SUPPORT DOCUMENT

Community adult language, literacy and numeracy provision in Australia: Diverse approaches and outcomes—Support document

DARRYL DYMOCK

CENTRE FOR LEARNING RESEARCH

GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY

This document was produced by the author based on research for the report *Community adult language, literacy and numeracy provision in Australia: Diverse approaches and outcomes*, and is an added resource for further information. The report is available on NCVER's website:
<http://www.ncver.edu.au>

Contents

Introduction

This Support Document is intended to supplement the main report of the study into non-accredited community language, literacy and numeracy provision in Australia. Extended versions of the Survey Results and Case Studies sections in the main report are presented here in order to provide a fuller account of the data collected.

Because this study was exploring an area of provision which had not previously been systematically documented, the Literature Review is not extensive, but was used to inform the development of the survey questionnaire and the interview questions for the case studies.

The information sheet, consent forms, and the several versions of the interview questionnaire are included in the section, 'Case study materials'. The interview questions were used only as a guide and sometimes varied according to the circumstances.

Literature review

The extent of a lack of literacy among significant numbers of adults in modern Australia was first effectively recognized in the 1970s (Dymock, 1982). Despite significant changes in the national adult language, literacy and numeracy landscape since that time, two factors have remained constant: significant numbers of adults have continued to need help in those sorts of areas, and diversity of provision has been regarded as essential in meeting diverse needs. The Australian Council for Adult Literacy (2004, 2) observed:

> Literacy and numeracy skills can and need to be developed in many ways. Pathways start from unpredictable points. Literacy and numeracy improvement is a whole of community issue.

In the development of a more systematic approach to training and an emphasis on measurable outcomes, as in Australia, the role of community agencies that march to a different tune may be undervalued.

The purpose of this review is to inform the development of the survey questionnaire and interview schedules for this project.

International trends
Internationally, adult literacy in developed countries has remained in focus through the concerns of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 2000, 2005) and two waves of its International Adult Literacy Survey (IALS). The OECD (2005, 85-6) found that those with the lowest scores on the IALS had the least likelihood of participating in adult education and training. In Canada, systematic data gathering from the provinces following the second IALS found that irrespective of the domain assessed, those employed had higher proficiency scores than those who were unemployed or not in the labour force (Brink, 2005). The same study found that participation in adult education and learning activities was around 20% for those with Level 1 proficiency in prose literacy (the lowest) compared to some 70% for those at levels 4/5.

In their comprehensive six-country study, McKenna and Fitzpatrick (2004, 6) found that there were significant numbers of adults in all of the countries who had the lowest levels of proficiency on the IALS tests. They also noted that adult literacy in most of the countries was 'characterised by diversity and proliferation of providers'. Additionally,

> most countries rely heavily on volunteers and community-based organizations. All countries have programs which are community-oriented and aimed at a variety of personal needs alongside those aimed at the workforce, both the employed and job seekers (McKenna and Fitzpatrick, 2004, 6).

Three examples illustrate the diversity of approaches. In New Zealand, following the first ever Ministry of Education adult literacy policy in 2001, there has been a significant attempt to map national adult literacy provision (Sutton, Lander, Benseman, unpublished). A small government-funded program in Canada encouraged literacy practitioners to provide professional development to staff of government agencies in regional areas so that the latter could better embed literacy in their work with clients in their communities (Holbrow, 2005).

In a UK research study, Hannon et al (2003, 7) presented an example of a community adult basic skills provider that 'seemed also to address issues of social inclusion, to value a variety of progression routes for learners, to be willing to work with learners in groups rather than only as individuals, to have a community power agenda, and a commitment to inter-agency working'. They indicated this was not a unique example, and concluded that a key feature of community provision was that 'much of it relied upon an over-arching vision that imbued each organization and was also translated into practice' (p.14). In this study, the researchers distinguished between literacy providers that were community-*based* (i.e. the emphasis was on where they were located), and those that were community-*focused* (i.e the emphasis was on the people they served). This distinction, while it may have some effect on how an agency operates, did not seem to be useful for the present study.

The Australian scene
Within the diversity of provision of adult language, literacy, and numeracy in Australia, the contribution of non-accredited community provision has tended to be overshadowed by the focus in the last decade or so on accredited training. The push for accreditation has been fostered by Federal and State government policies that have seen the development of the Australian Quality Training Framework, the opening up of the vocational education and training marketplace, the emergence of Registered Training Organisations, and government funding of language, literacy and numeracy training on the basis of achievement of nationally defined benchmarks. Typically the purpose of accredited training is to encourage learners to move on to other training or to employment.

Yet, for adult language, literacy and numeracy learners, the outcomes may be more diverse. Not all the outcomes of LLN programs can be easily measured. Foster and Beddie (2005, 2) observed that

> Literacy has many purposes. For individuals it contributes to personal development and provides economic and social benefits, it shapes an individual's capacity to view the world critically, to exert influence in their daily life, and provides a tool for ongoing learning through civic, social and economic life.

In Australia, community provision of ALLN may be through an organization set up specifically for the purpose, through an agency that deliberately embeds literacy and numeracy in other activities, such as in a family support group, and through a neighbourhood house with a range of community roles and responsibilities. Beddie's discussion paper (2004) highlighted the diverse literacy and numeracy needs of communities, and Kral and Falk (2004) showed the complexity of meeting literacy and numeracy needs in an indigenous community. Reports (e.g. Aulich, 1991; Campbell and Curtin 1999; Birch et al 2003) have consistently championed the achievements and potential of adult and community education (ACE) but have also noted the difficulty of capturing its essence alongside the more recognized sectors of education.

The significant contribution this group of providers makes to community learning was categorised in a study by Clemens, Hartley and Macrae (2003) as: individual development outcomes, community development outcomes and economic development outcomes. At the same time, the authors commented:

> ACE agencies know they make a difference. They 'see' evidence of change, even dramatic change, in individuals, in communities and, to a lesser extent, in local economies. But they will never measure this change because they can't isolate or quantify their contribution to change in one individual life, let alone succeed in the more complex task of isolating or quantifying their contribution to social capital and economic capital (p.47).

It is such organizations that provide most of the non-accredited ALLN support of various kinds, although Registered Training Organisations also deliver non-accredited LLN courses (OPCET, 2005, 6). The importance of these contributions was further underlined by Wickert and McGuirk's (2005, 2) research into community partnerships, which noted that literacy and numeracy were fundamental to the growth of social capital, and recommended 'creating a framework for community organizations which coordinates and supports diverse approaches and outcomes, and which is in consultation with the VET system but not constrained by it'. This research project has taken 'Diverse approaches and outcomes' as its main title.

Literacy in the community
The diversity of provision of ALLN programs in Australia is an indicator of the diversity of uses of English language, literacy and numeracy in the community. There has been increasing support among researchers and practitioners for literacy to be regarded as social practice rather than as a skill, a dichotomy that has been under discussion for some two decades. Castleton and McDonald (2002, 3) suggested a need to reconceptualise understandings of literacy from those that characterise individuals as 'deficient', to those that focus on the numerous ways that people use literacy in their everyday lives. This theme was reinforced by Lonsdale and McCurry (2004, 10), who were critical that literacy in Australia was 'still tied to successful participation in school, further study, training or work'. They noted (p.11) the tension between the definitions of literacy as a set of specific skills and as a tool for making meaning, and advocated accepting a wide range of literacies:

> A broad conception of literacy requires a teaching and learning process (including assessment) which is focused on meaning-making. That is, rather than merely reproducing uncritically what they have been taught, learners should be able to make sense of the world and develop their own perspectives.

This concept of literacy as what Lonsdale and McCurry (2004, 11) described as a 'genuinely transforming experience' rather than mastery of a set of sub-skills, has clear implications for the aims of literacy programs and for the assessment of the learners.

However such an approach also raises the question of where to stop. Lonsdale and McCurry (2004, 9) observed the rise of 'new literacies' in recent times, including scientific literacy, ethics literacy, health literacy, computer literacy, financial literacy, environmental literacy, media literacy and information literacy. This stretches the definition of the term 'literacy', but in being applied to so many different fields, the term itself actually loses clarity, and these concepts are not regarded as being within the scope of this project.

Nevertheless, 'traditional' language, literacy and numeracy courses do not necessarily provide the only ALLN support to help adults make meaning of their worlds. The most recent examples of systematic embedding of LL and N come from the accredited courses in the Australian Quality Training Framework., where training packages have strongly reinforced the need to include such activities. However, such courses are outside the scope of this study.

Within non-accredited activities, language, literacy and numeracy are sometimes embedded in other sorts of learning activities, e.g a cooking course which includes a specific LLN aim. In a draft report on embedded language, literacy and numeracy courses, Schueler (forthcoming, 8) identified five areas which she regarded as 'beyond the scope of basic language, literacy and numeracy skills'. Her review was of VET (and therefore accredited) courses, but it is helpful for the present study in identifying what might be excluded. Under 'Communication', Schueler included business communication, public speaking and assertiveness communication.; under 'Writing' were courses such as academic writing, essay writing and creative writing among others;

and under 'Numeracy' were 'VCE mathematics' and 'Discrete mathematics'. Such courses do not seem relevant for the purposes of this study, even if unaccredited.

Under 'Literacy', Schueler listed computer literacy, music literacy, information literacy, tutoring for volunteer teaching literacies, fingerspelling, literacy tutoring, and support/teaching of literacy. Again these appear to be beyond the scope of the present study, even if non-accredited. There were seven topics listed by Schueler under 'Language', including sign language/AUSLAN, VCE English, Teaching language, English advanced, and Specialised language in industry. While a case might be argued for the latter two in particular circumstances of non-accreditation, none of these on the face of it seems relevant enough to the present study to justify inclusion.

Schueler also included under 'Language': 'English as a Second language (ESL)' and 'English for migrants'. While there has been distinct provision of such courses in Australia, increasingly there has been a coming together of literacy and English language provision for adults. This has been driven partly by Commonwealth Government policy through funding for English language, literacy and numeracy training by Registered Training Organisations, and partly by pragmatics in organizations where resources dictate that ESL and literacy/numeracy students learn together. The latter practice has been evident in rural areas for many years, where student numbers are small.

Other issues
Outcomes
There seems little available data on outcomes of non-accredited LLN programs. A 2005 survey of all Tasmanian providers (OPCET, 2005, 13) found that 'the majority use some form of client satisfaction survey or feedback to determine the effectiveness of their programmes for participants and also subjective assessment of their clients' skill levels to determine progress'. Anecdotal evidence from Queensland suggested that community providers funded by the State Government used a curriculum framework from an accredited LLN course but did not formally assess the outcomes.

In Ireland (NALA, 2004: 41, 42), research into numeracy provision found that what was offered and why, did not often reflect the real needs of learners. "Helping with children's homework" was the main the motivation cited for learners to become involved in numeracy programs in non-accredited provision. The National Adult Literacy Agency (2004) maintained that 'the core ingredient of learners' development is empowerment'.

A UK study (Torgerson and Brooks 2005) found that adult literacy and numeracy trials both affirmed and challenged long held beliefs about progress of individuals and groups. They found there was "just enough evidence to demonstrate rigorously in a meta-analysis that participating in adult literacy and numeracy tuition does produce more progress for the learner than not participating". Particular teaching techniques were found to facilitate progress., as was regular attendance. " Surprisingly", they said, "few other factors thought to influence progress are supported by quantitative, empirical evidence; this is especially true of ICT, workplace provision, numeracy, and writing."

Tulip and Burlinson (2005) said that "[t]he founding ethos of our [UK Neighbourhood Learning Centres] is that they are meant to provide experiences and activities that will attract those members of our communities not normally willing to return to or enhance their learning profile. Given the proportion of our particular community that lack even basic skills this ethos of non-formal or non-accredited learning provision is particularly important". They noted that there may be "no quantifiable or traditional measurement of achievement generated by such effort".

Engagement

In the UK engaging young adult learners was regarded as difficult, and McNeil and Dixon (2005: 13 and 14) found that young adults responded well to 'hooks' in order initially to attract them to provision, and subsequently to promote retention, since 'keeping them on board' was an ongoing challenge. They also found location a strong motivator with young adult learners because "young adults found projects more approachable when the base was 'on their patch' so that they did not have to venture into spaces they would normally avoid".

An Australian study with some implications for LLN provision (Golding, Harvey and Etcher, 2005), found that men had been marginalised from adult and community education in Victoria, perceiving its context to be a feminine learning space, so they were only occasional users. They found that "most men want learning provided in less formal, less structured, practical group settings, locally and on site through organisations they know and feel comfortable within. Men generally learn best by doing and through practice in familiar situations, through organisations and people they know and trust rather than via abstracted learning 'about' something in simulated situations."

Paradoxically, they found that those men "who are most likely to be 'put off' by ACE were older or with the most need (and with fewest opportunities) to learn elsewhere. However even younger men with good ICT skills tended to have dismissive, uninformed and negative attitudes towards ACE and were also less likely to learn through leadership and active involvement in other organisations".

Professional development

McKenna and Fitzpatrick (2004, 7) observed that 'the volunteer ethos in most countries, despite its strengths, has created a tradition of a teaching workforce with minimal professionalism, with high degrees of casual employment, even in paid workforces, and a lack of clear training and career pathways'.

In a study of the professional development of tutors and teachers in Australian adult literacy and numeracy programs,Mackay, Burgoyne and Warwick (2006) found that further development of individual expertise as a teacher was of great importance to even the most experienced teachers. Demands for compliance were perceived to be impacting on the quality of teaching, time and enthusiasm for professional development. The content desired by organisations and that of teachers appeared often to be at issue. Teachers had strong preferences for face-to-face, 'hands on' and peer learning across all sectors of the field. However, providers on short term contracts faced barriers to professional development, and difficulty in building community capacity (Wickert and McGuirk, 2005; Mackay et al 2006).

Mackay et al (2006, 21, 23, 25) found that

> [v]olunteer tutors have almost all attended an initial volunteer tutor training program as a minimum entry standard. The other qualifications held by volunteers vary widely and their sense of value comes from the rewards of interaction with their learners and peers. ... Most volunteer tutors were satisfied that their initial training had equipped them with the skills they needed. [They] were realistic about the amount of professional development their organisations can provide to volunteers and keen to augment this initial training and develop their competence through informal support structures.

Implications for research project

There are a number of issues raised by the literature review which are relevant to this research project, including:
- There is no agreed definition of literacy so organisations should be asked to identify such programs according to their own definitions; the 'new literacies' listed above will be excluded;
- Non-accredited English as a second language (ESL) courses should be included;

- Embedded language, literacy and numeracy will be included where they are part of a course which includes a specific LLN aim; such an approach may mean including organisations beyond those that regard themselves as LLN providers.
- The wording of the questionnaire and interview schedules should allow for a range of learning outcomes
- Organisations should be asked to indicate the nature of the assessments they use for non-accredited LLN
- There should be some exploration of what motivates learners to make the initial contact, and to persevere; attention should also be paid to programs that attract particular sorts of learners, e.g young people, men;
- The meaning and significance of 'progression' in and beyond LLN programs needs to be explored from the perspectives of the organisations and the learners;
- Professional development for volunteers in resource stretched community organisations needs to be considered in a different way to professional development in government organisations; this might be part of a broader exploration of organisational support for LLN.

References

Aulich, T. (Chair). (1991) *Come in Cinderella; the emergence of adult and community education.* Canberra: Report of the Senate Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training

Australian Council for Adult Literacy. (2004) *ACAL submission to the Senate inquiry into the progress and future directions of life-long learning.* Canberra: Australian Council for Adult Literacy.

Beddie, F. (2004) *Community literacy: a discussion paper.* Canberra: Department of Employment, Science and Training.

Birch, E. , Kenyon, P., Koshy, P. & Wills-Johnson, N. (2003) *Exploring the social and economic impacts of adult and community education.* Adelaide: NCVER.

Brink, S. (2005) *International Adult Literacy Surveys: Key policy research findings.* Human Resource Skills Development, Canada.

Campbell, A. & Curtin, P. (Eds). (1999) *ACE – some issues.* Adelaide: NCVER.

Castleton, G. and McDonald, M. (2002) *Multiple literacies and social transformation.* Brisbane: ALNARC, Griffith University.

Clemans, A., Hartley, R. & Macrae, H. (2003) *ACE outcomes.* Adelaide: NCVER.

Dymock, D. (1982) *Adult literacy provision in Australia: trends and needs.* Armidale: Australian Council for Adult Literacy.

Foster, S. and Beddie, F. (2005) *Adult literacy and numeracy: At a glance.* Adelaide: NCVER.

Golding, B., Harvey, J., Echter, A. (2005) *Men's learning through ACE and community involvement in small rural towns Findings from a Victorian Survey.* School of Education, University of Ballarat.

Hannon, P., Pahl, K., Bird, V., Taylor, C., & Birch, C. (2003) *Community-focused provision in adult literacy, numeracy and language: an exploratory study.* London: National research and Development Centre for Adult Literacy and Numeracy, Institute of Education.

Holbrow, B. (2005) *Building Community Capacity: Focus on Literacy* Alberta: Bow Valley College.

Lonsdale, M. & McCurry, D. (2004) Literacy in the new millennium. Adelaide: NCVER.

Kral, I. & Falk, I. (2004) What is all that learning for? Indigenous adult English literacy practices, training, community capacity and health. Adelaide: NCVER.

Mackay, S., Burgoyne, U., & Warwick, D. (2006) Current and future professional development needs of the language literacy and numeracy workforce: Support document. Adelaide: NCVER.

McKenna, R., & Fitzpatrick, L. (2004) *Building sustainable adult literacy policy and provision in Australia: A review of international policy and programs.* Adelaide: NCVER.

McNeil, B. & Dixon, L. (2005) *Success factors in informal learning: Young adults' experience of literacy, language and numeracy.* London: National Research and Development Centre for Adult Literacy and Numeracy.

National Adult Literacy Agency (2004) *Literacy and empowerment : NALA's policy on learners' development.* Ireland: NALA.

Office of Post-Compulsory Education and Training (2005) *Adult literacy provision in Tasmania 2004/5.* Hobart: Department of Education.

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (2000) *Literacy in the information age: Final report of the International Adult Literacy surveys.* Paris: OECD.

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (2005) *Learning a living: First results Adult Literacy and Life Skills*, Paris: OECD.

Schueler, J. (2005) *Embedded language, literacy and numeracy courses: a feasibility study.* Draft report. Adelaide: NCVER.

