICHIGAN	141,733	43,949	18,354	79,430
MINNESOTA	37,734	15,942	11,946	9,846
MISSISSIPPI	27,416	20,588	710	6,118
MISSOURI	34,010	24,419	4,845	4,746
MONTANA	6,321	3,839	246	2,436
NEBRASKA	8,060	4,757	2,584	719
NEVADA	20,984	1,338	3,760	15,896
NEW HAMPSHIRE	5,428	1,888	1,202	2,238
NEW JERSEY	38,166	12,217	19,539 52%	6,410
NEW MEXICO	36,817	13,459	8,320	14,838
NEW YORK	201,321	87,888	71,163 35%	42,270
NORTH CAROLINA	117,827	66,121	18,361	33,345
NORTH DAKOTA	3,229	1,712	568	949
OHIO	107,701	78,352	11,928	17,421
OKLAHOMA	30,198	18,404	5,114	6,680
OREGON	37,479	10,540	13,135	13,804
PENNSYLVANIA	51,938	23,945	11,038	16,955
RHODE ISLAND	5,807	2,925	1,642	1,240
SOUTH CAROLINA	106,470	40,004	3,367	63,099
SOUTH DAKOTA	4,679	3,165	539	974
TENNESSEE	50,889	34,151	4,188	12,550
TEXAS	236,347	82,977	105,965 45%	47,405
UTAH	35,127	8,530	6,174	20,423
VERMONT	4,696	3,929	390	377
VIRGINIA	25,410	11,030	6,273	8,107
WASHINGTON	45,235	18,792	21,745 48%	4,698
WEST VIRGINIA	24,712	17,939	566	6,207
WISCONSIN	73,231	43,823	11,232	18,176
WYOMING	3,860	1,843	569	1,448
PUERTO RICO	63,345	15,556	3,496	44,293
GUAM	1,365	199	173	993
NO. MARIANA IS.	366	156	25	185
VIRGIN ISLANDS	1,325	373	0	952
UNITED STATES	4,042,172	1,555,709	1,557,985 38.5%	928,478

SOURCE: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, DIVISION OF ADULT EDUCATION AND LITERACY
JANUARY 1998

OPTIONAL FORM 99 (7-90)

FAX TRANSMITTAL # of pages ▶ 1

To ANDREA KANE	From RONALD PUGSLEY
Dept./Agency	Phone #
Fax # 456-7431	Fax # 205-8973 (202)

NSN 7540-01-317-7368 5099-101 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

205-9242 (phone)

State-Administered Adult Education Program
Fiscal Year 1995 Expenditures
(July 1, 1995 - June/September 30, 1997)

STATE or OTHER AREA	TOTAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES	TOTAL STATE/LOCAL EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	STATE MATCH*	1995/1996 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	COST PER STUDENT
ALABAMA	$5,079,031	$4,931,022	$10,010,053	49.26%		
ALASKA	$555,433	$1,760,960	$2,316,393	76.02%	54,191	$173
ARIZONA	$3,326,597	$3,556,600	$6,883,197	51.67%	7,147	$317
ARKANSAS	$3,073,140	$15,712,041	$18,785,181	83.64%	56,246	$113
CALIFORNIA	$24,979,228	$301,512,259	$326,491,487	92.35%	43,315	$420
COLORADO	$2,382,774	$1,210,539	$3,593,313	33.69%	1,291,370	$252
CONNECTICUT	$2,922,708	$22,129,641	$25,052,349	88.33%	15,458	$225
DELAWARE	$800,923	$289,929	$1,090,852	26.58%	27,941	$868
DIST. of COLUMBIA	$881,081	$5,465,913	$6,346,994	86.12%	3,956	$252
FLORIDA	$13,137,337	$72,531,192	$85,668,529	84.66%	7,128	$849
GEORGIA	$7,175,669	$2,605,006	$9,780,675	26.63%	450,575	$189
HAWAII	$1,057,406	$2,118,939	$3,176,345	66.71%	91,845	$97
IDAHO	$1,030,375	$401,144	$1,431;519	28.02%	64,285	$48
ILLINOIS	$10,498,723	$7,320,000	$17,818,723	41.08%	10,472	$130
INDIANA	$5,359,254	$25,029,679	$30,388,933	82.36%	99,706	$173
IOWA	$2,358,854	$5,161,830	$7,520,684	68.64%	39,886	$748
KANSAS	$2,049,866	$800,000	$2,849,866	28.07%	38,810	$192
KENTUCKY	$4,857,098	$2,542,499	$7,399,597	34.36%	13,927	$197
LOUISIANA	$4,939,431	$7,748,360	$12,687,791	61.07%	31,685	$217
MAINE	$1,232,841	$5,851,467	$7,084,308	82.60%	47,712	$257
MARYLAND	$4,188,409	$6,191,018	$10,379,427	59.65%	17,097	$210
MASSACHUSETTS	$4,933,272	$10,501,480	$15,434,752	68.04%	28,478	$360
MICHIGAN	$8,444,659	$181,300,000	$189,744,659	95.55%	13,295	$1,114
MINNESOTA	$3,260,087	$19,925,199	$23,185,286	85.94%	141,733	$1,336
MISSISSIPPI	$3,416,436	$1,477,027	$4,893,463	30.18%	37,734	$608
MISSOURI	$5,183,354	$3,197,663	$8,381,017	38.15%	27,416	$172
MONTANA	$850,980	$781;387	$1,632,367	47.87%	34,010	$239
NEBRASKA	$1,363,327	$521,546	$1,884,873	27.67%	6,321	$250
NEVADA	$1,267,982	$669,814	$1,937,796	34.57%	8,060	$223
NEW HAMPSHIRE	$1,047,031	$1,221,270	$2,268,301	53.84%	20,994	$86
NEW JERSEY	$7,091,481	$23,265,454	$30,356,935	76.64%	5,428	$411
NEW MEXICO	$1,645,324	$2,932,405	$4,577,729	64.06%	38,166	$779
NEW YORK	$17,362,385	$79,448,582	$96,810,967	82.07%	36,617	$123
NORTH CAROLINA	$7,533,405	$26,785,481	$34,318,886	78.05%	201,321	$477
NORTH DAKOTA	$783,641	$484,675	$1,268,316	38.21%	117,827	$289
OHIO	$10,219,215	$8,733,485	$18,952,700	46.08%	3,229	$369
OKLAHOMA	$3,218,742	$1,082,277	$4,301,019	25.16%	107,701	$171
OREGON	$2,384,072	$25,314,468	$27,698,540	91.39%	30,198	$137
PENNSYLVANIA	$11,510,802	$11,985,753	$23,496,555	51.01%	37,479	$736
RHODE ISLAND	na	na	na	na	51,938	$436
SOUTH CAROLINA	$4,206,641	$10,483,674	$14,690,315	71.36%	5,807	na
SOUTH DAKOTA	$833,858	$400,790	$1,234,648	32.46%	106,470	$136
TENNESSEE	$6,078,500	$2,828,219	$8,904,719	31.76%	4,678	$250
TEXAS	$17,717,045	$8,903,888	$26,620,933	33.45%	50,889	$169
UTAH	$1,271,922	$5,947,704	$7,219,626	82.38%	236,347	$107
VERMONT	$670,526	$3,113,129	$3,783,655	82.28%	35,127	$202
VIRGINIA	$6,010,379	$5,285,519	$11,295,898	46.79%	4,696	$770
WASHINGTON	$3,528,230	$9,674,180	$13,202,410	73.28%	25,410	$439
WEST VIRGINIA	$2,469,863	$2,076,504	$4,546,467	45.67%	45,235	$286
WISCONSIN	$4,194,417	$7,827,540	$12,021,957	65.11%	24,712	$175
WYOMING	$557,491	$409,180	$966,671	42.33%	73,231	$161
PUERTO RICO	$5,780,791	$1,956,356	$7,737,147	25.29%	3,860	$238
GUAM	$213,331	$0	$213,331	0.00%	63,345	$112
NO. MARIANA COL	$154,035	$0	$154,035	0.00%	1,365	$124
VIRGIN ISLANDS	na	na	na	na	366	$284
					1.325	na
UNITED STATES	$241,827,923	$928,375,008	$1,170,202,931	79.33%	4,043,560	$284

*State Match is the State's Percentage Share of Total Expenditures
Source: U.S. Department of Education
Division of Adult Education and Literacy
July 1998

Family Investment Centers

Expanding Employment Opportunity through Education, Telecommunications, and Computer Technology.

This HUD initiative is designed to help "transform" low-income communities into safe and livable neighborhoods where families could undertake training in new telecommunications and computer technology and partake in educational opportunities and job training initiatives with local businesses. The goals is to :

- Establish centers of education, where families participate together

- Inject an education ethic into inner-city communities

- Equip residents with the education and computer skills necessary to complete education requirements for GED, High School Diploma, and employment.

- Provide a place for children to participate in early childhood development programs and/or after school activities while their parent work or receive training.

What it Costs. Federal Funding needed is estimated at $70 million. Reliance on community partnerships such as, social service organizations, local employment initiatives, community groups, public schools, local businesses, or institutions of higher education to deliver supportive services, learning opportunities, job training, and other services that are brought on-site to the community. Often bringing education and supportive services on-site to places most familiar and comfortable to the families is KEY and eliminates transportation and child care barriers. There is a great need for outside expertise and assistance in finding the best software and the best curriculum developers. Although many communities receive donated equipment, there is a need for funding for state of the art computer equipment and training in equipment maintenance as well as persons to run centers and provide instruction to those who use the computers.

16 November, 1998

MEMORANDUM

PROFILE OF COMPENSATION RATES FOR PART-TIME TEACHERS IN ADULT EDUCATION

DEFINITION: The definition of a part-time teacher varies from state to state. Examples are:

- Part-time teachers work less than 20 hours per week and receive no benefits (Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Missouri, New York)
- Part-time teachers work less than 30 hours per week and receive no benefits (Delaware, North Carolina, Minnesota)
- Follow local union contract (Wisconsin—from a few hours to 20+ hours with pro-rated benefits; Washington State—each community & technical college has local contract and local policy about how many "full-time" faculty are allowed)
- Defined locally (Nebraska—at some community colleges a teacher is part-time if he/she teaches less than 35 hours, in other institutions, it is less than 40 hours)

COMPENSATION: Average hourly compensation for part-time teachers range from a low of $8.50 (Wyoming) to $35.00 (Indiana). The average is around $15.00 to $18.00, with no benefits. Wages also vary depending on whether the teaching situation is rural/urban, union/non-union. Hourly salaries in many states are the same for full- and part-time, though most part-time teachers do not receive benefits which range from 20 to 40 percent.

WHAT STATES WOULD DO WITH AN INFUSION OF FUNDS:

NEW YORK—
- Eliminate waiting lists for ESOL instruction
- Expand technology throughout system
- Incentive grants for connecting to one-stop
- Expand # of full-time teachers and inservice training
- Expand family literacy programs in schools with performance gaps
- Expand workplace literacy programming

Rhode Island, West Virginia, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota—
- Selective investment in more full-time staff
- Emphasize benefits for all instructors
- Convert part-time to full-time in ½ of programs (ND)
- Increase hours of instruction in small communities; invest in classroom technology and support services for students (NE)

Delaware, Missouri, Minnesota—
- Invest in program expansion
- Enhance program services through technology, transportation, child care
- Hire counselors

Alabama, Arkansas—
- More full-time supervisors and full-time teachers in one stop centers
- Work more with family service centers
- Provide more technology and technology training
- Invest more in family literacy

Tennessee—
- Expand instructional opportunities
- Achieve greater flexibility through creation of 10-20 hour blocks of instruction

Georgia—

- Expand family literacy programs
- Expand funding for Certified Literacy Community programs
- Expand additional full-time teachers in counties with greatest need
- Establish community technology centers for disadvantaged adults

Texas—

- Create a cadre of full-time staff in each program to provide stability, increase professionalism, and improve program quality and accountability
- Expand hours of instruction (intensity) and duration of programs
- Expand services to more students
- Pay for additional costs associated with standardized assessment, management information system, and staff development to implement MIS and performance measures
- Pay for follow-up surveys on who gets employed, additional training, and wage benefits
- Launch special initiatives for Hispanics: develop computerized ESL assessment and other instruments for assessing Hispanic students; expand services to serve more Hispanic adults and offer more hours of instruction; develop technological applications; and address needs of border states with Mexico (NAFTA impact, and needs of employment and workplace training)

Wisconsin—

- Encourage local programs to hire full-time counselors
- Expand number of "traveling classrooms" as well purchase of internet capability, software, and other upgrades for existing equipment
- Support a broad RFP to provide all county jails with on-site programs of sufficient intensity and duration; incorporate family education into each program
- Establish more family literacy programs and full-time faculty dedicated to this programming
- Contract for services of data analysts to interpret the mountain of State and local data in depth; do a much better job of relating data to program quality and program accountability; add local support staff to support the implementation and on-going management of awarding Certificates of Accomplishment
- Hire a variety of bilingual staff to meet the needs of multi-national populations in each ESL program

Oregon—

- Build capacity for adequate intensity and planning in all programs
- Develop full-time capacity for workforce literacy/workforce incumbent training; overcome huge need for qualified teachers for the workplace (this is a different kind of teacher with different skill sets)

Close hold – not for distribution **DRAFT** **November 18, 1998**

Tax Credit for Employer-Provided Workplace Literacy and Basic Education Programs

Current Law

Workplace literacy and basic education expenses are deductible to employers, either as ordinary and necessary business expenses to the extent they are job related, as working condition fringe benefits, or as employee compensation. If they are deemed to be compensation, the expenses are includable in the worker's gross income unless provided under a section 127 educational assistance plan. Educational expenses under a section 127 plan are excluded from an employee's gross income for income and employment tax purposes, up to $5250 per year.

