

Running head: THE CHALLENGES OF BEING A VOLUNTEER BOARD MEMBER

**Who's in Charge Here? – The Administrative Challenges of Being a
Volunteer Board Member for a Community-Based Adult Literacy Program**

Marion Terry, Ph.D.

Brandon University

Marion Terry

The Writing Centre

Brandon University

Brandon, Manitoba R7A 6A9

Telephone: (204) 729-9021

Fax: (204-725-2143

Email: terry@brandonu.ca

This manuscript was prepared using the 5th edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (2001). The article is 5040 words long, including the title, headings, and reference list.

**Who's in Charge Here? – The Administrative Challenges of being a
Volunteer Board Member for a Community-Based Adult Literacy Program**

Abstract

A 2003 qualitative study examined the perspectives of 70 stakeholders in two adult literacy programs in Manitoba, Canada. Two stakeholders were Literacy Working Group (LWG) chairpersons, who held administrative positions akin to public school boards. Of particular significance to these administrators were issues related to program coordination, instruction, finances, and community image. The experiences that they shared reveals a familiarity with program operations that is unrecorded elsewhere in the literature on adult education. Therefore, in addition to exposing the challenges faced by voluntary board members, this article's examination of their perspectives opens an avenue for further exploration of similar administrative bodies in other settings. The primary lesson to be learned is that optimally successful programs/organizations depend on more than just the good will of their volunteer boards and paid staff; they also rely on administrative savvy and the mutual exchange of information for the purpose of improving policies and procedures.

**Who's in Charge Here? – The Administrative Challenges of Being a
Volunteer Board Member for a Community-Based Adult Literacy Program**

In 2003, a qualitative research study examined the perspectives of various stakeholders connected to two community-based adult literacy programs in Manitoba, Canada. The study sought to give voice to these research participants, and to use their experiences as the basis for suggesting improvements to adult literacy practices in general. Two of the 70 stakeholders were Literacy Working Group (LWG) chairpersons Ellen and Carl, who held administrative positions akin to the boards that govern public schools and post-secondary institutions.

In Miller Creek, LWG chairperson Ellen had been recruited as a member-at-large by coordinator/instructor Yvonne in 1998, because of her longstanding association with the program as a community referral agent. Ellen had assumed the role of secretary in 1999, and then of chairperson in 2000. In Charlesville, LWG chairperson Carl had been recruited as a member-at-large by coordinator/instructor Shirley in 2000, because of his prior experiences as a program learner. Carl had assumed the role of chairperson in 2001. The experiences shared by these administrators reveal a familiarity with program operations that is unrecorded elsewhere in the literature on adult education. Therefore, in addition to exposing the challenges faced by voluntary board members, this article's examination of LWG chairpersons' perspectives opens an avenue for further exploration of similar administrative bodies in other settings.

All given names in this article, including program titles, are pseudonyms. The following definitions of terms apply, in accordance with their use by program stakeholders. Community-based adult literacy programs are programs that receive provincial literacy funding; they are therefore obliged to follow the learner-centered, community-based literacy model endorsed by the Government of Manitoba (see *Adult Learning and Literacy*, 2002). Learners are adult literacy

students. Youth-at-risk learners are school-age students between the ages of 16 and 21 years who are attending an adult literacy program either instead of or as a supplement to regular high school. Coordinators/instructors are equivalent to grade 1-12 school principals who have teaching duties. Other staff are paid and volunteer literacy instructors and office support staff. Parents/significant others are learners' close relatives and friends. Referral agents are government and community agency representatives who refer learners to literacy programs. Provincial funding agents are representatives of the Adult Learning and Literacy branch responsible for administering annual literacy grants. LWG administrators, the stakeholders who constitute the focus for this article, are volunteer advisory board members.

Review of the Literature

The educational literature focuses primarily on learners, with corollary interests in teaching and administrative practices, and the influences of students' out-of-school lives. Passing mention is made of other educational stakeholders, as well, such as when adult education program planners are advised to solicit input from "government programmers, funders, and policy makers" (Scott & Schmitt-Boshnick, 1996, p. 69), "the affected public" (Wilson & Cervero, 1996a, p. 12), or "any of a wide range of stakeholders" (Sork, 1991, p. 5). Nevertheless, most educational writers concentrate on students as the centres of their own schooling experiences.