Sutton, A., Lander, J., & Benseman, J. (unpublished) Foundation learning in Aotearoa/new Zealand: Mapping the nature and extent of provision, 2003. Uniservices, University of Auckland.

Torgerson, C., & Brooks, G. (2005) *Research Review Adult literacy and numeracy interventions and outcomes: an exploratory study a review of controlled trials.* London: National Research and Development Centre for Adult Literacy and Numeracy.

Tulip, J. , & Burlinson, M. (2005) *Quantifying "soft outcomes"* . Pennywell and Ford Neighbourhood Learning Centres. http://www.skills.org.uk accessed 4 February 2006.

Wickert, R. & McGuirk, J. (2005) Using partnerships to build literacy and numeracy capabilities in communities. Adult Literacy Research. Adelaide: NCVER.

Survey results

In this chapter, the responses to the national survey are presented in summary form. A summary of the case studies is presented in the chapter that follows.

Extent of non-accredited adult language, literacy and numeracy provision in Australia

For this study, 'extent of provision' was considered to include not only the number and types of providers, but also the nature of the courses, their target markets, and the training and support of teachers and tutors.

Number of responses

In total, web-based questionnaires were despatched to 1464 email addresses, 284 hard copy questionnaires were sent by mail, and a small number of questionnaires was sent direct by email on individual request. The email version was also attached to a follow-up letter to organisations asking them to distribute this through their electronic networks, and it is not possible to know the extent to which that happened. Because the Reading Writing Hotline database was due to be updated, some of the contact addresses were out of date, and some 200-300 addresses from that original list of around 1100 bounced back. In terms of response, although the (extended) closing date for the survey was 12 June 2006, questionnaires continued to trickle in beyond that date, and all those received to mid July were included. The total number received to that time was 140, of which 125 were deemed to be eligible. 66 of the total were received via Surveymaker.com, the rest by email or fax.

It is usual with surveys to regard the percentage of returned questionnaires to be a measure of the success of that particular method. In this case, however, that figure is irrelevant and meaningless, since the initial intention was to contact as many organisations as possible which appeared to offer adult language, literacy and/or numeracy support of some kind, with no attempt to differentiate between those offering accredited or non-accredited programs. Since the Reading Writing Hotline database was the substantive basis for the mailing list, it was inevitable that some of those organisations would be providing only accredited training.

The 15 questionnaires deemed ineligible included duplicates for two organisations; the rest were from organisations that said they had *no* non-accredited provision, or did not appear to include any structured provision for language, literacy or numeracy, even in embedded form. Clarification was sought from a number of these providers about whether their responses applied to non-accredited provision, and a decision about eligibility was made on the basis of their responses. In two of those cases no reply was received after an initial query and follow-up, so for the sake of rigour in the research, their responses were not include in the analysis, i.e. only eligible respondents have been included in this report. The state profile of eligible respondents is shown in Table 1.

Table 1:   Number of questionnaires returned by state

State	Number of eligible questionnaires returned
Victoria	39
South Australia	39
Queensland	29
New South Wales	12
ACT	2
Western Australia	2
Tasmania	2
Total	**125**

In relation to the Western Australian figure, the majority of non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy provision in that State is through a network of 25 providers administered as part of an organisation called Read Write Now!, and the State Coordinator of that organisation preferred to submit only a single response on behalf of the whole group, mainly on the grounds that to do otherwise would place an unacceptable additional workload on the volunteer coordinators. So that single response actually represents those 25 organisations, bringing the total number of eligible organisations included in this report to 149, but without details for those individual organisations in Western Australia.

One possibly eligible questionnaire was received from the Northern Territory, but eligibility had not been confirmed at the time of preparing the report. Initial contacts with Tasmanian and with Australian Capital Territory educators during the period of assembling the mailing list indicated that non-accredited provision in those places was very limited, which seems borne out by the number of responses. The extent of the response nationally is explored in the 'Discussion' section.

46% of the respondents said that they were registered training organisations. However, the range of primary roles they identified for themselves from the options provided, as shown in Table 2, indicates the diversity of provision.

Table 2:   Primary role of organisations

Role	No.	%
General adult/community education	49	39.2
Specific adult literacy/numeracy improvement	9	7.2
Community Information	6	4.8
English as a Second Language	11	8.8
Welfare/counselling	2	1.6
Health	1	0.8
Disability Service Provider	8	6.4
Accredited Training	23	18.4
Not shown	16	12.8
Total	**125**	**100.0**

Table 2 shows that general ACE providers comprised almost 40 per cent of those organisations that responded to the survey. However, if those identifying as 'Community information/Referral', 'General adult/community education' and 'specific adult literacy/numeracy improvement' are also considered as being part of community provision, some 51 per cent might be regarded as being community providers. While most of the responding organisations would probably see themselves as working in and for their communities, the two organisations in the 'Welfare/Counselling' group and the one in the 'Health' group were found to be primarily working in the English as a second language field with migrants and refugees, so if

they were joined for the purposes of discussion with the 'English as a second language teaching/tutoring' group, together they would comprise some 11 per cent. The nature of the field and the blurring of boundaries are shown by the fact that almost one-fifth of the organisations indicated *accredited* training as their primary role, even though they also offered non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy. Disability service providers are also reasonably represented among the respondents. The broader groupings advanced here are used later in the report when issues for organisations are discussed.

Another way of looking at the emphases of the providers is to consider whether they have identified target groups. More than half (57%) of the respondents said they had a particular target group for their services. Sometimes they had more than one group, as shown in Table 3. So, while only some 9 per cent of providers said that English as a Second Language was their primary aim (Table 2), almost half the group had migrants and/or refugees among their students. A question that tried to identify actual groups served yielded insufficient information to be useful, so is not discussed in this report.

Table 3: Target groups identified by providers (57% of total)

Target group	No. of orgs	% of total orgs (n= 125)
Migrants/Refugees	46	36.8
Disabled	36	28.8
Women	28	22.4
Men	24	19.2
Seniors	28	22.4
Youth	23	18.4
Aboriginals & Torres Strait Islanders	12	9.6

Course purpose

The question that asked for the titles of non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy courses or other structured activities, including those embedded in other courses, brought home the extent of the diversity of provision in this sub-sector. The range of responses included *English for employment, Lifelong literacy, Basic language skills, English language for refugees, Reading, writing and numeracy for adults, Statement of Attainment in foundation and vocational education,* and *Numeracy and literacy for special needs clients.*

As can be seen, there is a wide variety of purposes, and the titles are also sometimes indicative of the intended target audiences.

Length of courses

Another indicator of the diversity of the courses and other activities is the range of time allocated for them. Respondents were asked to indicate the length of each course, in hours. The request was interpreted in different ways, so it is not possible to compare the lengths. For those that indicated the total number of hours, the figures ranged from 6 hours to 400 hours, but some of the responses referred to hours per term or semester, while others were for a whole year. Where organisations indicated the number of hours per week allocated to the activity, these ranged from one hour a week to four hours a week, with two-hour sessions apparently the most common. Some respondents added riders such as 'during school terms'. One organisation offering computer-aided language learning for one hour per week added that students could attend in their own time for as many additional hours as they wished. The nature of the field is further revealed by the fact that for some Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy activities it was not possible to specify the length of a course. For example, one organisation offered 'half hour

blocks on a one-to-one basis as people require literacy and numeracy assistance'. Several others said that it varied according to the needs of the individual, and one related it to group needs. Another replied that it depended on the needs of the target group 'and available funds'.

Course content

Just over one-third of the respondents said that they used a structured course or curriculum. Only a small number of the 43 in this category indicated the curriculum basis of their teaching. Most of those used either an existing accredited course, e.g. 'Work-related Literacy and Numeracy' (30369) in Queensland, 'Foundation and vocational education' (9566-9) in New South Wales and South Australia, or adaptations of those or similar courses (e.g. 'We use the old Certificate in English Language and Literacy as a base and add and subtract topics of interest or modify as group requires'). The majority did not follow a specific curriculum, with most of those indicating that their courses or activities were developed to meet learners' individual needs, occasionally through an initial interview and/or assessment, but generally through one-to-one consultation with a tutor. For the rest of this group, the content was devised by the coordinator or tutor on the basis of their experience.

Embedded courses

There are literacy and numeracy requirements in all sorts of courses, e.g. woodworking, computing, as some respondents noted. Some providers also observed that tuition was designed around the learner and therefore language, literacy or numeracy learning was embedded in a general way in such activities as shopping and excursions or in workplace specific roles. However, for the purposes of this research, organisations were invited to indicate courses that were not outright language, literacy or numeracy courses but which had a *specific* language, literacy or numeracy aim embedded in them. For example, a reading program focused initially on 'assisting parents, grandparents and carers to support and model reading strategies with pre-school age children'. There were also some examples of embedded language, literacy and/or numeracy in such courses as 'English through cooking', 'Language of childbirth', 'Healthy Eating', and a proposed course, 'Computers for migrants'.

Disability service providers generally embedded language, literacy and numeracy in other activities. One of those said that language, literacy and numeracy were specifically included in a life skills/personal development curriculum. Another said that most of their literacy courses were embedded in other courses, including 'Workplace health and safety', 'Budget skills', and a computer course. A coordinator of a workplace program also pointed out that language, literacy and numeracy 'in workplace/industry contexts is generally integrated with industry/vocational training, e.g. occupational health and safety, food safety, basic computer skills, working effectively in teams' (ACC 12).

Number of participants

The question that asked 'how many students on average do you have in a program at any particular time' might have better asked for an annual figure, because the diversity of ways in which the programs are offered meant that there was a wide variety of ways in which they were reported in the survey. The numbers ranged from '2-3 but growing' to a state community program coordinator's estimate of 800-850 students currently, with a maximum of 1100-1200. But these latter figures were a total for all programs, so cannot be compared with individual program figures. An English as a Second Language organisation said it had 70-80 per week in conversation classes and 30-50 per week wanting a tutor, while a welfare organisation said it had 10 students at any one time because 'that's how many computers we have' (WEL 129).

Another English as a Second Language provider said that it assisted 500 people from 50 nationalities each year. An example of the diversity of provision *within* an organisation came from an ACE agency: 'English for beginners – 30, Improve your spelling – 8, Improve your spelling (computers) – 5, Literacy special activities group – 10, Getting your learner's permit – 10' (ACE 88). On the other hand, another ACE agency said that it had no students at the moment 'due to lack of non-accredited funding' (ACE 64).

Teachers and tutors

Given the diversity of provision, it is not surprising that there was also a range of ways in which the teaching or training was organised. It was recognised that this range could apply within organisations as well as across them, so multiple responses were accepted. Just over half the respondents used 1:1 tuition, and slightly under half of them taught groups of two to five and six to ten students, respectively. 28 per cent said they had classes of 11-15 students, and around 13 per cent had classes larger than that.

Of the 119 non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy providers who responded to the question about volunteers, 36% said they used volunteer tutors. In those programs, the use of volunteers was strongest in 1:1 tuition (30%), with a generally even spread across the other three categories: teaching small groups, a combination of one-to-one and small groups, and as support for classroom teaching. Several of the providers said they had no volunteer tutors at the moment, and some of those who said they used volunteer tutors did not indicate how many, if any, were currently on their books. For the 57 organisations that did provide figures, the number of volunteers ranged from one tutor in a community education centre in a small rural town, to 200 tutors in a state-wide English as a Second Language tutoring program, and 738 in a state-wide community literacy and numeracy program.

Given the diversity of provision, it was not surprising to find a range of qualifications and expectations about qualifications among the providers, with over 70% requiring a minimum qualification. These qualifications included a formal teaching qualification (34%), an in-house volunteer induction course (26%), Certificate IV in Training and Assessment (27%), and the Certificate IV in Language, Literacy and Numeracy Assessment and Training (9%).

Over 80% of respondents indicated that they provided some form of professional development for their teachers, whether paid or volunteer, although the attitudes to it varied. Two organisations indicated that conference attendance was their prime means of professional development and another three said it was conducted through regular meetings. One said it used annual mentoring. Fifty-one organisations had definite provision for professional development. Around half of these required teachers/tutors/trainers to undertake a particular structured program (e.g. a Certificate IV in Training and Assessment, the English Language Service (ELS) course through the Home Tutor Scheme or TAFE, a tutor training course, or an ACE training course). The other half had an explicit commitment to professional development, sometimes through an earmarked item in the annual budget, or, in one case 'all funded programs incorporate a component for staff training/professional development' (ACE 58). Sometimes there was a requirement for teachers to identify their professional development needs in order to for a program to be developed.

Of the other 40 organisations, some 'encouraged' professional development, others said teachers/tutors/trainers had 'access' to unspecified opportunities, sometimes provided by their own organisations, e.g. TAFE, and some simply noted that various external workshops or courses were available. It is difficult with this group of 40 to know from the responses how strong the expectations of the organisation were or the extent of the take-up.

Learner characteristics and motivations

Age ranges

Respondents were asked to indicate which age ranges the *majority* of their participants fell into. In order to accommodate a spread of ages they could specify up to three age groups.

Table 4:   **Main learner age groups**

Age Group	No. of orgs	% of total (n=125)
Under 20 years	15	12
20 to 29 years	51	41
30 to 39 years	85	68
40 to 49 years	88	71
50 to 59 years	64	51
60 to 69 years	23	18
70 years or over	4	3
Not shown	3	2

Table 4 indicates the relative proportions of the listed age groups reported by each organisation as the cohorts they most work with. The age grouping most strongly represented in the figures is the 30-49 age cohort, but the 50-59 and 20-29 age groups are also prominent. However it should be noted that since the numbers in the programs vary widely, Table 4 does not necessarily show the age groups of the total *number* of participants in non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy in Australia.

Gender

One-hundred and seven valid responses were received to the question of the gender balance of students in non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy programs, and the mean was 68% females and 32% males. There were several programs that had only female students. The highest percentage of males, in two organisations, was 70%. Eight organisations reported a 50/50 split. Overall 87 of the 107 organisations had a majority of or exclusively female students. The lowest female percentage in any program was 30%, and the lowest for men were 3% and 5%.

Learner motivations

One of the main questions about the apparently ongoing need for non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy provision is what motivates those requiring assistance to seek it out. In general terms, the most identified reasons were: English improvement, returning to the workforce, need for more control of their lives, and a social opportunity. 4% of providers thought 'no clear reason' was applicable for some students. Multiple responses were accepted for this question, but respondents were also asked to nominate from the list provided what they believed were the *two main* reasons, and these are summarised in Table 5.

The motivations listed in Table 5 are based on the perceptions of those responsible for the programs rather than the students/clients themselves, so it is always possible that there could be some variation from the motivations identified by the students. However, there were valid responses from experienced coordinators in 116 organisations to this question, so the perceptions should carry considerable weight.

Table 5:   Main reasons for seeking ALLN assistance

Reason	%
Short-term specific need (such as obtain Driver's Licence)	5
Returning to the workforce/seeking employment	16
Changes in Language, Literacy and Numeracy requirements at work	7
Want to support children at school	3
Learn or improve English for everyday living	35
Spouse/carer no longer available to support Language, Literacy and Numeracy needs	2
More control in their lives/self esteem	13
Social opportunity/meet people	13
Required to attend Language, Literacy and Numeracy course	6
TOTAL	**100**

Table 5 shows that improving literacy for everyday living was considered by far the most important single reason for students to seek Language, Literacy and Numeracy assistance. This reflects the range of organisations represented, including the preponderance of adult and community education organisations, as well as the needs of English as a Second Language learners. The next largest grouping is of those wanting to return to the workforce or seeking employment, and there may be a small overlap in responses with the number of those who were required to attend Language, Literacy and Numeracy courses, presumably in order to fulfil government employment benefits requirements.

In order to assess the extent to which the 23 organisations with accredited training as their primary role influenced the percentages shown in Table 5, the figures were re-calculated without those responses. The results were minor increases (+2.5%) in the number motivated by the need to learn English for everyday living and those keen to make more social contact respectively, and a 4% drop in the number for whom participation was mandatory.

Learner outcomes

The question of outcomes is an important one for Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy providers and policy-makers because it has implications for the purposes of the programs, for the aspirations of the learners, and ultimately for funding. It also bears on that rather sublime question, 'What is literacy?', with which numerous writers have grappled, including recently Lonsdale and McCurry (2004). In the survey, the question on outcomes was in four parts: one on skills development, one on learner personal development, and one each on progression to other training and employment respectively. The issue of what learning outcomes are achieved hinges to some extent on the nature of the assessment undertaken, so providers were first asked to indicate how they approached assessment as well as to indicate thee outcomes for learners.

Assessment

Around one-quarter of the organisations employed *formal* means to assess the learning outcomes of students. A number used the phrase 'ongoing formal assessment', whilst several used 'formal pre training and post training assessment mapped to the National Reporting System'. One mentioned formal feedback from the participants and another said that some were assessed against 'standardised levels by a portfolio of work'. Some of those that used formal tools said they supplemented this with informal assessment. In all cases the assessment reported here was related to non-accredited training.

The *informal* assessment reported by some three-quarters of the respondents included observation, feedback from participants, an ongoing portfolio, student satisfaction surveys and

'by what the student produces'. One ACE provider said that they were 'not interested in the assessment of skills – just the increase in confidence so they will take the next step to join a class' (ACE 03). This response from one provider probably sums up the general approach to assessment in this field, particularly in community-based organisations:

> Some of the courses have assessment tasks to do – most of the assessment is by observation and improvements of skill levels. In the course where they do written work the assessment of improvement can be seen from the quality of the work. (ACE 20)

Organisations were not asked to indicate what sorts of records they kept, but under such circumstances as indicated in the quote above, there is an implication that the nature of the record-keeping varies. For example, one community organisation providing English as a Second Language support issued a Certificate of Completion at each level of the course. However, those organisations with such responses as 'outcomes reported by learners' (OTH 76) or 'we look at the learning to be an ongoing project with the students – tests are done occasionally' (ACE 73), would seem less likely to have any systematic record keeping. Several indicated that the students did a self-assessment, either through feedback or at an interview, or by leaving a course at a point where their immediate goals had been achieved.