No credits are allowed to employers for workplace literacy or other types of employee education expenses. Life-long learning tax credits may be available to employees for high school equivalency courses taken at postsecondary institutions such as community colleges.

Proposal

Employers who provide certain workplace literacy and basic education programs for their employees would be allowed an income tax credit against a portion of the expenses.

Specifically:

(1) Eligible education: Adult basic or secondary education (including courses leading to a GED), basic ESL, but excluding instruction in technology or other fields beyond a high school equivalency level.

(2) Eligible employees: Employees working in the US who --
- (a) Have worked for the employer for at least 6 months,
- (b) Are resident aliens or citizens over 16 years ~~of age~~, and
- (c) Have not received a high school degree, GED, or its equivalent. If they received the equivalent of a high school degree in a non-English speaking country, they may be eligible for basic ESL instruction.

anyone who is eligible to work (non-temp.)

(3) Eligible expenses: Expenditures by the employer --
- (a) To provide eligible education to eligible employees,
- (b) Including payments made to third parties and payments made directly to cover instructional costs, including curriculum development, salaries of instructors, textbooks, etc. [Alternative: limit to third party payments];
- (c) Made under a section 127 educational assistance plan (to assure nondiscrimination and to prevent undue benefits to owners or their relatives), and
- (d) [Option: made in partnership with a local adult education authority.]
- (e) Eligible expenses do not include wages paid to workers while they participate in the educational programs, rent, or other components of "overhead."

Providers under Adult Educ. Act Basic

Link to community colleges or public schools (H.S.) as an alternative screen. (but, then not worksite-based)

qualified educational providers (3d party)

(4) Rate of credit: 10 percent of eligible expenses. [Alternative: 20%]

(5) Maximum credit: $525 per participating employee per year. [Alternatives include $250 or $1050.]

(6) Tax treatment of the credit: The amount of the credit will reduce, dollar for dollar, the amount of education expenses that the employer may deduct against taxable income.

Issues With Tax Credits

1/3 of employees in taxable sector would not be covered

- Approximately two-thirds of employers do not pay taxes and therefore could not benefit from a tax credit: 56% of C corporations with wages pay no taxes. About 15% of the labor force works for governments; others work for nonprofits. Employers most likely to employ low education workers (hotels, restaurants, retail) are least likely to be taxable. ?
  low profit industries; don't pay any taxes.

- Employers using tax credits would not necessarily have much, if any, involvement with the rest of the Education Department's workplace education initiative, nor perhaps even with adult education professionals.

- If tax credits are limited to payments for third party expenses, they could distort employers' choices of how to offer employer literacy programs. But if expenses incurred in directly providing educational services qualify for the credit, preventing abuse would be more difficult.

- Tax credits provide less flexibility, discretion, and accountability than would direct grants.

- The cost of subsidizing employers is less controllable with tax credits, which are essentially entitlements.

- The administrative burden on employers would be at least as great with tax credits as with direct grants.

- Credits include no role for an education professional to exercise judgement and discretion, and the IRS would need covered services to be defined clearly enough to prevent employers from attempting to recharacterize ineligible types of educational expenses.

- A tax credit for employer-provided workplace education increases the complexity of the tax code and tax forms, even for those who don't qualify, adding more fuel to the calls for replacement of the income tax.

Questions

(1) What precise definition of eligible education can be used that will be clear to employers, administrable by the IRS, and limit the qualifying education to basic types of education?

(2) Can workers with a high school degree but lacking a basic education be defined and identified in a way that would allow them to be considered eligible employees?

(3) Should qualifying expenses be limited to third party costs?

(4) Should employers be required to form partnerships with adult education authorities? If so, how can that be administered?

November 17, 1998

The Partnership for a Literate America: Filling the Gaps in Adult Education and Literacy

Outstanding Issues:

(1) Should we use tax credits or grants to subsidize the provision of workplace education?

(2) The packaging/theme for this initiative. Options:

- Link adult basic education to a broader message on lifelong learning and education (so, for example, it could be one component of the "skills gap" theme (i.e., we want to help all adults obtain the skills they need and that are in such demand (thereby recognizing that not all adults can take advantage of Pell Grants and the Lifelong Learning Tax credit));
- These policies are the ticket to the middle class for those needing basic skills improvement.
- Don't be embarrassed if you can't read to your child, get help!
- Other ideas?

policy objections to the components(?)

Potential Components of the Initiative:

1. *Expanding the capacity and quality of the adult education system*: An increase in funding for the adult basic education system by $85 million (to $450 million) for FY2000 and to $1 billion by FY 2005. A key component will be to substantially increase quality.

2. *Jump-Start for Literacy: Quality Teaching for Adult Learners*: Improving the quality of adult basic skills instruction by supporting professional development for adult education teachers over a five-year period (cost: $50 million annually).

3. *ESL Civics Initiative: Common Ground Partnerships*: Allow States or localities significantly impacted by immigration to volunteer to establish systemwide ESL/civics program to help immigrants adapt to their new lives in America (cost: $40 million annually if only fund states; $60 million if also fund cities).

4. *Filling the Gap: A 21st Century Workforce Education Initiative*: Encourage employers to provide workplace education in two ways:

   - Either through a tax credit to employers or with federal grants to employers.
   - Establish State Workplace Extension Service coordinators who would work actively with employers on how to use the workplace more effectively as a

learning environment (cost: $12.5 million annually).

5. *High Skill Communities Campaign*: Create a framework in which States and local communities could mobilize and implement, according to their needs, strategies to promote lifelong learning and literacy and accelerate progress in meeting state and national goals related to adult education and lifelong learning (cost: $0 if bully pulpit or $15 million if fund state coordinators and substate grants for outreach and partnership building).

DoEd — what would this mean?

6. *America Learns Technology*: The array of programs developed by Tom Kalil to develop and demonstrate practices and products that may be successfully used in adult education programs across the country. These include:

I. **Content/sofware development**: The government could cost-share the development of instructional material with publishers and software companies to encourage the private sector to develop higher-quality material for adult basic education, ESL, GED equivalence, etc. Some of the content could be customized to particular skill standards, such as those developed by the National Retail Federation. The idea would be to make content available in multiple formats [Web, CD, game player, interactive television.] It might also be possible to get matching funds from community colleges or employers.

Cost: $1-3 million. 10 grants for ~ $20 million.

II. **Pilots and evaluation**: The government could provide matching grants to communities that deploy and evaluate the use of these new technologies for adult literacy (rate of completion, results on relevant tests, other learning outcomes).

Cost: $250K per pilot - 80 grants for $20million.

III. **Community access points**: We need to expand the number of places in the community that have access to computers, software and the Internet. We have an existing program to provide support for community computing centers that is funded at $10 million. Note that the e-rate is already connecting libraries, which play an important role in some adult literacy programs.

Cost: $250K per center per year. Existing program could fund 40 centers. Adding $10 million to the program could double the number of centers funded. Communities could also be encouraged to keep their schools open longer, which will have computers and Internet access.

IV. **Recruiting 50,000 volunteer tele-mentors**: The government could provide a grant to an organization to help recruit and train people that could serve as "tele-mentors" for adults participating in online literacy programs. For example, organizations such as

"Impact Online" are using the World Wide Web to recruit volunteers for a variety of non-profit organizations. Companies such as Hewlett-Packard are encouraging their employees to serve as tele-mentors.

Cost: $2 million per year.

V. **Research and development**: Preliminary results have shown that advanced technologies such as speech recognition and intelligent tutoring systems can significantly improve student outcomes. R&D is needed to advance the state-of-the-art and train the next generation of software developers.

Cost: $1 million per research team - 10 grants for $10 million year.

VI. **Bully pulpit**: We could challenge the private sector to help out by, for example:

- Making the content available at video rental stores, or making it available on cable and WebTV;

- Exploring new business models that make this market more attractive for software developers (e.g. getting a local chamber of commerce to purchase a "site license" for an entire metropolitan area);

- Making the use of technology for adult basic education part of the "Welfare to Work" effort.

VII. **Ensure that the other elements of the literacy initiative are designed with technology in mind**: For example, it should be an eligible expenditure for the workplace tax credit for employers to provide their employees with home PCs and courseware.

United States Department of Education
Office of Vocational and Adult Education
Office of the Assistant Secretary

☆ 21st Century Workforce Education Initiative

Building on the pioneering work of Bill Clinton as Governor of Arkansas, and substantial research and demonstration on the part of the federal government, it is proposed that five year grants be provided to states to build capacity in the area of Workforce education and to implement statewide systems.

How It Works. To ensure effective development, implementation, and continuation, the Workplace Education Initiative would support three types of investments:

- For State Adult Education Programs with limited workplace education experience, grants for system planning and initial implementation are most appropriate.
- For States that are already implementing a system, improvement and expansion grants would enhance existing efforts.
- In order to assist State and local programs directly in developing or expanding their workforce education systems, regional or state technical assistance centers would be funded to provide workplace educator training, technical assistance, and program support.

Allowable expenditures:

- State Administration
- Substate allocation to develop and supervise local programs
- Provision of local\regional workplace literacy extension brokers
- Instructional costs (including salaries and curriculum purchase)
- Professional development
- Program evaluation

Cost. If 40 States successfully applied and were awarded five-year grants at an average of $3.25 million per state for five years (or $650,000 per year), the cost would be $130 million. An additional $30 million would fund six regional technical assistance centers at $1 million each per year for five years.

Rationale. An ED contract with the Conference Boards of Canada and the USA is currently providing funding for them to document the benefits of workplace education programs. In February 1999, when research is completed, the project will begin an outreach campaign to enlist the support of employers and unions nationwide in developing workplace education programs. Ultimately, the success of a Workplace Education Initiative will depend on the ability of State adult education systems to meet the demands that the Conference Board project will generate among employers and unions.

In 1988, ED began the National Workplace Literacy Demonstration Program. 300 demonstration projects were supported with $130 million in federal funding. All States should be encouraged to utilize the best practices, curriculum resources, and trained staff that are the products of this investment. A decade of experience in funding these demonstration projects shows that workplace programs are more likely to become institutionalized when they are part of a larger system, such as a statewide program. The National Alliance of Business has noted that "without ongoing technical assistance" as workplace education programs are being implemented, real progress in improving workers' literacy and basic skills is most often not achieved.

Analyses of data from the International Adult Literacy Survey (IALS) finds that many workers have low reading skills, but few believe it is a problem on the job. Employees should care about literacy skills because they can mean higher income, lower unemployment, access to better jobs and increased job training. Instructional programs that provide education in the context of work increase critical skills such as listening for learning and work application, developing a positive attitude to change, learning for life, effective use of work documents, teamwork, and thinking critically. Benefits to employers include higher worker morale, increased quality of work, improved productivity, and better success in job training.

Studies on workforce education policy suggest that Federal support is needed to encourage systems thinking about workforce skill development. States need to:

- Develop integrated systems approaches to workforce education and training,
- Support flexibility in programming so that regions and states can respond to emerging workforce needs,
- Assure that practitioners have access to high quality professional development opportunities, and
- Give programs and workers access to technology for learning and developing workplace skills

Finally, research shows that the most common barriers to learner participation in basic skills programs are lack of time and the cost, in both money and time, of participation. Educational opportunities at or near the workplace can help overcome these barriers.

Bill Clinton began and funded the state workplace education initiative during his last term as Governor of Arkansas. State funding for adult education tripled during that period resulting in Arkansas becoming a pioneer and national leader among states in workplace education innovation. Currently Arkansas' proportion of workplace learners is among the highest in the nation. This initiative would provide capital for other states to build similar systems.

Fact Sheet 16

ADULT LEARNING & LITERACY
Clearinghouse

March 1998

Workplace Literacy

What is Workplace Literacy?

Workplace literacy programs focus on the literacy and basic skills training workers need to gain new employment, retain present jobs, advance in their careers, or increase productivity. Curricula are developed by educators, working with employers and employee groups, who assemble written materials used on the job and who analyze specific jobs to determine what reading, computation, speaking and reasoning skills are required to perform job tasks effectively. By their nature, successful efforts to institute workplace literacy programs require strong partnerships among educators, employers and employees.