From students' perspectives, program administration begins with whatever staff members appear to be in charge of their instructors, and then radiates out to any other within-school and out-of-school administrative personnel. LWGs comprise the out-of-school administrative boards for community-based adult literacy programs in Manitoba, Canada. In 1990, the Government of Manitoba (Manitoba Literacy Office, 1990e) explained, "Community-based literacy programs are

developed and delivered at the community level under the direction of a voluntary Literacy Working Group which represents various local organizations" (p. 3). In 1998, the Government of Manitoba recommended that these community representatives be recruited from "significant community groups or agencies including local educational providers (schools, colleges, training centres, etc.), businesses, interest groups, media, community volunteers and potential students" (Adult Literacy and Continuing Education, 1998b, p. 1).

To these community-based boards the Government of Manitoba has assigned responsibility for program publicity and promotion, community outreach and awareness-raising, learner and instructor recruitment, coordinator/instructor liaison, program evaluation and development, and financial reporting and accountability (Adult Literacy and Continuing Education, 1998b). In order to qualify for annual provincial adult literacy grants, moreover, a program must confirm that its LWG includes a minimum of eight community-based members who have agreed to serve two-year terms (Adult Learning and Literacy, 2004). LWG members are thus expected to meet Wilson & Cervero's (1996b) prescription for program planners as community representatives who "will represent the range of possible interests" and be "the best possible planners given the circumstances" (p. 22), in addition to fulfilling Charuhas' (1993) description of advisory board members as "committed to the long-term growth" (p. 49) of the educational organization.

Setting

The Miller Creek and Charlesville programs followed the community-based adult literacy program model endorsed (and funded) by the Government of Manitoba. This model uses "teacher-based classroom instruction, small group and/or one-to-one tutoring" (Literacy Services of Canada Ltd., 2001, p. 16) in order "to enable Manitobans to have the ability to understand and

employ printed information in daily living activities at work, at home, and in the community" (Adult Learning and Literacy, 2002), with the understanding of all interested parties that literacy education is "not just for young people, or not just for getting jobs" (Adult Learning and Literacy, 2000, p. 8). Other key components of the model are continuous student entry/exit and flexible attendance, individualized learning using teacher and learner-made materials rather than arbitrary curricula, paid coordinators/instructors, administration by a voluntary LWG, use of donated or minimum-rent facilities, and a clear focus on soliciting community supports as well as meeting community needs (Adult Learning and Literacy, 2000; Manitoba Literacy Office, 1990b, 1990e; Literacy and Continuing Education, 1996). Variations on the implementation of this model depend on the individual literacy program's community setting, its hiring of "a solid instructor with a good reputation in the community," and the "direction and imagination" that its community-based LWG members bring to planning meetings (Adult Learning and Literacy, 2000, p. 8).

Although the Miller Creek and Charlesville programs were obligated by their funding agreements to follow the Government of Manitoba's community-based adult literacy model, their different histories had resulted in somewhat different foci for program delivery. The Miller Creek program began in 1989 when a group of concerned citizens became aware of provincial funding for literacy programs. It started out in a church basement as a part-time one-to-one service by a paid instructor to a handful of students with basic literacy needs, but by 2002-03 it was serving 116 students in a rented classroom. The Miller Creek program supplemented adult literacy instruction with adult high school courses accredited by the local school division. It had earned a reputation for helping adult dropouts complete their high school education, as well as for successfully integrating one-to-one and small-group instruction, for blending adult literacy

and high school curricula, and for delivering internationally recognized MicroSoft computer courses.