The sensitivity of the issue of assessment in the Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy field is perhaps best illuminated by this comment from an organisation catering for a particular category of disability, which said that it chose 'the least obtrusive assessment methods at all times as most Language, Literacy and Numeracy students have suffered under education systems that did not recognise their needs or denied them access to the information being taught/assessed. Many are highly apprehensive…'(DIS 29)

Learning outcomes

There were five options for each of the perceived skills development and personal growth outcomes, using validated terms from a Likert scale. As summarised in Table 6, there were no responses in the 'not at all' and 'very little' categories, indicating that all providers thought their learners were achieving above those baselines. Table 6 shows that in the *skills* category, almost half the respondents thought that their students/clients improved 'quite a bit', the second highest level, as a result of being in their programs. Around 20% thought they achieved the highest level from the options offered, with a similar percentage in the third highest.

Table 6:   Perceptions of learner outcomes

Extent of improvement	LLN Skills	Self-Confidence
Not at all	-	-
Very little	-	-
Somewhat	22.4	5.6
Quite a bit	48.8	35.2
Very much	19.2	55.2
Not known	2.4	-
Not shown	7.2	4.0
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**

On the *self-confidence* aspect, more than half the providers thought their students/clients improved 'very much' through participation in their programs, and most of the others thought they improved 'quite a bit'.

Pathways

As some respondents, particularly from community organisations, were at pains to point out, and as illustrated in Table 5, not all adults seeking Language, Literacy and Numeracy assistance want vocationally related outcomes, but government funding agencies often have expectations that improved literacy will lead to training or employment outcomes, so providers were asked about the perceived extent of such transitions. On the assumption that such links facilitate articulation, they were also asked to indicate whether they had partnerships or arrangements with other education or training providers or with employment agencies.

Table 7:   Provider perceptions of learner pathways

Estimated percentage of learners	No. of Providers (%)	No. of Providers (%)
	To other training	To employment
None	2.4	6.4
Up to 10%	25.6	26.4
Up to 25%	20.8	19.2
Up to 50%	10.4	7.2
About 50%	6.4	4.8
Up to 75%	11.2	6.4
Up to 100%	2.4	1.6
Not known	17.6	20.8
Not shown	3.2	7.2
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**

The questions about pathways built on the questions about learner outcomes, and were included in the same section of the questionnaire. Table 7 shows the percentage of organisations at each level who believed that that percentage of their students went on to other training or to employment. For example, 25.6% of organisations believed that up to 10% of their students went on to other education or training, and 6.4% believed that up to 75% of their students went on to employment. Responses were limited to just one of the eight options provided in each category.

Table 7 shows that around one fifth of the organisations did not know the extent to which their students went on to other training or employment – one person interviewed said 'that's got very little to do with me'. It seems that most organisations have no systematic way of tracking students, so most of the responses summarised in Table 7 are likely to be estimates. Nevertheless, the fact that the largest groupings of organisations are in the 'up to 10%' and 'up to 25%' bands, does suggest that these are modest estimates. Further analysis would be needed to identify the types of providers in the 2.4% and 1.6% of organisations that believed 100% of their students went on to other training or employment respectively.

Partnerships

Some two-thirds of 120 respondents said they had partnerships, networks and other links with other organisations and agencies in the training and employment field. Around 20% of those said they had a *formal* agreement with another agency. These formal agreements included memoranda of understanding (MOUs) with other education providers, including primary schools, high schools, TAFE, and adult and community education, and one had a formal agreement with the local library. In addition the registered training organisations noted the contracts they had with Centrelink and Jobs Network members, and one was with a department of Corrective Services. As will be seen later in this report, these vocationally related agreements related to non-accredited as well as accredited training. Some of those with formal arrangements were also part of informal networks. As might be expected, the range of *informal* links was broad for the other 80% of

organisations. They included the full range of educational institutions, from primary schools to TAFE institutes and universities, as well as with libraries and community organisations of all kinds, and there was also some cross-referral. Some community organisations reported informal cooperation with referral agencies such as Centrelink.

Support for non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy providers

This section goes beyond the programs to explore how the organisations themselves support non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy and ways in which they believe they can be better supported in order to enhance the service they provide. To help this exploration, the organisations were asked about the extent to which there was some regular evaluation of the non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy program for quality control purposes, and where their funding came from.

Evaluation of programs

With accountability a major factor in the funding of government programs, the responding organisations were asked to indicate whether they had any regular evaluation of their non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy program (as distinct from assessment of learner outcomes), or a quality assurance strategy. There was a 90% response to this question, and two-thirds of those indicated that there was some means of validating their programs.

Seventy-nine of the responding organisations indicated the nature of their program evaluation processes. For 25 of them this was conducted externally, usually by a government funding body directly, or through reports to the funding body. The nature of internal evaluations varied widely across the other 54 organisations, including feedback from students at the end of courses, student satisfaction surveys, and informal discussions among tutors, sometimes on a regular basis, and reviews by management committees. One said: 'The volunteer tutors meet monthly and discuss the programs they are running [and] issues that arise, and work together on policy development and planning for the future' (ACE 132). A more relaxed approach was adopted by another agency: 'A regular check is kept on student numbers; if students keep attending, this suggests they feel that their needs are being met' (ESL 94). It seems that around one-third of organisations did not have a program review strategy.

Funding sources

In the light of the dominance of accredited courses in Australian education and training, funding is an ongoing issue in adult and community education for non-accredited courses; it was raised in this mapping exercise in order to explore its dimensions in the particular context of Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy. Table 8 shows the sources of funding which support the sub-sector. The list of options was developed from feedback on the Pilot Study.

Table 8 shows that earmarked recurrent state government funding was the largest source of funding. In order to estimate the extent to which individual organisations were funded, they were asked to indicate what percentage of their funds came from each source. However, the mix of funding was so diverse that it was not possible to summarise funding source percentages in the sub-sector in a way that was meaningful or useful. As an example, of the 26 ACE organisations that provided funding details, 8 received all their funding from one of four different sources respectively, most identified two different sources, with various percentage combinations, and one said that 80% of its funding came from non-recurrent State Government funding – literacy specific, 10% from local government, and 10% from its own revenue.

Table 8: Sources of funding of non-accredited ALLN (n=119)

Source of funding	%
Local government funding	8.8
Recurrent direct Federal funding	10.4
Non-recurrent State Government Funding – non-literacy specific	14.4
Recurrent State Government Funding – non-literacy specific	16.0
Non-recurrent State Government Funding – literacy specific	22.4
Recurrent State Government Funding – literacy specific	34.4
Unfunded – own revenue sources	21.6
Fee for service	20.8

The fact that specific recurrent state government funding was an important source (Table 8) does not seem to mean that such funding is guaranteed from year to year. By far the majority of the numerous suggestions for improvement were that funding should be on a longer cycle, e.g. three years rather than one year. There were also a number of individual suggestions or criticisms. For example, one ACE provider complained that a current government funding application required completion of 12 documents. Two other respondents raised differences between TAFE and other registered training organisations: one said that private registered training organisations were paid a lower amount per student contact hour than TAFE providers, and the other asked that government Workplace English Language and Learning (WELL) funding be open to private registered training organisations to enable them to compete equally with TAFE institutes. There are bigger issues than funding in the suggestion that TAFE should have a broader scope to deliver personal development programs because 'the current restrictions that courses should lead to employment outcomes exclude our clients who have intellectual disabilities' (DIS 43). A more radical suggestion was for an 'integrated service delivery model rather than project based funding, leading to a more care-based approach and funding the right mix of services for an individual' (ACC 15).

The limitations for community providers is evident in such requests as provision of funds for purchase of resources; that professional development sessions for volunteers should be free; that there should be a defined funding category for volunteer 1:1 programs 'so that we are not lumped in with group programs'; and the ongoing problem of rural areas: specific funding to cover smaller class sizes 'because we draw from a sparse population over larger distances' (LN 114).

Reporting data

One of the triggers for this research was the apparent lack of reporting of student numbers and outcomes compared to that in accredited programs for inclusion in the annual Australian Vocational Education Training Management Information Statistical Standards (AVETMISS) data used for national reporting purposes. Organisations responding to the survey were asked to indicate whether they reported their non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy data to any external body. Almost three-quarters stated that they did, and there was a range of organisations and institutions to whom they reported outside the program. In almost all cases these were the government funding departments, State and national, but with two providers indicating they reported to their own larger organisation (which may of course have reported to funding agencies).

The organisations were also asked to comment on whether non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy statistics should be reported in the same way accredited course data were, and to give reasons for their answers. The contentiousness of this issue is illustrated by the response: exactly 50% said that such reporting should be mandatory, almost 30% were opposed, and the rest did not respond.

Those organisations that supported mandatory reporting generally felt that it would mean either better recognition of the benefits and/or extent of non-accredited courses or the possibility of increased government funding, or both. For example, one said:

> Non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy is a hidden piece of the jigsaw in education in Australia. If we want a complete picture and understanding of the learning that occurs in Australia, then these courses should be accounted for. Many people are not ready [for], or do not need, formal accreditation. (UNC 132)

On the other hand, one respondent who was opposed to mandatory reporting believed that 'People can waste a lot of time reporting on little groups that are basically just part of the community working together' (ACE 45).

This tension between the need to report and the time and effort required is a constant theme in the discussion of this topic in the survey responses. It appears to be the smaller community organisations that had the most concerns about whether they would have the resources ('I spend half my life reporting, and don't get paid for my time'), but some of those that supported reporting suggested they could do it if there was provision for it in the funding. Other respondents said they already reported non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy statistics, and several noted that they reported both non-accredited and accredited course data, one noting that 'the outcome codes are different'. The general tenor of most of the supportive responses to this question is probably best summed up by the belief expressed by a specific literacy/numeracy program coordinator that 'the time taken for compliance is an issue, but the recognition of the importance of community building skills and the improvement to society would be valuable and maybe assist future funding sources'. (LN 119)

However, several providers raised the question of whether non-accredited outcomes *could* be reported, given the variety of outcomes:

> Community program outcomes are usually in regard to social networks, confidence, self-esteem, as well as skills-based outcomes. Accredited training does not always address such outcomes – which for the students worked with [in the non-accredited] target groups are just as vital. (ACE 96)

One-to-one Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy tuition by volunteer tutors was singled out by another respondent as an area where outcomes could not be reported in the same format as for accredited programs. Another response was that volunteers may be 'so "scared" of reporting requirements they may decide not to continue' (WEL 127). The manager of a registered training organisation suggested that non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy could be benchmarked to a standard using a framework such as the National Reporting System (ACC 15).

Apart from the issues of time and resource limitations, those opposed to mandatory reporting did so on such grounds that only publicly funded programs should be reported, that this requirement might impose a requirement for competency based learning outcomes, that flexibility would be lost with the need for too much accountability and record-keeping, and that courses vary so much that the keeping of statistics would not be 'either relevant or useful'.

Issues

In order to enable providers to identify and discuss issues faced in non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy provision, there were several items in the questionnaire that allowed for both set responses and comments. First a list was provided of issues that had been identified from the literature and initial feedback as being of concern. The responses are shown in Table 9. Multiple responses were acceptable.

Table 9:   **Main issues for non-accredited ALLN providers**

Issue	%
Lack of funding	44.8
Attracting students to the program	37.6
Students dropping in and out of program	36.8
Slow progress of students	33.6
Lack of support generally for non-accredited programs	27.2
Inadequate facilities (e.g. classrooms)	23.2
Lack of teachers/tutors	21.6
Lack of professional development for teachers/tutors	20.0
Inability to follow up students after the Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy course	17.6
Low motivation of students	12.0
High student drop out	8.8

Unsurprisingly Table 9 shows that lack of funding again registers as a major concern. The next three factors, each identified by around one third of the respondents, are all student related: attracting students to the program, students dropping in and out of the program, and slow progress.

It had been anticipated that funding would be a major issue for providers, so the survey included a question, with a list of responses, about what additional support, apart from financial, would most help to enhance non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy programs. Table 10 shows how they ranked the items in the list.

Table 10:   **Additional support needed**

Factor	%
Government recognition of the worth of non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy	61.6
More professional development for teachers/tutors	39.2
Improved links with other agencies	38.4
Better promotion of your program	34.4
Assistance to follow up students after completion/non-completion	28.0
Assistance with preparing grant applications	19.2

In a sense, this is the flipside of the question about issues (Table 9), except that funding was excluded. Overwhelmingly the largest single request is for improved government recognition of non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy, which included recognition of the value of the range of learning outcomes as well as recognition for funding purposes.

Providers were also invited to enlarge on their responses to the questions about issues and additional support which are summarised in Tables 9 and 10. It was considered that such issues may be peculiar to each of the main categories of provider, so they are discussed here in the four groupings identified earlier in relation to Table 2.

Among the organisations that identified their primary purpose as *Accredited Training*, there was a general spread of concerns across links with other relevant agencies, including for professional development purposes; encouraging students to enrol and persist; and policy issues. The latter included the comment that 'individual managers and volunteer hours cannot be relied upon to keep [migrant] programs afloat' (ACC 45), and a proposal that there be a 'national Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy framework' whereby all participants engaged in government-funded programs achieve the same Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy outcomes, 'i.e. progression through the NRS' (ACC 15). Two of the agencies in this group commented on the

difficulty of establishing links with other providers, one appealing for 'advice regarding best practice organisations to partner with for mentoring'.

In the *Disability Support Providers* group, there was concern from several agencies that teachers needed better professional development to deal with adults with cognitive or learning disabilities. One asked for funding for vocational education and training providers to work with non-government organisations to develop and deliver appropriate programs for people with disabilities. Another said that specialised employment agencies did not recognise non-accredited student outcomes or the potential of students.

For the *English as a Second Language* group of providers, there was no outstanding issue, but improving links with other organisations, assistance with 'incredibly complex' grant applications, supporting volunteer tutors, and more professional development options were all mentioned. There were also two requests for funding to purchase resources such as books and stationery.

Within the larger group designated *Community* for the purposes of this discussion, the 'Community Information' agencies said they struggled with offering an adequate service either directly or through referral. They generally found making strong links difficult with other Language, Literacy and Numeracy groups with one complaining that although the Reading Writing Hotline listed the local public library as a source of help, 'it would be great if the Library could actually help people' (CI 37). Another said that their key performance indicators did not include Language, Literacy and Numeracy so 'these programs are run virtually without government support' (CI 39).

Amongst others in the *Community* group, government recognition of the role of community education and of the value of non-accredited learning was a recurring theme, as exemplified by the call for 'recognition of the value non-accredited training can play in enhancing individuals' lives, in particular the role it plays in re-engaging individuals into some form of education' (ACE 61). The same ACE provider complained that the lack of recognition meant that Centrelink and Jobs Network providers would not assist with funding participants through these programs (ACE 61) (although as noted earlier there are occasional examples of such referrals). Coupled to this was a concern that emerged a few times in different places during this research: 'because of the slow pace of the learner it is very difficult for progress to be mapped using existing curriculum', something it was claimed government bodies often did not understand (ACE 128). Another provider put it this way:

> Learners come and go. While they are here they are motivated and make progress but when circumstances prevent them coming and they stop for a while, they are possibly discouraged from coming back if they don't see the worth of non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy.

The difficulty of providing Language, Literacy and Numeracy support for the range of participants in such programs is also shown in the comment that 'so often governments do not see the need for courses for people who will probably NEVER GAIN PAID EMPLOYMENT but still wish to function better in the wider English speaking community' (ACE 77; emphasis in original). One ACE respondent said that because Language, Literacy and Numeracy learners often had issues that competed with their learning, teachers sometimes provided 'hours of support' outside class time. Improving networking among Language, Literacy and Numeracy providers also received several mentions by the *Community* providers, along with the need for more professional development opportunities.

In another part of the survey, providers indicated the various ways they promoted their courses, including word of mouth, flyers on notice boards, through employment agencies and Centrelink, in community newspapers, and on websites. The range of strategies was very wide, so it is

interesting to see that 'attracting students' and 'program promotion' featured so prominently in the needs they expressed (Tables 9 and 10 respectively).

Suggestions from providers

The questionnaire ended with an invitation to make any other comments that might help influence policy-making in non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy. For 49 of the respondents, the idea of influencing policy was appealing, but the range of suggestions was predictably wide, including some about education and training generally. Those included have been limited to the ones that are particularly relevant to non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy, and the responses were again categorised into those whose primary purpose was *Accredited Training*, *English as a Second Language*, *Disability Support Provider* or *Community*.

Among the *Accredited Training* group, individual suggestions included: that more consideration needs to be given to rural areas because distance from home and staff training facilities are often a problem; the need for government policy makers to recognise the need for 'low level courses' in TAFE to help clients progress to higher level courses; and a more structured approach to assessing individuals' Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy skills in community programs.

Two of the *Disability Support Provider* group pointed out the need for recognition of the slower rate of development of social and vocational skills, with one observing that: 'the 'cap' on the number of hours a person can spend undertaking one TAFE program is not appropriate to a person with a disability, especially an intellectual disability. It should be appreciated that they learn and develop more slowly, and will still benefit' (DIS 43). For the *English as a Second Language* providers, individual policy issues included the provision of childcare for 'clients'; that there was a demonstrated need for 'personalised small-scale tutorial style assistance with language learning' that could not be addressed through formal institutional classes; and the observation that 'the demand for English as a Second Language programs is huge'.

From the *Community* providers, a major issue was the need to recognise the distinctive nature of the sorts of students they catered for. There were such phrases as 'people that have somehow slipped through the educational system', 'people who have the needs but are not able to fit into normal classes', 'people will not attend formal education courses if they have low incomes and low self-esteem', and that many were not looking for work. According to one community education coordinator, 'Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy is fundamental to meeting our commitment to social justice; it enables participants to gain basic skills that greatly improve their daily family and community lives and gives them better work/study options in life'. (ACE 88)

Overall, the community providers wanted greater policy recognition of the impact of their Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy programs on the lives of learners and on the wider community.

Case studies

There are four categories of provider in the case studies: Literacy/Numeracy, Adult and Community Education, English as a Second Language, and a Disability Service Provider. They were located in three different States, and in a mix of urban and rural locations. Altogether individual interviews were conducted with four people at management level, nine who were in coordinating roles, eleven teachers or tutors and nine students, a total of 33, as well as a focus group of four who had developed a literacy and numeracy program for adults with an intellectual disability. Their responses have been summarised below.

Case Study One

Primary purpose: Specific Literacy/Numeracy program

Location: Rural – small town

This program was located in a rural town with a population of some 4,000, with a small Muslim population. The coordinator, who began as a tutor in the 1990s, and the current tutors, were all volunteers.