Who Participates?

Workers may be identified for participation in the programs by the employer, or they may identify themselves as interested in basic skills training. Workers may participate in programs to upgrade basic skills in order to deal with new technology or to transfer to new positions as old jobs are phased out. Other workers may receive English as a second language training to increase productivity or make them eligible for promotion. Workers also may learn speaking, listening, and problem-solving skills to maximize efficiency and participation in team work. Workplace literacy programs may be used to train new hires or may be used to train pools of applicants who will be screened for hiring by employers.

Why are Workplace Literacy Programs Needed?

A structural shift in the American economy from goods-producing to service-producing industries by the year 2000 will put most new jobs in management, sales and service. The number of minorities and women will increase as a percentage of the workforce, and these groups will need training to qualify for jobs requiring further education. In addition to upgrading their basic skills, workers will also need skills for team work, goal setting, problem solving, as well as participative management. Life cycles for products and processes have been shortened and future jobs may be restructured about every seven years. Continuous learning and reskilling will therefore be a top priority in order to develop qualified people for available jobs.

How are Workplace Literacy Programs Established?

Most workplace literacy programs throughout the United States have been established without Federal assistance. Large businesses and industries frequently establish their own programs. Small organizations may pool resources to establish centers where training designed for a particular type of industry can be offered. Obtaining the cooperation of employee groups and designing a program to meet the mutual goals of employers and employees is essential. Programs are best presented as joint skill-development efforts, career enhancement programs, or other programs acceptable to adult learners in a working environment. Usually employers offer release time which employees match with an equal share of personal time devoted to training. Employers and employee groups work together to establish on-site or nearby training locations.

What is the National Workplace Literacy Program?

Section 371 of the Adult Education Act as amended by the National Literacy Act of 1991 authorizes the Secretary to make demonstration grants for job-related programs of literacy and basic skills that result in new employment, continued employment, career advancement or increased productivity for workers.

What Kinds of Projects Have Been Funded?

This highly competitive program awarded \$118.9 million for 299 demonstration projects in 41 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam since its establishment in 1988. Funding levels increased from $9.5 million, awarded to 37 projects in 26 states, in FY 1988 to $18.5 million awarded to 45 projects in 27 States in FY 1994. The FY 1994 cycle ends in the fall of 1997. Neither the 1996 or 1997 budgets include funding for this program.

Partnerships vary with each project. Awards have been made to partnerships including state education agencies, local education agencies, universities, community colleges, community-based organizations, businesses, for-profit and non-profit industries, labor unions, and private industry councils.

Who Conducts These Programs?

Grants are made to a partnership including at least one partner from group (a) and group (b) below:

(a) a business, industry, labor organization or private industry council; and

(b) a State or local education agency, an institution of higher education or school (including an area vocational school, an employment and training agency, or community-based organization).

Each project must be designed to improve the productivity of the workforce through one or more of these options:

- providing adult literacy and other basic skills services or activities;
- providing adult secondary education services and activities that may lead to the completion of a high school diploma or its equivalent;
- meeting the literacy needs of adults with limited English proficiency;
- upgrading or updating basic skills of adult workers in accordance with changes in workplace; requirements, technology, products or processes,
- improving the competency of adult workers in speaking, listening, reasoning and problem solving; or,
- providing for adult workers educational counseling, transportation, and child care services during non-working hours while the workers participate in the project.

What Resources are Available?

The Clearinghouse offers at no cost the following documents relating to workplace literacy:

BI-80 *Annotated Bibliography of Workplace Literacy Materials.*

BI-78 *Does Your Company Need a Workplace Literacy Program?*

BI-77 *National Workplace Literacy Program: 1994 Award Abstracts.*

BI-79 *Availability of Products from the National Workplace Literacy Program, 1992-1993.*

These documents may be ordered by sending a written requset to the address below.

For Additional Information, Contact:

Allison Hill, William Saunders, or James Parker

Division of Adult Education and Literacy
600 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20202-7240
Fax: (202) 205-8973
Phone: (202) 205-5499 - James Parker
(202) 205-5921 - Allison Hill
(202) 205-5698 - William Saunders

James_Parker@ed.gov
Allison_Hill@ed.gov
William_Saunders@ed.gov

FactsLine
24 hour automated document request service
(202) 401-9570

11/13 Julie-Mc Andrea

United States Department of Education

Office of Vocational and Adult Education
Office of the Assistant Secretary

☆ Expanding the Capacity and Quality of The Adult Education System

It is proposed that a significant increase in funding take place for the Adult Education Basic State Grant program to improve program quality and capacity to serve.

How it Works. Additional funding for the Adult Education Basic State Grants program will help States build adult education systems that: 1) serve substantially more adult learners 2.) offer improved services 3.) effectively measure and report educational outcomes.

The Adult Education Act is currently the major source of Federal support for basic skills improvement. Basic grants to States are allocated by a formula based upon the number of adults, over age 16, out of school and who have not completed high school. States distribute funds to local providers through a competitive process based upon State-established funding criteria. Local programs of instruction emphasize the acquisition of basic skills including: reading, writing, computation, communication and problem solving. Courses of instruction include Adult Basic Education (ABE), Adult Secondary Education (ASE), and English as a Second Language (ESL).

Under the new Workforce Investment Act, signed by President Clinton on August 7, 1998, states will be challenged to dramatically improve the quality of adult education programs and be accountable for results. For the first time ever, local programs will be required to use practices that research has shown to improve educational outcomes for adults, such as: effectively using technology, employing well-trained instructors, providing learning in real- life contexts such as the workplace, and offering expanded support services.

What it Costs. Funds are being requested to increase the Adult Education Basic State Grant program from $365 in FY 1999 to $ 445 million in FY 2000 -- with funding in subsequent fiscal years rising to at least $1 billion by FY 2005. Over the last several years, Congress has consistently appropriated more for the basic State grant program than the Administration has requested.

States are currently required by law to provide a 25% match for adult education funds, but recent assessments show the federal investment leverages more than three times the required match in State and local funds for adult education and literacy programs. The average per learner expenditure is less than $300 annually. Moreover, using constant 1995 dollars, spending per participant dropped from $274 in 1966 to in 1998, despite an increased federal investment.

Rationale. Expanding our investment in the Adult Education Basic State Grant program is critical not only because of the requirements of the new Workforce Investment Act, but because the demand for services is escalating.

The provisions in the Workforce Investment Act may assist programs to be more effective but only if additional funds are available. The impact of a substantial increase would vary from State to State as they allocate resources according to their unique priorities such as increasing investments in ESL-Civics Instruction or expanding the workplace education infrastructure. Because the Act gives priority to program improvement it is expected that States would initially use the increases to provide more intensive services, hire more professional teachers, and effectively employ new technologies.

Additionally, the requirements of the Workforce Investment Act make it necessary for States to develop reporting systems and create certificates for what adult learners should know and be able to do when they exit programs. The Department is working with State to develop a national results based reporting system using a common set of outcome measures and a uniform data collection system. The requested funds for FY 2000 - 2001 would provide States with resources to put in place these new systems that are critical to improving program quality and getting results.

Increases to FY 2005 would substantially increase the capacity of the system. More than 4 million adults in 4,000 adult learning centers participate in adult education annually. Between 1990 and 1994, the Adult Education State Grant program enabled 1.5 million adults to complete high school or earn a GED. Yet, the 1994 National Evaluation of Adult Education Programs found that current programs serve only a small percentage of adults in need of services and that many participants leave before they achieve any literacy gains (primarily for personal reasons such as child care and transportation that are unrelated to instructional program quality).

The 1992 National Adult Literacy Survey found that more than 1 in 5 -- or more than 40 million Americans -- demonstrated literacy and numeracy skills at or below the 5th grade level (Level 1). These adults usually cannot locate an intersection on a street map, identify and enter background information on a social security card application, or calculate the total costs of purchase from an order form. Over 25 to 28 percent, or about 50 million additional adults, demonstrated skills between the 6th and 8th grade levels (Level 2). These individuals cannot meet the skill requirements for entry-level work in a modern manufacturing plant.

76 percent of adults 65 and older, and around 40 percent of adults aged 19 to 39, scored in the lowest two literacy levels, i.e. proficient at or below the 8th grade level. 13 percent of young American adults (aged 25 to 29) have not completed high school or earned an equivalency certificate -- including 39 percent of young Hispanics.

Over the last decade, adult education enrollment has increased by nearly one third. Adult basic education enrollments have increased by 46 percent. The adult education system is currently experiencing an influx of out-of-school youth whose goal is secondary education completion.

English language instruction for limited English proficient adults is the fastest growing component of the adult education program, with enrollments increasing 70 percent in the last ten years. Currently, enrollments in English literacy programs represent represent 40 percent of all adult education enrollments and six states (California, Florida, Texas, New York, Illinois and Arizona) enroll almost all of these learners. New immigrants wishing to enroll in English literacy remain on long waiting lists -- large cities such as Los Angeles and New York City use a lottery system to determine who on the waiting list "wins" the opportunity to attend class.

United States Department of Education
Office of Vocational and Adult Education
Office of the Assistant Secretary

☆ Jump-Start for Literacy: Quality Teaching for Adult Learners

Jump-Start for Literacy would improve the quality of adult basic skills instruction by supporting professional development for adult education teachers over a five-year period. The initiative would make funds available to States that volunteer to participate by dedicating State and local funds for adult education inservice teacher training.

How It Works: States receiving assistance would agree to provide State and local funds to match a federal grant at the 25% level to upgrade the adult education teacher force by providing specialized preservice and inservice training for teachers in:

- teaching subject matter to adults in contexts such as work or citizenship
- teaching to high standards;
- effectively teaching learning disabled adults;
- effectively assessing learning gains; and
- effectively using technology as an educational tool for adults

What it Costs. This initiative would allow States an opportunity to implement innovative and integrated professional development and training systems. If all States participated, the cost of the initiative would be $50 million annually for five years or $250 million dollars. Teachers would be paid for the time spent in training.

Rationale. Most adult education teachers work part-time. Many are elementary and secondary education teachers who do not have formal training in teaching adult learners. A majority of adult education teachers are employed by public school districts. Other organizations that employ adult education teachers include community colleges, universities, large corporations, speciality schools, job training centers and religious or community-based organizations.

A majority of States do not have a system for certifying adult education teachers. Many ABE and ESL teachers -- as well as volunteer instructors -- receive little training in subject matter content or in the process of teaching. Improving the quality of instructors is a critical component of reforms envisioned under the Workforce Investment Act and this five-year investment will help jump-start teacher preparation, recruitment, and professional development capacity.

United States Department of Education
Office of Vocational and Adult Education
Office of the Assistant Secretary

☆ Filling the Gap: A 21st Century Workforce Education Initiative

The **21st Century Workforce Education Initiative** would provide for State Workplace Extension Service coordinators who would work actively with employers on how to use the workplace most effectively as the newest learning environment.

How It Works. Regional coordinators within States would provide technical assistance to help employers develop and implement workplace education programs, locate instructors with special expertise in providing workplace education, and broker services customized to meet individual business needs, especially for small and medium sized businesses. States would receive additional funding in their adult education Basic State grant program allotments to support networks of regional, within State, Workplace Extension Service coordinators that would promote and link workforce education efforts with the local workforce boards.

What it Costs. If each State funded an average of five Workplace Extension Service coordinators, approximately $12.5 million would be needed.

Rationale. The Conference Board, under contract with ED/OVAE is documenting the benefits of workplace education programs. When research is completed in February 1999 the project will begin an outreach campaign to enlist the support of employers and unions nationwide in developing workplace education programs. The success of the Workplace Education Initiative will depend, in part, on the ability of State adult education systems to meet the demand that the Conference Board project will generate among employers and unions.

Preliminary results from our new Conference Board survey indicate that employers expected and received the following skill improvements for workers in workplace education programs: improved ability to listen, improved ability to understand and apply information; greater willingness to learn; positive attitudes about change; better team work; improved ability to use documents, numbers and manuals; improved capacity to solve problems and make decisions; and improved ability to use English to communicate in the workplace.

A survey of Fortune 1000 executives showed that 90 percent felt that illiteracy is hurting productivity and profitability in their businesses. Other documented negative economic impacts of illiteracy on corporate performance include: reduced adaptability of firms to implement new technology and production techniques; reduced product quality; decreased productivity; reduced health and safety performance; increased difficulty in assigning staff to new responsibilities; and higher training costs.

Documented Workplace education benefits include: increases in corporate earnings of 11-17%; empirical estimates of a return on workplace literacy training of up to 25%; and reduced employee turnover. A Magnavox evaluation of its literacy skills training program demonstrated a total economic benefit of $321,600 -- an average of $10,720 per employee. Training costs were $38,233 (or an average of $1,275 per employee) with a net total benefit to Magnavox of $283,367. Another study of a workplace education program documented a 1.45 percent annual productivity improvement as a result of delivering workplace education, or an increase of $2,000 more productivity per worker.