The Charlesville program began in 1989 when a group of parents decided to provide out-of-school tutoring support for their teenage children who were experiencing academic difficulties that were not being addressed within the regular school system. The program started out as a home-based one-to-one volunteer tutoring program for school children, but by 2002-03 it was serving 194 (mostly adult) students in a rented classroom. The Charlesville program offered instruction at all academic levels ranging from beginning literacy to post-secondary tutorial support. It was particularly well known for accepting every learner who asked for help, including youth-at-risk, and for successfully meeting the special needs of students with learning disabilities and other learning challenges.

Methodology

The Miller Creek and Charlesville programs were chosen from a total of 37 community-based adult literacy programs funded by the Government of Manitoba. The 70 research participants who volunteered for the study consisted of 37 learners, 2 coordinators/instructors, 11 other staff members, 7 parents/significant others, 8 community referral agents, 3 provincial funding agents, and 2 LWG chairpersons.

Two primary types of qualitative data were collected from the study's participants: 34 compositions by learners, staff members, and a provincial funding agent (brief written responses to questions about their program experiences); and 58 interviews with individuals from every stakeholder category (45-minute conversations based on more detailed questions about their program experiences). Interview respondents were asked for permission to have these conversations audio-taped and were given opportunities to check the interview transcripts for

accuracy and to make any desired changes. The compositions and interview transcripts were then analyzed through iterative cycles of progressively more interpretive coding and memoing, in order to produce within-case and cross-case comparisons of program stakeholder perspectives.

Results

The within-case analysis yielded descriptions of each program's mission statement, learner recruitment, staff selection, instructional practices, learning climate, changes in program learners, influences by parents/significant others, hiring of the coordinator/instructor, community credibility, funding, facility, and adult education model. The cross-case analysis revealed four themes: program design, human relations, community context, and financial support. Of particular significance to the LWG administrators were issues related to program coordination, instruction, finances, and community image.

Coordination

As LWG chairpersons for the Miller Creek and Charlesville adult literacy programs, Ellen and Carl reported being primarily responsible for signing checks and chairing semi-annual board meetings. To these duties Ellen added the tasks of liaising with Miller Creek program staff, scribing student feedback for annual program evaluations, and attending compulsory government-sponsored LWG training events. Carl added the task of supporting the Charlesville coordinator/instructor, particularly in terms of suggesting ways to augment program funding.

Ellen and Carl depended on their literacy programs' coordinators/instructors to look after day-to-day program management and to provide leadership and direction for administrative planning. Ellen expressed unequivocal satisfaction with the Miller Creek program's coordinator/instructor, Yvonne, whom she credited with the program's rapid increase in student numbers, instructional services, and financial resources. Her only concern as a program

administrator was that the program might "get out of control" if it continued to grow at such a rapid rate. Carl also expressed an unwavering loyalty to his program's coordinator/instructor, Shirley, whom he described as the inspirational core of the program. He especially admired Shirley's capacity to welcome disadvantaged students and give them an opportunity to learn, regardless of their incoming skills or educational experiences.

Ellen and Carl took pride in their positions as program administrators. Nevertheless, both foresaw a day when they would relinquish the role of chairperson, and both were concerned about finding replacements who would work toward their programs' best interests. Ellen worried about her successor's ability to help the program continue to grow in a responsible, controlled manner. She insisted, "I've invested a lot of my energy into this program. Some day I'm going to have to step down and let someone else take over, but I want someone who's capable of doing that." Carl, on the other hand, worried that he had been unable to help his coordinator/instructor secure adequate funding, and he expressed an eagerness to pass this responsibility on to someone with better financial connections in the community. He explained, "We need someone who is more involved than I am in the community. Someone who can solicit for funding, and has knowledge on how to set up programs, organize, and so on – which I don't have."

Instruction

The Miller Creek and Charlesville programs' disparate foci for staff selection, learner recruitment, and instructional practices were reflected in the information provided by the study's LWG administrators. In Miller Creek, coordinator/instructor Yvonne and the other three instructors were certified teachers with decades of collective experience in the public school system – and they were paid \$33.00 per hour. LWG administrator Ellen attributed the Miller Creek program's accelerated growth and its provision of accredited adult literacy and high school

courses to the academic qualifications of these staff members. In Charlesville, on the other hand, no paid instructors and only a few volunteer tutors were certified teachers – and the paid instructor wages ranged from \$7.00 to \$15.50 per hour. LWG administrator Carl praised the Charlesville staff for "being so dedicated to the program" despite their low salaries. However, he also saw these instructors' lack of teaching credentials as a program weakness. He speculated that "someone with more academic training, more expertise" could offer certified courses and more diverse learning activities. Furthermore, although he cautioned that he would not want a new instructor to "take away what they've established already," Carl felt that adding a certified teacher could raise the program's public profile and give it more funding options.

