Data collection issues are the primary concern in this strand of the study. To what extent do state library agencies collect data about local public library involvement in adult literacy service provision? Is the data substantial enough to give a meaningful current picture of the nature, degree, and financing of that involvement. Only library agency literacy professionals (Q2) were questioned.

The section also provides an estimate of the number of public libraries offering adult literacy services.

In retrospect, expectations about the range and depth of information that could be provided were unrealistically high. Questions asked not only for numbers of local programs involved in specific substantive aspects of literacy service provision but also for those numbers according to different population service areas.

In the hope of compiling comparable data, the population groupings

specified were basically those used by the National Center for Educational Statistics in tracking and reporting on library activities generally. Respondees were asked to report according to 11 different population services areas, ranging from a population base of a million or more people down to units of 1,000 or less.

LAPD 1. Does your state library agency collect data on the library-based literacy programs in your state? (If yes, please give your best estimates to questions 2-4. If no, skip to question 5.) [Q2 only]

State Library Literacy Contacts (39 of 44 responded, 89%)

1		2	3
% (#) Responding		# Giving	# Giving Data
Yes	No	Some Data	In NCES Format
33% (13)	67% (26)	14	13

1: CA, FL, GA, IL, IN, LA, MA, MO, ND, NH, SD, TX, WA
2: AK, AR, CA, CO, DE, FL, GA, MA, ND, NH, OK, SD, TX, WA
3: All states included in 2, except CO

A CRYING NEED FOR DATA COLLECTION

Occasionally, earlier sections of this report have delivered very mixed messages and sometimes deeply discouraging news. But there is opportunity in nearly everything discussed and findings are emphasized that might provide a foundation on which to build.

However, the response to question LAPD 1 reveals that a central building block is missing: **the vast majority of state libraries do not collect data on local public library literacy activities**. Library literacy programming and planning is handicapped as a result.

Moreover, not only don't most state libraries collect data, but extensive telephone interviewing found that other likely sources don't collect it either, at least not in any systematic or regular way—not the Public Data Service of the American Library Association, or the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, or the

---

Your report screams out for better data collection and dissemination, and for getting information on promising practices (and failed approaches) out to the field in a timely way—on a national basis. (Helen Crouch, LVA)

LAPD 2. How many local public libraries and library branches in your state offered adult literacy serivces ap. 5 years ago and how many do today? If you do not have 1995 figures, please give the latest available and indicate the year.

LAPD 3. Of those libraries offering services in 1995, how many in each population group have the following characteristics?

1 - # with an all-volunteer staff
2 - # with some paid staff
3 - # providing book collections for adult beginning readers
4 - # providing learning materials for students and/or tutors
5 - # providing space for classes and meetings
6 - # providing information and referral services
7 - # providing direct tutor training and/or student instruction using library staff
8 - # using computer technology for literacy program management purposes

LAPD 4. Of those programs that provide direct tutor training and/or instruction using library staff, how many have the following characteristics?

a - # with an ESL component
b - # with a family literacy component (instruction focused on parents)
c - # with a workforce/workplace component
d - # with off-site instruction (e.g. in prisons, worksites, schools)
e - # that collaborate with outside groups for instructional purposes
     (e.g. voluntary organizations, community colleges, public agencies)
f - # using computer technology for instruction/training purposes
g - # using television or video technology for instruction/training purposes

CALIFORNIA (reported in terms of library jurisdictions)

LAPD 2

	5 years ago	In 1995	
In areas of over 1,000,000	4	6	[Note: Some
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	7	6	population areas
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	7	8	have increased
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	22	23	and thus been
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	18	30	recategorized in
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	13	18	1995.]
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	8	14	
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	1	0	
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	0	0	
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	0	0	
In areas of less than 1,000	0	0	
Totals	81	105	

LAPD 3:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000	0	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	0	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	0	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	1	22	23	23	23	23	22	22
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	3	27	30	30	30	30	27	27
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	3	15	18	18	18	18	15	15
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	3	11	14	14	14	14	11	11
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

National Center for Education Statistics, or any number of other national or state-level groups one might consider.

