

## 4: FINANCES & FUNDING

As another measure of leadership, capacity, and substantive engagement, this section takes up a variety of financial and funding questions. Two main lines of inquiry are the issue of dependency on federal funding and the likely impact of state block grant funding on public library involvement in adult literacy.

### STATE LIBRARIES As A SOURCE OF FUNDING

State library personnel were asked (in F1) if their agencies are now a source of literacy funding to regional and local public libraries in their systems. The responses of the two categories of respondents are in some conflict. Nearly three of every five librarians say no, while three of every five of library literacy people say yes. One can only speculate on how to account for the difference, because both groups would be expected to know the facts.

The essential finding is that about half of the state libraries claim to have a funding role. How substantial this

<b>F1. Does your state library agency currently provide adult literacy funding to the state's central and branch public library facilities? [Q1-Q2]</b>					
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>		
Q1	State Librarians (34 responses of 35 possible)	44%	56%		
Q2	Library Agency Literacy Contacts (39 of 44)	62	38		
<b>F2. If federal funding for library literacy programs were substantially cut, which of the following do you think would occur? [Q1-Q4]</b>					
		<u>Q1</u>	<u>Q2</u>	<u>Q3</u>	<u>Q4</u>
	Most library literacy programs would have to reduce their level of outreach/service.	80%	64%	58%	78%
	Most programs would be able to find replacement funding.	6	11	5	13
	Many programs would be unable to survive.	57	41	45	24
	Most programs would not be significantly affected.	11	16	3	18
	Other Impacts	3	7	0	21
	Would lose staff, volunteers				
	Many would survive only with difficulty				
	Program would be kept routine, little new				
	Strong collections will become outdated in 5-6 years				
	Less national advocacy, reduced state emphasis				
	More time would have to be spent fundraising				
<b>F2a. If federal funding for adult literacy programming in general were cut substantially, which of the following do you think would occur? [Q3 only]</b>					
		<u>SLRC</u>			
	Most programs would have to reduce service/outreach.	95%			
	Most programs would be able to find replacement funding.	3			
	Many programs would be unable to survive.	59			
	Most programs would not be significant affected.	3			
	Other impacts	10			
	Reduced emphasis on program quality				
	Some CBOs would cease to exist or to offer literacy instruction.				

funding role is is another matter. A comparison of the F1 responses with those given earlier in Table R3 of Section 1

provides some further insight. When asked if the development of library-

based adult literacy programs was presently a major mission of their state agency, half of the Q1 and Q2 respondees

said yes. So it would seem that most state libraries that consider adult literacy services to be a major part of their mission also back it up with at least some money.

Moreover, analysis of raw material in the background data book reveals a very interesting fact. Note that the operative word in the question about role was “major.” So “no” answers to that question do not necessarily mean those agencies do not work in literacy at all, or that they do not perceive it to be a legitimate activity. (It only means that adult literacy is a relatively low priority in their scheme of things and thus probably more vulnerable in economically troubled times.)

Deeper analysis of data book material reinforces this point. Respondents from groups Q1 and Q2 said that state libraries in 26 states consider the development of library literacy programs a major part of their mission; only 7 of those states did not appear on the F1 list as sources of literacy funding (ID, LA, MA, NH, NV, RI, and VT). Similarly, 30 state agencies are named