Ellen and Carl reported high student numbers for the 2002-03 academic year, but these learners had been drawn from very different target populations. Ellen praised Yvonne for increasing enrollment by changing the student composition in Miller Creek from primarily lower level literacy students with non-specific learning goals, to mostly middle and higher level literacy and adult high school students with definite plans for subsequent education and employment. In contrast, Carl commended Shirley for remaining true to the Charlesville program's policy of inclusion and its mission to serve academically disadvantaged learners. Noting that Shirley welcomed everyone who asked for help, including students with various learning disabilities and developmental challenges, Carl enthused, "She won't let anyone be passed by!" Carl spoke particularly fondly of the young quadriplegic adult who had not learned to read in regular school because of his other disabilities, but who was finally learning to read in the Charlesville program. Carl emphatically declared, "So what if he doesn't get his grade or whatever? He's learning to read. At least they've opened that up for him."

While both programs offered literacy instruction ranging from beginning readers and writers through to the high school level (and beyond, in the case of Charlesville), Ellen reported that the Miller Creek program primarily provided upper level literacy and adult high school courses, and Carl reported that the Charlesville program primarily provided lower and middle level literacy training. According to Ellen, the Miller Creek program "was pretty basic in the way it was run and in the lower literacy it offered" and "wasn't clicking" before Yvonne came on staff," but under Yvonne's direction it was helping high school dropouts finish their grade 12. Carl, on the other hand, was pleased that the Charlesville program was not dependent on assigning grades and course qualifications. He explained that students with weaker skills could feel successful about whatever they accomplished in the Charlesville program, instead of sensing that they were "scraping through a course" for credit.

Finances

Ellen and Carl recognized that the Province of Manitoba's community-based adult literacy grants fell far short of their respective programs' financial needs. The Miller Creek program's 2002-03 adult literacy grant of \$44,500 was 17% of its total income of \$263,002. The Miller Creek program received another 52% of its income from other government grants, 29% from fees-for-service, and 2% from charitable donations. In comparison, the Charlesville program's adult literacy grant of \$56,600 was 60% of its total income of \$93,561. The Charlesville program received another 24% of its income from other government grants, 1% from fees-for-service, 9% from charitable donations, 1% from fund-raising activities, and 5% from carry-forward and miscellaneous other sources.

As LWG chairpersons, Ellen and Carl credited their programs' coordinators/instructors for finding these supplemental sources of income. Ellen acknowledged Yvonne's "drive and

motivation" to seek extra funding. Carl expressed regret that most of the burden to find extra income had fallen upon Shirley. He contended that the LWG should convince local politicians to lobby for more provincial funding, and that it should recruit as LWG members local business owners who would donate money to the program. Carl was adamant that more public money should be diverted to adult literacy programs, as an investment in the future. He explained, "The way the [Charlesville] program stands right now, if two people get off social assistance in one year, the program would be paid for over and over every year those people don't collect welfare."

Community Image

Community image was important to both of the LWG administrators in the study, but they had very different visions of the images that their respective literacy programs should project. For Ellen, it was essential that the Miller Creek program be viewed as academically credible. She noted that, in direct contrast to the program's "unprofessional" reputation under the direction of its previous coordinator/instructor, it was "seen in a very professional light" by community referral agencies and other organizations in 2002-03, because of Yvonne's reputation for delivering accredited courses. Ellen was especially pleased that the program was gaining credibility with the Mennonite community, describing its first full-time Mennonite student as a "test case" for this community's endorsement of the program.

