IES Institute of Education Sciences

Linking Adult Education to Workforce Development in 2018-19: Early Implementation of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act at the Local Level

A Publication of the National Center for Education Evaluation at IES

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) is the independent, nonpartisan statistics, research, and evaluation arm of the U.S. Department of Education. The IES mission is to provide scientific evidence on which to ground education practice and policy and to share this information in formats that are useful and accessible to educators, parents, policymakers, researchers, and the public.

We strive to make our products available in a variety of formats and in language that is appropriate for a variety of audiences. You, as our customer, are the best judge of our success in communicating information effectively. If you have any comments or suggestions about this or any other IES product or report, we would like to hear from you. Please direct your comments to ncee.feedback@ed.gov.

March 2023

Cronen, S., Diffenderffer, A., & Medway, R. (2023). *Linking adult education to workforce development in 2018-19: Early implementation of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act at the local level* (NCEE 2023-001a). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee

This report is available on the Institute of Education Sciences website at http://ies.ed.gov/ncee.

Linking Adult Education to Workforce Development in 2018-19: Early Implementation of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act at the Local Level

Appendices

March 2023

Stephanie Cronen
Anne Diffenderffer
Rebecca Medway
American Institutes for Research

CONTENTS

TABLES

INTRODUCTION

These appendices supplement the report on *Linking Adult Education to Workforce Development in 2018-19: Early Implementation of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act at the Local Level*. They provide additional information about the analyses conducted for the report and present select results from a national survey of local adult education providers. This includes information about the key constructs and estimation approaches used in the report (appendix A), statistics that support key findings in the report (appendix B), and comparisons of statistics reflecting adult education in 2001-02 and 2018-19 (appendix C).

Information on how the survey sample and questionnaire were developed is available in the study's compendium report. Supplemental tables for the survey are also available in that report.[1]

APPENDIX A. KEY CONSTRUCTS AND ESTIMATION APPROACHES USED IN THE REPORT

This appendix includes information about the analytic methods used to generate estimates of learner enrollment and to compare subgroups (section A.1), and for comparing estimates on a variety of topics in 2001-02 and 2018-19 (section A.2).

A.1   Analytic Methods for Enrollment and Subgroup Estimates

This section describes the methods for calculating and comparing the estimates described in the key findings of the report. The key findings are based on the following constructs:

- Provider use of and learner enrollment in key types of instruction

- Collaboration with workforce development partners

- Challenges in implementing key activities called for in Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) reforms

Methods for calculating these estimates are described in sections A.1.1-A.1.3. Methods for comparing these estimates for select subgroups of providers are described in section A.1.4.

A.1.1   Estimating provider use of and learner enrollment in key types of instruction

Provider use

A provider could have offered Adult Basic Education (ABE), Adult Secondary Education (ASE), and English as a Second Language (ESL) programs, or any combination of those programs. The overall number and percentage of providers using a particular type of instruction was based on providers reporting that they used that type of instruction in at least one course in any of the programs they offered. Similar estimates were calculated to reflect the use of particular types of instruction in all programs offered and in each program offered (ABE, ASE, and/or ESL).

Learner enrollment

Learner enrollment was estimated using a combination of local provider survey responses and provider-level data from each state's National Reporting System for Adult Education (NRS).

Overall enrollment and enrollment by program type were based on provider-level data from each state's NRS data whenever they were available. For states where NRS data were not available–Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas–overall enrollment and enrollment by program type were based on local provider survey responses. Cases were included in program-specific analyses only if providers reported having at least one learner enrolled in that program type; this is also true for all enrollment estimates presented by program type.