<b>F3. Federal support for literacy will likely be provided through state block grants starting in the fall of 1996. How do you think this dramatic shift will affect your agency's capacity to provide leadership in library literacy (e.g. will it affect the level of funding available from your agency, will shared decision making among local libraries and your agency be increased or decreased)? [Q1, Q2]</b>			
		% Responding	%N.R.
Q1	State Librarians (33 of 35)	94%	6%
Q2	State Agency Literacy Contacts (37 of 44)	84	16
			<u># Mentions</u>
			<u>Q1</u> <u>Q2</u>
	Minimal or limited impact		4 7
	Probably none—we have strong literacy support from governor's office		3
	No impact		3
	Services for literacy will increase due to recent reorganization in state		1
	Services for literacy may increase somewhat because state library shares decision-making with state board of education		1
	Our state role and ability to provide library literacy funding may increase		1
	We have statutory state funding for adult and family literacy in public libraries		1
	If funds are not earmarked for library literacy, we'll lose substantially	2	2
	Loss of support will probably be significant	2	2
	Without federal funding, there will be no literacy dollars, no state-level capacity	1	1
	Literacy will become a lower priority at state/local levels		4
	Depends on funding priorities of state or governor	1	3
	Funds will go to the state education agency and libraries will lose out	1	1
	If funds go to state education agency, we will lose out/won't be able to complete	1	1
	If not earmarked for libraries, schools will get the money. Libraries, CBOs and community colleges will be fighting for the same reduced funds		1
	No leadership training could be provided & other core program services would have to be reduced		1
	Depends on what state agency/office controls the block grant funding		1
	Substantial losses if block grants are earmarked for workforce development	1	
	Funding will go to traditional ABE programs, not library literacy programs	1	
	More staff time and resources will be needed to compete for the resources	1	1
	We will have to reduce or eliminate ongoing program support	1	
	It all depends on the level of block grant funding	1	1
	We will continue to sponsor literacy workshops for librarians and to help librarians develop grants and take part in joint planning	1	
	Shared decision making among local and state libraries will decrease		1
	Decision making among locals and state library will increase	1	1
	None—we have never been able to use federal literacy funding as it is because of other pressing needs	1	1
	We'll continue to do the best we can	1	
	Don't know	4	5

**F3a. Federal support for literacy will likely be provided through state block grants starting in the fall of 1996. How do you think this dramatic shift will affect the adult literacy situation in your state from the standpoint of funding, policy development and planning, and service provision? [Q3, Q4]**

		<u>% Responding</u>	<u>% N.R.</u>
Q3	SLRCs (37 of 40)	93%	7%
Q4	Local Programs (61 of 63)	97	3

	<u># Mentions</u>	
	<u>Q3</u>	<u>Q4</u>
Will force major reduction of literacy services in the state; there'll be significantly less funding for literacy	5	6
Will eliminate libraries as literacy providers in the state, leave them out in the cold		4
Will eliminate literacy education in the state	1	1
Library groups won't be able to compete with education groups for the funding; we'll be shut out of the funding		7
We'll end up squabbling/competing/scrambling with one another for the state's funding crumbs	1	3
Will not be able to compete for funding without set asides	2	3
Diminished funding for literacy will be further reduced by state program administrative costs, not currently the case with the federal distribution of LSCA		1
Voluntary programs in the state are nearly at a standstill already due to lack of funding and would virtually cease		1
Will be able to compete for funding only if we can become more involved with our state legislators		1
Will be able to access funding only through job and crime prevention programs		1
Will force more collaboration/networking	6	1
Collaboration and communication will be more difficult as we struggle to provide services with less funding		2
Fund distribution may not be made fairly and program favoritism could prevail; state may lack resources to disperse or disperse effectively to local literacy groups	1	3
It all depends on who makes the rules/which agency administers the funds	1	4
It will depend on the governor/governor's office/state politics	5	3
If SDE is in control, there'll be a decrease in services/programs for lowest-skilled individuals, voluntary programs, and the like		5
If SDE is in control there may be new growth opportunities	1	
Policy will be directed by governor's office which will strengthen our position and possibly lead to an increase in funding for adult basic skills services	1	
Will result in service emphasis on more highly-skilled individuals and systems with powerful voices—e.g. ABE, community colleges, schools, job training systems. Voluntary and programs serving lowest skilled individuals will lose out	5	7

in F1, including 12 not included in R3 (AK, AR, CA, CO, CT, MD, MS, NJ, NM, SC, and UT). On balance, then, a significant number of state library agencies that do not consider literacy programs a major part of their mission nevertheless provide some funding for literacy activities.

In other words, although 60% of all 44 state libraries participating in the study say that literacy is a major part of their agencies' mission, significantly more, nearly 70%, apparently provide *some* funding for literacy.

Unfortunately, the next section of this report will show that this funding role does not, with a few extraordinary exceptions, add up to a lot in terms of the actual dollar level of the support.