For Carl, on the other hand, it was especially important that the Charlesville program project an image of fiscal accountability. He celebrated the relationships that coordinator/instructor Shirley had forged with community referral agents, but he also insisted that the program should cultivate "more local involvement" by "politicians and businessmen." He saw such people not only as general community advocates, but also as potential sources of

program income. Carl argued that these stakeholders had vested interests in supporting adults' efforts to become more employable by improving their academic skills.

Discussion and Recommendations

A significant criterion for receiving community-based adult literacy funding from the Province of Manitoba is the formation of an LWG with responsibilities for general administration, staff and learner recruitment, financial management, and program promotion (Adult Literacy and Continuing Education, 1998b; Literacy and Continuing Education, 1996; Manitoba Literacy Office, 1990b, 1990e). The following discussion considers these expectations within the context of information reported by Ellen and Carl as LWG administrators and augmented by other stakeholders connected to the Miller Creek and Charlesville adult literacy programs. The recommendations, however, are targeted to a much broader audience of individuals with vested interests in a wider range of volunteer board settings.

Coordination

The constitution of the Miller Creek and Charlesville LWGs appeared on the surface to reflect the Government of Manitoba's mandate that advisory board members be drawn from various public and private sectors of the community. However, both sets of LWG members had been invited to the board by their respective coordinators/instructors, in accordance with these coordinators'/instructors' own vested interests. Yvonne had chosen LWG members on the basis of their potential to support the Miller Creek program's role as an accredited educational institution, and Shirley had chosen LWG members on the basis of their commitment to support the Charlesville program's mission to serve socially and educationally disadvantaged learners. Thus, while Yvonne had selected individuals with whom she was already connected on inter-agency committees in Miller Creek, Shirley had selected individuals who had prior connections

to the program as learners or the parents/significant others of learners in Charlesville. Moreover, while the membership of the Miller Creek LWG tended to rotate every few years as new individuals became more active on the community's inter-agency groups, the membership of the Charlesville LWG seldom changed and, in fact, still included several individuals who had founded the program in 1989. As a provincial funding agent, Adele wished that other provincially funded literacy programs, including the Charlesville program, would follow Miller Creek's lead in establishing and maintaining LWGs with closer connections to the community than to the programs themselves.

Recommendations:

- That terms of office be established for volunteer board members, in order to facilitate the recruitment of new members on a regular basis.
- That volunteer boards assume responsibility for recruiting new members, and that they choose members who represent a variety of community stakeholder groups.

The Miller Creek and Charlesville program administrators had abdicated to Yvonne and Shirley many coordination tasks that the provincial government had assigned to LWGs: finding and furnishing suitable facilities, developing and monitoring the programs, promoting these programs in the community, recruiting learners and other staff, and locating additional sources of funding. Perhaps the Government of Manitoba expects too much of volunteer LWG members, and the way that these programs evolved under the direction of their coordinators/instructors is a natural – and necessary – solution to this dilemma. On the other hand, perhaps Yvonne and Shirley took advantage of the opportunity to take control of the Miller Creek and Charlesville programs by relieving their respective LWGs of government-vested powers. When they recruited their programs' LWG members, Yvonne and Shirley essentially picked their own bosses, and

they were even planning to select their own replacements upon retirement. Yvonne had been selected by the Miller Creek LWG, but she had already chosen a potential replacement and had made arrangements for this individual to sit on the LWG as part of her training for the position. Shirley had essentially fallen heir to the position by virtue of her founding member status, which predated the Charlesville program's application for community-based funding. She, too, had plans to select and train her own replacement when the time came. This situation begs the question, "Who's in charge here – the employers or the employees?"

Recommendations:

- That volunteer boards strike formal committees to hire coordinators/office managers and other paid staff. That these committees include members from different stakeholder groups.
- That volunteer board members make periodic program/organization visits in order to become acquainted with their day-to-day operations.
- That volunteer boards meet regularly, and that the meeting chairpersons solicit individual members' feedback and suggestions for program/organization improvements.