Enrollment in courses that used linked or bridge instruction was not available from NRS and was estimated based on survey responses combined with NRS data, where available. Enrollment in courses that used a particular type of instruction was estimated using a four-step process:

> In step 1, the proportion of a provider's courses in which linked or bridge instruction was used was estimated separately for each program type (ABE, ASE, and ESL–including Integrated English Literacy

and Civics Education [IELCE]). This estimate was based on responses to survey items that used a scale of "No courses," "Less than half of the courses," "About half of the courses," and "More than half of the courses." These responses were converted to values of 0 percent, 25 percent, 50 percent, and 75 percent, respectively, to enable their use in calculations.

In step 2, the number of courses in which a provider offered linked or bridge instruction was estimated for each program type. This estimate was generated by multiplying the number of courses offered in that program type by the proportion of courses (from step 1) in which a provider reported using linked or bridge instruction in that program type.

In step 3, the average number of students per course in a given program type–regardless of the type of instruction–was estimated by dividing the number of students enrolled in that program type (from NRS data) by the number of courses providers reported offering in that program type.

In step 4, the number of students receiving linked or bridge instruction was estimated by multiplying the number of courses in which a provider offered each type of instruction (from step 2) by the provider's average number of students per course in a given program type (from step 3).

A.1.2   *Estimating collaboration with workforce development partners*

Providers could have collaborated with a variety of workforce development partners to implement adult education and literacy instructional programming, occupational skills training, or transition services. The overall number and percentage of providers collaborating with a select set of partners to implement any of these types of services were based on providers reporting that they worked with partners to implement programming or related policies for at least one of the types of service. Similar estimates were calculated for collaborating with workforce partners to implement each of the three types of services.

A.1.3   *Estimating challenges in implementing key activities*

In addition to findings that reflect providers' implementation of key instructional and collaboration activities, the report includes estimates of the number and percentage of providers that experienced challenges in doing so. Estimates were also calculated for challenges providers experienced in implementing other aspects of WIOA reforms, including meeting federal performance accountability reporting requirements. Estimates of the number and percentage of providers that experienced challenges in implementing each aspect of the WIOA reforms examined by the study were based on provider reports that a particular aspect was "very challenging." For challenges related to collecting performance data to meet federal reporting requirements, aggregate estimates were also calculated. Overall estimates were calculated for the number and percentage of providers reporting that any of the aspects of data collection asked about were very challenging. Estimates were also calculated for reporting that any of a subset of data collection aspects related to workforce-related outcomes were very challenging.

A.1.4   *Subgroup analyses*

Estimates were calculated for subgroups of providers–in particular, by type of provider, relative size of provider based on enrollment, and the setting in which the provider was located (table A.1). For example, estimates were compared for local education agencies and community-based organizations. Provider type, size, and setting were of interest in the study because those characteristics were likely to be proxies for pre-existing differences in resources (for example, staff with occupational expertise, established relationships with occupational training partners, and so forth) that could be related to a provider's ability to offer linked instruction and other workforce development services. Two sample *t*-tests were used to determine whether differences between subgroup

estimates were statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level; that is, that the difference between the subgroups was unlikely to have occurred by chance. The results of these *t*-tests are included in appendix B.

Table A.1.   Provider characteristics and subgroups used in reporting and analyses

Selected provider characteristics
Provider type
Local education agency (LEA)
Community-based organization (CBO)
Community or technical college (CC)
Public or private college or university (not a community, junior, or technical college)
Correctional institution
Faith-based organization
Library
Other
Provider size (based on enrollment)
25th percentile or below
26th to 50th percentile
51st to 75th percentile
76th percentile or above
Provider setting
Urban
Suburban/town
Rural

A.2   Analytic Methods for Comparing Estimates from 2001–02 and 2018–19

To assess changes in adult education since the last national survey was conducted, estimates from the provider survey were compared to published estimates from another nationally representative survey of federally funded providers–the 2003 Adult Education Program Survey (AEPS).[2] The AEPS estimates focused on the 2001–02 program year. The comparisons were based on a shared set of measures used in both surveys, including the following:

- Types of providers administering adult education programs
- Provider size
- Funding and expenditures

- Amount of instruction offered

- Enrollment type(s) offered for courses (open versus managed)

For example, estimates reflecting provider size–including number of sites and enrollment–and funding for the 2 years were compared. For all comparisons, two sample *t*-tests were used to determine whether differences between estimates were statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level; that is, that the difference between the subgroups was unlikely to occur by chance. The estimates for 2001-02 and 2018-19 and the results of the *t*-tests are included in appendix C. Details on how the measures were constructed and used are provided in the remainder of this appendix.