Yet, a study conducted by the National Alliance of Business found that without ongoing technical assistance as a workplace education strategy is being implemented, real progress in improving workers' basic skills is most often not achieved. Workplace Extension Service coordinators would fill in this gap.

United States Department of Education
Office of Vocational and Adult Education
Office of the Assistant Secretary

☆ America Learns Technology Challenge Grants

The purpose of the grants would be to serve as the catalyst for the creation of public-private partnerships that develop new and innovative applications of technology, expand access, and make significant contributions to improving adult learning.

How it Works. America Learns grants would provide seed capital in three areas to develop and demonstrate proven practices and products that may be successfully used in adult education programs across the country.

I. Content/Software Development

The government would cost-share with the private sector in the development of higher-quality materials for adult education. Funded activities might include states' and other partners working with private sector software designers to promote the development or adaptation of interactive content and products to better meet the needs of adult learners -- using such devices as multi-media CD-ROM, interactive television, or game players.

Cost: $20 million for around 10 grants of $1 - 2 million each

II. America Learns Demonstrations

The government would provide matching grants to communities that effectively deploy and evaluate the use of new technologies to improve adult education delivery and service. Grants could be used to support multi-state consortia who are developing and providing virtual adult education instruction on a multi-State or national basis and using proven models that help adults learn anytime\anywhere. Technology projects could focus on particular fields of technology (such as video or Internet access), instructional areas (such as English literacy or learning disabilities) geographic areas (such as urban or rural locations) and could be carried out by consortia of contiguous or noncontiguous States.

Cost: $20 million for 80 grants of around $250,000 per pilot

III. Community Access Centers

The Department will fund in FY 99 a program to serve as the catalyst for the expansion and development of model community technology centers (CTCs) in low-income urban and rural communities. These centers would provide access to information technology, and other services, for disadvantaged adults. Eligible applicants would include partnerships, or consortia members, such as postsecondary education institutions, local adult education systems, vocational-technical programs, one-stop employment centers, and business.

Cost: $10 million was appropriated in FY 1999. It is proposed that an additional $10 million be requested in FY 2000 to continue the expansion and development of CTCs. It is estimated that the range of awards would be between $75,000 and $300,000 and, at the FY 2000 level, fund up to 150 centers.

Rationale. Rolling out *American Learns* grants would help expand access to adult education by focusing federal investments on developing innovative products and approaches that use data, voice, video and fiber optics technology to link at-risk adults with state-of-the-art basic skills services they can use anytime\anywhere-- in classrooms, libraries or the privacy of their homes.

Under the new reauthorization, States and localities must give priority to adult education activities that, among other priorities, effectively employ technology, including the use of computers. *America Learns* would serve as the testbed for products and systems innovations that would be used by programs across the nation.

A body of research shows that technology provides: opportunities for learners to get immediate feedback and individual attention; the possibility to engage learners in the instructional process; a wider array of instructional methods; and presentation of complex material in more concrete and visual way.

On July 28, 1998 the Department of Commerce released *Falling through the Net II: New Data on the Digital Divide* showing that although more Americans now own computers, minorities and low-income households are still far less likely to have computers or on-line access to the internet than white or more affluent households. Most alarmingly, the report revealed that the "digital divide" is growing.

In citing the substantial pockets of technology "have-nots" among low income, minorities, and the young -- particularly in rural areas and central cities -- and the time it would take to get them connected at home, *the report advocated that it was essential that schools, libraries, and other community technology centers provide computer access.* Community technology centers can serve as an effective means for providing access to technology and information to students and adults that have been denied access to technology and its related outcomes.

United States Department of Education
Office of Vocational and Adult Education
Office of the Assistant Secretary

☆ ESL Civics Initiative: Common Ground Partnerships

Common Ground Partnerships would allow States or localities significantly impacted by immigration to volunteer to put in place systemwide implementation of English as a Second Language/civics programs that would address four critical areas in helping immigrants adapt to their new lives in America.

How It Works: Hoping to make new lives in the United States, recent immigrants are awaiting assistance in the areas of: acquisition of English literacy skills; knowledge about the rights and responsibilities of citizenship; understanding of participation in American culture; and life skills necessary to function well in daily life. All of these areas promote productive employment.

Common Ground Partnerships could be targeted to the six or twelve States that are home to a majority of immigrants as well as to localities within other States that display significant concentrations of immigrant populations in need of services. *Common Ground Partnerships* would replace the discretionary ESL demonstrations proposed for FY 2000 at the $20M level but would require proposals from each State in order to operate the program under the discretionary "National Activities" portion of he Workforce Investment Act after appropriations language was in place to override set aside requirements of the law. *Common Ground Partnerships* would be cooperative agreements with the Department so that design and implementation of each State's activities could be worked through together and the Department would be party to changes made in the plans.

States with the highest density of ESL participants include: California; New York; Texas; Arizona; Florida; Michigan; Hawaii; Illinois; New Jersey; Georgia; Oregon; and Pennsylvania.

What it Costs. At the $40M level, State grants would be given of from $6.6 to about $3.3M, depending on whether the design accommodated six or twelve ESL States. If the proposal includes services to localities that are home to high concentrations of immigrants--notably cities that are not included in the list of highest density States for ESL participants receiving Statewide grants above--$15 - $20M more would be required to deliver from 20-40 local programs annually.

Rationale. One out of every five foreign-born persons came to the United States in the last five years. Twice as many came per year during the 1990's than during the 1970's. About 4.5 M persons arrived in the five-year period between 1990 and 1994 while 4.8M came during the decade of the 1970's. For the 4.5 M most recent immigrants, Mexico and Russia are the two origin countries. Over a quarter (1.3M) came from Mexico and an additional 243,000 came from Russia. Other countries with large numbers of recent immigrants include Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, the Phillippines, India and El Salvador.

On average recent immigrants are much younger than natives. Those who came to the United States between 1990 and 1994 have a median age of only 26 years, compared to almost 33 years of natives. About 59.4 percent of the recent immigrants are between age 18 and 44, while only 40.7 percent of natives are in this age range. Of the 4.5 million recent immigrants, about 43 percent are of Hispanic origin. In Texas and Florida respectively, 70 percent and 61 percent of all recent immigrants are of Hispanic origin, while in California and New Jersey, Asian immigrants account for 28 percent and 25 percent of recent immigrants.

Comparisons of the educational attainment of the recent immigrant and natives show several extremes. Immigrants are less likely to have graduated from high school than natives. While one-third of the recent immigrants do not have high school diploma or equivalent, only 17 percent of natives are not high school graduates.

In 1993 recent immigrants aged 16 and over also had the lowest median income ($8,393) of all immigrants by period of entry into the United States. Their median income was substantially lower than the median income of $15, 876 for natives. Part of this is related to the relatively high unemployment rate of the recent immigrants. While the unemployment rates for natives and naturalized citizens were 6.8 and 5.9 percent respectively, unemployment hit 12.2 percent for recent immigrants in 1993.

United States Department of Education
Office of Vocational and Adult Education
Office of the Assistant Secretary

☆ The High Skill Communities Campaign

The High Skill Communities initiative would create a framework in which States and local communities could mobilize and implement, according to their needs, strategies to promote lifelong learning and literacy and accelerate progress in meeting state and national goals related to adult education and lifelong learning.

How it Works. Modeled after Georgia's successful Certified Literate Community Program, and building on community engagement efforts underway through Goals 2000, this initiative would create a framework for States and localities to develop and expand lifelong learning opportunities.

The High Skills Communities initiative would result in a community mobilization effort to assess their needs in the area of adult and lifelong learning, outline goals, create an action plan, take concrete steps to build a community in which lifelong learning is the norm, and to assess progress.

A "community lifelong learning assessment toolkit" would be developed for use. U.S. Department of Education estimates of state\local literacy levels and Census data would be available and could used to establish baseline data and set community goals. The toolkit would provide tools for assessment, organizing a campaign, building community partnerships, and submitting applications (with examples of bylaws, surveys, plans, report forms, resolutions\letters, budgets, and administrator job descriptions).

Costs.

Option I: Non-funded The Campaign could be launched as a national challenge with states choosing to participate and using their own funding -- with the Vice President or President holding an annual recognition ceremony for exemplary state and local efforts.

Option 2: Funded $15 million in federal funding could be requested to fund state coordinators and provide substate grants for outreach and partnership building. If 30 states applied to participate average awards of $500,000 would be made.

A Model: The Georgia Certified Literate Community Program

The Certified Literate Community Program (CLCP) promotes literacy in Georgia by making literacy a community-wide commitment. A broad variety of community resources are mobilized to promote and support literacy training. The CLCP is a business-education-government partnership resulting in improved literacy levels of children, families, and workers in an entire community. The program began in 1989 with five pilot communities. Currently the CLCP has 38 participants with twenty-five other communities in various stages of organizing.

The Georgia Office of Adult Literacy provides a full-time Certified Community Program Executive Director who is responsible for providing technical assistance to communities as they develop the structure to attain Participant certification. A community that is accepted into the program receives certification twice, first when the community meets eight criteria for becoming a Certified Literate Community Participant and later when the community meets all qualifications for achieving the designation Certified Literate Community.

Tax Treatment of Major Educational Assistance
Current Law and Administration Proposal

Type of Assistance	Student qualifications	Type of Institution	Type of Education	Type of Expenses	Nondiscrimination plan required	Tax treatment: General rule	Tax treatment: Special limitations
Current Law							
Qualified scholarship (section 117)	degree candidates	any	any	tuition, fees; related expenses	N.A.	excluded from gross income	not excludable if teaching, research or other services required
Qualified tuition reductions (section 117)	employee (spouse or dependent children) of educational institution	any	no graduate education (except for grad students who teach or do research)	tuition	yes	excluded from gross income*	none
Forgiveness of student loan indebtedness (section 108(f))	must be working in certain professions	any	any	covered by loan	N.A.	excluded from gross income*	none
Employer paid (section 132)	employee	any	must be related to current job	any	no	excluded from gross income*	none
Fringe benefit - no additional cost to employer (section 132)	employee (spouse or dependent children) of educational institution	any	Any	similar to expenses charged to customers	yes	excluded from gross income*	none
Employee paid (section 162)	taxpayer	any	must be related to current job	tuition, fees, books, supplies and equipment	N.A.	deductable as itemized deduction	subject to 2% of AGI limitation
Savings Bond proceeds (section 135)	taxpayer, spouse and dependent children	public and private non-profit post-secondary	any, except hobby, etc.	tuition & required fees;	N.A.	interest excluded from gross income	income phase-out married: $76,250 - 106,2 single: $50,850 - 65,850; ranges indexed
Employer paid (section 127) (expires 5/31/00)	employee	any	any, except hobby, etc; no graduate after 6/30/96	tuition, fees, books, supplies and equipment	yes	excluded from gross income*	$5,250 per year
State pre-paid tuition plans	named beneficiary	colleges, etc eligible to participate in GSL program (depending on state plan)	any	tuition, fees, books, supplies and equipment; room and board	N.A.	earnings taxable to beneficiary upon disbursement	amounts reasonably required to pay qualified educational costs

Type of Assistance	Student qualifications	Type of Institution	Type of Education	Expenses	Nondiscrimination plan required	Tax treatment General rule	Tax treatment Special limitations
Tuition credit (HOPE Scholarship)	taxpayer, spouse and dependents; drug felons ineligible	colleges, etc eligible to participate in GSL program	degree or certificate program; at least 1/2 time; 13th & 14th year	tuition & required fees	N.A.	lesser of first $1000 +50% of next $1000 of tuition & fees; reduced by grants,etc; per student basis	income phase-out, married: $80,000 - 100,000 single: $50,000 - 70,000 indexed beginning in 2002;
Tuition credit (Lifetime Learning)	taxpayer, spouse and dependents	colleges, etc eligible to participate in GSL program	any except hobby, etc.	tuition & required fees	N.A.	20% of up to $10,000 ($5000 before 2002); per taxpayer basis	income phase-out, married: $80,000 - 100,000 single: $50,000 - 70,000; indexed beginning in 2002
Student loan interest	taxpayer, spouse and dependents	colleges, etc eligible to participate in GSL program; health institutions	at least 1/2 time	tuition, fees, books, supplies and equipment; room and board	N.A.	deduction of up to $2500 ($1000 in 1998, $1500 in 1999, $2000 in 2000) of interest on qualified loan	income phase-out, married: $60,000 - 75,000 single: $40,000 - 55,000; indexed beginning after 2002
IRA withdrawals	taxpayer, spouse, dependents, children, and grandchildren	colleges, etc eligible to participate in GSL program	any; at least 1/2 time for room and board to qualify	tuition, fees, books, supplies and equipment; room and board	N.A.	no early withdrawal penalty	income phase-out for $2,000 contribution deduction - married: $50,000 - 60,000 in 1998; increasing to $80,000 - 100,000 after 1998; singl $30,000 - 40,000 in 1998; increasing to $50,000 - 60,000 after 1998
Education IRAs	named beneficiary	colleges, etc eligible to participate in GSL program	any; at least 1/2 time for room and board to qualify	tuition, fees, books, supplies and equipment; room and board	N.A.	$500 annual contribution limit; distributions excludable from gross income	income phase-out, married: $150,000 - 160,000 single: $95,000 - 110,000

Administration Proposal

Employer paid (section 127 expires 5/31/00)	employee	any	any, except hobby, etc; graduate after 6/30/98	tuition, fees, books, supplies and equipment	yes	up to $5,250 excluded from annual gross income*	limited to courses beginning before June 1, 2001

*Also reduces the Social Security and Medicare tax bases.

federal register

Monday
January 10, 1994

Part II

Department of Education

34 CFR Parts 462 and 472
National Workplace Literacy Program;
Final Regulations and Notice

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[CFDA No. 84.198]

National Workplace Literacy Program; Inviting Applications for New Awards for Fiscal Year (FY) 1993

Note to Applicants: This notice is a complete application package. Together with the statute authorizing the program and applicable regulations governing the program, including the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), the notice contains all of the information, application forms, and instructions needed to apply for a grant under this competition.