Moreover, as will be seen later, the federal government has been the source of much of the state library literacy funding—but earmarked federal funds for library literacy have all but disappeared at this writing. This fact has obvious repercussions for the literacy leadership capacity of state libraries, to say nothing of literacy

**Table F3a, cont'd**

If workforce development remains/becomes a priority in our state, general adult education services will be reduced/further reduced/defunded	4	8
If emphasis is on getting people off welfare and into work programs that serve lowest-level students will lose funding because they won't be able to meet "hours of participation" funding criteria	1	1
Rural/smaller/innovative programs will lose out to urban programs and more powerful voices—which happened in Indiana when Even Start money shifted from the federal to the state level		3
Stronger agencies/larger programs will survive; those less "evolved" won't		3
SDE emphasis will stay the same, but dollars will be fewer	1	
More adults will turn to libraries and volunteer groups for services		1
May force the state to more clearly define its literacy mission	1	
In this state we'll probably do okay		1
It will be easier to get supplemental funding		1
No impact		1
Don't know or not sure	8	5
We aren't involved in funding, policy development, & planning	1	
No response	1	2

pants themselves say that federal sources (largely LSCA) account for the lion's share of their funding, nearly 40% of it.

---

### THE TROUBLE WITH BLOCK GRANTS

---

Of course, for libraries the big issue is not the disappearance of Title VI of LSCA per se (now scheduled to occur after one last round of grants this fall). It is whether the federal funding that library agencies and library literacy programs have been getting for several years now would still come to them if it is shifted to state block grants.

services at the community level.

---

### THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL CUTS

---

In F2, the vast majority of respondees in all four groups think that **substantial cuts in federal funding for literacy will force most library literacy programs to reduce their level of outreach and service: 80%** of state librarians think so, as do **64%** of library agency literacy contacts, **58%** of SLRC heads, and **78%** of the local programs.

A very high percentage of each group also think that **many programs would**

**be unable to survive: 57%** of state librarians, **41%** of library agency literacy contacts, and **45%** of SLRCs. Least pessimistic about the prospect of total collapse are the local programs; only one in four of them predict this.

Correspondingly, very few respondees in any of the groups think replacement funding could be found.

[Note that as bad as things could get for public libraries trying to offer literacy services, SLRCs say in F2a that substantial further erosion of federal funding would

have even worse consequences for adult literacy generally.]

Unthinkable as this scenario is, analysis of the background data book and of some of the tables in Section 7 of this report indicate that these predictions are not far off.

According to state library agency literacy experts, LSCA Title VI accounts for about 43% of all library literacy funding. LSCA Title I accounts for another 15%, and an additional 8% comes from other federal sources. Furthermore, the local public library partici-

Thus, questions F3, F3a, and F4 asked the four study groups how, if at all, block grant funding would affect them, their organizations, and adult literacy services in their states.

A few but not many of the respondees believe that a federal shift of funds to state block grants will have little or no impact on them. Overwhelmingly, they are convinced that if **block grant funds are not earmarked for library literacy services, libraries will lose out.**

The reasons are many and varied: In some

**F4. Some library literacy personnel are worried that the block grant approach will place libraries at a disadvantage in competing for available state education/literacy funds. What difficulties will you, your organizations, or others involved in the provision of library literacy services face if the majority of literacy funding does come in block grant form? [Q1-Q4]**

		<u>% Responding</u>	<u>% N.R.</u>
Q1	State Librarians (32 of 35)	91%	9%
Q2	State Library Literacy Contacts (35 of 44)	80	20
Q3	SLRCs (33 of 40)	83	17
Q4	Local Programs (55 of 63)	87	13