A.2.1   *Estimating types of providers*

For 2001-02, provider type was based on a 2003 AEPS survey question. In 2018-19, for most providers, it was based on provider-level NRS data obtained from states. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, it was based on provider self-reports in the current study's provider survey. Because the provider survey included more provider categories than are shown in the AEPS report, several provider survey categories were collapsed into a new "other" category (public or private college or university, faith-based organization, library, and other) to be more comparable to AEPS. The provider type measure was then used in two ways–to estimate the percentage distribution of provider types, and to produce subgroup estimates by provider type for provider size, funding amount, and enrollment type (open versus managed) comparisons, as described below.

A.2.2   *Estimating provider size*

There were two measures of provider size–number of sites where services were provided, and enrollment in ABE, ASE, and/or ESL. As with provider type, for 2001-02, number of sites and enrollment measures were based on a 2003 AEPS survey question. In 2018-19, for most providers, they were again based on provider-level NRS data obtained from states. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, they were based on provider self-reports in the provider survey. The provider size measures were used to estimate the percentage distribution and the mean and median for number of sites and enrollment, overall (mean and median) and by provider type. The provider enrollment measure was also used to estimate mean and median enrollment for ABE, ASE, and ESL programs. For 2018-19, ESL enrollment included IELCE for comparability with AEPS. While the IELCE program did not become codified into law until WIOA, enrollment in a similar type of instruction–English literacy and civics–has historically been reported under the ESL program.

A.2.3   *Estimating funding and expenditures*

Funding and expenditure measures were based on survey questions for both years compared. The funding measure was used to estimate the percentage distribution and the mean and median of total funding, overall (mean and median) and by provider type. It was also used to estimate the percentage distribution, the mean and median percentage, and the amount of total funding coming from selected sources. All 2001-02 funding estimates and standard errors expressed as dollar values were adjusted for inflation. To make the adjustments, the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index inflation calculator[3] was used to convert June 2002 values to June 2019 values.

The expenditure measure was used to estimate the mean and median percentage of total funding allocated to a shared set of expenditures included in both surveys.

A.2.4 *Estimating amount of instruction offered*

There were two measures of the amount of instruction offered–number of weeks and number of hours per week that instruction or courses were offered. These measures were based on survey questions for both years compared. The number of weeks measure was used to estimate the mean and median number of weeks instruction was offered, for each program type. For the number of hours per week measure, the mean and median percentage of courses offered for certain numbers of hours per week were estimated for each program type.

A.2.5 *Estimating enrollment type(s) offered for courses (open versus managed)*

The enrollment type measure was based on survey questions for both years compared. This measure was used to estimate the mean percentage of courses that providers offered with open or managed enrollment, overall and for each provider type. The measure was also used to estimate the percentage of providers that did not offer courses with open or managed enrollment and the percentage of providers that offered each type of enrollment for more than 80 percent of courses offered, overall and for each provider type.

APPENDIX B. ADDITIONAL REPORT TABLES

This appendix includes tables with supporting detail for the findings that are discussed in Cronen, Diffenderffer, and Medway (2023b).[4] These tables include findings on the following topics:

- Provider characteristics

- Enrollment

- Use of instructional approaches that link basic skills and occupational skills

- Use of instructional approaches that bridge to occupational skills training or postsecondary education

- Collaboration with workforce development partners

- Expenditures

- Performance data collection challenges and use

Section B.1 includes findings tables, section B.2 includes the associated standard error tables, and section B.3 includes *t*-test tables for differences based on provider characteristics.