Purpose of Program: The National Workplace Literacy Program provides assistance for demonstration projects that teach literacy skills needed in the workplace through exemplary education partnerships between business, industry, or labor organizations and educational organizations.

The Secretary wishes to highlight, for potential applicants, that this program can help to further National Education Goal 5—ensuring that every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. The program helps by improving approaches and methods used in meeting the literacy needs of adults in the workplace, including those with limited English proficiency.

Eligible Applicants: (a) Awards are provided to exemplary partnerships between—

(1) A business, industry, or labor organization, or private industry council; and

(2) A State educational agency, local educational agency, institution of higher education, or school (including an area vocational school, an employment and training agency, or a community-based organization).

(b) A partnership must include as partners at least one entity from paragraph (a)(1) of this section and at least one entity from paragraph (a)(2) of this section and may include more than one entity from each group.

(c)(1) The partners shall apply jointly to the Secretary for funds.

(2) The partners shall enter into an agreement, in the form of a single document signed by all partners, designating one member of the partnership as the applicant and the grantee. The agreement must also detail the role each partner plans to perform, and must bind each partner to every statement and assurance made in the application. Applications are governed by the EDGAR provisions in 34 CFR 75.127–75.129 regarding group applications.

Deadline For Transmittal of Applications: March 11, 1994.

Deadline for Intergovernmental Review: March 10, 1994.

Available Funds: $18,527,425 for the first 12 months. Funding for the second and third year is subject to availability of funds and to a grantee meeting the requirements of 34 CFR 75.253.

Estimated Range of Awards: $105,469–$1,205,234 (funding for first 12 months).

Estimated Average Size of Awards: $370,549 (funding for first 12 months).

Estimated Number of Awards: 50.

Note: The Department is not bound by any estimates in this notice.

Project Period: Up to 36 months (3 twelve-month budget periods).

Applicable Regulations: (a) The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR part 74 (Administration of Grants to Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Nonprofit Organizations), part 75 (Direct Grant Programs), part 77 (Definitions that Apply to Department Regulations), part 79 (Intergovernmental Review of Department of Education Programs and Activities), part 80 (Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments), part 81 (General Education Provisions Act—Enforcement), part 82 (New Restrictions on Lobbying), part 85 (Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and Governmentwide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants)), and part 86 (Drug-Free Schools and Campuses); and (b) the regulations for this program in 34 CFR parts 460 and 472, including amendments to part 472 that are found elsewhere in this issue of the Federal Register.

Description of Program: The Secretary provides grants or cooperative agreements to projects designed to improve the productivity of the workforce through improvement of literacy skills in the workplace by—

(a) Providing adult literacy and other basic skills, services, and activities;

(b) Providing adult secondary education services and activities that may lead to the completion of a high school diploma or its equivalent;

(c) Meeting the literacy needs of adults with limited English proficiency;

(d) Upgrading or updating basic skills of adult workers in accordance with changes in workplace requirements, technology, products, or processes;

(e) Improving the competency of adult workers in speaking, listening, reasoning, and problem solving; or

(f) Providing educational counseling transportation, and child care services for adult workers during nonworking hours while the workers participate in the project.

The statute authorizing this program requires that projects use Federal funds to supplement, and not supplant, funds otherwise available for the purposes of the program.

Selection Criteria: The Secretary uses the following selection criteria to evaluate applications for new grants under this competition.

The maximum score for all of these criteria is 100 points. The maximum score for each criterion is indicated in parentheses.

In addition to the points awarded based on the selection criteria, the Secretary assigns five points to applications from partnerships that include as a partner one or more small businesses that have signed the partnership agreement. An applicant must provide on the Partnership Agreement form the Small Business Administration's (SBA) Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code for the small business partner. See the Small Business Size Standards: Final and Interim Final Rules (13 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part 121). These rules may be found at many public libraries or by contacting a Small Business Administration local district office or regional office, or by calling the SBA's Office of Size Standards in Washington, DC at (202) 205–6618.

Reserved points: The program regulations in 34 CFR 472.21(b) provide that the Secretary may award up to 100 points for selection criteria, including a reserved 10 points. For this competition, the Secretary distributes the reserved 10 points as follows:

Program Factors (34 CFR 472.22(a)). Five points are added to this criterion for a possible total of 20 points.

Plan of Operation (34 CFR 472.22(d)). Five points are added to this criterion for a possible total of 20 points.

The criteria: (a) *Program Factors.* (20 points) The Secretary reviews each application to determine the extent to which the project—

(1) Demonstrates a strong relationship between skills taught and the literacy requirements of actual jobs, especially the increased skill requirements of the changing workplace;

(2) Is targeted to adults with inadequate skills for whom the training described is expected to mean new employment, continued employment,

career advancement, or increased productivity;

(3) Includes support services, based on cooperative relationships within the partnership and from helping organizations, necessary to reduce barriers to participation by adult workers. Support services could include educational counseling, transportation, and child care during non-working hours while adult workers are participating in a project;

(4) Demonstrates the active commitment of all partners to accomplishing project goals; and

(5) Focuses on improving performance in jobs or job functions that have a broad representation within the nation's workforce so that the products can be adapted for use by similar workplaces across the Nation.

(b) *Extent of need for the project.* (10 points) The Secretary reviews each application to determine the extent to which the project meets specific needs, including consideration of—

(1) The extent to which the project will focus on demonstrated needs for workplace literacy training of adult workers;

(2) The adequacy of the applicant's documentation of the needs to be addressed by the project;

(3) How those needs will be met by the project; and

(4) The benefits to adult workers and their industries that will result from meeting those needs.

(c) *Quality of training.* (15 points) The Secretary reviews each application to determine the quality of the training to be provided by the project, including the extent to which the project will—

(1) Develop or use curriculum materials for adults based on literacy skills needed in the workplace;

(2) Use individualized educational plans developed jointly by instructors and adult learners;

(3) Take place in a readily accessible environment conducive to adult learning;

(4) Provide training through the partner classified under 34 CFR 472.2(a)(2), unless transferring this activity to the partner classified under 472.2(a)(1) is necessary and reasonable within the framework of the project; and

(5) Provide, and document for others, a program of training for staff including, but not limited to, techniques of curriculum development and special methods of teaching that are appropriate for workplace environments.

(d) *Plan of operation.* (20 points) The Secretary reviews each application to determine the quality of the plan of operation for the project, including—

(1) The quality of the project design, especially the establishment of measurable objectives for the project that are based on the project's overall goals;

(2) The extent to which the plan of management is effective and ensures proper and efficient administration of the project, and includes—

(i) A description of the respective roles of each member of the partnership in carrying out the plan;

(ii) A description of the activities to be carried out by any contractors under the plan;

(iii) A description of the respective roles, including any cash or in-kind contributions, of helping organizations;

(iv) A description of the respective roles of any sites; and

(v) A realistic time table for accomplishing project objectives;

(3) How well the objectives of the project relate to the purposes of the program;

(4) The quality of the applicant's plan to use its resources and personnel to achieve each objective; and

(5) How the applicant will ensure that project participants, who are otherwise eligible to participate, are selected without regard to race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

(e) *Applicant's experience and quality of key personnel.* (8 points)

(1) The Secretary reviews each application to determine the extent of the applicant's experience in providing literacy services to working adults.

(2) The Secretary reviews each application to determine the quality of key personnel the applicant plans to use on the project, including—

(i) The qualifications, in relation to project requirements, of the project director;

(ii) The qualifications, in relation to project requirements, of each of the other key personnel to be used in the project;

(iii) The time that each person referred to in paragraph (e)(2) (i) and (ii) of this section will commit to the project; and

(iv) How the applicant, as part of its nondiscriminatory employment practices, will ensure that its personnel are selected for employment without regard to race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

(3) To determine personnel qualifications under paragraphs (e)(2) (i) and (ii) of this section, the Secretary considers—

(i) Experience and training in fields related to the objectives of the project;

(ii) Experience and training in project management; and

(iii) Any other qualifications that pertain to the quality of the project.

(f) *Evaluation plan.* (10 points) The Secretary reviews each application to determine the quality of the plan for an independent evaluation of the project, including the extent to which the applicant's methods of evaluation—

(1) Are clearly explained and appropriate to the project;

(2) To the extent possible, are objective and produce data that are quantifiable;

(3) Identify expected outcomes of the participants and how those outcomes will be measured;

(4) Include evaluation of effects on job advancement, job performance (including, for example, such elements as productivity, safety, and attendance), and job retention;

(5) Are systematic throughout the project period and provide data that can be used by the project on an ongoing basis for program improvement; and

(6) Will yield results that can be summarized and submitted to the Secretary for review by the Department's Program Effectiveness Panel.

Note: The Program Effectiveness Panel (PEP) is a mechanism the Department has developed for validating the effectiveness of educational programs developed by schools, universities, and other agencies. The PEP is composed of experts in the evaluation of educational programs and in other areas of education, at least two-thirds of whom are non-Federal employees who are appointed by the Secretary. Regulations governing the PEP are codified in 34 CFR parts 785–789. Specific criteria for PEP review are found in 34 CFR 786.12 or 787.12.

(g) *Budget and cost-effectiveness.* (7 points) The Secretary reviews each application to determine the extent to which—

(1) The budget is adequate to support the project;

(2) Costs are reasonable and necessary in relation to the objectives of the project; and

(3) The applicant has minimized the purchase of equipment and supplies in order to devote a maximum amount of resources to instructional services.

(h) *Demonstration.* (5 points) The Secretary reviews each application to determine the quality of the applicant's plan, during the grant period, to disseminate the results of the project, including—

(i) Demonstrating promising practices used by the project to others interested in implementing these techniques;

(ii) Conducting workshops or delivering papers at national conferences or professional meetings; and

(iii) Making available material that will help others implement promising practices developed in the project.

(i) *Commitment.* (5 points) The Secretary reviews each application to determine the quality of the partnership's plan to increase, during the project, the capacity of partners to provide a coherent program of learning in the workplace that is based on promising practices demonstrated in the project. For example, the partners could—

(1) Integrate workplace literacy services into long-term planning of partner organizations;

(2) Create and implement policies and practices that encourage worker participation in the project;

(3) Provide training that will enable each partner to build a capacity to furnish necessary workplace literacy services in the future; or

(4) Include in the project design an opportunity to assess what workplace literacy services partners may provide in the future.

Additional Factor: In making awards under this program, the Secretary may consider, in addition to the selection criteria, whether funding a particular applicant would improve the geographical distribution of projects funded under this program.

Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs: This program is subject to the requirements of Executive Order 12372 (Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs) and the regulations in 34 CFR part 79.

The objective of the Executive order is to foster an intergovernmental partnership and to strengthen federalism by relying on State and local processes for State and local government coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance.

Applicants must contact the appropriate State Single Point of Contact to learn about, and to comply with, the State's process under Executive Order 12372. Applicants proposing to perform activities in more than one State should contact the Single Point of Contact for each of those States and follow the procedure established in each State under the Executive order. If you want to know the name and address of any State Single Point of Contact, see the list published in the Federal Register on September 24, 1993 (58 FR 50162–50164).

In States that have not established a process or chosen a program for review, State, areawide, regional, and local entities may submit comments directly to the Department.

Any State Process Recommendation and other comments submitted by a State Single Point of Contact and any comments from State, areawide, regional, and local entities must be mailed or hand-delivered by the date indicated in this notice to the following address: The Secretary, E.O. 12372–CFDA 84.198, U.S. Department of Education, room 4181, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20202–0125.

Proof of mailing will be determined on the same basis as applications (see 34 CFR 75.102). Recommendations or comments may be hand-delivered until 4:30 p.m. (Washington, DC time) on the date indicated in this notice.