	<u>Q1</u>	<u>Q2</u>	<u>Q3</u>	<u>Q4</u>
Depends on what state agency/office controls the funds	1	2	1	1
We/voluntary programs/CBOs already have trouble getting funded because library-based literacy programs are not an SDE/education priority	2	3		1
State library would lose out (or continue to lose out) to state education department/agency	2	3	2	1
Schools will be the priority/and the rest of us will be pitted against each other	1	2		2
If funds go to SDE, we won't get any/or won't be able to compete with ABE	1	1		3
Traditional providers will keep all the money; the whole literacy community is threatened, not just libraries				1
Unless funds are earmarked for state library/library literacy, we won't get any/much of it	1	2	1	9
If funds not given directly to state library, we'll have great trouble getting it	2			
Unless governor/SDE are convinced that libraries have an education role they will do poorly/lose out in the funding competition		2	2	1
Depends on whether the governor has a personal interest/commitment	1	1	1	
If workforce/employment programs are given funding priority it will be at the expense of other programs	1	1	1	4
If adult education is retained as a separate funding track, and doesn't have to compete with vocational education, we should be okay				1
Other education programs, not library programs, will get the funding				1
Library-literacy programs will be given low/lower priority	1	2	1	
Programs that serve lowest-skilled adults (library, voluntary, CBO) will lose out				2
Libraries will have trouble competing with direct service providers	2			
Libraries will have trouble competing because they have no strategic plan			2	
Libraries may/will be pushed out of the funding loop		1	1	1
Very intense competition for the funds with libraries (and voluntary programs, and CBOs) losing	1	1		1
Libraries in many states will not get funded and will lose their incentive to be an integral part of the literacy movement	1			
Staffs will be reduce, in turn increasing administrative and managerial burdens and reducing services			1	4

cases, they think that governors won't care enough. In many cases, they believe that state education agencies will automatically be the fund administrators, and they fear that these agencies won't (many don't now) understand or welcome the library's education role.

[Note: In the essay answers to many of the

questions in this study there is an unmistakable undercurrent of mistrust on the part of libraries toward state education departments.]

Many of the respondents are also concerned that workforce training will be emphasized at the expense of other kinds of programs (especially those of voluntary groups, CBOs, and libraries—organiza-

The endemic fragmentation of adult education efforts is particularly serious for library literacy programs. They rightly have the impression that they may dry up and blow away if federal categorical support (and the state policies it directly or indirectly drives) goes away. Overall, they are caught in a double bind. Support is waning for both the literacy movement and the library movement, but both need to be strengthened if library literacy programs are to survive. (Forrest Chisman, Southport Institute for Policy Analysis)

**Table F4 cont'd**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Large fish will gobble up the food/we're so small we'd get creamed	2	2	1	3
In a primarily rural state, urban programs will have trouble competing				1
Six wolves in a pen and only food for 3			1	
There will be decreased funding, more competition and/or less collaboration/ we'll be scrambling or pitted against each other for less money			2	5
We won't have enough clout/resources to compete		2		2
Without better communication among agencies, there will be problems		1	2	
Unless our state library is committed to library literacy we will suffer				2
Our library-literacy program already operates with no funding				1
Libraries don't have much of a role in our state; it'll be easy to decrease their funding			1	
None that we don't have now—we're already underfunded				2
We don't apply for state education/literacy funds now				1
Poor collections for use by adult students will result		1		
Very problematic				2
Don't know/hard to tell/not sure	6	5	4	7
None	4	1	1	
Groups that have established strong partnerships with others in the community should do all right; those that have no partners are less likely to get funded	1			1
Minimal, won't have much affect	2	2	3	4
Won't have much affect on established programs or high-visibility programs	1			1
Service provision will be less fragmented as programs will have to consolidate			1	
Answer not applicable/clear	1	2	6	1

**F4a. What can national and state leadership organizations do to help you and other literacy/library groups in your state minimize or protect against anticipated problems from the block grant approach? [Q1-Q4]**

		% Responding	% N.R.
Q1	State Librarians (27 of 35)	77%	23%
Q2	State Library Literacy Contacts (31 of 44)	70	30
Q3	SLRCs (33 of 40)	83	17
Q4	Local Programs(56 of 63)	89	11