The students

Based on her long experience, the coordinator gave examples of the range of motivations of the students in this program:

> We've had people who have got to be in their 50s and can't read and from there it's got to a stage where the wife's had enough and 'if you don't learn to read well that's it, the marriage is over, we're finished'. And so they've come to learn to read. There's the farmer also who all his life he's grown up with his dad looking after the Ford tractor, knows every part, knows exactly what to do, Ford tractor's done its dash, you can't buy parts anymore, we'll get a new tractor… But you've got to have a manual and you've got to know how to read it and you can't, so… they've come along to learn.

> …A few years back now, businesses wanted their staff to be multi-purpose, to be able to work in all different departments. And particularly we've had… several students, from the hospital where they've been doing jobs that have been mundane … and suddenly they've been taken away from that and put into another environment where they've got to write a report and they can't do it. They haven't had to know about writing. And so the … hospital actually made a room for us where we could go up there and the student could come in for an hour and learn and then just go back to work, and they paid their time still, they didn't miss out on wages or anything, which was very good.

> We've had people come to us from Centrelink who are applying for a job… applying for money and yet they can't fill their forms in because they can't read them. [Job Network provider] - when people turn up there and they find similar reasons, they tell their clients that… we are in town if they want to go, you know, we would help them.

> And that's one of the beauties of our scheme, the people that come to us come to us because they want to learn, not because they have to come to us, not been made to come

to us, they come because they want to and it's a big difference from somebody being told you've got to go and do it, because there's this willingness, they want to do something.

In these cases the tuition was normally one-to-one. However, there were also English as a Second Language classes for an earlier migrant group as well as for the newly arrived refugees. The men tend to be employed locally, so the classes were intended for women only. They were held in a room attached to a mosque, on a different morning for each of the two main 'ethnic' groups. There was a range of ages, including those with babies and some with teenage children. Sessions were two hours long each week, and a tutor said the new arrivals wanted sessions every day, but that this was not possible with volunteer tutors. The participants regarded the sessions as social occasions as well as learning times.

One of the students interviewed who was in his mid-20s who had left school after Year 10 and had later been in an accident and in his words: 'just like your filing cabinet's been chucked out… and it's all on the floor… I lost all the tools to use all my words and to be able to understand it.' He said at school 'I wasn't the brightest but I wasn't dumb'. With one-to-one volunteer tuition of one hour a week over about six years, he had re-developed these skills. He said:

> It's hard for me really to do all this stuff 'cause I don't like it and having a teacher that can do it with me – it's like being at school and having your own teacher with you all the time. You excel more than if you just had the teacher doing the whole class.

When he did an accredited course to operate machinery, he asked the tutor to sit in with him but found that he did need her, he said. Since then he had done a first aid course and at the time of the interview had just lost a local unskilled job, and was hoping to get a job driving a truck at a mine site.

Two other former students in this rural program were interviewed. They had migrated as young teenagers from a European country, and their parents arranged for them to obtain volunteer help with English language two days a week over about a year, since they did not speak English at the time. The older one then enrolled at the local TAFE college but continued to get language support, while the younger one continued until ready to undertake a TAFE course. Both were enrolled in the Certificate in General Education for Adults (CGEA), and working part-time at a local supermarket.

The tutors

The program was advertised as a confidential one-on-one tutoring scheme by volunteer tutors who had been trained and who set their own pace and own curriculum according to each student's needs. The coordinator's role was to interview would-be tutors for suitability, interview prospective students, and try to match them up and 'set them on a learning curve that will help them reach the goals they've set'. After a tutor and student had been meeting for a 'trial period' of about six weeks the coordinator interviewed each separately to see what progress was being made and if the student's needs were being met. Subsequent follow-ups were at about three-monthly intervals. An assessment tool was provided by a centralised support service. The centre had a 'basic group of books' for tutoring, purchased with a State-wide government grant, and tutors also tended to create their own resources. Every quarter the centre sent a standardised report to the central support service with student statistics, and with progress reported in general terms. The central service also did random follow-ups with students.

Tutors were expected to undertake a tutor training course and encouraged to attend professional development workshops, which were usually held in the capital city, 3-4 hours drive. One of the tutors interviewed had not yet undertaken the initial training, but seemed confident on the basis of her experience, her own children's schooling and her own interest in learning. The other tutor interviewed had helped about six students one-to-one and had taught English to students with a

non-English speaking background as well as to native-born Australians. She said that in her experience, 'establishing a rapport comes before the learning … and it builds from there. Once you establish trust it's a lot easier to get someone to learn.' She said that there was a basic assessment form and 'you mark that against the last review and the one before that and that's how you can see the progress'.

The coordinator said there were regular meetings to exchange information about tutoring and resources, which helped to keep the tutors motivated: 'You treat them like royalty, that's what they are, they just do a brilliant job'.

Issues

The main issue for the program was finding voluntary tutors; 'finding the students is not a problem at all'. There was a fairly high turnover of tutors, usually after two to three years. It also seemed that there were long periods between tutor training courses because of the town's rural location, and apparently not all the tutors were willing to travel to the State capital for professional development.

On the question of the impact of the program on the local community, the coordinator said:

> I get a lot of feedback, word of mouth feedback, of how people think it's a very good thing to have, but not a lot is talked about because for most of your students, it's private, and so the tutors can't go and discuss with others. …So it's known about in the community but… it's not something of everyday conversation, but we do our best to keep what we do in the spotlight so that people are aware it's there.

Case Study Two

Primary purpose: Specific Literacy/Numeracy program

Location: Urban – regional city

This program was located in a regional city of almost 80,000 people, which had apparently grown from around 2,500 in 20 years, and was continuing to grow. The program provided literacy and numeracy assistance one-to-one using only volunteers, and there were joint volunteer cooerdinators.

The students

There were around 20 students in the program at the time of the interviews. There had been a slight downturn in numbers, possibly due to migrants now having other agencies to choose from, and a local Registered Training Organisation/Job Network provider was running classes. They also received referrals of TAFE students needing help and a few referred by Centrelink. Some also came from CRS, mainly men who had done manual labour all their lives and had had an accident and now needed literacy skills for re-employment. Sometimes workers from non-English speaking backgrounds were sent so they could read well enough to observe occupational health and safety requirements. Increased use of email in workplaces had also brought in students in their late 30s to late 40s, and parents with children starting school also sought help.

'Most of them, for general literacy, I think just want to have the confidence to go into further education and feel that, 'Yes, I know enough to not feel like an idiot or to feel ashamed', said one coordinator. She estimated that about a third of the students wanted to go on to further education:

The others just want to improve their quality of life with their family. The just want to be able to live a life not feeling… put down by others and perhaps get information correctly rather than be misinformed because of their literacy skills.

On the question of why Centrelink and Job Network members referred people to this centre, this coordinator thought the reason was that 'they're in the "too hard" basket and they don't really know what else to do with them'. The other coordinator said that such students had often been to every other possible source of assistance and this was the last resort, 'but if it hasn't worked everywhere else, it certainly ain't going to work for us'. On the other hand, she gave an example of one person from the UK who had a tradesman's certificate because at that time 'so long as you could do the job they'd give you the papers', had managed a working men's club for many years with the help of his wife. His ambition when he came into the literacy program was to read a book before he died.

Of the two students interviewed for this project, one was doing a TAFE course so he could move into a supervisory tradesman role, but had found his reading skills were not sufficient: 'I'll read that in an hour but if you want me to read that in five minutes, well forget about it, I'll start stressing out'. He said that he had felt like 'a bit of a dummy' in the TAFE class when he realised how much reading was required in the course and in the regulations he had to learn, especially when the other three that had started at the same time, were 'miles in front'. This student was initially meeting two nights and then one night a week with his tutor, who was helping him with his study habits as well as his reading and writing.

The other student had been in the program for two years and appeared to have a slight intellectual disability. She said she was doing the program 'for my kids when they go to high school'. They were currently at primary school. Since joining the program her tutor had introduced her to computers for spelling and maths, which she had never used before, and then her husband bought her one. At the supported business service where she worked, she used the computer and the till and had completed a Certificate I and Certificate II. She said she enjoyed learning in the literacy program but had not enjoyed school.

The coordinators undertook an initial assessment with a standard form, provided by a central support service, and determined the level the student was at in reading, writing, speaking and numeracy. Once a match had been made with a tutor, the coordinator went through the assessment form with the tutor, and recommended resources. The tutors submitted a report on the student's progress on a standard form three times a year, which were checked by the coordinator for any follow-up action, progress was entered on a database, and the report filed with the student's paperwork.

The tutors

Over the years the ages of the tutors had apparently ranged literally from 18 to 80. The coordinator said they had different reasons for volunteering but they all had people skills and they liked helping the community. She emphasised that this particular service was not for people who liked the social side of volunteering, because one-to-one tuition could be quite isolating. Some were retired or practising teachers, some wanted to supplement a university course, and some did it as a form of work experience.

The training was usually over four consecutive Saturdays, and coordinated by the central support service. There were also two centrally organised conferences a year with professional development sessions. Coordinators met every two months (at least in the larger metropolitan areas). In this program, the volunteer joint coordinators were in the office only one day a week but they were contactable at home at any time 'because our numbers are plastered everywhere'. The centre had a resource collection which tutors were encouraged to use.

One of the tutors interviewed had taught 12 to 14 students over about 10 years. She had retired from an educational role in a private company and wanted to continue teaching. Because of her experience as well as time pressures, she rarely went to a professional development activity as a participant but had been invited to present at a couple of recent workshops. Of the students she had helped, two of them she said had 'failed' within two weeks of starting, which she attributed to their not being ready or to having been persuaded to come by others. (The coordinators also mentioned the importance of people making their own decisions to come into the program rather than to be referred.) This tutor regarded all the other students as successes. Her main interest was the 'basic literacy student' rather than people with learning difficulties or with English as a second language.

Another tutor who had also been involved in the program for 10 years said that he left it to the student to decide the time period but 'if they're starting off at the very basic level and they want to become fluent in reading and writing and spelling… one hour a week is going to take a long, long time', so he normally arranged two-hour sessions.

He also said he had had failures along with successes, and thought the ones who came voluntarily did best rather than those that were referred. This tutor was also beginning to contribute as a workshop presenter, but said he had also constantly participated in the workshops offered. He said:

> I suppose it started off as a selfish thing, I was sort of doing it more for myself, to keep in with education and what was going on… but I suppose over time I've sort of changed my perception. There's a lot of people with a need and I have some ability to help them with their need, so quite happy to share my time. I think that if you want to live in a good community, well that's dependent on how much effort you put into your community and I'm not a fire fighter, so can't do the SES thing, so I try to do this, and I coach young kids at footy as well.

Issues

One coordinator said that the main issues were making sure all the paperwork was up-to-date, making sure that the student and tutor match-ups were going okay, and that a student was not waiting too long for a tutor. She also would have liked more local training for the volunteers.

In terms of local impact, one coordinator said that there was some reluctance at local government level to acknowledge that some people in the community had literacy difficulties. One councillor allegedly said 'Well, we don't really want to spread that around, do we?' The coordinators also said they were sometimes surprised that despite the constant publicity, some people in the local community still did not know about the program. However, at the individual level:

> The impact is huge because people's lives are changed through coming to us, I believe, so long as they're willing to learn. Some people just go on and on and on with learning… It's absolutely individual really, how far they want to go, but sometimes I suppose some students think they can achieve more than what they can… It's not necessarily too great an expectation but they expect to achieve it too quickly. You know, you sort of say 'Look at all the years you had to go to school. If it took five or six years, you're not going to learn this in five or six days.' But I do think it is huge for the people that know, it changes their lives and I think that's the bit that affects me the most.

Case Study Three

Primary purpose: General adult and community education

Location: Rural - small town

This town and surrounding district had a population of about 3,000 people. Tourism was the town's main source of income, but it lay in a farming area. The Adult and Community Education centre had been operating for about 20 years and a literacy program from the 90s. More recent promotion of the literacy program had resulted in an increased number of students over a couple of years, leading to the appointment of a paid part-time coordinator, but retaining volunteer tutors. Funding was from philanthropic bodies as well as the State government.

The students

At the time of the interviews for this case study, there were only a couple of students in the one-to-one program. However, the coordinator had four potential students lined up for interviews the following week, for which tutors would then be sought. Considerable emphasis was being given to an emerging initiative under which disaffected young people who had not been successful at the local high school were enrolled in a program aimed to provide them with an alternative form of high school leaving certificate. It seemed that one of the major issues for the centre was attracting students into the volunteer literacy program, particularly men.

However, in the previous few years there had been a couple of significant involvements of men. One of these had resulted from the local council encouraging some of its employees to seek help because 'a lot of men who were predominantly mid-30s to perhaps early 50s who'd been working in… outdoor-type industries, and the VET sector was catching up with them – they needed certificates for chainsaws, a certificate for chemical handlers, things that they were in the field quite capable of doing, but they needed the certificate'.

Another burst of activity came when the mill in a nearby town closed down:

> And they put all these blokes off, all worked in the mill all their lives and couldn't do anything else, and so… there was a government grant to set up a special course and that was run by [a university] and went for a certain length of time, and then okay, you've done that, they… still weren't that literate. So that's when they started coming to us, what can we do, can we do a computer course, can we do this, can we do that? …So that's when we got this [private organisation] grant and it kicked it off and since then it has kicked over more and more. It has its ups and downs and demands and peaks and lows, but at the moment we're in a quiet time which, that's fine, that's good, you can do other stuff… But it's in response to demand.

In addition to these particular groups, there had been requests for literacy help due to work pressures to obtain certificates or do further training, from people who wanted to read to their grandchildren, and from people who were at home and just wanted to improve their reading and writing. A committee member and former tutor said that a lot of people were looking for help before going on to accredited training, and that they often had the ability but not the confidence:

> Sit them down, relax them, there's no pressure. They can do what they want to… Just give them the confidence and a few extra skills and away they go.

However, the coordinator felt that seasonal employment linked to the tourist industry was the cause of fluctuations in the number of people seeking help, and in some months there were no tutors and students working together, making it difficult to retain volunteers' interest. The attention given to providing a formal qualification for young people, in conjunction with the local

high school was seen to be filling the 'blank spot in the middle'. No students were available for interview for this research.

The tutors

The coordinator had developed a tutor training manual in response to local need. Tutors were from the local area, from a variety of backgrounds, often retired teachers and predominantly women.

Of the two tutors interviewed, one volunteered when she read about the program in the local newspaper and the other one said that 'when you live in the country you can get stuck in a rut where you're kind of living your life and you'll meet the same people all the time, so the secret is to go to different organisations – so it's purely selfish, why I'm doing it'. Although both volunteered because they thought they could help an adult with reading and writing, one was asked to help some Asian school students requiring conversation practice, and the other had started helping a European migrant whose written English was good but who had a problem with spoken English. The tutor had trouble having regular meetings with this student because of the distance they lived from each other.

Professional development for tutors was fairly informal, with a once-a-year refresher and occasional individual support sessions with the coordinator. Attendance at the centre's computer classes was free for tutors. When tutoring, they were asked to keep some sort of a log book to record what was done in sessions, for discussion with the coordinator on request. There was no formal assessment of progress. The coordinator was proactive in a regional literacy network with other providers.

Issues

One of the broader issues was for an ACE organisation to be seen as a legitimate provider, given that it lacked Registered Training Organisation status, and had only a small community program. There was also sometimes difficulty in sustaining the volunteer program even when there was tutoring needed, because tutors' did not work out or 'got bored'. Funding was a constant issue but the centre's Management Committee sourced funds through as many avenues as possible, acknowledging that the State government funding was always limited. A member of the Management Committee said that she knew ten men who would benefit from the program, who were intelligent, but just not educated and not literate but 'no matter how much you publicise it, you won't get them to come because it's a small community'. She said that these men, in their 40s and 50s, wanted to learn to use computers but would not do it: 'Women seem to be able to take themselves off to learn but men find it harder'.

Asked to assess the impact of the literacy program on the local community, the coordinator said:

Last count I think there's been 200 people come through the doors in one form or another, and it's a population of 20,000 in the shire, so that's a reasonable amount of people. So I think it does have an impact and I have seen people go on to further study or improve their personal circumstances because of what we do. So I think that it does have some impact on a town of this size. It hasn't reached… out to [another small town] …that you would like to see happen and are logical things to happen, but in terms of this town it's made a difference; but it's been hard work to get it perceived in that way.

Case Study Four

Primary purpose: General adult and community education

Location: Urban – large city

This centre offered community education programs and community development programs, coordinated by a single manager. The programs were intended mainly for people in a nearby housing estate in the inner suburbs of a large city. There were classes at the centre as well as an outreach program and partnerships with local groups. The centre was also involved in local and State government funded projects addressing particular social, health and economic issues. There was a number of language and literacy classes offered, but only the one-to-one volunteer literacy program was not accredited.

The students

Asked on what basis students end up in a literacy class or had one-to-one tuition, the coordinator explained the sifting process that takes place:

> I guess a lot of the one-to-one people can come through the Reading & Writing Hotline but they may not necessarily come looking for one-to-one. …Someone may refer themselves or be referred by Centrelink or a case manager through a rehabilitation program; it's fairly clear at the time of interview when we make the assessment as to whether they would want one-to-one or to be in a class. You know, if the person's unemployed and has the time to come to class and is willing to, then we would always put them in a class or perhaps the class and suggest some one-to-one support as well.

> There's people who come in very specifically wanting one-on-one, they don't want to be in a class and that may be to do with the fact that they can't be anyway, they're working full-time or that they don't want that stigma of being in a class with other people and having what they perceive as a stigma of learning problems.

> And then … there's other people who, over the years, when you first speak to them on the phone or talk to them, they'll say "Oh, I've been to classes and it's not what I want. There were too many people in the class who didn't speak English very well, it didn't suit me" or "All I want is spelling". So I sometimes feel that the one-to-one is very good in addressing those very specific needs… perceived by the learner, and they're not necessarily the only need. …You know that it's a lot more than that but… all the other stuff that goes on in a class is often considered by them as a waste of time. They just want someone to sit there with them and focus on a particular skill.

In the previous twelve months, either specific work issues or looking for work were the predominant motives. The students also included men in their late 20s or early 30s encouraged by their partners to 'have a go'. About half the students continued with the tuition, while the other half floundered quickly and were disappointed. Four or five pairs of volunteer tutor and student had met consistently in the previous year. For the others, 'their lives are in disarray' and problems such as drugs and alcohol, unemployment, and mental health got in the way. In recent years, with a drop in the number seeking one-to-one tuition, some individual tutoring had been done with English as a Second Language speakers, mainly women.