Instruction

Primarily due to the different teaching skills, experiences, and qualifications of their respective coordinators/instructors, the Miller Creek and Charlesville programs had very different instructional foci. To their adult literacy services, the Miller Creek program added adult high school courses and the Charlesville program added youth-at-risk services. Each of these combinations had its own benefits and drawbacks. For instance, including adult high school courses meant that the Miller Creek program was guaranteed to have a stable source of supplemental funding (from the same provincial government branch that funded adult literacy

programs), that learners could mix-and-match literacy and high school courses, and that literacy students could proceed into high school courses on the same site. However, some Miller Creek staff members, referral agents, and provincial funding agents admitted that this delivery model had also yielded a significant decline in the number of beginning level literacy students who attended the program. Including youth in the Charlesville program meant that the program's learner base was more age-representative of the outside community, that the classroom environment was full of youthful energy, and that displaced youth were being given a second chance to learn academic and social skills. However, some Charlesville parents/significant others, referral agents, and provincial funding agents admitted that this delivery model had also created classroom management problems, and they worried that older students' comfort levels were being compromised by the prevalence of youth. Carl also worried that the program's depth and breadth of instruction were hampered by its instructors' limited teaching credentials. Clearly, combining program models according to the proclivities of their coordinators/instructors had instructional impacts on this study's adult literacy programs.

Recommendations:

- That volunteer boards consider carefully their target service groups and the services that they wish their programs/organizations to offer, and that they hire coordinators/office managers and other paid staff who have the incoming skills, experience, and qualifications to offer those services.
- That before volunteer board members approve a coordinator's/office manager's proposal to supplement or change the program's/organization's current services, they weigh carefully the positive and negative impacts that those changes may have on existing services and target service groups.

Finances

The Miller Creek and Charlesville programs adhered to the community-based adult literacy program model, which was a condition of their literacy funding by the Government of Manitoba. However, this core literacy funding was insufficient for either program to function independently. Therefore, in addition to these annual literacy grants, each program accessed additional financial support from other sources, including other types of provincial funding. The Miller Creek program received about half of its total income from a provincial adult high school grant, and just over a quarter from fees-for-service to the local school division – a practice that coordinator/instructor Yvonne started when she joined the program in 1998. The Charlesville program received about a quarter of its total income from a provincial youth-at-risk grant, about a tenth from charitable donations, and a very small amount from charging fees-for-service to a government agency. Neither Ellen nor Carl was keen to have her/his coordinator/instructor spend significant amounts of volunteer time on local fund-raising projects, although both of these LWG administrators reported that their programs had procured financial support from a variety of community donors over the years. Ellen and Carl expressed gratitude to coordinators/instructors Yvonne and Shirley for successfully combining different funding sources to meet their programs' financial needs, but they also sympathized with the amount of paperwork that was required to meet various funding bodies' reporting needs.

Recommendations:

- That the volunteer boards of other programs/organizations consider following the Miller Creek program's example of charging fees to referral agencies and institutions that have the financial resources to pay for service. That these volunteer boards also learn from the Charlesville program's experience that such fees are easier to implement early in a

program's/organization's history, before referral agencies and institutions develop an expectation for no-charge service.

- That volunteer boards duly consider every possible avenue for program/organization funding, but that they then use discretion in choosing which sources to pursue, given the potential conflicts in program/organization services and coordinators'/office managers' (and other staff members') time commitments.

Community Image

The community-based delivery model obligates adult literacy programs funded by the Government of Manitoba to be responsible and responsive to their communities. The Miller Creek and Charlesville communities played fundamental roles in their respective adult literacy programs, from providing continuous supplies of learners to accepting these programs into their networks of educational services. Although neither the Miller Creek nor Charlesville program had a need to advertise in order to recruit learners, both had a government-prescribed mandate to engage in public awareness-raising. Ellen and Carl saw window signage as visible proof of their programs' physical presence in the community. Ellen added that the Miller Creek program's location in a renovated store in the center of town enhanced its public image, and Carl thought that the Charlesville program's status would be improved by adding "politicians and businessmen" to the board and by hiring instructors with formal teaching credentials. Coordinator/instructor Yvonne advertised General Equivalency Diploma (GED) preparation classes and adult high school graduations as a means of keeping the Miller Creek program in the public eye, but coordinator/instructor Shirley did not want to draw more public attention to the Charlesville program until such time as she had space and instructional resources for additional learners. Regardless of a program's need to recruit students, however, the extent to which adult

literacy programs wish to be seen as community agencies in their own right should dictate the degree of effort they take to publicize their services.

