NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR LITERACY

Goal: To provide the adult education and literacy field with the knowledge, resources, and infrastructure necessary to improve the quality of literacy instruction and the achievement of learners.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Program objectives are in support of the Department's Strategic Plan Objective 3.4, which is to ensure that all adults can strengthen their skills and improve their earnings power over their lifetime through lifelong learning.

FY 2000—$6,000,000
FY 2001—$6,500,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROVIDE LITERACY INSTRUCTORS, STUDENTS, AND ADMINISTRATORS WITH AN INTERNET-BASED, STATE-OF-THE-ART INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION SYSTEM—THE LITERACY INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION SYSTEM (LINCS)—THAT IMPROVES THE QUALITY AND INCREASES THE AVAILABILITY OF LITERACY SERVICES.

Indicator 1.1 Improving quality: The percentage of LINCS users judging its information and communications resources useful in improving the quality and availability of literacy services will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Data are currently being collected for reporting next year. **Explanation:** Because of feedback on the need for significant changes in LINCS, the site was completely overhauled in 1999. The new site, including many new and improved features, went on-line in October 1999. The new evaluation form was added in November 1999.	**Source:** On-line survey of LINCS users. *Frequency:* Ongoing. *Next Update:* December 2000. **Validation Procedures:** None. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		Baseline		
FY 2001:		Increase over baseline		

Indicator 1.2 Expanding use of technology: The number of instructors trained to use LINCS will increase by 20 percent over the baseline year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** 1999 target for training was exceeded. **Explanation:** In FY 1999, 60,000 instructors received the performance target set for 5,880 instructors.	**Source:** Enrollment data at LINCS training, 1999. *Frequency:* Reported to NIFL quarterly. *Next Update:* December 2000. **Validation Procedures:** None. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
FY 1998:	4,900			
FY 1999:	**6,000**	**5,880**		
FY 2000:		5,880		
FY 2001:		5,880		

Indicator 1.3 Technology in the classroom: By 2000, of those trained through LINCS, 40 percent will report an expanded use of technology and improvement in the quality of instruction.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Followup survey not implemented as of December 1999. **Explanation:** NIFL resources were directed to the redesign and upgrading of LINCS in 1999. Funds have been approved in 1999-00 spending plan to support contract for LINCS followup survey.	**Source:** Followup survey of a sample of instructors trained to use LINCS. *Frequency:* Semiannually. *Next Update:* December 2000. **Validation Procedures:** None. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		40%		
FY 2001:		40%		

OBJECTIVE 2: IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION FOR ADULTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES, ESPECIALLY IN THE AREA OF READING.

Indicator 2.1 Improving instruction for learning-disabled adults: By 2000, 70 percent of individuals trained in the use of Bridges to Practice, a set of guidebooks for identifying and serving adults with LD, will report satisfaction with it as a means of improving services and the quality of instruction for LD adults.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Data have been collected from participants in training, but analysis of the data has not been completed in time to be included in this form. We hope to be able to report the results of the surveys by March 2000. **Explanation:** Initiation of training on Bridges to Practice was delayed. This has caused a delay in data collection and analysis.	**Source:** Survey of training participants. *Frequency:* Ongoing with training. *Next Update:* December 2000. **Validation Procedures:** None. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		70%		
FY 2001:		70%		

Indicator 2.2 Training teachers for better reading instruction: The number of teachers trained to use a research-based reading approach will increase annually.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Our original plan, as reflected in last year's indicators, was for data collection not to occur until next year (2000). Data would have been available to report December 2000. Now that we are starting to move forward with the work, we believe the development phase will extend through 2000, and data on use and impact will not be available until 2001. **Explanation:** None.	**Source:** Data from pilot programs and subsequent surveys on the extent of use of the approaches. *Frequency:* N/A. *Next Update:* Data will first be collected in 2001. **Validation Procedures:** None. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		No target set		
FY 2001:		Baseline		

OBJECTIVE 3: EQUIPPED FOR THE FUTURE SYSTEM REFORM PROJECT. DEVELOP CONTENT STANDARDS, PERFORMANCE STANDARDS, AND ASSESSMENTS THAT WILL IMPROVE LITERACY ABILITIES IN A BROAD ARRAY OF SKILL AREAS.