Please note that the above address is not the same address as the one to which the applicant submits its completed application. Do not send applications to the above address.

Instructions for Transmittal of Applications: (a) If an applicant wants to apply for a grant, the applicant shall—

(1) Mail the original and six copies of the application on or before the deadline date to: U.S. Department of Education, Application Control Center, Attention: (CFDA #84.198), Washington, DC 20202–4725; or (2) Hand deliver the original and six copies of the application by 4:30 p.m. (Washington, DC time) on the deadline date to: U.S. Department of Education, Application Control Center, Attention: (CFDA #84.198), Room #3633, Regional Office Building #3, 7th and D Streets, SW., Washington, DC.

(b) An applicant must show one of the following as proof of mailing:

(1) A legibly dated U.S. Postal Service postmark.

(2) A legible mail receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service.

(3) A dated shipping label, invoice, or receipt from a commercial carrier.

(4) Any other proof of mailing acceptable to the Secretary.

(c) If an application is mailed through the U.S. Postal Service, the Secretary does not accept either of the following as proof of mailing:

(1) A private metered postmark.

(2) A mail receipt that is not dated by the U.S. Postal Service.

Notes: (1) The U.S. Postal Service does not uniformly provide a dated postmark. Before relying on this method, an applicant should check with its local post office.

(2) The Application Control Center will mail a Grant Application Receipt Acknowledgement to each applicant. If an applicant fails to receive the notification of application receipt within 15 days from the date of mailing the application, the applicant should call the U.S. Department of Education Application Control Center at (202) 708–9494.

(3) The applicant must indicate on the envelope and—if not provided by the Department—in Item 10 of the Application for Federal Assistance (Standard Form 424) the CFDA number of the competition under which the application is being submitted.

Application Instructions and Forms: To apply for an award under this program competition, your application must be organized in the following order and include the following six parts:

Part I: Application for Federal Assistance (Standard Form 424 (Rev. 4–88)) and Instructions.

Part II: Partnership Agreement Form.

Part III: Budget Information and Instructions.

Part IV: Budget Narrative.

Part V: Application Narrative.

Part VI: Additional Assurances and Certification:

a. Assurances—Non-Construction Programs (Standard Form 424B).

b. Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements (ED form 80–0013) and Instructions.

c. Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion: Lower Tier Covered Transactions (ED Form 80–0014) and Instructions.

(Note: ED Form 80–0014 is intended for the use of grantees and should not be transmitted to the Department.)

d. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (Standard Form LLL) (if applicable) and Instructions, and Disclosure of Lobbying Activities Continuation Sheet (Standard Form LLL–A).

All forms and instructions are included as Appendix A of this notice. Questions and answers pertaining to this program are included, as Appendix B, to assist potential applicants.

An applicant may submit information on a photostatic copy of the forms in Appendix A. However, each of the pertinent documents must include an original ink signature. All applicants must submit ONE original signed application, including ink signatures on all forms and assurances and SIX copies of the application. Please mark each application as original or copy. Local or State Agencies may choose to submit two copies with the original.

No grant may be awarded unless a complete application form has been received.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Liz Miller or Jeanne Williams, Special Programs Branch, Division of National Programs, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education, room 4513–MES, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20202–7327. Telephone (202) 205–9750.

Information about the Department's funding opportunities, including copies of application notices for discretionary grant competitions, can be viewed on the Department's electronic bulletin board (ED Board), telephone (202) 260–9950; or on the Internet Gopher Server at GOPHER.ED.GOV (under Announcements, Bulletins, and Press Releases). However, the official application notice for a discretionary grant competition is the notice published in the Federal Register.

Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

PROGRAM AUTHORITY: 20 U.S.C. 1211(a).

Dated: January 3, 1994.

Augusta S. Kappner,

Assistant Secretary Vocational and Adult Education.

BILLING CODE 4000-01-M

Tax Credit Qs (Treasury)

Assoc. w/entity eligible under the Adult Basic Educ. Act

State Adult Educ. system linked to provision of these services.

→ Certification of course provided (by state Adult Ed. provider or community colleges)

Currently, there are thousands of work-site literacy programs under the Adult Basic Educ. Act.

Grants (Ed)

systems building & development grants for states to build comprehensive systems (prof. dev.; coord; brokering)

targeted grants to states

Grants to states; from states to employers

[states administering competive grants]

We want: $ to employers to defray costs of providing adult literacy programs

50/50 match (from states)

Run through Title II of WIA.

Qs: what are states doing

Match (?)

Indexes → Options of whether we should allow WTW funds ~~to~~ as State match?

other ways to link part of grant to WTW efforts

United States Department of Education

Office of Vocational and Adult Education
Office of the Assistant Secretary

☆ 21st Century Workforce Education Initiative

Grants would provide for a state Workplace Extension Service coordinators who would work actively with employers on how to use the workplace most effectively as the newest learning environment.

How It Works. Regional coordinators would provide technical assistance to help employers use new workplace education tax credits to invest in improving workers' literacy skills, locate instructors with special expertise in providing workplace education, and broker services customized to meet individual business needs, especially for small and medium sized businesses. States would receive additional funding in their adult education Basic State grant program allotments to support networks of regional Workplace Extension Service coordinators that would promote and link workforce education efforts with the local workforce boards.

Cost. If each State funded a maximum of 5 Workplace Extension Service coordinators, approximately $12.5 million would be needed. States already match adult education Basic State grants at 25%.

Rationale. The Conference Board, under contract with ED\OVAE is documenting the benefits of workplace education programs. When research is completed in February 1999 the project will begin an outreach campaign to enlist the support of employers and unions nationwide in developing workplace education programs. The success of the Workplace Education Initiative will depend, in part, on the ability of State adult education systems to meet the demands that the Conference Board project will generate among employers and unions.

Preliminary results from our new Conference Board survey indicates that employers expected and received the following skill improvements for workers in workplace education programs: improved ability to listen, improved ability to understand and apply information; greater willingness to learn; positive attitudes about change; better team work; improved ability to use documents, numbers and manuals; improved capacity to solve problems and make decisions; and improved ability to use English to communicate in the workplace.

(coordination)
could this work in a one-stop environment (?)

(tax?) incentive for employers if they mount workplace literacy programs

Documented costs to business of low literate workers include estimates that low literate workers cost United States businesses $225 billion annually in lost productivity. A survey of Fortune 1000 executives demonstrates that a full 90% felt that illiteracy is hurting productivity and profitability in their businesses. Other documented negative economic impacts of illiteracy on corporate performance include: reduced adaptability of firms to implement new tehcnology and production techniques to compete globally; reduced product quality; lost productitivy; reduced health and safety performance; and increase difficulty in assigning staff to new responibilities; lower quality and general corporate performance and higher training costs.

Documented benefits of workplace education initiatives include: Increases in corporate earnings of 11-17%; empirical estimates of a return on workplace literacy training of up to 25%; and reduced employee turnover. A Magnavox evaluation of its literacy skills training program demonstrated a total economic benefit of $321,600, or an anverage of $10,720 per employee. At the same time, training costs were $38,233 or an average of $1,275 per employee with a net economic benefit to Magnavox of $283,367. Another study of a workplace education program documented a 1.45 per cent annual productivity improvement as a result of delivering workplace education or an increase of $2, 000 more productivity per worker.

United States Department of Education

Office of Vocational and Adult Education
Office of the Assistant Secretary

☆ Community Technology Centers

The Department will use $10 million in FY 99 for a program to serve as the catalyst for the expansion and development of model community technology centers (CTCs) in low-income urban and rural communities. These centers would provide access to information technology, and other services, for disadvantaged students and adults. It is proposed that $20 million be requested in FY 2000 to continue the expansion and development of CTCs in impoverished urban and rural communities.

How it Works. Libraries, youth organizations, multiservice agencies, stand-alone or networks of CTCs, or other community based organizations would be eligible to apply. Eligible applicants would include partnerships, or consortia members, such as postsecondary education institutions, local adult education systems, vocational-technical programs, one-stop employment centers, and business.

Funded projects will offer the use of computers and information technology to residents who otherwise would lack such access, and program offerings in three or more of the following areas:.

- **Pre-School and Family** - Programs for parents and young children to use appropriate software such as drawing, animation, and learning games. Opportunities to partner with Head Start, family literacy or day care programs that may not have access to computers.

- **Afterschool and Weekend Activities** -- Structured activities for children of different age groups to use software that offers homework help and academic enrichment, exploration of the internet, multimedia publishing including web page design and creation of project reports for school.

- **Adult Education** -- Individually, or in collaboration/partnership with existing programs, offer GED training, ESL and adult basic education (ABE) education classes, introduction to computers, and lifelong learning opportunities, including distance learning extension courses.

- **Career Development and Job Preparation** -- Computer skills training (basic literacy and advanced applications), resume writing workshops, and access to databases of available community jobs and other such online materials.

- **Electronic Commerce** -- Business activities that can be conducted by CTCs including business outsourcing, small business support, and entrepreneurship.

- **Home Access** -- Services to promote the acquisition, installation, and use of information technology in the homes of individuals they serve through low-cost items such as web-based television, network PCS, or recycled computers.

Cost. $10 million for FY99 and $20 million in FY2000. It is estimated that the range of awards would be between $75,000 and $300,000. The size of the award would depend on whether the applicant was proposing to use funds for the initial development and implementation of a stand-alone CTC or a major expansion and upgrading leading to a network of CTCs. It is expected that between 80 and 100 awards would be made. The project period would be for up to 36 months. Grant recipients under this program would be required to provide matching funds toward the total project cost, in the form of cash or in-kind contributions, and applicants would be required to document how the project would be sustained after federal funding ended.

Rationale. On July 28, 1998 the Department of Commerce released *Falling through the Net II: New Data on the Digital Divide* showing that although more Americans now own computers, minorities and low-income households are still far less likely to have computers or on-line access to the internet than white or more affluent households. Most alarmingly, the report revealed that the "digital divide" is growing.

In citing the substantial pockets of technology "have-nots" among low income, minorities, and the young -- particularly in rural areas and central cities -- and the time it would take to get them connected at home, *the report advocated that it was essential that schools, libraries, and other community technology centers provide computer access.* Community technology centers can serve as an effective means for providing access to technology and information to students and adults that have been denied access to technology and its related outcomes -- as well as be an instrument for community economic development.

United States Department of Education
Office of Vocational and Adult Education
Office of the Assistant Secretary

☆ The High Skill Communities Campaign

The High Skill Communities initiative would create a framework in which States and local communities could mobolize and implement, according to their needs, strategies to promote lifelong learning and literacy and accelerate progress in meeting state and national goals related to adult education and lifelong learning.

How it Works. Modeled after Georgia's successful Certified Literate Community Program, and building on community engagement efforts underway through Goals 2000, this initiative would create a framework for States and localities to develop and expand lifelong learning opportunities.

The High Skills Communities initiative would result in a community mobilization effort to assess their needs in the area of adult and lifelong learning, outline goals, create an action plan, take concrete steps to build a community in which lifelong learning is the norm, and to assess progress. A "community lifelong learning assessment toolkit" would be developed for use. Census data would be used to establish baseline data and set goals.

Costs. The Campaign could be launched as a national challenge with states choosing to participate and using their own funding -- with the Vice President or President holding an annual recognition ceremony for exemplary state and local efforts -- OR a small amount of federal funding could be requested to fund state coordinators and provide substate grants for outreach and partnership building.

A Model: The Georgia Certified Literate Community Program

The Certified Literate Community Program (CLCP) promotes literacy in Georgia by making literacy a community-wide commitment. A broad variety of community resources are mobilized to promote and support literacy training. The CLCP is a business-education-government partnership resulting in improved literacy levels of children, families, and workers in an entire community. The program began in 1989 with five pilot communities. Currently the CLCP has 38 participants with twenty-five other communities in various stages of organizing.

The Georgia Office of Adult Literacy provides a full-time Certified Community Program Executive Director who is responsible for providing technical assistance to communities as they develop the structure to attain Participant certification. A community that is accepted into the program receives certification twice, first when the community meets eight criteria for becoming a Certified Literate Community Participant and later when the community meets all qualifications for achieving the designation Certified Literate Community.

United States Department of Education

Office of Vocational and Adult Education
Office of the Assistant Secretary

☆ ESL Civics Initiative: Common Ground Partnerships

Common Ground Partnerships would allow States or localities significantly impacted by immigration to volunteer to put in place systemwide implementation of English as a Second Language/civics programs that would address four critical areas in helping immigrants adapt to their new lives in America.

How It Works: Hoping to make new lives in the United States, recent immigrants are awaiting assistance in the areas of: acquisition of English literacy skills; knowledge about the rights and responsibilities of citizenship; understanding of participation in American culture; and life skills necessary to function well in daily life. All of these areas promote productive employment.