In fact, the last time anything resembling comprehensive, system-wide data was collected was in the 1990 effort of the Public Library Data Service to inform the 1991 White House Conference on Libraries and Information Science. But that data reflected only what 583 Data Service members volunteered to report about the kinds of literacy activities they were engaged in.

USING OLD DATA TO DERIVE CURRENT NUMBERS

The best that can be done to estimate current numbers is to fall back on a study contracted more than a decade ago by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the U.S. Department of Education.

That study was conducted by a team of researchers from the University of Wisconsin— Douglas Zweizig, Jane Robbins, and Debra Wilcox Johnson. As one component of a larger study, the group surveyed

a national sampling of public libraries to determine, among other things, how many were involved in adult literacy and the extent of that involvement judged by the number and type of literacy activities in which they were engaged.

Their May 1988 report—*Libraries and Literacy Education: Comprehensive Survey Report*—indicated that of the 8,561 public libraries then in existence, some 19% were "moderately" involved, while 4% were found to have a high level of involvement.

This translates into some 1,969 public libraries (23%) then involved substantially in adult literacy service provision. In other words, about one-quarter of all public libraries had a *major* adult literacy involvement eight to ten years ago.

Moreover, another 64% were "minimally" involved in adult literacy (only 13% were not involved at all), translating into an additional 5,479 libraries having *some* involvement.

The number of public libraries in existence has grown since 1988. According to the National

Tables LAPD 2-4, cont'd

California, cont'd

LAPD 4:

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas of over 1,000,000	1	5	1	6	6	3	4
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	1	5	1	6	6	0	1
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	1	5	3	8	8	2	3
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	6	10	6	22	22	8	7
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	5	11	6	27	27	8	8
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	5	11	3	15	15	2	5
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	3	11	4	9	9	0	3
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FLORIDA

LAPD 2:

	5 years ago	In 1995
In areas of over 1,000,000	65	65
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	80	84
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	69	69
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	91	90
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	41	42
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	26	28
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	19	19
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	10	10
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	4	4
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000	0	0
Totals	405	411

LAPD 3:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000	0	65	65	65	65	65	65	65
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	0	84	84	84	84	84	31	70*
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	0	69	69	69	69	69	20*	60*
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	0	90	90	90	90	90	20*	79*
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	0	22	42	42	42	42	10*	15*
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	5*	16	28	28	28	28	8*	12*
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	10*	9	19	19	19	19	5*	8*
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	8*	2	10	8	10	10	2*	2*
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999								
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499								
In areas of less than 1,000								

* approximate

LAPD 4:

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas of over 1,000,000	65	35	65	30*	65	15*	0
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999							
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999							
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999							
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999							
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999							
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999							
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999							
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999							
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499							
In areas of less than 1,000							

* approximate

[Note: We do not collect specific data to be able to respond accurately to this question. Level of service is far greater than guess-timates would indicate.]

NEW HAMPSHIRE

LAPD 2

		5 years ago	In 1995
In areas of over 1,000,000	n.a.		
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	n.a		
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	n.a		
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	n.a.		
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999		0	1
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999		1	3
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999		2	7
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999		2	7
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999		1	10
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499		2	5
In areas of less than 1,000		0	1
Totals		8	33

LAPD 3:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000	n.a.							
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999								
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	n.a.							
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	n.a.							
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999		1	1	1	1	1		
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	2	1	3	3	3	3	1	1
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	8	0	8	8	8	8	0	0
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	6	1	7	7	7	7	1	1
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	8	2	10	10	10	10	2	2
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	4	1	5	5	5	5	0	1
In areas of less than 1,000	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0

LAPD 4:

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas of over 1,000,000	n.a.						
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	n.a.						
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	n.a.						
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	n.a.						
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	n.a.						
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	2	1	0	0	2	2	2
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	n.a.						
In areas of less than 1,000	0	1	0	0	1	0	0

SOUTH DAKOTA

LAPD 2:

		5 years ago	In 1995
In areas of over 1,000,000		n.a.	n.a.
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999		n.a.	n.a.
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999		n.a.	n.a.
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999		n.a.	n.a.
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999		2	2
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999		2	2
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999		6	6
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999		4	4
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999		1	1
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499		1	1
In areas of less than 1,000		0	0
Totals		16	16

Center for Educational Statistics, there were 8,929 local public libraries in 1993—the latest year for which figures are available. They were spread throughout the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The ALA indicates that this number has not changed appreciably since 1993. Thus, the 1988 percentages applied now would mean that today some 2,054 public libraries have a major involvement in providing adult literacy services—assuming, of course, that the definiton of "major " is about the same. Similarly, the number of public libraries having a low level of involvement, *but still some*, would be around 5,700.