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
National groups can provide information and statistical data	1	1	1	
Document and provide information about programs and their achievements to legislators	1	1	1	2
Providing timely information about the changes would help		1		
Issue position statements on the use of funds, models of service/propose standards		2	1	
Develop information pieces for state education agencies, human resource groups, and other state entities which may get block grants to show the value of library-literacy programs. Distribute this through state libraries and ask them to take an active communications role.		1		
Provide every governor with print information on role and importance of library literacy programs. Follow up with personal phone calls		1		
Promote collaboration/coordination/consolidation of activities	3	3	7	5
Provide policy development and planning assistance/be a partner in such activities			3	
Encourage each state to develop a comprehensive statewide development plan which explicitly includes literacy/urge or require each state to allocate a percentage of its funding for literacy and for voluntary/library programs			1	3
Help get the message out that programs serving low-skilled adults (library-literacy programs, CBOs, voluntary programs) and ESL programs provide a vital service not offered in traditional ABE, workforce, or job training programs/show importance of social values as well as economic				12
Publicize the negative national impact if low-level adult readers were suddenly denied library-literacy services (perhaps in a television campaign)				2
Education departments should be required to include nontraditional and non-classroom-based programs in their thinking and funding		1		1
Help incorporate technology more into service delivery			1	
Make it clear that literacy is a national and state priority			1	1
Help dispel the concept of the "quick fix"			1	
Advocacy and public relations—directed especially to policymakers, governors, legislators	2	1		5
Conduct a major information blitz to state library directors stressing the importance and cost-effectiveness of library literacy programs				1

tions that serve the lowest-skilled adults). Along the same lines, they fear that schools and traditional ABE programs, both having more organized and powerful voices, will get preferential treatment—pushing things back to where they were before the adult literacy movement came along and leveled the playing field.

In short, there is a powerful sense, which appears to be based on experience, that how well libraries do on the playing field of the future—indeed whether they are even able to get onto the field—will depend on who controls the funds and whether anything is earmarked for library literacy.

Of course, the amount of financing is obviously a crucial matter, too. Increasingly, these groups see a situation of diminished funding in which lack of sensitive federal or state leadership will pit them against each other and everyone else.

“Six wolves in a pen and only food for three,” observes one respondent. “Large fish will gobble up the food,” say others. Or, “rural programs won’t be able to compete with

urban programs” or vice versa.

Clearly, the groups in the study understand as well as anyone the dangers they face. And some fully appreciate that the adult literacy movement as a whole is on or headed for a backward slide. It could be pushed *way* back into the shadows if the block grant movement goes forward without adequate, earmarked funding provided, and if explicit federal guidelines are not set down for state spending on both adult literacy and library literacy.

---

### HOW NATIONAL & STATE ORGANIZATIONS CAN HELP

---

In question F4a, groups Q1-Q4 were asked to think about how national and state-level groups might help them minimize or protect against problems resulting from the state block grant approach. The responses range all over the map. But the majority fall into several broad thematic areas:

There is a heavy call for national and state leadership organizations

**Table F4a, cont'd**

	<u>Q1</u>	<u>Q2</u>	<u>Q3</u>	<u>Q4</u>
Awareness activities that educate policymakers on the relationships between adult illiteracy and welfare, unemployment, and crime			1	
Public awareness campaigns to promote/make evident what libraries can/do contribute to adult literacy service provision	1	1		2
Promote literacy at the National Governors' Conference	1	1		
Educate political leaders, funders, the National Governors' Association on the role of public libraries in adult literacy programming		1		2
Assure a process that gives all groups—regardless of size and outreach—an effective voice and equal access to funds			4	6
Mandate truly representative advisory groups and state interagency working groups to plan and coordinate policies			1	
Keep lines of communications open between diverse literacy and adult education providers		1	1	
Have SLRCs seek input/ involvement from all players through workshops				1
State/local organizations can work together to mesh overlapping/duplicative programs that are by themselves too expensive to run	1	1		2
Help local groups develop planning, fundraising and budgeting, and coalition-building skills	1			
Help state and local libraries develop better marketing strategies	1			
Encourage, develop, demonstrate meaningful systems of accountability			2	1
Consultants could travel to the states to give workshops and seminars	1	1		
Convene a national library literacy forum with involvement of the ALA, the US Department of Education, and other national groups		1		
Provide forums for discussion and information				1
Legislation should set aside a specific percentage of adult education funds for literacy/library-literacy programs	3	1	1	
Libraries should be included as potential recipients in set-aside funding for literacy services below GED level		1		
Push for block grants to be awarded for literacy through LSCA/LSTA legislation	1			
Ensure set-asides for library literacy programs			1	8
Make sure that adult education and vocational education funding are kept separate				1
Ensure that a percentage of literacy funding goes directly to the state library agencies/public libraries	2	2		3
Push for percentage of block grants to be earmarked for adult literacy/basic education	1	1	3	3
Insist that adult literacy funds be administered by state education agencies				1