B.1   Findings Tables

Table B.1.   Number of providers and percentage distribution of selected provider characteristics: Program year 2018-19

Selected provider characteristics	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Provider type[1]		
Local education agency (LEA)	751	45.9
Community-based organization (CBO)	264	16.1
Community or technical college (CC)	480	29.4
Public or private college or university (not a community, junior, or technical college)	25	1.5
Correctional institution	41	2.5
Faith-based organization	18	1.1
Library	23	1.4
Other	32	2.0
Provider size[2]		
25th percentile or below (0 to 151)	421	25.9
26th to 50th percentile (152 to 336)	394	24.2
51st to 75th percentile (337 to 765)	404	24.8
76th percentile or above (766+)	408	25.1
Provider setting[3]		
Urban	608	37.2
Suburban/town	785	48.0
Rural	242	14.8

[1] For most providers, this characteristic is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the provider survey conducted as part of the National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education.

[2] This characteristic is based on program year 2018-19 enrollment in adult education programs. For most providers, this characteristic is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the provider survey conducted as part of the National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education.

[3] This characteristic is based on 2019 Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments available from the National Center for Education Statistics.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample size for these estimates ranges from 1,400 to 1,407 depending on item-level missingness. Standard errors are found in table B.23. For related estimates, see table 2 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20; U.S. Department of Education, National Reporting System, 2018-19; and U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments, 2019.

Table B.2. Enrollment, percentage of overall enrollment, mean enrollment, and median enrollment, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19

Program type	Enrollment	Percentage of overall enrollment[1]	Mean enrollment[2]	Median enrollment[3]
Overall	1,207,594	100.0	742	336
Adult Basic Education (ABE)	499,423	41.4	327	162
Adult Secondary Education (ASE)	98,410	8.1	68	32
Combined English as a Second Language (ESL) and Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE)	609,762	50.5	466	164
English as a Second Language (ESL)	422,910	35.0	337	122
Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE)	186,852	15.5	337	85

[1] The number of learners reported for this program type divided by the overall number of learners reported in all program types.

[2] Mean overall enrollment represents the mean of the total number of learners reported by providers. Mean enrollment for each program type represents the mean number of learners reported for that program type among programs that reported having at least one learner enrolled in that program type.

[3] Median overall enrollment represents the median of the total number of learners reported by providers. Median enrollment for each program type represents the median number of learners reported for that program type among programs that reported having at least one learner enrolled in that program type.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. For most providers, enrollment is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the provider survey conducted as part of the National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample size for totals and percentages is 1,400. Unweighted sample sizes for means and medians are 1,399 overall; 1,316 for ABE; 1,240 for ASE; 1,093 for ESL; and 483 for IELCE. All sample sizes exclude providers with missing data for the item. Standard errors are found in table B.24. For related estimates, see table 4 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20; and U.S. Department of Education, National Reporting System, 2018-19.

Table B.3. Number and percentage of providers that reported using selected approaches to linked adult basic skills instruction and occupational skills training in any programs offered, in all programs offered, and in each program offered, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19

Selected instructional approaches	Used in any programs		Used in all programs[1]		Used in Adult Basic Education program		Used in Adult Secondary Education program		Used in English as a Second Language program[2]	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Any selected linked basic skills and occupational skills instructional approach	**1,019**	**63.8**	**500**	**33.0**	**748**	**51.7**	**679**	**52.4**	**604**	**48.4**
Basic skills instruction (e.g., reading, mathematics) taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner (i.e., integrated instruction or co/team-teaching)	676	42.3	295	19.0	481	33.3	423	32.7	373	29.9
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but NOT in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum (coordinated instruction, or two instructors that co-plan but do not co-teach)	636	39.8	251	16.1	421	29.2	376	29.1	348	27.9
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously with instruction with an occupational skills training partner that does not use a shared curriculum (i.e., concurrent enrollment)	642	40.2	250	16.2	427	29.7	431	33.4	348	27.9

[1] A provider could have offered Adult Basic Education (ABE), Adult Secondary Education (ASE), and English as a Second Language (ESL) programs, or any combination of those programs, in program year 2018-19. A provider was considered to have used the selected types of instruction in all programs if they reported using them in every program they offered.