In other words, public libraries are hardly a trivial part of the country's adult literacy delivery system.

Obviously, the above estimates are based on a number of hypotheticals. But the order of magnitude suggested is probably reasonable. In fact, findings elsewhere in this study suggest that, if anything, the percentages of moderate to high involvement actually grew during much of the last decade (and began to decrease only recently).

Note that the activities of branch sites were not even included in the 1988 study and are thus not included here. But it is highly significant that more than 1,400 public libraries have branch operations, adding more than 7,000 community service venues. And it is common knowledge that many branches across the country are providing adult literacy services, some very extensively.

For instance, the New York Public Library is a single library system that actually serves the three huge boroughs of Manhattan, the Bronx, and Staten Island. Its one adult literacy program—the Centers for Reading and Writing—is really eight different operations based in branch libraries scattered among the three boroughs. (Brooklyn and Queens are served by their own library systems.)

Each branch literacy site has its own staff and site director, its own book and materials collection, a computer center, its own pool of tutors, and other features. The makeup of the staff, tutors, and adult student body differs

---

Tables LAPD 2-4, cont'd

South Dakota, cont'd

LAPD 3:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 500,000-999,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	0
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	2	0	2	2	1	2	0	0
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	6	0	6	6	4	6	0	0
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	4	0	4	4	4	4	0	0
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TEXAS

LAPD 2:	1990	In 1994
In areas of 1,000,000 or more	1	4
In areas of 500,000-999,999	3	1
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	3	3
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	13	16
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	12	12
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	32	27
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	45	45
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	44	37
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	25	15
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	11	2
In areas of less than 1,000	2	1
Totals	182	163

LAPD 3 (1994):	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000	0	4	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	4	n.a.
In areas of 500,000-999,999	0	1					1	
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	0	4					3	
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	0	20					16	
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	0	24					12	
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	0	46					27	
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	2	101					45	
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	2	108					37	
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	3	104					15	
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	4	63					2	
In areas of less than 1,000	1	13					1	

LAPD 4:	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas of over 1,000,000	4	2	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
In areas of 500,000-999,999	1	1	1				
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	1	2	1				
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	7	4	2				
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	6	2	2				
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	15	6	2				
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	21	5	5				
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	12	2	2				
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	20	9	3				
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	7	4	4				
In areas of less than 1,000	0	1	0				

LAPD 5. What is the total amount of the State Library's FY95 funding for library literacy programs? [Q2 only]

Q2	State Library Literacy Contacts	39 of 44 responded, 89%
Illinois	6,000,000	Agency is entire Secretary of State Literacy Office
California	3,466,000	FY year ended 6/96
New York	385,000	$185,000 state grant; ap. $200,000 LSCA
Texas	359,874	10 library systems disburse, ESL included
Indiana	341,831	
Kansas	277,000	
Hawaii	187,575	
Oklahoma	152,781	Plus SLRC @ ap. $100,000
New Jersey	100,000	
New Mexico	70,000	From NM Coalition for Literacy budget of $350,000
Tennessee	64,154	
Montana	61,000	$35,000 LSCA Title VI; $26,000 SLRC
Massachusetts	60,000	Do not provide direct funding apart from LSCA
Kentucky	39,130	
Arkansas	35,000	LSCA Title VI
Oregon	34,992	FY94 LSCA Title VI
Florida	25,000	
Missouri	18,257	
Michigan	17,381	
South Dakota	15,000	
Mississippi	10,116	
Ohio	5,400	Down from $55,000 in 1991 and $116,000 high in 1989
Delaware	4,147	
Pennsylvania	0	
West Virginia	0	
Virginia	0	
Vermont	0	
South Carolina	0	
New Hampshire	0	
Wyoming	0	
Louisiana	0	
Idaho	0	
Georgia	0	LSCA Title I funds only
Iowa	0	
North Dakota	0	
Nebraska	0	
Maine	0	
Alaska	0	
Colorado	?	Minimal. All federal grants

significantly from site to site depending on the economic and social make-up of the community in which the branch is located. And program problems and strengths differ because of variations in specific branch environment.