**Table F4a, cont'd**

	<u>Q1</u>	<u>Q2</u>	<u>Q3</u>	<u>Q4</u>
Make sure that local programs are not held to improper/impossible standards and thus cut out of the funding				3
It's a question of politics in our state, which state agencies are in control and the literacy interests/commitment of elected officials	1			
Recognize public libraries as players, in legislation and other ways	1	1		1
Ensure that library leaders have an equal say in planning and funding decisions/encourage state library agencies to participate in administration of block grant funds	1	1		1
Encourage state-level groups to permit local literacy programs to determine their own program orientation based on their assessment of local need, rather than to be forced into, say, a workforce mode getting state emphasis				2
Make sure that block-grant funds are equitably distributed based on need				5
Lobby for adequate/increased funding	1	1	1	1
Require a higher level of support than is the case now			1	
Revise legislation to guarantee longer-term funding				2
Continued lobbying by all individuals and organizations		1		
Professional organizations should do more to bring about funding increases based on demonstrated need			1	
Block/don't implement the block grant movement/literacy funding should be kept at federal level		1		2
Reduce conflicting provisions in public law			1	
Eliminate expensive bureaucratic requirements				1
Develop a sound plan			1	
It depends on the interest/commitment of the governor			1	
Provide more state funding, less national funding	1			
Keep an open mind—it may be an opportunity			1	1
National groups can't help; it's a state-based problem; it's a matter of our own understanding/commitment; we have to be organized at the local level	1	2	1	1
Don't know/not sure	6	2	2	5
None	2			
Not applicable		1		
Answer unclear			1	

to provide more and better information about adult illiteracy and to undertake awareness activities that promote illiteracy as a continuing national priority.

There are numerous calls for evaluating, documenting, and getting the word out about successful programs. Many respondents feel that the role of public libraries should be more widely publicized. And many, especially local library literacy programs, want help to show that programs serving low-skilled adults (libraries, CBOs, voluntary groups) are performing a unique and vital service.

Among the most important targets for these activities are governors and the National Governors' Association, state and national legislators and other political leaders, state education agencies, and public libraries themselves.

Various kinds of hands-on technical assistance is also called for—with both local and state groups seen as benefitting from it. The leadership sources indicated are SLRCs, national organizations, and nationally-supplied consultants who could

**F5. Please give your state's FY95 funding for all adult literacy programs—including workforce, family, ESL, ABE, voluntary—or give the amount for the latest year available and specify the year. [Q3 only]**

**F5a. Indicate the percentage of state adult literacy funding that goes to library literacy programs. [Q3 only]**

**F6. As a percentage of the total state budget, in the past 5 years has state funding of adult literacy increased, decreased, or stayed about the same? [Q3 only]**

**F6a. In dollar amount of support, in the past 5 years has state funding of adult literacy increased, decreased, or stayed about the same? [Q3 only]**

	F5 Total Est. State Literacy Funding		F5a Library Literacy \$ as % Of F5	State's Adult Literacy Funding In Past 5 Years									
	Year			F6 As % of Total State Budget				F6a In \$ Amount Of Support					
				(+)	(-)	Same	D.K.	(+)	(-)	Same	D.K.		
AL	4,000,000	FY95	5	1					1				
AK	3,000,000	FY95	?				1					1	
AZ	3,000,000	FY96	N.R.				1					1	
CA	D.K.		D.K.										
CO	D.K.		D.K.				1					1	
CT	23,000,000	FY95	1				1			1			
DE	D.K.		D.K.			1					1		
FL	N.R.		N.R.						N.R.				N.R.
HI	N.R.		N.R.				1					1	
IA	1,759,000	FY95	3				1					1	
IL	25,000,000	FY95	20				1			1			
IN	1,500,000		10			0.5	0.5			1			
KS	1,000,000	FY95	20	1						1			
KY	N.R.		N.R.	1						1			
LA	D.K.		D.K.			1					1		
MD	N.R.		N.R.				1					1	
MI	D.K.		D.K.				1					1	
MN	18,000,000	FY94-95	D.K.			1					1		
MO	N.R.		N.R.	1						1			
MS	8,000,000	FY95-96	D.K.	1						1			
MT	D.K.		D.K.				1						1
NC	29,000,000	FY94	0					1					1
ND	1,500,000	FY94-95	0				1					1	
NE	D.K.		D.K.				1					1	
NH	1,800,000	FY95	0				1					1	
NJ	D.K.		D.K.						1				1
NM	4,570,000	FY95	10			1						1	
NY	D.K.		D.K.	1						1			
OH	N.R.		N.R.						1				1
OK	500,000	FY95	N.R.						N.R.				N.R.
PA	20,102,231	FY95	2				1					1	
SC	N.R.		N.R.	1						1			
SD	800,000	FY95	0				1					1	
TN	N.R.		0	1						1			
UT	7,134,000	FY95/96	0				1			1			
VT	N.R.	FY95-96	N.R.			1					1		
VA	850,000	D.K.				1							N.R.
WA	18,000,000	FY95	1	1						1			
WV	2,013,827	FY95	1	1						1			
WI	N.R.	D.K.					1					1	