Common Ground Partnerships could be targeted to the six or twelve States that are home to a majority of immigrants as well as to localities within other States that display significant concentrations of immigrant populations in need of services. *Common Ground Partnerships* would replace the discretionary ESL demonstrations proposed for FY 2000 at the $20M but would require proposals from each State in order to operate the program under the discretionary National Activities portion of the Workforce Investment Act after appropriations language was in place to override set aside requirement of the law. *Common Ground Partnerships* would be cooperative agreements with the Department so that design and implementation of each State's activities could be worked through together and the Department would be party to changes made in the plans.

States with the highest density of ESL participants include: California, New York, Texas, Arizona, Florida, Michigan, Hawaii, Illinois, New Jersey, Georgia, Oregon, and Pennsylvania.

What it Costs. At the $40M level, State grants would be given of from $6.6M to about $3.3M, depending on whether the design accommodated six or twelve ESL States. If the proposal includes services to localities that are home to high concentrations of immigrants--notably cities that are not included in the list of highest density States for ESL participants receiving Statewide grants above--$15 - 20M more would be required to deliver from 20-40 local programs annually.

Rationale. One out of every five foreign-born persons came to the United States in the last five years. Twice as many came per year during the 1990's than during the 1970's. About 4.5 million persons arrived in the five-year period between 1990 and 1994 while 4.8 million came during the decade of the 1970's. Of the 4.5 million most recent immigrants, Mexico and Russia are the two origin countries. Over a quarter (1.3 million) came from Mexico and an additional 243,000 came from Russia. Other countries with large numbers of recent immigrants include Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, the Philippines, India, and El Salvador.

25% of those in Level 1 are immigrants

On average recent immigrants are much younger than natives (persons born in the U.S., Puerto Rico, or an outlying area of the U.S., and persons who were born in a foreign country but who had at least one parent who was a U.S. citizen). Those who came to the United States between 1990 and 1994 have a median age of only 26 years, compared to almost 33 years of natives. About 59.4 percent of the recent immigrants are between age 18 and 44, while only 40.7 percent natives are in this age range. Of the 4.5 million recent immigrants, about 43 percent are of Hispanic origin. In Texas and Florida respectively, 70 percent and 61 percent of all recent immigrants are of Hispanic origin, while in California and New Jersey, Asian immigrants account for 28 percent and 25 percent of recent immigrants.

Comparisons of the educational attainment of the recent immigrants and natives show several extremes. Immigrants are less likely to have graduated from high school than natives. While one-third of the recent immigrants do not have a high school diploma or equivalent, only 17 percent of natives are not high school graduates.

In 1993 recent immigrants aged 16 and over also had the lowest median income ($8,393) of all immigrants by period of entry into the United States. Their median income was substantially lower than the median income of $15,876 for natives. Part of this is related to the relatively high unemployment rate of the recent immigrants. While the unemployment rates for natives and naturalized citizens were 6.8 and 5.9 percent respectively, it was a high 12.2 percent for the recent immigrants in 1993.

Tom Kalil
Draft November 5, 1998

I. The use of technology to promote adult literacy and adult basic education

There are a number of compelling reasons to use technology to advance adult literacy and adult basic education:

1. **Technology can deliver instruction "anytime, anywhere"**: Many adult learners find it difficult to participate in traditional classroom-based instruction because they are working full-time or because they can't afford child care. The ability of adults to gain access to high-quality instructional material at a time, place and pace that is convenient for them could significantly expand the number of adults who are willing and able to acquire basic skills.

2. **Technology literacy provides an additional benefit and motivation for adult learners**: Adults know that the ability to use a computer or the Internet is a highly marketable skill. The National Center for Adult Literacy reports that adults are more motivated to acquire basic skills using technology because they know that gaining some level of technological literacy will allow them to compete for higher-paying jobs.

3. **The ability to use technology may reduce the "stigma" associated with having to admit that one is not able to read or write**: Some adults may feel more comfortable acquiring basic skills in the privacy of their own home than attending an adult literacy class.

4. **Technology can support the very important social dimensions of learning**: Trials by the National Center for Adult Learning discovered that adult learners benefit from the ability to communicate electronically with their peers.

5. **The cost of computing is dropping dramatically -- making it much more affordable for the people that would be served by an expanded adult literacy initiative. Adult literacy can get a "free ride" on the infrastructure created by the cable/entertainment industry**: The computer industry operates on the "Moore's Law" curve -- the number of transistors on a computer chip doubles every 12-18 months. Recently, PC manufacturers have started selling PCS for $600. A "WebTV" can be purchased for $100 - $200. Game platforms now use the same sophisticated microprocessors that were used in high-end graphics workstations. In addition, cable companies are deploying "set top boxes" for interactive, digital television that can be used for high-speed Internet access and "video on demand." This same infrastructure can be used for the delivery of adult education as well. It is important to note that many low-income households subscribe to cable.

6. **Advanced technology can provide the "next best thing" to a "one-on-one" tutor**: Although not yet widely available, intelligent tutoring systems and speech recognition technology may provide the "next best thing" to individualized tutoring. Researchers at universities such as Carnegie-Mellon have been able to develop intelligent Reading Tutor software that intervenes when the reader asks for help, makes mistakes, gets stuck, or is likely to

encounter difficulty. In a 1996-97 pilot test at an inner-city elementary school, third graders who started almost three years below grade level and used the Reading Tutor averaged two years' progress in under eight months.

7. **Technology-mediated instruction can scale**: Providing adult education to the millions of Americans that could use it would be prohibitively expensive using classroom-based instruction. On the other hand, the marginal cost of making instructional content available in a networked environment is almost zero. Networked content can be scaled to serve millions of users. For example, Yahoo!, one of the most popular Internet directories, delivered an average of 144 million pages of information per day in September 1998.

II. Possible elements of an initiative

1. **Content/sofware development**: The government could cost-share the development of instructional material with publishers and software companies to encourage the private sector to develop higher-quality material for adult basic education, ESL, GED equivalence, etc. Some of the content could be customized to particular skill standards, such as those developed by the National Retail Federation. The idea would be to make content available in multiple formats [Web, CD, game player, interactive television.] It might also be possible to get matching funds from community colleges or employers.

Cost: $1-3 million. 10 grants for ~ $20 million.

2. **Pilots and evaluation**: The government could provide matching grants to communities that deploy and evaluate the use of these new technologies for adult literacy (rate of completion, results on relevant tests, other learning outcomes).

Cost: $250K per pilot - 40 grants for $10 million.

3. **Community access points**: We need to expand the number of places in the community that have access to computers, software and the Internet. We have an existing program to provide support for community computing centers that is funded at $10 million. Note that the e-rate is already connecting libraries, which play an important role in some adult literacy programs.

Cost: $250K per center per year. Existing program could fund 40 centers. Adding $10 million to the program could double the number of centers funded. Communities could also be encouraged to keep their schools open longer, which will have computers and Internet access.

4. **Recruiting 50,000 volunteer tele-mentors**: The government could provide a grant to an organization to help recruit and train people that could serve as "tele-mentors" for adults participating in online literacy programs. For example, organizations such as "Impact Online" are using the World Wide Web to recruit volunteers for a variety of non-profit organizations. Companies such as Hewlett-Packard are encouraging their employees to serve as tele-mentors.

Cost: $2 million per year.

5. **Research and development**: Preliminary results have shown that advanced technologies such as speech recognition and intelligent tutoring systems can significantly improve student outcomes. R&D is needed to advance the state-of-the-art and train the next generation of software developers.

Cost: $1 million per research team - 10 grants for $10 million year.

6. **Bully pulpit**: We could challenge the private sector to help out by, for example:

- Making the content available at video rental stores, or making it available on cable and WebTV;
- Exploring new business models that make this market more attractive for software developers (e.g. getting a local chamber of commerce to purchase a "site license" for an entire metropolitan area);
- Making the use of technology for adult basic education part of the "Welfare to Work" effort.

7. **Ensure that the other elements of the literacy initiative are designed with technology in mind**: For example, it should be an eligible expenditure for the workplace tax credit for employers to provide their employees with home PCs and courseware.

United States Department of Education

Office of Vocational and Adult Education
Office of the Assistant Secretary

The Partnership For A Literate America: Filling the Human Investment Gaps in Adult Education and Literacy

As we begin the new millennium, an alarming number of American adults struggle with a job application, cannot read to their children, and are left on the welfare rolls because they lack basic skills. Through the Partnership for a Literate America, the nation will mobilize communities and target investments to ensure that every American gains the knowledge and skills to continue their education and be successful at home, work, and in their community.

The Impact of Low Literacy

The 1992 National Adult Literacy Survey found that more than 1 in 5 -- or more than 40 million Americans -- demonstrated literacy and numeracy skills at or below the 5th grade level (Level 1). These adults usually cannot locate an intersection on a street map, identify and enter background information on a social security card application, or calculate the total costs of purchase from an order form. Over 25 to 28 percent, or about 50 million additional adults, demonstrated skills between the 5th and 8th grade levels (Level 2). These individuals cannot meet the skill requirements for entry-level work in a modern manufacturing plant.

76 percent of adults 65 and older, and around 40 percent of adults aged 19 to 39, scored in the lowest two literacy levels, i.e. proficient at or below the 8th grade level. 13 percent of young American adults (aged 25 to 29) have not completed high school or earned an equivalency certificate -- including 39 percent of young Hispanics.

Direct impacts:

- **Poverty.** Nearly half of adults in the lowest literacy level were living in poverty.
- **Dependency.** About 1 in 5 adults in the lowest literacy level received food stamps.
- **Employment and Earnings.** Individuals in the lowest level of literacy were less likely to be employed, worked fewer hours per week, and earned lower wages than individuals with higher proficiencies.

- **Crime.** 70 percent of adults in prison had literacy skills at or below the 8th grade level.

- **Health.** Individuals with low literacy skills are at increased risk of being unable to make informed health care choices. The health care cost of functionally or marginally literate adults is estimated at $30 to 73 billion in 1998.

- **Civic Participation.** Around half of eligible voters with skills in the lowest literacy level reported voting in the past 5 years -- compared with nearly 90 percent of those in the highest literacy level.

- **Productivity.** Many business leaders estimate that the U.S. loses $60+ billion in productivity due to their employees' low level of basic skills.

- **Children.** Children's literacy levels are strongly linked to the educational level of their parents. A new report from the National Academy of Sciences stresses the importance of a literacy rich environment for a child entering school ready to learn.

The Federal Role in Adult Education

The Adult Education Act is the major source of Federal support for basic skills improvement. Basic Grants to States are allocated by a formula based upon the number of adults, over age 16, who have not completed high school in each State. States distribute funds to local providers through a competitive process based upon State-established funding criteria. Local programs of instruction emphasize the acquisition of basic skills including: reading, writing, computation, communication and problem solving. Courses of instruction include Adult Basic Education (ABE), Adult Secondary Education (ASE), and English as a Second Language (ESL).

The new Adult Education Act establishes new, researched based criteria for program quality and provides strong accountability for results. Under the new law, states will set goals for adult learner achievement and will negotiate those levels with the Department prior to plan approval.

- The federal investment in adult education for FY 99 is $385 million. Of that, $365 million goes directly to states to support adult education and literacy services. States are required by law to provide a 25% match for adult education funds, but recent assessments show the federal investment leverages more than three times the required match in State and local funds for adult education and literacy programs. The average per learner expenditure is less than $300 annually. Moreover, using constant 1995 dollar values, spending per participant dropped from $274 in 1966 to an actual value of $73 in 1998, despite an increased federal investment.

More than 4 million adults in 4,000 adult learning centers participate in adult education annually. Between 1990 and 1994, the Adult Education State Grant program enabled 1.5 million adults to complete high school or earn a GED. Yet, the 1994 National Evaluation of Adult Education Programs found that current programs serve only a small percentage of adults in need of services and that many participants leave before they achieve any literacy gains (primarily for personal reasons such as child care and transportation that are unrelated to instructional program quality).

Over the last decade, adult education enrollment has increased by nearly one third. English language instruction for limited English proficient adults is the fastest growing component of the adult education program, with enrollments increasing 72 percent in the last ten years. Adult basic education enrollments have increased by 46 percent. Adult education is currently experiencing an influx of out-of-school youth whose goal is secondary education completion. Large urban areas report an unmet demand for ESL services. States are being called upon to simultaneously meet the demand for increased adult education services and to improve program quality.

Fast Forward: Mobilizing, Investing, and Creating a Partnership for A Literate America

The proposed new funding package represents an aggressive and comprehensive approach to filling the human investment gaps in adult education and literacy and ensuring that all American adults enter the new millennium with the knowledge and skills to continue their education and be successful at work, home, and in their community .

- *Increasing Pubic Awareness.* An expanded national public awareness campaign would increase the awareness of the importance of adult education and literacy and serve as a catalyst for mobilization and action. This effort would build on the public awareness campaign developed by the National Institute for Literacy and an outreach campaign to employers by the Conference Board, funded by the Department of Education.