[2] Includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education.

NOTE: Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted number of providers that offered ABE was 1,316. The unweighted number of providers that offered ASE was 1,240. The unweighted number of providers that offered ESL was 1,135. Due to missing data in survey items, not all providers offering a given type of program are included in the estimates for that program. Standard errors are found in table B.25. For related estimates, see tables 17, 19, and 21 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.4. Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of linked adult basic skills instruction and occupational skills training, by program type and selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19

Program type and selected instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half of the courses	About half of the courses	More than half of the courses
Adult Basic Education				
Basic skills instruction (e.g., reading, mathematics) taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner (i.e., integrated instruction or co/team-teaching)	66.7	19.9	4.2	9.2
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but not in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum (coordinated instruction, or two instructors that co-plan but do not co-teach)	70.8	21.2	4.1	4.0
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously with instruction with an occupational skills training partner that does not use a shared curriculum (i.e., concurrent enrollment)	70.3	22.8	3.5	3.4
Adult Secondary Education				
Basic skills instruction (e.g., reading, mathematics) taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner (i.e., integrated instruction or co/team-teaching)	67.3	19.9	5.7	7.1
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but not in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum (coordinated instruction, or two instructors that co-plan but do not co-teach)	70.9	20.7	4.7	3.7
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously with instruction with an occupational skills training partner that does not use a shared curriculum (i.e., concurrent enrollment)	66.6	25.4	4.5	3.5
English as a Second Language[1]				
Basic skills instruction (e.g., reading, mathematics) taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner (i.e., integrated instruction or co/team-teaching)	70.1	20.7	4.2	5.0
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but not in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum (coordinated instruction, or two instructors that co-plan but do not co-teach)	72.1	21.1	3.9	2.9
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously with instruction with an occupational skills training partner that does not use a shared curriculum (i.e., concurrent enrollment)	72.1	21.1	3.6	3.2

[1] Includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Estimates are restricted to providers with non-zero enrollment in Adult Basic Education (ABE), Adult Secondary Education (ASE), and English as a Second Language (ESL). Unweighted sample sizes for these estimates range from 1,241 to 1,247 for ABE, 1,113 to 1,118 for ASE, and 1,083 to 1,085 for ESL depending on item-level missingness. Standard errors are found in table B.26. For related estimates, see tables 17, 19, and 21 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.5. Number and percentage of students estimated to be enrolled in courses using linked adult basic skills instruction and occupational skills training in any programs offered, and in each program offered, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19

Selected instructional approaches	Used in any programs		Used in Adult Basic Education program		Used in Adult Secondary Education program		Used in English as a Second Language program[1]	
	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students
Any selected linked basic skills and occupational skills instructional approach	**379,352**	**31.4**	**183,880**	**36.8**	**32,408**	**32.9**	**163,064**	**38.6**
Basic skills instruction (e.g., reading, mathematics) taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner (i.e., integrated instruction or co/team-teaching)	138,477	11.5	63,067	12.6	11,584	11.8	63,826	15.1
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but NOT in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum (coordinated instruction, or two instructors that co-plan but do not co-teach)	132,929	11.0	62,433	12.5	10,634	10.8	59,862	14.2
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously with instruction with an occupational skills training partner that does not use a shared curriculum (i.e., concurrent enrollment)	144,391	12.0	74,808	15.0	13,677	13.9	55,906	13.2

[1] Includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education.