The one student interviewed was a man estimated to be in his late 20s who said he wanted to improve his spelling because he wanted to get a different job, which had a spelling test as part of its entry requirements. He said that at school he had not been interested in learning, and his spelling there was '50-60 percent'. In seeking help, he searched on the Internet for 'spelling tutors' and then asked around. He said there were a couple of places he contacted which 'didn't have an idea what I was looking for', and then he 'just found out' about the centre's program. Following a face-to-face interview with the coordinator, he was matched with a volunteer tutor and 'it worked out perfect'. This student had been in classes in the past but found that in a class they put the attention on the whole group but in one-to-one 'they're really just working on you'.

The tutors

The coordinator ran an 18-hour tutor training course. There was an initial information session that helped act as a filter, and being more explicit about the expectations and commitment had come to mean that the people who started the course generally finished it. One of the coordinators said that more younger people were volunteering as tutors and she saw that as a positive trend, while also valuing the life experiences of older volunteers. She said that in recent years more of the tutors had tertiary qualifications than in the early '90s, but that some of the best tutors had no tertiary background: 'Its more about a love of language and reading, that passion coming from within the person'. With the matching process:

> I would do the initial interview with the student wanting one-to-one tutoring and I just get a good feel for what they're looking for, their personality type, and then I look at the available tutors and do the matching. And I've always been explicit about that matching process as being really important because we want it to succeed. …Sometimes if I don't think there's a tutor suited I'll hold off… It's been pretty serendipitous I guess in the end, that the majority have worked very well, but you kind of bring them together, 'cause having interviewed the student I would then organise a time for the tutor and the student to come together with me, we do a three-way interview and then they start meeting from there.

There were resources at the centre but the tutors were encouraged to develop their own. Assessment was basically left to the tutors. After the session and before they left the centre (where all meetings were held as a matter of policy), the tutors wrote the date and a brief progress report for the coordinator. Professional development was through term meetings, with any in-between contact with the coordinator by phone or email. Tutors were also encouraged to send in a 'mid-term' report, but this was not mandatory, particularly given that tutoring did not start and stop to a particular timetable. The coordinator worked to school terms and was paid for a few hours a week. A monthly statistical report was provided for the centre's management committee, but no other details were included. Overall, the volunteer tutor program was quite a small part of the centre's operations

Two tutors were interviewed, both men. One of them had been helping a student over a period of three years, and described the changing needs and motivations (drivers) over that period:

> When he started his driver was he felt that... his literacy wasn't very strong. He certainly had some skill and he was in a semi-professional job, so he had enough to get him through but he was getting to the stage where he had a toddler son, [and] the kid was starting to ask him to read to him at night and he knew it was only a matter of time before he would be struggling there as a parent figure and to answer questions. So that was his initial driver, but because it's not a full-time course, life overtakes the situation on many occasions, so through that period he lost his job and had to go for another job. So we went from the basic techniques we were working on to suddenly writing and assisting him with resumes and CVs and covering letters and that type of thing.

He then found a job and he found himself doing management reports and presentations, and I was suddenly helping him with that type of thing, whilst trying to maintain some level of consistency. So... it is tricky sometimes, and I think… understanding that you just need to be flexible and ultimately they will drive, to some extent… their own path because unless they're motivated they're not going to do it.

This tutor's own motivation was that he loved reading and writing, and he was in a professional job and making good money, and it was 'just one of those… karma things where I felt like giving back'.

The other tutor was studying social work and wanted to do some volunteer work prior to finishing. He was helping the student mentioned above who wanted help with his spelling. Sometimes when he asked the student the meaning of a word the student wanted to learn to spell, 'you can see that he knows what it means and he wants to say but he sort of just has to um and ah and think, and I think he sort of feels the pressure sometimes to spit it out. And I think if there were more people in here [i.e. in a class] then it would be a lot harder for him to speak up and… get to that thought process'.

Issues

The main issue was seen as keeping up the energy and enthusiasm about the program, particularly when it was in a 'little trough' as it was at the time of the interviews. It was suggested that with the push for accreditation and measurable outcomes and student contact hours, 'people aren't able to… take the risk or take a gamble with something that's not got an accredited curriculum to it'. Another view was that because the volunteer program was small, and operated mostly in the evenings when the centre was not otherwise used, it was 'a little bit hidden', and that sometimes the class teachers had to be reminded of the existence, and the value, of one-to-one tuition.

Case Study Five

Primary purpose: General adult and community education

Location: Rural – two medium sized cities

This general adult and community education provider operated in two rural cities with an area population of around 35,000. There was a variety of programs, including a range of liberal arts courses, senior secondary certificates, and vocational education and training with accredited certificates, and school-based apprenticeships. In addition to being a Registered Training Organisation, the centre supported a University of the Third Age (U3A) group and managed a federally funded Community Visitors Scheme. The centre also ran courses in a nearby town.

There was a volunteer one-to-one literacy program as well as courses at several levels based on the Certificate of General Education for Adults (CGEA). The volunteer program had been introduced only the previous year with some grant funding. There was a separate non-accredited program for students with a disability which included a specific literacy component and the centre also had a non-accredited English as a Second Language program. The information that follows is mainly about the volunteer literacy program.

The students

Asked about the basis on which students were allocated to Certificate in General Education for Adults class or to one-to-one tuition, the coordinator said that they encouraged students to go into a class because 'they're part of funded programs and more particularly they have teachers and do more sessions'. Some students cannot come to a class because of work commitments, so

they might have a tutor. The choice of class or one-to-one was based on the learner's circumstances 'but for preference they come to a class'. Occasionally a student had to move from a class to one-to-one because of changed work requirements.

One-to-one tuition was usually short-term, for an hour a week, and a lot of the students sid they were not respected at school and there was no one to help them. The coordinator thought a lot of it was about confidence. At one stage the volunteer program had provided support to students enrolled in TAFE courses in the city, but TAFE had recently obtained funding to provide its own support.

In a telephone discussion, the coordinator of the whole literacy program said that students often came through Centrelink referrals, because of workplace needs – finding employment because their literacy skills were not sufficient, wanting to prepare for other training, e.g. a certificate in childcare or disability support, and because of changed family circumstances. She said that there was a lot of younger people, estimating about one-third were aged between 15 and 19 and another third in their early to mid-20s.

In the 2005 program, 12 learners were matched with a tutor. Examples provided of outcomes for some of those students included: One man had got his Learner Driver Permit, and another two were very likely to get their Ls early in 2006; two women had overcome a lifetime of 'shame' about their low literacy skills and were realising they were not 'dumb'; a young woman was finding that she could produce good handwriting and read and write much more easily if she didn't rush things to 'get it over and done with'; a man (for whom English was not his first language) was starting to feel more comfortable about social conversations at work; help with maths was underway for a woman who wanted to improve her numeracy skills; there were three learners for whom the tutoring experience was not so positive or productive, but all of them indicated that they had 'learnt something'. There was no expectation that such students would move into a Certificate in General English for Adults class, given the individuality of their situations.

Assessment was informal, mainly through interviews, doing some reading, writing and talking. There had been discussion about using the National Reporting System (NRS) levels as a measure of student progress, but these were generally felt to be inappropriate for the purpose, but were utilised for job seekers under the Australian government's Language, Literacy and Numeracy Program.

Two students were interviewed from this program. One was in the course to help prospective drivers get their learners' permits. He had been referred to the centre by a Job Network provider and had been 'on and off' in the literacy program for about three years. This student went to year 8 at school and since then his life appeared to have been marked by intermittent low skill jobs and period on unemployment benefits. He said he could not read much at all – 'the odd word', and then more recently after he 'bummed around for a while' he decided he wouldn't mind going and finding out how to read and write 'so I could read the paper and… look for jobs and stuff like that and understand what it's all about'. Centrelink gave him two phone numbers. He rang TAFE first and was apparently told about their program and then he rang the centre, where he arranged an interview with the literacy coordinator then started in the literacy program the next day.

The other student interviewed was a mature-age woman who had also been referred by a Job Network provider. She had left school at 14 and had worked for many years as a hotel cook but had lost her job when a pub was sold and was unable to fill out forms. On being placed in a class she said she was scared and didn't like it but with individual support from a volunteer tutor, 'I'm coming on alright – I can read a story to my grandkids now… Before they used to call me dummy'.

The tutors

In the initial one-to-one program, the centre provided a 12-hour non-accredited training course for prospective tutors, in two locations. The tutors were aged from late teens to late 60s, most were women, and a significant number had other volunteer experience. After the initial matching of tutors and students, centre staff found the management of some of the process a little cumbersome, particularly as students had to call the centre rather than the tutor if they could not make a meeting.

One of the tutors interviewed had a teaching qualification, had gone through the tutor training course, and was helping initially as a volunteer in the Certificate in General English for Adults course but this had developed into paid part-time work, three mornings a week. She had found the training course 'excellent' but thought her teaching background might have helped. Having worked one-to-one as a volunteer tutor and then in a broader classroom role, she said she saw the one-on-one as 'teaching and building up the skills to enable somebody to participate in class'. In the one-to-one tutoring, there was no formal assessment, but she kept samples of the students' work and wrote her own notes, 'always building on what was done before'.

Issues

One of the issues identified was having good resources and enough time to offer a variety of programs at a variety of times. The volunteer tutor program was initially funded by a grant but was felt to be running 'on a shoestring'. And reporting on the State government funding was sometimes seen to be 'non-creative and non-productive' because it did not help the students. There was a need for a paid coordinator to manage the volunteer program, and more flexibility about what government funds could be used for.

Transport to the centre was a big issue because some students had to travel into the city from nearby areas and public transport was not always readily available and the cost of petrol, including for the volunteer tutors, was a barrier. The literacy coordinator also observed that in a rural community there was a wide variety of students' skills and goals, which was a challenge for the tutors.

In the English as a Second Language program, one of the issues was being able to offer a class for a small number of people – 'it's very difficult in the country' to get sufficient numbers to make a viable class from an administrative/economic point of view. With the disability program, one limitation was that there was only one literacy class a week, when three would be preferable 'because they often don't remember a lot and they don't go away and practise, and so much of language and literacy is use'.

Case Study Six

Primary purpose: English as a Second Language teaching

Location: Urban – large city

Located on a main road in a small suburban shopping area in a large metropolitan city, this centre was established several years ago by a Christian church-linked organisation out of a local community need for learning and literacy initiatives primarily for refugees to Australia. It was open for fixed hours four days a week including Saturday, and the English as a Second Language assistance was available for two hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon. There was a part-time coordinator and a part-time assistant, both paid, and one person was on a one-year traineeship. All the tutors were volunteers and the centre encouraged students to drop in rather than enrol in a class. Other activities included community internet access and after-school

homework assistance. Various other community organisations used the centre for meetings and activities.

The students

The students were mostly from the surrounding suburbs, with a high proportion of Sudanese. Other Horn of Africa countries were also represented, and there were also migrants, from such areas as Latin America, Vietnam and occasionally European countries such as Russia.

While the focus of the State government funding for the program was making people employment ready or preparing them for further training, many of the centre's clients were English language beginners, so much of the tutoring was aimed at helping them function better in society. Some were not yet ready for vocational education and training courses and some had been to such courses (mainly in TAFE institutes) and had either dropped out or needed language support to keep them going. The coordinator said there were also some who:

> Come when they first arrive and haven't got themselves oriented yet… they come here because it's a sort of trusted space and a comfortable one, and they just come here and hang out… and get a bit of English on the way.

Others had some sort of barrier, such as difficulty in grasping a new language, or had very young children to distract them, so the centre tended to get 'people who are battling their way through it, including people that are totally non-literate to start with, so that it's a very slow haul for them'.

Some people come for just a couple of months 'and then something new happens in their life', other people were regular over a year or more, and occasionally they were intermittent over several years, perhaps starting at the centre, later seeking help with a TAFE course, or coming back for a while 'when relatives come from Africa and they introduce them here'.

The coordinator said that most of the students were women, with any men tending to come as a group for a short period to supplement their TAFE lessons, but the men generally seem to be better educated. More of them appeared to get work than the women did, but some of the women had jobs as cleaners. One of the volunteer tutors said she had been helping a woman for a few years and the student was planning to go to TAFE next year: 'I tried to suggest that she go to TAFE this year, but she said 'No', because she has to work – she does cleaning at four o'clock in the morning, offices, and it didn't fit [this year] but she's really primed up'.

One of the students interviewed was an older man who had been born in Europe and had come to Australia several years ago. He had been a plumber in his home country and had started a TAFE course to get his plumbing certificate (Level III) but had found the English too hard, but 'now it's much better because my English is getting better'. Before coming to the English as a Second Language centre he had been in a TAFE English class. A female student from an African country had also been in a TAFE English class, but someone had told her the classes at the centre were free so 'I came here and I start here. It's good.' She thought the tuition was the same at both places but that the TAFE reading and writing tests were very hard but 'here it's easy'. Both students ultimately wanted to get a vocational certificate for employment purposes.

While the curriculum used was an accredited course at State level, and had a number of levels, assessment was mostly informal, as the coordinator explained:

> when someone progresses from being able to sort of haltingly fill out the name, address and phone number to working their way through more complex forms and being able to ask what does this mean and things like that, and interact, well then they've gone on to the next level, it means they're able to engage, and so it's really through interaction rather than a test … But I've got like a check sheet as to what they should be able to do.

One of the tutors said the tutors filled in forms of what they were doing for the coordinator to look at but that she did not formally assess the students. 'When they first come', she said. 'I have a form where they have to write where they live… and things that they would use in everyday language… And I think when they can read that to me is a wonderful assessment.'

The tutors

There was no pre-requisite training, qualifications or experiences of the tutors, just 'the willingness to be here'. Some were former or practising teachers, a couple had English as a Second Language qualifications, and they were encouraged to undertake volunteer tutor training, usually through TAFE, and materials for that course can be borrowed from the centre. Newcomers sit in with an experienced tutor for a while to learn what was needed. The coordinator said that those who were not suitable tend to self-select and stop coming: 'If they're suitable for it they get some sort of rapport with the students and the students get something useful out of it.' One tutor who had been at the centre for several years said:

> When they first come, I help them with shopping. Like we role play supermarkets, we role play visiting the doctor and making appointments by telephone… and I am happy to point them in the right direction for health services. But as they settle in those needs are less and less.

This tutor, who was retired from a position in the helping professions, had developed her approach and resources over her time with the centre, based on the needs of the students.

The coordinator explained the nature of this program, and the approach taken:

> I've always promoted it as supplementary to other learning, not as a course in itself, just because we take a continuous enrolment really. A person can roll up and stay that day as far as I'm concerned, but because there's a fair volatility in the students, you know, if something happens at home or they move onto something else, it's very hard to really get a cohort of students and say you start at Lesson 1 and go through to Lesson 50 or something; it just doesn't work that way. And ditto the tutors, even if the students were able to come they'd have a different teacher at each lesson, which again, breaks down. So the way that in practice it works is that there's a varying number of volunteers, anything from about two up to about six in a session and a varying number of students: anything again from around ten up to thirty, and we assess the students when they first come, they get an assessment as to their level.

> It doesn't map into the national accredited levels because they tend to be concertinaed down at the bottom end but this curriculum that I mentioned , it's [State accredited] – the levels there give shades of beginner-dom, so that's quite good. So we get a feel for where people are at and group them as best we can by that on any given session and divide that amongst the tutors, and different people have their preferences for what they like – the level they like to teach.

Professional development comprised occasional daytime sessions every few months for tutors who can make it, on such topics as phonics and cultural modes in countries of student origin. One of the tutors interviewed was a trained teacher waiting for a school appointment who felt she did not need any further training; another said she had done several one-day tutor workshops at TAFE, but also generally had an interest in grammar and language.

Issues

The coordinator put in a monthly report to the sponsoring organisation, and there were regular checks from the government funding agency: 'It's not like a bureaucratic hurdle that you've got to

get through but rather [the government department person] works with you to try to make sure that you're achieving something useful from their point of view'.

Nevertheless, funding was a major concern. When the interviews for this report were being undertaken in May, the organisation had not been formally advised if it had Government funding (mainly to pay the coordinator) for the year beginning July 1. A senior manager of the church organisation that runs the centre said that short-term funding meant they had contingency plans and were 'in troubleshooting mode rather than strategic planning mode'. She said that while they thought there was a great need for such centres they were struggling financially to keep this one going, and there was certainly no way they could operate without volunteer tutors. There was recognition that if the funding criteria were changed to a stronger employment focus and less on life skills, the nature of the centre would change. Nevertheless, the nature of the centre also meant that a significant issue for the coordinator was maintaining student motivation – those that were motivated seemed to benefit but for those with erratic attendance the outcomes were less certain. A more committed and continuing group of students would help the centre structure the lessons in a way that was probably more satisfying for the teachers.

On the impact of the centre, the coordinator said:

> We've had direct feedback from a significant number of people saying that it's made a difference and we have had people that come back over the years; they've gone on with their lives but when they need some assistance they sort of drop in here as an easy spot that they sort of feel confident in, which I guess gives it its own flavour.

Case Study Seven

Primary purpose: Disability Service Provider

Location: Urban – large city

Based on research, and developed and owned by a university, this post-school program for adults with an intellectual disability was located in an inner suburb of a large city. It was operated under licence by a large sate-wide disability support services agency. A major aim of the program was to develop literacy and technology skills in young adults with Down syndrome. This particular program operated over four terms a year for two years, and was limited to two small groups of students, each group attending two days a week. It was aimed primarily at school leavers with intellectual impairment in order to develop 'the sorts of skills that other kids have developed during their 12 years of schooling'. It did not have an employment focus. The teaching staff comprised a paid coordinator and two paid part-time tutors. There was a relatively high annual fee, with some parents able to access direct government funding and others subsidising the fee from the disability pension or paying form their own resources. Following the success of the two-year program, an optional third year had been added. At the time of the interviews, there were 12 students in years 1-2 and 6 in year 3.

The students

All the students had completed 12 or 13 years of schooling, and ranged in age from about 18 to mid-20s. Parents applied for their children to join the program. Some of the students had been in some form of paid work before entering the program, and several had part-time work at the time of the interviews, e.g. one worked on one day a week at a fast food restaurant, and another worked part-time in a supported business service. Most of the students did a combination of work and study during the week, with some also going to TAFE. Typically students lived at home with their families, and in disability terms they were regarded as 'low support'. However, many of

the students had health issues, and in the classroom the tutors noticed that their energy flagged by the early afternoon.