Indicator 3.1 Expanding the number of practitioners trained to use the EFF standards: The number of teachers trained to use EFF will increase over the baseline by 10 percent each year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** As originally proposed, the baseline year of data on EFF training will be available in December 2000. **Explanation:** EFF training began in September 1999. Thus the baseline period for this indicator will be September 1999 through September 2000.	**Source:** Data on the number of practitioners who receive EFF training. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Sep. 2000 (baseline) **Validation Procedures:** None. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		Baseline		
FY 2001:		Baseline plus 10%		

Indicator 3.2 Improving instruction of adult learners: Seventy percent of practitioners who have received more than the introductory training in using the Equipped for the Future framework and standards will report satisfaction with them as a means of providing more effective instruction to adults who come to their programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** As originally proposed, these data will be reported in next year's plan. **Explanation:** EFF training began in September 1999. Thus the data collection period for this indicator will be September 1999 through September 2000. These data will be reported in next year's plan.	**Source:** Practitioners trained to use EFF. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* December 2000 (baseline). **Validation Procedures:** None. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		70%		
FY 2001:		70%		

OBJECTIVE 4: INCREASE AWARENESS OF THE AVAILABILITY OF LITERACY SERVICES AND THE NEED FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SUPPORT FOR LITERACY EFFORTS.

Indicator 4.1 Recruitment and program support: The number of youth and young adult literacy volunteers (ages 16-24) will increase 20 percent in the 15 cities participating in the NIFL literacy promotion activities.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Baseline of youth and young adult volunteers in the 15 cities			**Status:** Materials development and training for the campaign has been ongoing. Radio PSAs began in all 15 cities in November 1999, and other materials will be available January 2000. **Explanation:** Campaign kickoff has been delayed by several months, partially because more cities wished to participate. Data from the cities will now be collected between January 2000 and September 2000.	**Source:** Reports from each of the 15 cities to the National Alliance of Urban Literacy Coalitions (NAULC), with funding from the NIFL, will work with the cities to receive the data and report to the NIFL. *Frequency*: This will be a one-time effort lasting from January 2000 through September 2000. *Next Update:* December 2000 **Validation Procedures:** None. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
FY 1999:	**1,121**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		1,345		
FY 2001:				

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Continue to build a high-quality data base of materials and communications opportunities that directly and indirectly support the improvement and growth of literacy services in the Nation. Provide training to individuals at the state and local program level.
- Use recent research on reading instruction to develop and test a model of effective reading instruction for adults that can be incorporated into literacy programs nationwide.
- Link ongoing effort to improve instruction for adults with learning disabilities with a new reading project to begin in the summer of 1999.
- Fund state and local literacy professionals and work with commercial publishers to create materials and assessments that lead to achievement of EFF standards. Support pilot program sites in using and assessing EFF products.
- Create public awareness opportunities in the media and through other mechanisms that increase awareness about the availability of literacy services and the need for increased support.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The NIFL is unique in that it is administered by an Interagency Group made up of the Secretaries of Education, Labor, and HHS. We have worked extensively with Education and Labor and somewhat with HHS. For example, we are working closely with DOL to integrate our LINCS project with their America's Learning Exchange (ALX) initiative. Our data base of literacy providers will be an integral part of ALX's data base of education and training providers. We have been working with ED throughout development of the EFF standards to ensure that states and local programs can use them to meet the Federal reporting requirements of WIA. These are just two examples of how we work with other Federal agencies and programs on all of our major activities.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- The mission of the NIFL, as defined by our legislation, is to help build the infrastructure of the adult and family literacy field. We do this through a variety of communications and information, research and development, and collaboration-building initiatives. The NIFL does not provide direct educational services to students. In addition, the NIFL is a very small Federal agency ($6 million for program and S&E). This combination of being primarily a service provider to practitioners/policymakers and being small creates a challenge to meeting the goals of GPRA, which appears to be designed for programs, such as Title I, that can report learning gains for students served by Federal programs.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (2 years ago)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New

- Several indicators were modified to provide a clearer sense of how improvement and success will be measured. For example, Indicator 1.1 was changed from a general statement about user satisfaction to a goal of making annual improvements in the percentage of users reporting satisfaction with LINCS's content.