NOTE: Enrollment in courses that used a particular approach to linked instruction was estimated by multiplying the number of courses in which a provider reported using that approach by the provider's average number of students per course in a given program (Adult Basic Education [ABE], Adult Secondary Education [ASE], and English as a Second Language [ESL]). The number of courses in which a provider used a particular approach to linked instruction in each program was calculated by multiplying the number of courses offered in a program by the proportion of courses in which a provider reported using that approach in that program. The proportion of courses in which a particular approach to linked instruction was used was based on responses to survey items that used a scale of "No courses," "Less than half of the courses," "About half of the courses," and "More than half of the courses," which were converted to quartile-like values of 0 percent, 25 percent, 50 percent, and 75 percent, respectively, to enable their use in calculations. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted number of students enrolled in ABE was 501,437. The unweighted number of students enrolled in ASE was 98,503. The unweighted number of students enrolled in ESL courses was 799,955. Due to missing data in survey items, not all students enrolled in a given type of program are included in the estimates for that program. Standard errors are found in table B.27. For related estimates, see tables 4, 17, 19, and 21 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.6. Number and percentage of providers that reported using linked adult basic skills instruction and occupational skills training in any programs offered, in all programs offered, and in each program offered, by selected provider characteristics: Program year 2018-19

Selected provider characteristics	Used in any programs		Used in all programs[1]		Used in Adult Basic Education program		Used in Adult Secondary Education program		Used in English as a Second Language program[2]	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Provider type[3]										
Local education agency (LEA)	465	62.8	209	29.6	332	47.7	315	47.9	282	48.3
Community-based organization (CBO)	118	46.8	70	28.8	74	41.2	56	42.5	76	36.4
Community or technical college (CC)	351	74.2	171	38.7	277	61.0	255	62.4	210	54.7
Public or private college or university (not a community, junior, or technical college)	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Correctional institution	30	72.1	21	57.2	29	69.7	25	70.0	‡	‡
Faith-based organization	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Library	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Other	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Provider size[4]										
25th percentile or below (0 to 151)	203	50.2	107	28.4	162	47.1	122	44.7	55	27.2
26th to 50th percentile (152 to 336)	232	59.2	120	31.8	175	50.1	160	52.7	109	36.2
51st to 75th percentile (337 to 765)	266	66.8	116	30.7	195	52.5	178	51.5	180	50.1
76th percentile or above (766+)	318	78.7	156	41.1	216	56.6	220	58.4	260	67.4
Provider setting[5]										
Urban	395	66.5	200	35.4	278	53.3	259	56.5	275	53.0
Suburban/town	452	59.0	225	30.7	326	47.3	297	47.2	266	45.6
Rural	173	72.0	74	34.4	144	61.2	123	58.9	63	43.1

‡ Reporting standards not met. Either there are too few cases for a reliable estimate, or the coefficient of variation (CV) is 50 percent or greater.

[1] A provider could have offered Adult Basic Education (ABE), Adult Secondary Education (ASE), and English as a Second Language (ESL) programs, or any combination of those programs, in program year 2018-19. A provider was considered to have used the selected types of instruction in all programs if they reported using them in every program they offered.

[2] Includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education.

[3] For most providers, this characteristic is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the provider survey conducted as part of the National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education.

[4] This characteristic is based on program year 2018-19 enrollment in adult education programs. For most providers, this characteristic is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the provider survey conducted as part of the National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education.

[5] This characteristic is based on 2019 Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments available from the National Center for Education Statistics.

NOTE: Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted number of providers that offered ABE was 1,316. The unweighted number of providers that offered ASE was 1,240. The unweighted number of providers that offered ESL was 1,135. Due to missing data in survey items, not all providers offering a given type of program are included in the estimates for that program. Standard errors are found in table B.28. For related estimates, see tables 2, 17, 19, and 21 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20; U.S. Department of Education, National Reporting System, 2018-19; and U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments, 2019.