Assessment was by standardised tests for reading ability and comprehension, and the students were streamed into ability groups. A file was also kept of each student's work to check how skills had improved. The coordinator commented that in the three years she had been involved with the program:

> We often see great increases in communication skills. Even if the literacy levels don't increase markedly, it's very rare that we don't see quite significant improvements in their ability to get on with other people, their social skills, their communication skills, their sight vocabulary, things like that that make them much more able to go out into the community and socialise, have a job, just to learn to respect one another.

Reports were given to parents on the students' reading, writing, communication and technology skills – a big part of the program was using the computer in a variety of ways – and social skills. Standardised test scores were not included in those reports, but general indications of progress were provided. For this research, two of the students in the program, with a little teacher prompting, mentioned such aspects as writing using the computer, using Powerpoint, scrapbooking and art, and gym. One had a regular shift one day a week at a fast food outlet, and the other helped her father with 'shredding and labels' in his home office. This latter student also said she was good at reading. When asked about how they liked the program at the centre, both used the word 'happy' in their brief reply.

The course was not accredited within the Australian Qualifications Framework. At the end of the course students receive a Statement of Attainment. The organisation that developed and owns the course explored the possibility of having the course accredited, primarily because it would allow parents to claim Youth Allowance and thus help meet the substantial program fee, but were told by the then Australian National Training Agency it did not fit the guidelines. And as one of the developers of the program said, accreditation had 'nothing to do with student outcomes at all'. On the other hand, not being accredited allowed for more flexibility of content and the absence of an employment focus: 'It's providing them with that opportunity in a safe and supported environment to talk about and read about and write about things that they're interested in without focusing on very specific learning outcomes that may or may not be appropriate'.

The teacher and tutors

The coordinator had professional educational qualifications but the two tutor positions did not require that (although at the time of the research both had them). While the organisation that developed the course stipulates the structure and the themes, and provides the basic resources, the coordinator had the flexibility to decide on how the groups operate and to develop resources to meet individual needs beyond the core material provided.

The coordinator did an initial mandatory non-accredited training program with the owner organisation. The tutors received training from the coordinator using resources developed by the university.

Issues

A major concern from those involved with this program was the lack of learning options for school leavers with intellectual disabilities:

> Most of the post-school services options for people with disabilities are employment focused or community access focused, so they're not getting much opportunity, even if

they've got reading and writing skills when they leave school, to continue to use the skills and certainly not to develop them further and therefore often… they go backwards because they haven't got the need in their life to use the skills that they may have developed.

It was suggested that the TAFE programs 'don't develop the clients – they just stay at the same level', so that a program of this sort was vital. However, it was a quite expensive fee-paying program for the students and their parents. An intention to offer the program in other parts of the State had been put on hold because the disability support service had unexpectedly been unable to commit finances to it. A senior manager of the organisation said that as a disability service it was difficult to access educational funding. They had been looking at other options, such as including more literacy and numeracy in day programs at their other centres, with the present program coordinator offering a visiting support service. The program developers also said that while there had been considerable interest from organisations interstate and overseas in developing the program for their purposes, those organisations had been unwilling to pay the developers for the costs involved.

A new target market had been identified which it was suggested could also benefit from such a program: older people with intellectual disability. Some of the disability support service clients had been with it in various programs since they left school and were now in their 40s, 50s and 60s. The developer and owner of the program for school-leavers was also keen to develop a program for older learners, but funding was again the stumbling block.

The senior manager in the disability support service said that it was very difficult to find programs in the community that built on the skills that people with an intellectual disability already had. One of the course developers was more cynical:

> why would you bother with people with an intellectual disability? Why would you … be throwing money after something that's not really worthwhile? And who cares if they can write a poem? Who cares if they can do a Powerpoint presentation?

Questionnaire

Griffith UNIVERSITY

Centre for Learning Research

National survey: Mapping *non-accredited* adult language, literacy and numeracy provision

Information provided in this survey is confidential and will not identify organisations or people individually except in the list of respondents.

Non-accredited provision is any Adult Language, Literacy or Numeracy (ALLN) course or structured activity for which **no** formal recognition or accredited certificate is provided. It includes courses where students are given a statement of attendance or participation, but **not** for example a Certificate I. It includes specific literacy activities embedded in other courses.

For this survey, Adult Language, Literacy or Numeracy includes adult literacy for native speakers of English, adult English as a Second Language (ESL) students, and adult numeracy students.

NOTE: Either click on a field or press the TAB key on your keyboard to jump from one answer field to the next. For tick box questions, click on the correct box with your mouse.

CONTACT DETAILS (not for publication)

1. Name of organisation/institution:

2. Is it a Registered Training Organisation (RTO)?

☐ **YES** ☐ **NO**

please click your response

3. Address of organisation:

4. Postcode:

5. Contact person for this survey: Name:

6. Position in organisation:

7. Phone (with area code):

8. Email:

---

9. How would you describe the *primary* role of your organisation?

(Please click only one)

☐ Accredited training (RTO)

☐ Community Information/Referral

☐ Disability Service Provider

☐ English as a Second Language teaching/tutoring

☐ General Adult /Community Education

☐ Health

☐ Specific adult literacy/numeracy improvement

☐ Welfare/Counselling

☐ Other (please state):

10. Are your organisation's services (LLN+any other programs) aimed at a particular group or groups?

☐ **YES**　　　　☐ **NO** *please click the appropriate box*

11. IF YES, are they:

☐ Aboriginals & Torres Strait Islanders

☐ Disabled

☐ Men

☐ Migrants/ Refugees

☐ Seniors

☐ Women

☐ Youth

☐ Other (please indicate):

12. Please list the name/s of your non-accredited ALLN courses (e.g Reading, Writing and Numeracy for Adults, Improve Your Spelling, English for migrants).

1.
2.
3.
4. [*Please add others here, if necessary*]

---

13. How long is/ are your non-accredited ALLN course/ s (as listed above)?

Please indicate the total number of hours for each course.

1.
2.
3.
4. [*Please add others here, if necessary*]

14. How do you promote this course/these courses (e.g. separate brochure, in agency's program guide, word-of-mouth)?

15. Are you able to mail a brochure/booklet describing your program/s to the Project address shown at the end of this questionnaire? If so, that would be appreciated.

☐ **YES** ☐ **NO** *please click the appropriate box*

16. If your organisation provides English language, literacy or numeracy help to adults in different sorts of ways than through specific LLN courses, but with a specific language, literacy or numeracy aim, e.g through literacy and numeracy embedded in a cooking course, or in an introductory computer course, please indicate the title and type of activities.

Please add further details at the end of the questionnaire if you need more space to explain the program.

17. Does your organisation have any local partnership/s with other education or training providers, employment agencies etc. which may benefit students.

☐ **YES** ☐ **NO** *please click the appropriate box*

18. If YES, what sort of partnership/s (eg. formal agreement, informal cooperation) and with whom?

19. The majority of your participants come from which age groups?

Please indicate up to 3 options from the list below.

☐ under 20 years

☐ 20 to 29 years

☐ 30 to 39 years

☐ 40 to 49 years

☐ 50 to 59 years

☐ 60 to 69 years

☐ 70 years or over

20. What is the gender balance of learners in your organisation?

Please indicate below the approximate percentage of females and males.

21. Which of the following best describes the participants in your program?

Please click all categories that apply.

☐ Unemployed/ underemployed

☐ People with a disability

☐ Recent immigrants/refugees (last 12 mths)

☐ Earlier immigrants/refugees (more than 12 mths)

☐ Other. Please specify:

22. In your experience, what are the reasons people come to your organisation for assistance with their adult language, literacy or numeracy needs?

Please click all relevant reasons.

☐ Short-term specific need (such as obtain Driver's Licence)

☐ Returning to the workforce/seeking employment

☐ Changes in LLN requirements at work (eg. computers, Quality Assurance, promotion)

☐ Want to support children at school

☐ Learn or improve English for everyday living

☐ Spouse/carer no longer available to support LLN needs

☐ More control in their lives/ self esteem

☐ Social opportunity/meet people

☐ Required to attend LLN course

☐ No clear reasons

23. From your responses to the question above, please indicate the two main reasons.

24. On average, how many learners are participating in your non-accredited ALLN program/s at any one time? Approximately . . .

25. Realistically, what kind of outcomes do you think learners in your community non-accredited ALLN program achieve? Question 25 to 29 cover different aspects.

In general, how much are their <u>LLN skills</u> improved?

☐ Not at all

☐ Very little

☐ Somewhat

☐ Quite a bit

☐ Very much

☐ Not known

26. Further training: Approximately what percentage continue to <u>other training</u> (LLN or other) from this program?

Please click one only.

☐ None

☐ Up to 10%

☐ Up to 25%

☐ Up to 50%

☐ About 50%

☐ Up to 75%

☐ Up to 100%

☐ Not known

27. Employment: Approximately what percentage continue to part or full-time paid <u>employment</u> from this program?

☐ None

☐ Up to 10%

☐ Up to 25%

☐ Up to 50%

☐ About 50%

☐ Up to 75%

☐ Up to 100%

☐ Not known

28. Self-confidence: In general, learners' <u>self-confidence</u> is improved:

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Very little
- ☐ Somewhat
- ☐ Quite a bit
- ☐ Very much
- ☐ Not known

29 Any other outcome/s, or comments on Questions 25 to 28 above:

30. Do you use a structured course ('curriculum') in your non-accredited ALLN program?

☐ **YES**   ☐ **NO** *please click the appropriate box*

31. If YES, please provide details, including course codes if relevant.

32. If NO, how do your decide what to include in the course?

33. How do you assess or otherwise identify learner outcomes? E.g formal test at end, ongoing formal assessment, observation, ask the learners, or assessment is not considered important.

34. Do you have any regular evaluation of your non-accredited ALLN program, quality assurance strategy etc?

☐ **YES**   ☐ **NO** *please click the appropriate box*

35. If YES, how is it done and how often?

36. What form does the teaching/tutoring take?

Please tick all those relevant

- ☐ Class more than 15 students
- ☐ Class 11-15 students
- ☐ Group 6-10 students
- ☐ Small group 2-5 students
- ☐ 1:1 tuition

37. Do you use volunteer tutors in your ALLN program?

☐ No

☐ Yes, in 1:1 tuition

☐ Yes, with small groups

☐ Yes, 1:1 and small groups

☐ Yes, as classroom support for a teacher

38. If you answered YES to the question above, how many active volunteer tutors do you have (whether currently matched with a student or not)?

39. Is there a minimum qualification or training your teachers/tutors are required to have before participating in your adult literacy program?

☐ **YES**   ☐ **NO** *please click the appropriate box*

40. If YES, please indicate type of qualification below

☐ In-house formal qualification such as an accredited volunteer tutor training course

☐ In-house volunteer induction program – non-accredited

☐ Formal qualifications such a as a degree in Education

☐ Certificate IV in Training and Assessment (Cert IV in Ass & Workplace Training)

☐ Cert IV in Language, Literacy and Numeracy Assessment and Training

☐ Other. Please specify:

41. Is there any provision for professional development for your tutors/ teachers?

☐ **YES**   ☐ **NO** *please click the appropriate box*

42. If YES, please provide brief details.

43. What are the main sources of funding for your ALLN program?
A. ☐ Recurrent State Government Funding - literacy specific
B. ☐ Recurrent State Government Funding – non-literacy specific
C. ☐ Non-recurrent State Government Funding - literacy specific
D. ☐ Non-recurrent State Government Funding – non-literacy specific
E. ☐ Recurrent direct Federal funding
F. ☐ Local government funding
G. ☐ Fee for service
H. ☐ Unfunded – we pay for it from own revenue sources

44. Please indicate for each main funding source above the percentage of funding,

eg. A- 20%.

45. Do you have any suggestions for realistic changes to the way your program is funded?

☐ **YES** ☐ **NO** *please click the appropriate box*

46. I YES, please indicate the changes you think would help:

47. Do you report annual statistics etc for your *non-accredited* ALLN program outside the organisation/institution such as to Government or funding bodies?

☐ **YES** ☐ **NO** *please click the appropriate box*

48. If YES, to whom are they reported?

49. Should the contribution of *non-accredited* ALLN be nationally recognised by reporting statistics annually in a similar way to how *accredited* courses are reported?

☐ **YES** ☐ **NO** *please click the appropriate box*

50. Please give reasons for your response to the question above, and indicate if there are any issues (eg. resources, time) for your organisation associated with such reporting, which would need to be addressed if it were mandatory.

51. What are the main issues you have to deal with in your non-accredited ALLN program? *Please tick all that apply.*

☐ Attracting students to the program

☐ High student drop out

☐ Students dropping in and out of program

☐ Slow progress of students

☐ Low motivation of students

☐ Lack of funding

☐ Lack of support generally for non-accredited programs

☐ Inadequate facilities (e.g. classrooms)

☐ Lack of teachers/ tutors

☐ Lack of professional development for teachers/tutors

☐ Inability to follow up students after the ALLN course

52. What sort of additional support if any, apart from funding, would help your organisation improve/expand/change its ALLN program?

    ☐   Improved links with other agencies

    ☐   More professional development for teachers/ tutors

    ☐   Government recognition of the worth of non-accredited ALLN

    ☐   Better promotion of your program

    ☐   Assistance to follow up students after they complete (or don't complete) a course

    ☐   Assistance with preparing grant applications

53. Briefly explain your responses to the question above.

54. What suggestions do you have for dealing with any of the issues you have identified in the two questions above.

55. Any other comments about your program or non-accredited ALLN that might help influence policy-making

Please also include here any further information continued from Question 16.

56. Please provide contact details (inc. email) of any other organisation you know of that is offering non-accredited ALLN but may not be included in the survey for some reason.

———————————————————

Thank you very much for your participation in this survey.

Please return the questionnaire as promptly as possible by the most convenient means for you (email, fax, post). See details below.

Please check the NCVER website (www.ncver.edu.au) later in the year for details of publication of the final report for this project.

Any questions in the meantime can be directed to the project leader:

Dr Darryl Dymock

Principal Research Fellow

centre for Learning Research

Mt Gravatt Campus

Griffith University

Nathan, Qld 4111

email: d.dymock@griffith.edu.au

phone 07 3735 5935 (Tuesday and Thursdays)

Fax: 07 3735 6868

QUESTIONNAIRE COVERSHEET

National Non-accredited Language, Literacy and Numeracy Survey

Who is conducting the research?

Name: Dr Darryl Dymock

Centre: centre for Learning Research, Griffith University, Brisbane

Contact Phone: 07 373 55935 (Tuesdays and Thursdays)

Contact Email: d.dymock@griffith.edu.au

Why is the research being conducted?
This research has been commissioned by the National centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER), Adelaide. The purpose of the research is to obtain as full a picture as possible of *non-accredited* adult language, literacy and numeracy (ALLN) provision across Australia. The research is being undertaken through a national survey and through seven case studies. The result will be the first comprehensive national profile of non-accredited ALLN providers.

What you are asked to do
You are invited to contribute to the survey by completing the attached questionnaire, which should take about 15-20 minutes.

The benefits of the research
By providing as full a picture as possible of non-formal, non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy provision in Australia, it should be possible to ensure that its contribution is not only properly acknowledged, but also better supported through State and Federal government policies.

Confidentiality
All information collected from individuals and organizations will be individually confidential. Information collected in this research will be collated and analysed and then presented *in aggregate* in the project report. Individual organizations or individuals will not be identified or identifiable in the report, except in the list of responding organizations and contact persons in an Appendix to the report.

Participation is voluntary
Participation in this survey is completely voluntary. Completion of the questionnaire indicates consent to take part.

Questions / further information
Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans. If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project you should contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3875 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

Feedback
The final report on this project will be submitted to the National centre for Vocational Education Research, Adelaide, by mid October 2006. Subject to final approval by NCVER, the report will normally subsequently be published on the organisation's website (www.ncver.edu.au). Dr Dymock may also write articles about the research for publication in relevant journals.

Please print this sheet and retain it for your later reference.