- *Community Engagement.* To stimulate activity at the local level, it is proposed that the Department roll out a community mobilization campaign based on the Georgia Literate Community Model. This campaign, linked to the public awareness effort, would challenge communities to -- with the assistance of a toolkit to be developed -- assess their needs in adult education, outline goals, and take concrete steps to get results. Communities would be encouraged to use federal, state, local, and private resources to set and meet specific literacy goals.

- *Improving ESL and Civics/Life Skill Instruction.* Common Ground Partnerships would provide $40 million to State and local communities to better serve their immigrant population and help them succeed in American life and demonstrate models of effective ESL instruction.

- *Expanding Learning Opportunities in the Workplace.* The proposed 21st Century Workforce Initiative would provide grants to build and expand workplace education and literacy systems and better serve small and medium-sized employer seeking to improve the quality of their workforce. The Department of Education has already contracted with the Conference Board to highlight the benefits of workplace education programs and engage employers. Tax incentives for employers could complement this investment.

- *Developing Innovative Uses of Technology so Adults Can Learn Anytime/Anywhere.* It is proposed that $50 million be used for American Learns Technology Challenge Grants for public-private partnerships to develop innovative software or technology products. It is proposed that funding be increased for Community Technology Centers to $20 million to help bridge the digital divide and increase assess to computer resources and training for adults in low-income communities.

- *Research and Development.* An expanded R & D effort would focus on the assessment and screening of adults with learning disabilities and would increase our knowledge of intervention strategies to more effectively serve these adults (NIFL is developing).

- *Building the Infrastructure.* It is proposed that the basic state grant be increased to $445 million in FY2000, increasing to at least $1 billion by 2005. Funding at this level would allow states to dramatically increase the number of individuals served and improve the quality of the services they deliver. A targeted $50 million a year program would support improved professional development for adult education teachers, with an emphasis on assessment and teaching of students with learning disabilities and using technology effectively. The new Adult Education Act sets new standards for accountability and will ensure that adult learners increase their skills, obtain jobs and further education, and are equipped for the future.

Adult Literacy 11/6/98

HHS funds some ESL for refugees (sometimes in combination w/state Adult Educ. $).

Need a way to tie in ~~TANF~~ TANF administrators into literacy project (use of WTW $ ~~$~~ to match federal $ on a ~~[illegible]~~ workplace literacy project).

~~A~~ [ESL counting as a qualified "work" activity] (?? big policy Q)

Job-related ESL. — contextualized learning

3 ~~kinds~~ motivations for learning English
citizenship work family

Coordinators
Best Practices booklet (w/a CD)
Links to community colleges

~~Q: Could~~

Andrea Kane [redacted]

Record Type: Record

To: Cecilia E. Rouse/OPD/EOP, Julie A. Fernandes/OPD/EOP

cc:
Subject: Literacy

Increase Employment Opportunities for Individuals with Low Literacy Levels

Historically, individuals with low education levels have remained on welfare longer, and there is an increasing concentration of individuals with English language barriers on the welfare rolls in some places.

Set aside within WTW competitive grant funds for work-based literacy projects. (new policy, should not require legislation) Low education level is currently an eligibility criteria for WTW funds, and a few competitive grants are focusing on work-based approaches to increasing basic skills, for immigrants and other populations. To encourage additional services for individuals who need to learn English and other adults with low basic skills, we could direct DOL to set aside approximately $100 million of the $375 million competitive grant funds for work-based literacy projects. A high priority should be given to projects with strong employer involvement. (Cost: None).

Create 21st Century Workforce Education Initiative. (new grant idea submitted by ED, not currently included in their FY 2000 budget proposal). Barriers preventing more adults from participating in Adult Education include time, the need to work, and child care and transportation. Providing access to services on or near the work site that complement work and are supported by employers would greatly assist individuals to raise their literacy levels and succeed in the workplace. Education has proposed grants to help support partnerships of business, labor, and education organizations to improve the basic literacy skills of current or newly hired workers to meet the demands of a global economy. These should be closely linked to the One-Stop system created under the Workforce Investment Act. While Adult Ed programs are not income-targeted, many of those with the lowest literacy levels are poor and either unemployed or working in low-wage, part-time jobs. Nearly half are black or Hispanic, and one-quarter are immigrants. Adult Ed programs typically require a 25% state match -- we may want to allow this match to be met by employers and/or by WTW and TANF funds. [ED is refining and costing out the proposal for NEC's E&T meeting on 11/6.]

Increase funding for Adult Education, including ESL. There is evidence of large unmet need for adult ed services, particularly for ESL in urban areas and for basic education for out-of-school youth. ED has proposed a $15 million increase in Adult Ed Basic Grants for FY 2000, from $385 million in FY 1999 to $400 million. States provide a 25 percent match, and decide how much of the Adult Ed funds to use for ESL. ED also received $7 million in FY 1999 for ESL discretionary grants, and has proposed a $20 million expansion in FY 2000. Within the Department's proposed funding level, or with additional funds, ED could create incentives for states or communities to expand adult basic skills and ESL services to address the long-waiting lists in some areas and also to expand capacity of work-focused ESL. (Cost: Need 5 year cost from Ed)

Authorization (?) [Adult Educ. National]

Workplace, community, home

① Building Adult Ed. Infrastructure (training providers)
- volunteers (Basic literacy)
- ESL teachers
- guides (how to run an effective program)
- Best practices
- developing model programs ESL/Adult Literacy

② Civics link — include fostering innovation.

③ $20 million (what asked for last year)

[* competitive grants (last year got $7 million)]

Screening for learning disability (all adults able to get) (related to welfare case-load)
Kansas & Washington are leaders on this.

Goal (?)

Technology

any time; any where

~~basics~~

additional incentive → basic ① technology literacy

community of learners

reduce stigma

→ new technology ① creates more interactive tutoring

- ② Speech recognition
- ③ emergence of low-cost equipment

  $100 web-tv

  service providers could end-up giving it away.

Six pieces

(*) highest priority — ① sub-sizing content development

higher quality developed

ESL/GED

teaching skill requirements linked to a particular job

software developers interested in his market

② pilots combined w/evaluation

in X # of communities

effort to get technology into peoples hands

③ more community-access points

pay for those people (?) ④ on-line tutors (?) (GED ?) Nat. Service ?) campaign to encourage more people to volunteer

(5) Challenge to the private sector
- Cable companies to carry
- Blockbuster to carry video
- software developers

(6) Research component

encourage university researchers to look @ Adult Basic + ESL as a grand research challenge to be solved.

technology

$1- $2 million per research group. (5 centers)

Funding (?)

(#3) we have $10 million for Dpt. of Ed to fund community computing centers

OPE

(#1) $10 mill for learning any-time any-where aimed @ post-secondary

But we could ask Dpt. of Ed. to do a proposal for Adult Basic Educ.

(#2) taking new stuff developed and trying it out.

Dpt. of Edu. — could do through National Activities

Funding Literacy-Link $15 mill over 5 yrs.

PBS developing web-based stuff

National Centers

for FY2000

do we want to expand existing

options

(1) Ed proposed $50 million program ~~for~~ for technology things. (tech program for Adult Literacy)

(2) Add to existing programs go to specific activities (Ed general research fund for #6)

Partnership for a Literate America. An alarming number of American adults -- 44 million according to the National Adult Literacy Survey -- struggle with a job application, cannot read to their children, or are left on the welfare rolls because they lack basic skills. Many have a learning disability and never knew it. Often, they do not know where to get help, are embarrassed to seek it, or cannot because of family responsibilities. Others are immigrants who face long waiting lists in many cities where they seek English~~-as-a-Second-Language~~ Lang. Proficiency courses. We are exploring how to provide these Americans with *every possible opportunity* to get screened for learning disabilities, improve their basic skills (in reading, writing, and arithmetic), and learn to speak English: at the workplace, in the community, or in the privacy and convenience of their home.

Policies we are considering include: (1) **Workplace**: a new tax credit and/or Federal grants to encourage employers to provide adult basic education classes at the worksite, and setting aside funds for work-based literacy projects within Welfare-to-Work competitive grants (this would not require new legislation); (2) **Community**: expanding the infrastructure and funding for adult basic education through the Adult Education program, encouraging the development of programs focused on easing the transition to the U.S. for new immigrants (through ESL and civics classes), subsidizing the provision of child care on college campuses and other adult education sites, and launching a national information campaign to make people aware of the problem of functional illiteracy and of available services; and (3) **Home**: using the new *Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships* to create software for adult basic education using $200 computers (e.g., WebTV, game players) and subsidizing public housing projects that create computer literacy programs.

Oprah

Norris @ Dpt. of Educ.
finalizing draft of civics link to

\$40 million to states
state-wide imp
ESL/civics
to help immig adapt to
Eng
Citizenship
Life
Life skills necessary to function

Common Ground Partnerships.

targeted 6.6 million — 3.3 million

If they choose to put in place a state-wide system

(states) comprehensive State system
(local angle)

Andrea Kane [redacted]

Record Type: Record

To: Julie A. Fernandes/OPD/EOP, Michael Cohen/OPD/EOP, Tanya E. Martin/OPD/EOP, Jonathan H. Schnur/OPD/EOP

cc:
Subject: New Ideas

Wanted to make sure you had chance to see what we are likely to send in -- lots of cross-cutting stuff. The ED proposals were presented at the last NEC E&T meeting; they obviously need more fleshing out, but wanted to make sure you were comfortable enough with them to have 'em show up on the list.

Increase Employment Opportunities for Individuals with Low Literacy Levels

Set aside within WTW competitive grant funds for work-based literacy projects. (new policy, should not require legislation) Historically, individuals with low education levels have remained on welfare longer, and there is an increasing concentration of individuals with English language barriers on the welfare rolls in some places. Low education level is currently an eligibility criteria for WTW funds, and a few competitive grants are focusing on work-based approaches to increasing basic skills, for immigrants and other populations. We could demonstrate our commitment to this important issues and attract additional communities and providers to develop targeted projects by highlighting services for individuals who need to learn English and other adults with low basic skills. For FY 1999, we could direct DOL to set aside approximately $100 million of the $375 million competitive grant funds for work-based literacy projects. For FY 2000, a similar set-aside could be included in the reauthorization, or could be done administratively. We could also consider waiving eligibility requirements for welfare recipients who have literacy needs but do not meet the other WTW eligibility criteria. A high priority should be given to projects with strong employer involvement. (Cost: no additional costs. Serve 10,000 - 20,000 people depending on program design)

Create 21st Century Workforce Education Initiative. (new grant idea submitted by ED, not currently included in their FY 2000 budget proposal). Barriers preventing more adults from participating in Adult Education include time, the need to work, and child care and transportation. Providing access to services on or near the work site that complement work and are supported by employers would greatly assist individuals to raise their literacy levels and succeed in the worklace. Education has proposed grants to help support partnerships of business, labor, and education organizations to improve the basic literacy skills of current or newly hired workers to meet the demands of a global economy. These should be closely linked to the One-Stop system created under the Worforce Investment Act. While Adult Ed programs are not income-targeted, many of those with the lowest literacy levels are poor and either unemployed or working in low-wage, part-time jobs. Nearly half are black or Hispanic, and one-quarter are immigrants. Adult Ed programs typically require a 25% state match -- we may want to allow this match to be met by employers and/or by WTW and TANF funds. [ED is refining and costing out the proposal for NEC's E&T meeting on 11/6.] *Should be cross-referenced with ED section*

Increase funding for Adult Education, including ESL. There is evidence of large unmet need for adult ed services, particularly for ESL in urban areas and for basic education for out-of-school youth. ED has proposed a $15 million increase in Adult Ed Basic Grants for FY 2000, from $385 million in FY 1999 to $400 million. States provide a 25 percent match, and decide how much of the Adult Ed funds to use for ESL. ED also received $7 million in FY 1999 for ESL discretionary grants, and has proposed a $20 million expansion in FY 2000. Within the Department's proposed funding level, or with additional funds, ED could create incentives for states or communities to expand adult basic skills and ESL services to address the long-waiting lists in some areas and also to expand capacity of work-focused ESL. (Cost: Average cost of adult ed is currently $300) *Should be cross-referenced with ED section*

Add 50,000 teachers for Adult Basic Skills. ED has also propose an initiative to raise the quality and capacity of Adult Education by providing 50,000 full-time professional teachers in adult learning centers over a five-year period. The initiative would provide funds to states who hire one new adult ed teacher for every two supported by federal funds. Currently, most Adult Ed teachers work part-time, do not have specialized training in working with adults. The field experiences 30% turnover with many of the teachers moving to full-time K-12 jobs where they can get better pay and benefits. Some of the new teachers could specialize in ESL. [ED is refining the proposal further for NEC's E&T meeting on 11/6.] *Should be cross-referenced with ED section*

* Link Adult ~~Ed~~ Literacy (ESL) classes to civics instruction

* Technology