Administrative support, evaluation standards, funding, and other system-wide supports are provided from a ninth branch location under the direction of an overall program head who reports back to senior library administrative personnel.

As this example shows, it would be highly instructive to know about the literacy activities of the branch libraries, even though many would probably not exist in the absence of administrative support and direction from the main facilities.

MOST STATE LIBRARIES LACK DATA TO LEAD

Returning to the original issue, the LAPD 1 table shows that only 13 of the 39 state libraries responding said that they collect library literacy data. This means that the vast majority of state library agencies in the

country are not sufficiently armed with hard data to be able to work effectively with their local libraries on adult literacy pro-gramming—or to advocate convincingly in crucial state and national political and policy forums. It is difficult to see how the role of public libraries in adult literacy can be developed in earnest while this glaring data problem goes unattended.

Furthermore, analysis of material in the back-ground data book shows that information provided by three of the respon-dents was so incomplete and superficial as to be of only marginal use. In fact, only nine of the library agencies responding with data collect really useful data—CA, FL, GA, MA, ND, NH, OK, SD, and TX—and even here, a few of the respondents said they had to make educated guesses or work very hard to adapt their data to the NCES format.

[Note: The Illinois State Library does an exemplary data collection job, but such extensive work would have been required to fit their data into NCES categories that it was mutually decided to proceed without it in the face of project deadlines

---

LAPD 6.   In the past 5 years has the State Library's adult literacy funding increased, decreased, or stayed about the same? [Q2 only]

As % of Total Library Budget			In Dollar Amount Of Support		
Increase	Decrease	Same	Increase	Decrease	Same
5%	41%	54%	6%	36%	58%

(+) MO, OR

(-) AR, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IN, KS, MD, ME, MI, ND, NE, SC, VA

(Same) AK, CA, DE, IL, KY, LA, MA, MS, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OK, PA, SD, TN, TX, VT, WA, WV

(+) IL, OR

(-) CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IN, KS, ME, MI, ND, OH, SC, VA

(Same) AK, AR, CA, DE, KY, LA, MA, MO, MS, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OK, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, VT, WA, WV

LAPD 7.   If the State Library agency provides adult literacy funding to the central and branch libraries, what criteria are used to decide on the relative allocations? [Q2 only]

AR   LSCA Title I - criteria for literacy subgrants for public libraries is the same as for any other LSCA Title I subgrant. LSCA Title VI - criteria for participation - (1) illiteracy rate, (2) geographic location in state, and (3) library cooperation with other established area literacy providers.

CA   Our funding is to the local library jurisdictions. They decide which branches to include.

CO   For LSCA , there is an RFP process. Although I have no say in final decision, I do [make recommendations].

DE   Grant process.

FL   We have never turned down a library's request for LSCA grant funds unless that library's request exceeded the 4-year limit that we currently use to fund any one project or unless the proposal was absolutely unsalvageable. We primarily look at the percentage of the total adult population that has not completed high school; number of adults who do not speak English well or at all; method of service delivery; education/training experience of project staff; costs of services proposed by specific budget category; quality of objectives and activities; evaluation plan; etc.

GA   It depends on the number of libraries submitting applications and the grant program area in which they apply.

IL   Our literacy funds are allocated on a community basis. If the library is the best agency to coordinate literacy efforts within a community or neighborhood they become the fiscal agent. They are involved as required partners in all projects. The Literacy Advisory Board has also determined that we should put large resources into communities whose residents are disproportionately represented in the two lower literacy levels—the Hispanic and African American populations.

IN   Program applications judged on merit.

KS   The need, program objectives, methods, evaluation, and future funding capabilities.

KY   One statewide program administers competitive subgrants.