Frequency tables from national survey

Table 1: No. of providers which are Registered Training Organisations (Q2)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	58	46.4	49.2	49.2
	No	60	48.0	50.8	100.0
	Total	118	94.4	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.6		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 2: Primary role of organisation (Q9)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Accredited Training	23	18.4	21.1	21.1
	Community Information	6	4.8	5.5	26.6
	Disability Service Provider	8	6.4	7.3	33.9
	ESL	11	8.8	10.1	44.0
	General adult/ community education	49	39.2	45.0	89.0
	Health	1	.8	.9	89.9
	Specific adult literacy/ numeracy improvement	9	7.2	8.3	98.2
	Welfare/ counselling	2	1.6	1.8	100.0
	Total	109	87.2	100.0	
Missing	9	16	12.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 3: No. of programs with particular target group (Q10)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	71	56.8	58.7	58.7
	No	50	40.0	41.3	100.0
	Total	121	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	3.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 4: Target group -Aboriginal/TSI (Q11)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	58	46.4	82.9	82.9
	1	12	9.6	17.1	100.0
	Total	70	56.0	100.0	
Missing	9	55	44.0		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 5: Target group –Disabled (Q11)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	34	27.2	48.6	48.6
	1	36	28.8	51.4	100.0
	Total	70	56.0	100.0	
Missing	9	55	44.0		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 6: Target group – Men (Q11)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	46	36.8	65.7	65.7
	1	24	19.2	34.3	100.0
	Total	70	56.0	100.0	
Missing	9	55	44.0		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 7: Target group – Migrants/ Refugees (Q11)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	24	19.2	34.3	34.3
	1	46	36.8	65.7	100.0
	Total	70	56.0	100.0	
Missing	9	55	44.0		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 8: Target group – Seniors (Q11)

		Frequency	**Percent**	**Valid Percent**	**Cumulative Percent**
Valid	0	42	33.6	60.0	60.0
	1	28	22.4	40.0	100.0
	Total	70	56.0	100.0	
Missing	9	55	44.0		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 9: Target group – Women (Q11)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	42	33.6	60.0	60.0
	1	28	22.4	40.0	100.0
	Total	70	56.0	100.0	
Missing	9	55	44.0		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 10: Target group – Youth (Q11)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	47	37.6	67.1	67.1
	1	23	18.4	32.9	100.0
	Total	70	56.0	100.0	
Missing	9	55	44.0		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 11: Ability to send program brochure (Q15)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	80	64.0	72.1	72.1
	No	31	24.8	27.9	100.0
	Total	111	88.8	100.0	
Missing	9	14	11.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 12: Partnerships with other organisations (Q17)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	81	64.8	67.5	67.5
	No	39	31.2	32.5	100.0
	Total	120	96.0	100.0	
Missing	9	5	4.0		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 13: Main age groups of students - under 20 (Q19)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	107	85.6	87.7	87.7
	1	15	12.0	12.3	100.0
	Total	122	97.6	100.0	
Missing	9	3	2.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 14: Main age groups of students - 20 – 29 (Q19)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	71	56.8	58.2	58.2
	1	51	40.8	41.8	100.0
	Total	122	97.6	100.0	
Missing	9	3	2.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 15: Main age groups of students - 30 – 39 (Q19)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	37	29.6	30.3	30.3
	1	85	68.0	69.7	100.0
	Total	122	97.6	100.0	
Missing	9	3	2.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 16: Main age groups of students - 40 – 49 (Q19)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	34	27.2	27.9	27.9
	1	88	70.4	72.1	100.0
	Total	122	97.6	100.0	
Missing	9	3	2.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 17: Main age groups of students - 50 – 59 (Q19)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	58	46.4	47.5	47.5
	1	64	51.2	52.5	100.0
	Total	122	97.6	100.0	
Missing	9	3	2.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 18: Main age groups of students - 60 – 69 (Q19)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	99	79.2	81.1	81.1
	1	23	18.4	18.9	100.0
	Total	122	97.6	100.0	
Missing	9	3	2.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 19: Main age groups of students - 70 or over (Q19)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	118	94.4	96.7	96.7
	1	4	3.2	3.3	100.0
	Total	122	97.6	100.0	
Missing	9	3	2.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 20: Student category - Unemployed/ underemployed (Q 21)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	37	29.6	30.6	30.6
	1	84	67.2	69.4	100.0
	Total	121	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	3.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 21: Student category - Not seeking employment (Q 21)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	57	45.6	47.1	47.1
	1	64	51.2	52.9	100.0
	Total	121	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	3.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 22: Main age groups of students - People with disability (Q 21)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	59	47.2	48.8	48.8
	1	62	49.6	51.2	100.0
	Total	121	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	3.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 23: Main age groups of students - Recent immigrants/ refugees (<12months) (Q 21)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	54	43.2	44.6	44.6
	1	67	53.6	55.4	100.0
	Total	121	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	3.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 24: Earlier immigrants/ refugees (>12months) (Q 21)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	78	62.4	64.5	64.5
	1	43	34.4	35.5	100.0
	Total	121	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	3.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 25: Student motivation - Short term need (Q 22)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	63	50.4	52.1	52.1
	1	58	46.4	47.9	100.0
	Total	121	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	3.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 26: Student motivation - Returning to workforce (Q 22)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	37	29.6	30.6	30.6
	1	84	67.2	69.4	100.0
	Total	121	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	3.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 27: Student motivation - Changes in workplace LLN requirements (Q 22)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	84	67.2	69.4	69.4
	1	37	29.6	30.6	100.0
	Total	121	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	3.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 28: Student motivation - Support children at school (Q 22)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	58	46.4	47.9	47.9
	1	63	50.4	52.1	100.0
	Total	121	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	3.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 29: Student motivation – Improve everyday English (Q 22)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	25	20.0	20.7	20.7
	1	96	76.8	79.3	100.0
	Total	121	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	3.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 30: Student motivation - Spouse/ carer no longer providing LLN support (Q 22)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	94	75.2	77.7	77.7
	1	27	21.6	22.3	100.0
	Total	121	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	3.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 31: Student motivation - More control in their lives/ self esteem (Q 22)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	29	23.2	24.0	24.0
	1	92	73.6	76.0	100.0
	Total	121	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	3.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 32: Student motivation - Social opportunity (Q 22)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	33	26.4	27.3	27.3
	1	88	70.4	72.7	100.0
	Total	121	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	3.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 33: Student motivation - Required to attend LLN course (Q 22)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	85	68.0	70.2	70.2
	1	36	28.8	29.8	100.0
	Total	121	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	3.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 34: Student motivation - No clear reason (Q 22)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	116	92.8	95.9	95.9
	1	5	4.0	4.1	100.0
	Total	121	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	3.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 35: Extent of outcomes for learners (Q 25)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	somewhat	28	22.4	24.1	24.1
	Quite a bit	61	48.8	52.6	76.7
	Very much	24	19.2	20.7	97.4
	Not known	3	2.4	2.6	100.0
	Total	116	92.8	100.0	
Missing	9	9	7.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 36: Percentage of students continuing to other training (Q 26)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	3	2.4	2.5	2.5
	up to 10%	32	25.6	26.4	28.9
	up to 25%	26	20.8	21.5	50.4
	up to 50%	13	10.4	10.7	61.2
	about 50%	8	6.4	6.6	67.8
	up to 75%	14	11.2	11.6	79.3
	up to 100%	3	2.4	2.5	81.8
	not known	22	17.6	18.2	100.0
	Total	121	96.8	100.0	
Missing	9	4	3.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 37: Percentage of students continuing to employment (Q 27)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	8	6.4	6.9	6.9
	up to 10%	33	26.4	28.4	35.3
	up to 25%	24	19.2	20.7	56.0
	up to 50%	9	7.2	7.8	63.8
	about 50%	6	4.8	5.2	69.0
	up to 75%	8	6.4	6.9	75.9
	up to 100%	2	1.6	1.7	77.6
	not known	26	20.8	22.4	100.0
	Total	116	92.8	100.0	
Missing	9	9	7.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 38:   **Extent to which learners' self confidence is improved (Q 28)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	some	7	5.6	5.8	5.8
	quite a bit	44	35.2	36.7	42.5
	very much	69	55.2	57.5	100.0
	Total	120	96.0	100.0	
Missing	9	5	4.0		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 39: Use of structured course/curriculum (Q 30)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	43	34.4	35.8	35.8
	No	77	61.6	64.2	100.0
	Total	120	96.0	100.0	
Missing	9	5	4.0		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 40: Regular evaluation of LLN program (Q 34)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	81	64.8	68.6	68.6
	No	37	29.6	31.4	100.0
	Total	118	94.4	100.0	
Missing	9	7	5.6		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 41: Teaching mode - Class more than 15 students (Q 36)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	103	82.4	86.6	86.6
	1	16	12.8	13.4	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 42: Teaching mode - Class 11 to 15 students (Q36)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	84	67.2	70.6	70.6
	1	35	28.0	29.4	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 43: Teaching mode - Group 6 to 10 students (Q 36)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	61	48.8	51.3	51.3
	1	58	46.4	48.7	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 44: Teaching mode - Group 2 to 5 students (Q 36)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	62	49.6	52.1	52.1
	1	57	45.6	47.9	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 45: Teaching mode - 1:1 tuition (Q 36)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	53	42.4	44.5	44.5
	1	66	52.8	55.5	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 46: No. of programs using volunteer tutors (Q 37)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 No	74	59.2	62.2	62.2
	1 Yes	45	36.0	37.8	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 47: No. of programs using volunteers in 1:1 tuition (Q 37)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	82	65.6	68.9	68.9
	1	37	29.6	31.1	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 48: No. of programs using volunteers with small groups (Q 37)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	95	76.0	79.8	79.8
	1	24	19.2	20.2	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 49: No. of programs using volunteers 1:1 and with small groups (Q 37)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	90	72.0	75.6	75.6
	1	29	23.2	24.4	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 50: No. of programs using volunteers as classroom support (Q 37)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	93	74.4	78.2	78.2
	1	26	20.8	21.8	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 51: No. of programs requiring minimum teacher/tutor qualification (Q 39)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	89	71.2	76.1	76.1
	No	28	22.4	23.9	100.0
	Total	117	93.6	100.0	
Missing	9	8	6.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 52: No. of programs requiring in-house formal qualification (Q 40)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	70	56.0	76.9	76.9
	1	21	16.8	23.1	100.0
	Total	91	72.8	100.0	
Missing	9	34	27.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Community adult language, literacy and numeracy provision: Support document

Table 53: No. of programs requiring in-house volunteer induction (Q 40)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	59	47.2	64.8	64.8
	1	32	25.6	35.2	100.0
	Total	91	72.8	100.0	
Missing	9	34	27.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 54: No. of programs requiring formal teaching qualifications (Q 40)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	48	38.4	52.7	52.7
	1	43	34.4	47.3	100.0
	Total	91	72.8	100.0	
Missing	9	34	27.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 55: No. of programs requiring Certificate IV Assess & Workplace Training (Q 40)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	57	45.6	62.6	62.6
	1	34	27.2	37.4	100.0
	Total	91	72.8	100.0	
Missing	9	34	27.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 57: No. of programs requiring Cert IV LLN Assessment & Training (Q40)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	80	64.0	87.9	87.9
	1	11	8.8	12.1	100.0
	Total	91	72.8	100.0	
Missing	9	34	27.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 57: No. of programs with provision for professional development (Q41)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	103	82.4	87.3	87.3
	No	15	12.0	12.7	100.0
	Total	118	94.4	100.0	
Missing	9	7	5.6		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 58: Source of funding - Recurrent State Govt funding - literacy specific (Q 43)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	76	60.8	63.9	63.9
	1	43	34.4	36.1	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 59: Source of funding - Recurrent State Govt Funding - non literacy specific (Q43)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	99	79.2	83.2	83.2
	1	20	16.0	16.8	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 60: Source of funding - Non-recurrent State Govt Funding - literacy specific (Q43)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	91	72.8	76.5	76.5
	1	28	22.4	23.5	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 61: Source of funding -Non-recurrent State Govt Funding - non-literacy specific (Q43)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	101	80.8	84.9	84.9
	1	18	14.4	15.1	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 62: Source of funding - Recurrent direct Federal govt funding (Q43)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	106	84.8	89.1	89.1
	1	13	10.4	10.9	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 63: Source of funding - Local government funding (Q 43)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	108	86.4	90.8	90.8
	1	11	8.8	9.2	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 64: Source of funding - Fee for service (Q43)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	93	74.4	78.2	78.2
	1	26	20.8	21.8	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 65: Source of funding – Unfunded - pay from own revenue (Q43)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	92	73.6	77.3	77.3
	1	27	21.6	22.7	100.0
	Total	119	95.2	100.0	
Missing	9	6	4.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 66: No. of programs with suggestion for change to funding arrangements (Q 45)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	51	40.8	47.2	47.2
	No	57	45.6	52.8	100.0
	Total	108	86.4	100.0	
Missing	9	17	13.6		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 67: No. of programs that report annual statistics (Q 47)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	92	73.6	76.7	76.7
	No	28	22.4	23.3	100.0
	Total	120	96.0	100.0	
Missing	9	5	4.0		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 68: No. of providers for/against national reporting of non-accredited ALLN (Q 49)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	63	50.4	63.6	63.6
	No	36	28.8	36.4	100.0
	Total	99	79.2	100.0	
Missing	9	26	20.8		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 69: Main issues - attracting students to program (Q 51)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	65	52.0	58.0	58.0
	1	47	37.6	42.0	100.0
	Total	112	89.6	100.0	
Missing	9	13	10.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 70: Main issues - High student dropout (Q 51)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	101	80.8	90.2	90.2
	1	11	8.8	9.8	100.0
	Total	112	89.6	100.0	
Missing	9	13	10.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 71: Main issues - Students dropping in and out of program (Q 51)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	66	52.8	58.9	58.9
	1	46	36.8	41.1	100.0
	Total	112	89.6	100.0	
Missing	9	13	10.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 72: Main issues - Slow progress of students (Q51)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	70	56.0	62.5	62.5
	1	42	33.6	37.5	100.0
	Total	112	89.6	100.0	
Missing	9	13	10.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 73: Main issues - low motivation of students (Q 51)

Community adult language, literacy and numeracy provision: Support document

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	97	77.6	86.6	86.6
	1	15	12.0	13.4	100.0
	Total	112	89.6	100.0	
Missing	9	13	10.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 74: Main issues - lack of funding (Q 51)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	56	44.8	50.0	50.0
	1	56	44.8	50.0	100.0
	Total	112	89.6	100.0	
Missing	9	13	10.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 75: Main issues - Lack of government support (Q51)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	78	62.4	69.6	69.6
	1	34	27.2	30.4	100.0
	Total	112	89.6	100.0	
Missing	9	13	10.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 76: Main issues - inadequate facilities (Q51)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	83	66.4	74.1	74.1
	1	29	23.2	25.9	100.0
	Total	112	89.6	100.0	
Missing	9	13	10.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 77: main issues - lack of teachers/ tutors (Q51)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	85	68.0	75.9	75.9
	1	27	21.6	24.1	100.0
	Total	112	89.6	100.0	
Missing	9	13	10.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 78: main issues - lack of professional development (Q 51)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	87	69.6	77.7	77.7
	1	25	20.0	22.3	100.0
	Total	112	89.6	100.0	
Missing	9	13	10.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 79: Main issues - Inability to follow up students (Q51)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	90	72.0	80.4	80.4
	1	22	17.6	19.6	100.0
	Total	112	89.6	100.0	
Missing	9	13	10.4		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 80: Additional support needed - Improved links with other agencies (Q 52)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	63	50.4	56.8	56.8
	1	48	38.4	43.2	100.0
	Total	111	88.8	100.0	
Missing	9	14	11.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 81: Additional support needed - More professional development (Q52)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	62	49.6	55.9	55.9
	1	49	39.2	44.1	100.0
	Total	111	88.8	100.0	
Missing	9	14	11.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 82: Additional support needed - Government recognition (Q52)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	34	27.2	30.6	30.6
	1	77	61.6	69.4	100.0
	Total	111	88.8	100.0	
Missing	9	14	11.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 83: Additional support needed - Better promotion of programs (Q 52)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	68	54.4	61.3	61.3
	1	43	34.4	38.7	100.0
	Total	111	88.8	100.0	
Missing	9	14	11.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 84: Additional support needed - Assistance to follow up students (Q52)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	76	60.8	68.5	68.5
	1	35	28.0	31.5	100.0
	Total	111	88.8	100.0	
Missing	9	14	11.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Table 85: Additional support needed - Assistance with grant applications (Q52)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	87	69.6	78.4	78.4
	1	24	19.2	21.6	100.0
	Total	111	88.8	100.0	
Missing	9	14	11.2		
Total		125	100.0		

Case study materials

Centre for Learning Research

Mapping non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy

and Numeracy Provision

INFORMATION SHEET

Who is conducting the research?

Name: Dr Darryl Dymock

Centre: centre for Learning Research, Griffith University, Brisbane

Contact Phone: 07 373 55935 (Tuesdays and Thursdays)

Contact Email: d.dymock@griffith.edu.au

Why is the research being conducted?
This research has been commissioned by the National centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER), Adelaide. Its purpose is to obtain as full a picture as possible of *non-accredited* adult language, literacy and numeracy (ALLN) provision across Australia. In addition to basic demographic data about students, information is being collected about such aspects as their motivations and outcomes, about what forms of assessment are used, and about pathways to other education, training and employment, and about quality control and professional development.

The research is being undertaken through a national survey and through seven case studies. The result will be the first comprehensive national profile of community ALLN providers. NCVER has awarded a grant to Dr Dymock, centre for Learning Research, Griffith University, to undertake this research. The interviews are part of the case studies.

What you are asked to do
You are invited to contribute to the research by completing an interview with Dr Darryl Dymock, which should take about 45 minutes. The interview questions have been developed in consultation with other literacy researchers and practitioners, including the Caboolture Community Adult Literacy Group, Queensland. With your approval, the interview will be audiotaped, and later transcribed for research purposes. The tape will then be destroyed.

In recognition of the time and effort involved, each organization that has volunteered to be a case study for the project will be paid a total of $1000. This amount will be paid to the organisation and not to any one individual. However such payment does not compel any person to take part in the research unless they want to.

The benefits of the research
By providing as full a picture as possible of non-formal, non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy provision in Australia, it should be possible to ensure that its contribution is not only properly acknowledged, but also better supported through State and Federal government policies. Typically in Australia non-accredited ALLN (sometimes known as ELLN) is offered

through community organizations, and one of the challenges of mapping this sub-sector is to ensure that its diversity is sufficiently captured. That is what this research is trying to do.

Risks
None anticipated.

Confidentiality
All information collected from individuals and organizations will be confidential. Information collected in this research will be collated and analysed and then presented *in aggregate* in the project report. Individual organizations or individuals will not be identified or identifiable in the report, except in the list of responding organizations and contact persons in an Appendix to the report.

Participation is voluntary
Participation in this interview is completely voluntary. You may withdraw at any time during or after the interview, without any adverse consequences.

Questions / further information
If you have any questions about this survey, please contact the Principal Investigator, Darryl Dymock, as shown at the bottom of this page.

Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans. If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project you should contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3875 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

Feedback
Program coordinators will be asked to comment on the draft report, which should be sent in August 2006. The final report will be submitted to the National centre for Vocational Education Research, Adelaide, by mid October 2006. Normally the report will be published subsequently on the organisation's website (www.ncver.edu.au) for free downloading, and can also be obtained in hard copy. Dr Dymock may also write articles about the research for publication in relevant journals. Again, no details will be published which might identify individuals or organizations.

Privacy Statement
The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and / or use of identified personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded. For further information consult Griffith University's Privacy Plan at www.gu.edu.au/ua/aa/vc/pp or telephone (07) 3735 5585.

Finally…
I hope that you will agree that there are significant potential benefits to all organizations from mapping non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy provision in Australia. If you are agreeable to taking part, you will be asked to sign a **Consent Form**.

Sincerely

Darryl Dymock

_____

Dr Darryl Dymock
Principal Research Fellow
Community ALLN Mapping Project
centre for Learning Research
Griffith University Nathan, Qld, 4111.
Phone 07 373 55935 (Tuesdays & Thursdays)
email: d.dymock@griffith.edu.au

NATIONAL NON-ACCREDITED ADULT LANGUAGE, LITERACY AND NUMERACY CASE STUDIES 2006

Student Interviews

I am talking with _____ on [day and date]: _____

1. **What course are you in at the moment here?** [rephrase if 1:1 tuition: what sort of help are you getting from….?]