Recommendations:

- That volunteer boards encourage their coordinators/office managers to conduct annual awareness-raising campaigns in their communities.
- That they discuss these publicity plans in light of balancing their programs'/organizations' needs for client recruitment and for community awareness and resources.

Conclusion

The Government of Manitoba prescribed LWGs as a condition of community-based adult literacy funding, in order to force provincially funded literacy programs to include a broad base of community representatives on their administrative boards. Provincial funding agent Adele noted weaknesses in the Charlesville LWG's membership composition and its ability to advocate for community support, but praised the Miller Creek LWG's membership composition and level of administrative activity. Nevertheless, both of the volunteer boards represented in this study would need to make significant changes before they could become the fully functioning vehicles of administrative community involvement envisioned by the Government of Manitoba when it started doling out community-based adult literacy grants in 1990. The primary lesson to be learned from LWG chairpersons Ellen and Carl is that optimally successful programs/organizations depend on more than just the good will of their volunteer board members and paid coordinators/office managers; they also rely on administrative savvy and the mutual exchange of information for the purpose of improving policies and procedures at all levels.

References

- Adult Learning and Literacy. (2000). *Before you start: Developing a community needs assessment for adult literacy programming*. Winnipeg, MB: Manitoba Education, Training and Youth.
- Adult Learning and Literacy. (2002, February 27). Adult Learning and Literacy. *Manitoba Education, Training and Youth*. Retrieved March 15, 2002, from <http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/tce/edutrnl/adultlearning/index.html>
- Adult Learning and Literacy (2004, December 24). Criteria for community-based adult literacy program funding. *Adult Learning and Literacy Publications and Resources*. Retrieved January 19, 2005, from www.edu.gov.mb/aet/all/publications
- Adult Literacy and Continuing Education. (1998b). *Quality programming: Literacy Working Groups (LWG) B Working together to build literacy programming in the community*. Winnipeg, MB: Manitoba Education and Training.
- Charuhas, M. S. (1993). Utilizing unilateral and multilateral groups to enhance program development. In P. Mulcrone (Ed.), *Current perspectives on administration of adult education programs* (pp. 45-56). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 60. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Literacy and Continuing Education. (1996, February). *Manitoba=s literacy initiative*. Winnipeg, MB: Author.
- Literacy Services of Canada Ltd. (2001). *Measuring outcomes in literacy, 2001. A national study*. Ottawa, ON: National Literacy Secretariat, Human Resources Development Canada.
- Manitoba Literacy Office. (1990b). *Annual report: 1989/90*. Winnipeg, MB: Manitoba Education and Training.
- Manitoba Literacy Office. (1990e). *Open your mind B Open a book: The Manitoba Literacy Initiative*. Winnipeg, MB: Manitoba Education and Training.
- Scott, S. M., & Schmitt-Boshnick, M. (1996). Collective action by women in community-based program planning. In R. M. Cervero & A. L. Wilson (Eds.), *What really matters in adult education program planning: Lessons in negotiating power and interests* (pp. 69-79). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 69. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sork, T. J. (1991). Learning about planning from success and failure. In T. J. Sork (Ed.), *Mistakes made and lessons learned: Overcoming obstacles to successful program planning* (pp. 5-13). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 49. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wilson, A. L., & Cervero, R. M. (1996a). Paying attention to the people work when planning educational programs for adults. In R. M. Cervero & A. L. Wilson (Eds.), *What really matters in*

adult education program planning: Lessons in negotiating power and interests (pp. 5-13). *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 69. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wilson, A. L., & Cervero, R. M. (1996b). Who sits at the planning table: Ethics and planning practice. *Adult Learning*, 8(2), 20-22.