MA   A competitive grant round is run every year in <u>all</u> LSCA projects which include literacy & ESL. This changes based on community need, interest, and ability to write and carryout a proposal. This is SEED money to begin new services; it cannot be used for ongoing expenses.

MI   LSCA competitive grant program.

MO   We have an LSCA competitive grants committee that makes the decisions on allocations of all LSCA funds.

MS   Is there a need? Will the dollars make a difference? Will impact justify the project? How will output be measured?

NJ   There are 3 programs: Literacy Instruction, Literacy Collection Development, and Family Literacy. Libraries can submit applications for any or all programs simultaneously. The money is distributed by rank scoring, regardless of program.

NM   The quality of their proposed projects in the universe of literacy program applicants (# of individuals likely to be assisted, use of volunteers, etc.).

NY   Awards based solely on grant applications.

OH   Monies are available through LSCA. We use a NOTICE OF INTENT process which allows the applicant to request what they need. In this next year we only have one library applying.

OK   They apply through a competitive grant process similar to the LSCA Title VI grant application (but easier). The highest scoring applications are funded.

OR   No allocation program. LSCA Title I compeitive grants have evaluation criteria that must be highly scored.

PA   Dependent on applications submitted under a competitive grant process.

SC   Grant application.

SD   Financial need - "mini grant" requests.

TN   Competitive proposals for use of funds.

TX   The library systems determine the allocation of literacy funds to the member libraries based on plans of service.

WA   Funds are distributed purely on the quality of grant proposals submitted to the State Library. Any public library in the state can apply with any literacy idea.

and the meager overall response already evident at the time.]

Finally, although it is an issue of secondary importance, it is interesting to note that there is a weak correspondence between state libraries that accept adult literacy as a major part of their mission, those that provide some funding for literacy, and those that collect useful data for planning and information purposes.

For example, only 6 of the 18 state libraries reported by Q2 respondees to have adult literacy as a major mission collect data on library literacy programs. They report 24 as providing some funding for literacy, but only 10 collect data. Similarly, there is not a 1:1 correspondence in Table LAPD 1 between state libraries that say they collect data and state libraries that actually provided it to the project.

BUT SOME STATES ARE GOOD MODELS

Because so few state libraries collect information on local library literacy programming, the data that was provided is of limited use

for making national generalizations.

However, five of the better data sets (CA, FL, NH, SD, TX) are included here in LAPD 2 - LAPD 4 to illustrate that the kind of information the survey tried to collect would be an extraordinarily powerful planning and communications tool—*if* it existed on a widespread basis or could be created.

Moreover, in some respects the information they contain is highly suggestive. For example, it is clear that in some states adult literacy service levels have increased dramatically. This is valuable to know, despite the fact that other data, especially in LAPD 5-6, indicates that on an overall national basis public library literacy service has probably *decreased* in the last two to three years.

The salient point is that experience differs markedly from state to state. To be sure, the lack of regular national data collection is a serious problem, but at the same time it is important to keep in mind that some state libraries are doing an excellent job of it and are very strong models from

LAPD 8. As best you can determine, what percentage of the state's 1995 funding for library literacy programs comes from the sources listed? [Q2 only]	
LSCA Title VI	43%
State sources	16
LSCA Title I	15
Other federal sources	8
Municipal sources	8
Foundation grants	4
Individual donations	3
Corporate grants	1
Other	3

which other states can learn.

These bright spots of library literacy programming and leadership need to be spotlighted at every opportunity and not buried in national averaging exercises.

PUBLIC LIBRARY INVOLVEMENT IS VARIED IN NATURE

The five data sets of LAPD 2-4 are also suggestive where the *nature* of current library involvement in adult literacy is concerned.

For the most part, local library literacy programs in the states shown are *known by the state agencies* to be involved in all forms of literacy service provision—from building and maintaining book and materials collections for tutors and adult new readers to providing space

for classes and meetings of outside groups...to providing information and referral services...to providing direct tutor training and student instructional services.

There is a heavy reliance on paid staff—volunteer tutors are nearly cost-free, but regular paid staff are needed for program administration, training, evaluation, and other program purposes.