2. **How long have you been doing that?**

3. **Tell me a bit about it.**

4. **Why did you decide: to do this course/ that you needed help with [your reading, writing, numeracy]?**

5. **What do you expect to get out of the [course]?**

6. **How do you think you're going, so far?**

7. **Do you have any tests from your tutor/teacher to see how you're going? If so, how often?**

8. **What do you plan to do when you finish with this course/individual help? What's the next step? [prompt: more training, find a job, go out more, join a club, nothing different, not sure]**

9. **What's the best thing about this present course/help? Is this the way you like to learn? [Suggestions for improvement?]**

10. **Are there any barriers or problems for you in doing this course – personal, travel, childcare, health? Do you miss many classes/meetings?**

11. **This course is non-accredited. That is, you don't get a formal qualification, like a training certificate, at the end of it. Does that matter to you? (Why did you come to this course rather than one where you get a certificate?)**

12. **Personal details:**

    Gender:

    Age range:

    Working?

    Seeking work?

    Family?

    Disabled?

    Highest level of school completed (year):

13. **Do you have any long-term goals –if you had the chance and there were no barriers, what would you really like to do? Other comments?**

Griffith UNIVERSITY

Centre for Learning Research

Mapping non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy
and Numeracy provision

CONSENT FORM - Students

Researcher

Name(s):   Dr Darryl Dymock

School(s) / centre(s):   Centre for Learning Research, Griffith University, Brisbane

Contact Phone: 07 373 55935 (Tuesdays and Thursdays)

Contact Email: d.dymock@griffith.edu.au

By signing below, I confirm that I have read or have had explained to me the information about this project and have understood what this research is about.

I understand that:

• I am agreeing to do an interview about being a student in a language or literacy or numeracy program.

• Any information I give will be **confidentia**l.

• Taking part in this research is **voluntary**. I am not being forced to take part.

• I can stop and leave the interview at any time, without any comment or penalty.

• There will be no direct benefit or payment to me for taking part in this research, but that the organization will receive a small fee for taking part.

• If I have any additional questions I can contact the main researcher, Darryl Dymock, at Griffith University.

• That I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University on 07 3875 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project.

• All my questions have been fully answered.

I agree to participate in the non-accredited Language, Literacy and Numeracy project 2006.

 Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: /   /2006

Centre for Learning Research

Mapping non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy provision

CONSENT FORM - Managers/Coordinators/ Teachers/ Tutors,

Researcher

Name(s):   Dr Darryl Dymock

School(s) / centre(s):   centre for Learning Research, Griffith University, Brisbane

Contact Phone: 07 373 55935 (Tuesdays and Thursdays)

Contact Email: d.dymock@griffith.edu.au

By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information package and in particular have noted that:

• I understand that my involvement in this research will include an interview about community non-accredited Adult Language, Literacy and Numeracy provision.

• I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;

• I understand any risks involved;

• I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research, but that the organization will be paid a small fee to acknowledge the time and effort involved.

• I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary.

• I understand that once the audiotape has been transcribed for research purposes, the audiotape will be destroyed.

• I understand that if I have any additional questions I can contact the research team;

• I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;

• I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on 3875 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project; and

I agree to participate in the non-accredited Language, Literacy and Numeracy Mapping Project 2006.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: /   /2006

Mapping literacy and numeracy in community settings

Interviews –Coordinators/Managers

[Emphasise that this is about *non-accredited* ALLN]

1. Person interviewed:

2. Position:

3 Name and address of organisation

4. What is the main purpose of the organisation?

5. How would you describe the aim of your non-accredited ALLN program/s?

6. How would you describe the sorts of learners who participate in those programs?

7. What do you think are the reasons that your learners to come to your courses? What motivates them?

Why do they choose this program over another, say an accredited program?

8. Realistically, what outcomes do you think learners in that program achieve? **What might be considered achievement?**

> [Prompts: improved skills, further training, employment, personal satisfaction/self-confidence?]

What sorts of pathways are available to them beyond your course/s? Do you encourage them to move on? Do you think 'progression' is important for these sorts of learners?

How do they find out about your ALLN course?

Are there any access issues? (physical, geographical, personal, e.g babysitting, transport, institutional requirements – prerequisites etc.)

10. Do you use a 'curriculum' or other structured course in your ALLN program?

[Prompt: please provide brief details]

9. How do you assess learner outcomes?

Formal, informal, continuous?

11. Do you have any regular evaluation of your non-accredited ALLN program, quality assurance strategy etc? YES/NO

[Prompt: If YES, how is it done and how often?]

12. What form does the teaching/tutoring take?

> [Prompt: Class, 1:1 tuition]

Discuss reasons for this choice of delivery.

13. On average, how many learners are participating in your non-accredited program/s at any one time? _____ Current number:

14. Do you use volunteer tutors in your program? Why or why not?

15. Are your teachers/tutors required to have formal or accredited qualifications? YES/NO

[Prompt: minimum qualification/s, professional development]

16. What are the main sources of funding for your non-accredited ALLN program?

Discuss funding issues: short-long term; amounts; learner needs vs funding guidelines?

17. Do you report annual statistics etc for your non-accredited ALLN program outside the organisation/institution? YES/NO

[Discuss reporting issues, barriers, benefits]

18. What are the main issues you have to deal with in your non-accredited ALLN program? Teachers/ Students/Administration/Funding/Relationships with other providers?

20. What sort of additional support if any, apart from funding, would help your organisation improve/expand/change its ALLN program?

20. How do you think that your organisation is perceived in the wider community? What difference do you think you make?

21. Any other comments.

Mapping non-accredited language, literacy and numeracy

Interviews - Tutors/Teachers

I am talking with _____ on [day/date]_____

At (location):_____

1. **Tell me a little about your teaching/tutoring role.**

2. **How long have you been doing this?**

3. **Why did you decide to get involved in this sort of program?**

4. **What do you see as the aim of the course/program?**

5. **How would you describe the sorts of learners who participate in this program?**

6. **What do you think are the reasons that your learners come for this sort lf tuition? What motivates them to come here rather than to an accredited course?**

7. **Realistically, what outcomes do you think learners achieve? What might be considered achievement? [Prompts: improved skills, further training, employment, personal satisfaction/self-confidence?]**

8. **What sorts of pathways are available to them beyond your corse/s? do you encourage them to move on? Do you think 'progression' is important for these sorts of learners?**

9. **How do they find out about your ALLN course? Are there any access issues? (physical, geographical, personal, e.g babysitting, transport, institutional requirements – prerequisites etc.)**

10. **Do you use a 'curriculum' or other structured course in your ALLN program? Can you describe this a little.**

11. **How do you assess learner outcomes? Formal, informal, continuous?**

12. **What do you see is the coordinator's role?**

13. **Do you have any particular training or qualifications for teaching ALLN?**

14. **Have you had any professional development (workshops, short courses) since you started teaching in this program?**

15. **What are the main issues you have to deal with in your teaching?**

16. **Is there any sort of additional support if any would help you in your teaching?**

17. **What would you say is the main thing you have learned from this role?**

18. **Any other comments?**

Thank you for talking with me today.

Appendix 1

List of eligible organisations that responded to survey

Aberfoyle Community Centre Inc, 56 Sunnymeade Drive, Aberfoyle Park SA 5159

ADRA Training, 16/250 Kingston Rd, Slacks Creek, QLD 4127

Adult Migrant Education West Coast TAFE Home Tutor Scheme, Level 6/16 Victoria Ave`, Perth WA 6000.

Angliss Neighbourhood House, 2/11 Vipont St, Footscray VIC 3011

Annerley Literacy Centre, 12/478 Ipswich Rd, Annerley QLD 4103

Ascot Community Uniting Church, 24 Fifth Ave, Ascot SA 5043

Australian Polish Community Service, 77 Droop St, Footscray VIC 3011

Barraba Community Learning Assoc Inc, PO Box 20, Barraba NSW 2347

Barrier Reef Institute of TAFE, Queens Rd, Bowen QLD 4805

Benambra Neighbourhood House, 34 Gibbo St, Benambra VIC 3900

Bowden Brompton Community Group, 19 Green St, Brompton SA 5007

Bridgeworks Personnel Ltd, Level, 1/60 Leichhardt St, QLD 4004

Brooklyn Park Church of Christ, 9 Allen Ave, Brooklyn Park SA 5032

Caboolture Community Adult Literacy, PO Box 137, Caboolture QLD 4510

CAE, Access, Education and Training, Level 2, 253 Flinders Lane, Melbourne VIC 3000

Caloundra City Council Adult Literacy Program, Caloundra City Libraries, Caloundra QLD 4551

Capabilities Employment Service, PO Box 735, Townsville QLD 4810

Carlton Neighbourhood Learning Centre, 20 Princes St, North Carlton VIC 3054

Cheltenham Community Centre Inc., 62 Strout St North, Cheltenham SA 5014

Chisholm Institute, 121 Stud Rd, Dandenong VIC 3175

Christie Downs Community House, Corner Morton and Flaxmill Rds, Christie Downs SA 5164

Church of Christ Nambour – Solutions, 22 National Park Rd, Nambour QLD 4560

Colac Adult & Community Education Inc, PO Box 382, Colac VIC 3250

Community House Drop In Centre, 34-36 Galpin St, Whyalla Stuart SA 5608

Community Learning Initiatives, 11A Sussex St, West End QLD 4101

Continuing Education Castlemaine, 30 Templeton St, Castlemaine VIC 3450

Continuing Education Centre Albury Wodonga, PO Box 129 Wodonga VIC 3689

Creswick Learning Centre, 19 -21 Victoria St, Creswick VIC 3363

Dallas Neighbourhood House, PO Box 65, Dallas VIC 3047

Deaf Education Network Inc, PO Box 5004, North Rocks NSW 2151

Doveton Neighbourhood Learning, Oak Avenue, Doveton VIC 3177

Dyslexia Testing Services Pty Ltd, 30 Thorne Rd, Birkdale QLD, 4159

Eastwood Community Centre, 95 Glen Osmond Rd, Eastwood SA 5063

Encounter Centre Inc, Lot 11 Armstrong Rd, Victor Harbor SA5211

Endeavour Foundation, PO Box 711, Townsville QLD 4810

Endeavour, Auckland St, Gladstone QLD 4680

English Language Learning Improvement Service, GPO Box 419, Adelaide SA 5001

Federation of Polish Organisations in SA Inc, 230 Angas Street, Adelaide SA 5000

Flinders St Baptist Church, 65 Flinders Street, Adelaide SA 5000

Foundation for Independent Recreation & Social Training, PO Box 4175, Eight Mile Plains QLD 4113

FSG Australia, PO Box 3065 Robina Town Centre, Robina QLD 4230

Fullarton Park Centre, 411 Fullarton Rd, Fullarton SA 5063

Gin Gin & District Community, 35 Minden St, Gin Gin QLD 4671

Glen Eira Adult Learning Centre Inc, 419 North Rd, Ormond VIC 3204

Glenroy Neighbourhood Learning, 5B Cromwell St, Glenroy VIC 3046

Goodwood Community Services Inc, 32-34 Rosa Street, Goodwood SA 5034

Hackham West Community Centre, Corner Majorca and Warsaw Crescent, Hackham West SA 5168

Hawthorne Community Education Centre, 31 Wakefield St, Hawthorne VIC 3122

Henley and Grange Community Centre Inc, 4 Charles Sturt Avenue, Grange SA 5022

Inner West Skills Centre Inc, Level 2, 36-38 Victoria St East, Burwood NSW 2134

Joan Gibbon's Neighbourhood Centre, 5-7 Head St, Whyalla Stuart SA 5608

Junction Community Centre, 2a May Terrace, Ottoway SA 5013

Keysborough Learning Centre, 402 Corrigan Rd, Keysborough VIC 3173

Kogarah Library, Kogarah Town Square, B, Kogarah NSW 2217

Learning Partners, 473 West Tamar Highway, Riverside TAS 7250

Life and Career Centre, Level 3, 516 Ruthven St, Toowoomba QLD 4350

Literacy Network Manly-Warringah Inc, PO Box 385 French's Forest NSW 1640

Louise Multicultural Community, 16-20 Silver Grove, Nunawading VIC 3131

Lowood & District Community Centre Inc, 1 Peace St., PO Box 140 Lowood QLD 4311

Lutheran Community Care, 5 Marchand St, Murray Bridge SA 5253

Maribyrnong Community Centre, 9 Randall St, Maribyrnong VIC 3032

Marion-Warradale UCA English as a Second Language Program, 68 Lascelles Ave, Warradale SA 5046

Meadow Heights Learning Shop, 3-13 Hudson Circuit, Meadow Heights VIC 3048

Melbourne English Tuition Service, Camden Community Centre, 7 Carliste St, Camden SA 5038

Migrant Resource Centre of Canberra, North Building 2nd Floor ACT 2601

Milpara Community House, 21 Shellcotts Rd, Korumburra VIC 3950

Mission Australia, 18 Brisbane Rd, Labrador QLD 4215

Mitchell Park Neighbourhood Centre, 1 Cumbria Court, Mitchell SA 5043

Modbury Uniting Church African, 572 Montague Rd, Modbury SA 5092

Monica Mitchell Consulting Pty, PO Box 46, The Gap QLD 4061

Moranbah Library, Grosvenor Complex Town Square, Batchelor Parade Moranbah QLD 4744

Morella Community House Inc, 90 Kings Rd, Parafield Gardens SA 5107

Morwell Neighbourhood House and Learning Centre Inc, 48-50 Beattie Crescent, Morwell VIC 3840

Mountain District Learning Centre, 13-15 The Avenue, Fern VIC 3156

Murray Bridge Community Centre Inc, 18 Beatty Terrace, PO Box 429, Murray Bridge SA 5253

Newmarket Learning Centre, 8 Vivienne Street, Newmarket QLD 4051

North Coast Institute of TAFE, Kempsey Campus, 58 Sea St, West Kempsey NSW 2440

Northern Area Community & Youth Services Inc, Oldford Rd, Davoren Park SA 5113

NSW AMES - Campsie Centre, 59-63 Evaline St, Campsie NSW 2194

Queensland Working Women's Service FNQ, PO Box 1460, Atherton QLD 4883

On Track Learning Wimmera Inc, PO Box 300, Horsham VIC 3402

Outer Eastern Literacy Program, c/- Boronia Library, Park Crescent, Boronia VIC 3155

Overseas Chinese Assoc, Pooraka Farm Neighbourhood House, 126 Henderson Rd, Pooraka, 5095 SA

Peter Pan Literacy Club Inc, PO Box 1189, Maryborough QLD 4650

Pine Rivers Neighbourhood Centre, PO Box 2038, Strathpine, QLD 4500

Preston Reservoir Adult Community Education Inc, Cnr Asquith & Sturdee Streets, Reservoir VIC 3073

Port Pirie Internet Centre, 106 Florence Street, Port Pirie SA 5540

*Read Write Now!, Locked Bag 6 Northbridge, WA 6865

Redlands Bayside Disability Service, 77 Shore St West, Cleveland QLD 4163

Reynella Neighbourhood Centre, 164-170 Old South Rd, Reynella SA 5161

Robinson Education Centre Inc, PO Box 5086, Broken Hill NSW 9999

Rope Inc, 31 Grace St, Scarborough QLD 4020

South West Victorian SEAL Inc, 71 Hyland Street, Warrnambool VIC 3280

Southern Region Community College, 34 Chantry St, Goulbourn, NSW2580

Southside Community Services, PO Box 7, Narrabundah ACT 2607

St Annis Anglican Church, 4 Denmark St, Merrylands NSW 2160

St Arnaud Community Resource Centre, 85 Napier St, St Arnau VIC 3478

St Patricks Language Grant Program, 1/113 Humphries Tce, Woodville Gardens SA 5012

State Library of Tasmania, 91 Murray Street, Hobart TAS 7000

Station Community Centre, Uniting Church, Station SA 5014

Sudanese Australian Integrated Learning (SAIL) Program, 21 Yardley Street, Maidstone, 3012; 67 Darnley Street, Braybrook, 3019; Corner Langhorne and Wilson Sts, Dandenong, 3175; Corner Bent and Queen Sts, Altona, 3018.

Swinburne University of Technology TAFE, 369 Stud Rd Wantirna VIC 3152

Tablelands Job Training Inc t/a Outcomes - The Training People, Community Centre, Mabel Street, Atherton QLD 4883

TAFE NSW Riverina Institute, PO Box 2231, Wagga Wagga NSW 2650

TAFE NSW Western Institute, Lords Place, Orange NSW 2800

TAFE Outreach, South Western Sydney Institute, Miller NSW 2168

TAFESA Port Lincoln Campus, 2 London, Port Lincoln SA 5606

The Aldinga Community Centre, PO Box 81 Aldinga Beach SA 5173

The Centre for Continuing Education Inc., Chisholm Street, VIC Wangaratta 3677

The Hut Community Centre, Aldgate Railway Station, 1 Euston Rd Aldgate SA 5154

Townsville Thuringowa Adult Tutor Group Inc, PO Box 473, Aitkenvale QLD 4814

Upper Beaconsfield Community Centre Inc, 10-12 Salisbury Rd, Upper Beaconsfield VIC 3808

Uych Learning Centre, 2463 Warburton Hwy, Yarra Junction VIC 3797

Victoria University, AMEP at VU, Room B30, Sunshine Campus VIC 8001

Wandana Community Centre, 48 Wandana Ave, Gilles Plains, SA 5086

Warracknabeal Neighbourhood House, 130-136 Scott St, Warracknabeal VIC 3393

Wavlink Inc, 36 Myrtle St, Glen Waverley, VIC 3150

Wellsprings for Women, 79 Langhorne St, Dandenong,VIC 3175

Wendouree West Community House, 12-14 Violet Grove, Wendouree West VIC 3355

Werribee Community Centre, 4 Synnot St, Werribee VIC 3030

Wesley Mission Brisbane, PO Box 6402, Fairfield, QLD 4102

Wide Bay TAFE (Bundaberg Campus), LMB 279, Maryborough QLD 4650

Woodcraft Morphett Vale Neighbourhood Centre, 175 Bains Rd, Morphett Vale SA 5162

Wycheproof Community Resource Centre, 280 Broadway, Wycheproof VIC 3527

* The single response from Read Write Now! was on behalf of the following literacy/numeracy groups in Western Australia:

Metropolitan groups:

Armadale	Collie
Canning	Esperance
City South	Geraldton
Duncraig	Kalgoorlie/Norseman
Fremantle	Karratha
Joondalup	Katanning
Mandurah	Northam/Toodya
Morley	
Murdoch	
Perth	
Rockingham/Kwinana	
South East Metro	
Stirling	
Swan	
Woodvale	

Country/Regional groups:

Albany

Broome

Bunbury