Note: The SLRCs in IA and SD indicate that the source of information is their SDE. NE indicates no access to the information but believes there is no state funding. SC said that the state contribution is 3 times the federal. State funding information in this table is relatively useless and probably represents a good deal of guessing. Little can be concluded except that most SLRCs do not appear to have direct access to information about their states' literacy finances and funding.

**F7. What % of FY95 literacy funding in the state (or use most recent year) comes from the sources listed below? [Q3]**

Key:	1	Title I of LSCA	8	Non-ABE state sources
	2	Title VI of LSCA	9	Municipal
	3	ABE State Grant Program	10	Corporate
	4	Workplace Literacy Grants, DAEL, USDE	11	Foundation grants
	5	Other USDE	12	Individual donations
	6	U.S. Dept. of Labor	13	Other (specify)
	7	Other federal		

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
AL			x					x					
AK			60			10		10					10
AZ		10	70	10							5	5	
CA	D.K.												
CO	D.K.												
CT			15		5	3		40	37				
DE	N.A.												
FL	N.R.												
HI		27			36								
IA	D.K.												
IL		1	25	5				60			8		
IN		30	30	10		5					5		20
KS								100					
KY	1	1	18	1		8	1	46	1	0.5	0.5	2	20
LA	N.R.												
MD	N.R.												
MI			8										
MN	0.5	0.5	15	1		7		55		4	2		15
MO	D.K.												
MS	1												
MT	D.K.												
NC	N.R.												
ND			50			5		30					10
NE	N.R.												
NH		5	70					25					
NJ	N.R.												
NM		10	60		20	2				3	5		
NY	N.R.												
OH	D.K.												
OK	N.R.												
PA			60		5			35					
SC			23		6	0.1	0.7	70					
SD	1		95		3							1	
TN	N.R.												
UT	1	1	24	8	2			64					
VT	1	1	40	17	38								3
VA	D.K.												
WA			20			10	10	60	1	1	1	1	
WV			33			67							
WI	N.R.												

Note: Little can be concluded from this table other than that in the judgment of SLRCs the principal source of funding in states for adult literacy (not library literacy programs!) is federal/state ABE grants. Among the non-ABE state sources specified were General Revenue (IL) and state appropriations generally (KS, ND). Even Start funding was cited in several of the Category 5 responses. JTPA and JOBS were cited in a number of instances. The National Guard provides significant funding in AK. Contractual arrangements produce some income (14%) in ND. VISTA, the state literacy board (VT), and a statewide foundation (IN) are cited as important current or future sources.

travel the states giving workshops and seminars. The respondents would also like to have help with policy and planning, developing accountability procedures, incorporating technology into service delivery, fundraising, budgeting, coalition-building, marketing, and other areas of perceived need.

Not unexpectedly, there are also strong calls for leadership groups to ensure that block grants include literacy set-asides for libraries, and that processes are protected or adopted to assure equitable distribution of funding.

It isn't hard to see that action on all of these

fronts would be helpful to state and local library-literacy groups, and to general literacy groups as well. Indeed, most of them are activities that have been needed all along—and that have been *given* all along, but in varying degree depending on the political and economic winds.