In the larger states, direct instructional services are provided by a surprisingly high percentage of the local libraries. ESL services, family literacy, and workplace/workforce literacy are the focus of much of that instruction. Moreover, the literacy programs have a great deal of outreach, often taking instruction off-site to prisons, worksites, or schools.

Similarly, there is heavy use of computers for both program management and instructional purposes.

These patterns of involvement are state-specific, of course, but it so happens that they fit what local library literacy programs report about their own activities in Section 6. Furthermore, many of the activity involvements are quite consistent with those reported years ago in the OERI study. It would be interesting to know if patterns of involvement have shifted in emphasis over the years, but that is a subject for another study.

STATE AGENCY FUNDING FOR LOCAL LITERACY PROGRAMS IS SCANT

The remainder of this section has to do primarily with matters of library literacy funding.

State library literacy personnel were asked in LAPD 5 to indicate the total amount of their agency's FY95 funding for library literacy programs. As the table shows, the response is notably unremarkable.

Of the 39 agencies answering the question, only two state libraries (5%) provide truly substantial funding—Illinois and California—and both are states in which the libraries have a central leadership role and plenty of political support. Another seven agencies (20%) report six-figure funding levels.

But, on the basis of the evidence supplied, the vast majority of state libraries do not, at present, provide much funding at all. Only 4 (10%) have five-figure grant budgets above $50,000, 10 (26%) report even lower sums, and 16 (41%) provide nothing at all.

Is this poor showing a recent phenomenon—a side effect of shrinking state library budgets generally —or has it been the pattern all along?

Again, with only two or three exceptions, a comparison of LAPD 5 and LAPD 6 responses indicates that about 40% of the agencies have recently experienced significant reductions. Indiana and Kansas are among these, although Ohio's drop from $116,000 in 1989 to $5,400 in 1995 (a 95% loss!) is the most chilling. In most cases, however, it looks as if state libraries now doing little or nothing never really did much.

Of course, a related and perhaps even more important issue is whether the funding that is being given has been coming from core library agency budgets—thus being relatively secure—or whether it is soft and transient in nature.

Tables LAPD 5 and LAPD 7-8 point once again to a dominant federal LSCA role. **These federal programs have been a major source of library literacy funding, Title VI alone accounting for some 43% of it in the estimation of the respondees.** [Note: OERI data indicate that of the 2,249 LSCA Title VI grants awarded between FY86-FY95—amounting to $57 million over the ten-year period—only 155 (6%) went directly to state libraries.]

Thus, much of what state library agencies have been doing in adult literacy—to say nothing of local library literacy programs themselves—is in grave danger of evaporating as a result of recent and expected federal cuts and/or unearmarked block grants. Very little appears to have been institutionalized.

STATE LIBRARIES GIVE PLENTY OF OTHER NEEDED HELP

Finally, it is essential to recognize that just because a state library is not directly providing significant or any direct funding to local public library literacy programs does not mean it provides no other important services to them, or that it is not involved in meaningful statewide planning and resource development.

Indeed, LAPD 9 shows that state library literacy personnel think their agencies play quite an important state and national advocacy role.

LAPD 9. *Please check any of the following services that your state library agency or the state's central/regional libraries provide for the benefit of local library literacy programs.* [Q2 only]

	State Library Agency	Central/ Regional Library
State advocacy	81%	36%
National advocacy	53	22
Policy development & planning	50	22
Statewide or regional conferencing	53	19
Professional staff development	53	17
Evaluation, program development, or other technical assistance	53	17
Data collection & analysis	33	14
Other	25	0

They also provide policy development and planning services, conferences, and other technical assistance—all activities of benefit to local programs, and **all of which cost the state libraries substantial amounts of money**.

Moreover, there is no direct relationship between what a state library grants to local public library literacy programs, the overall operating revenue of those local programs, or how extensive a state's network of library literacy services and programs is.

State library agencies in Massachusetts and Florida, for example, provide next to no literacy funding, but those states have among the most extensive systems of statewide library literacy service in the nation.

And library agencies and personnel in those states are deeply involved in state planning, data collection, and the like. They also tend to be connected to national planning and development activities and to be recognized leaders in national circles.