However, while it is a plus that the respondents recognize the form that most practical help can take, more movement on any of these fronts, while desirable, would not produce results overnight. **More urgently needed in the present economic and ideological climate is something new, something with potential for an immediate impact.**

The thinking is thin and lacking in innovation from this standpoint. But there are a few promising ideas. Here are three of the best:

- ◆ Professional organizations should do more to bring about funding increases based on demonstrated need.
- ◆ A national library literacy forum should be convened, with involvement of the American Library Association, the U.S. Department of Education, and other national groups.
- ◆ To show the value of library-literacy programs, information pieces should be developed specifically for state education agencies, human resource groups, and other state entities which may receive block grants. The material should be distributed through state libraries with state libraries asked to take an active communications role.

---

### USELESSNESS OF SLRC FUNDING DATA

---

The next five questions in this section (F5, F5a, F6, F6a, F7) were directed solely to the SLRCs. They were designed to shed light on three related

matters from the statewide perspective of the SLRCs: the amount of FY95 state funding for adult literacy, the change in level of that funding over the past five years, and the percent of this funding that has gone to library literacy programs. [Note: The issue of state funding for library literacy purposes is taken up again in Section 5.]

Unfortunately, because of the erroneous assumption that SLRCs had been implemented as the widely representative bodies conceived in the National Literacy Act, the survey questions, as it turned out, were somewhat pointless.

With few exceptions, the state funding information in F5-F7 is relatively useless and probably represents a great amount of guessing. Little can be concluded from it other than that the SLRCS are poorly informed about state literacy funding matters and even more so about library literacy funding.

The tables are further evidence, if more be needed, that most SLRCS are out of the loop and function as dependent offices within other organizations.

**F8. Does the SLRC currently have a major role in directing or facilitating the flow of adult literacy funding to the state's local literacy programs, including those based in libraries? If yes, what form does this role take and with what other key groups is the responsibility shared.** [Q3 only]

	Yes	No	Don't Know
SLRCs (40 of 40)	15%	83%	2%

States answering yes: Alaska, Illinois, Michigan, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota

Groups with which shared:  
 Advisory through ABE Interagency Committee (AK)  
 Secretary of State's Literacy Office because that office operates the SLRC (IL)  
 The Library of Michigan Foundation's *Read Indeed* program, which we fund (MI)  
 We administer several grants; our staff reviews local project proposals and recommends funding (SC)  
 The State Library, ABE, and SD Literacy Council (SD)

One thing that surprised me was how out of the loop SLRCs seemed to be. I think this reflects the fact that they were originally funded as governor's grants, and so ended up going to very different places in each state. (Virginia Heinrich, MN)

However, even if the questions had been directed to state departments of education, it is doubtful that the figures would be completely sound because the SDEs are just one of many state agencies that presumably make expenditures on adult literacy—including human resource, labor, and departments of justice. And no one at the state or national level has ever done a thorough and consistent job of drawing together funding information from such disparate jurisdictions.

Despite the general uselessness of the tables, however, they do raise some intriguing issues. Is it possible, for instance, that adult literacy funding in so many states has stayed the same over the past five years despite continual budget cutting at the state level? Or have most states never really allocated very much to adult literacy? Numerous

indicators in this study point to the latter.

Also of interest, it was noted earlier that SLRCs are less aware of libraries as a component of the statewide literacy providing system than they should be. This is shown again in F5a—hardly anyone ventures a guess on the library's share.

Finally, the last question in this section (F8) provides another measure of just how removed from the center of power and authority the SLRCs are. All 40 of the participating SLRCs answered the question, yet only 6 of them (AK, IL, MI, ND, SC, SD) said at the time of questioning that they had a major role in the actual *funding* of local literacy programs.

---

#### ONE OVERRIDING CONCERN

---

In the design of this study, a conscious decision

was made to avoid explicit references to the level of funding as a problem. The intent was to let the matter surface naturally as an issue, if indeed it was one.

In fact, strong evidence of a major funding problem began to accumulate at the outset of this report. This discussion of finances and funding only adds further urgency to the matter: The lack of funding—and of stability in funding—is an alarming problem on the verge of becoming a crisis. This issue, more than any other, is of overriding concern.