Table B.7. Number and percentage of providers that reported offering Integrated Education and Training (IET) instruction in any programs offered, in all programs offered, and in each program offered, by selected IET instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19

Selected IET instructional approaches	Used in any programs		Used in all programs[1]		Used in Adult Basic Education program		Used in Adult Secondary Education program		Used in English as a Second Language program[2]	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Any selected IET instructional approach	**783**	**49.0**	**329**	**21.3**	**533**	**36.9**	**477**	**36.8**	**445**	**35.6**
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner also included workforce preparation activities	599	37.5	241	15.6	401	27.8	371	28.8	335	26.9
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but NOT in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum also included workforce preparation activities	550	34.4	202	12.9	357	24.8	317	24.6	296	23.7

[1] A provider could have offered Adult Basic Education (ABE), Adult Secondary Education (ASE), and English as a Second Language (ESL) programs, or any combination of those programs, in program year 2018-19. A provider was considered to have used the selected types of instruction in all programs if they reported using them in every program they offered.
[2] Includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education.
NOTE: Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted number of providers that offered ABE was 1,316. The unweighted number of providers that offered ASE was 1,240. The unweighted number of providers that offered ESL was 1,135. Due to missing data in survey items, not all providers offering a given type of program are included in the estimates for that program. Standard errors are found in table B.29. For related estimates, see tables 17, 19, and 21 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.8. Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of Integrated Education and Training (IET) instruction in courses, by program type and selected IET instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19

Program type and selected IET instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half of the courses	About half of the courses	More than half of the courses
Adult Basic Education				
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner also included workforce preparation activities	72.2	14.3	4.9	8.6
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but NOT in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum also included workforce preparation activities	75.2	13.4	3.7	7.7
Adult Secondary Education				
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner also included workforce preparation activities	71.2	13.8	5.4	9.6
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but NOT in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum also included workforce preparation activities	75.4	11.9	4.3	8.4
English as a Second Language[1]				
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner also included workforce preparation activities	73.2	12.0	3.4	11.4
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but NOT in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum also included workforce preparation activities	76.3	11.4	3.2	9.1

[1] Includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Estimates for each program are restricted to providers with non-zero enrollment in that program. Unweighted sample sizes for these estimates range from 98,503 to 799,955 depending on item-level missingness. Standard errors are found in table B.30. For related estimates, see tables 17, 19, and 21 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.9. Number and percentage of students estimated to be enrolled in Integrated Education and Training (IET) courses in any programs offered and in each program offered, by selected IET instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19

Selected IET instructional approaches	In any programs		In Adult Basic Education program		In Adult Secondary Education program		In English as a Second Language program[1]	
	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students
Any selected IET instructional approach	**110,701**	**9.2**	**47,949**	**9.6**	**9,064**	**9.2**	**53,048**	**12.5**
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner also included workforce preparation activities	56,560	4.7	24,095	4.8	4,968	5.1	27,498	6.5
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but NOT in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum also included workforce preparation activities	54,141	4.5	24,185	4.8	4,207	4.3	25,749	6.1

[1] Includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education.

NOTE: Enrollment in courses that used a particular IET instructional approach was estimated by multiplying the number of courses in which a provider reported using that approach by the provider's average number of students per course in a given program (Adult Basic Education [ABE], Adult Secondary Education [ASE], and English as a Second Language [ESL]). The number of courses in which a provider used a particular IET instructional approach in each program was calculated by multiplying the number of courses offered in a program by the proportion of courses in which a provider reported using that approach in that program. The proportion of courses in which a particular approach to IET instruction was used was based on responses to survey items that used a scale of "No courses," "Less than half of the courses," "About half of the courses," and "More than half of the courses," which were converted to quartile-like values of 0 percent, 25 percent, 50 percent, and 75 percent, respectively, to enable their use in calculations. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted number of students enrolled in Adult Basic Education was 501,437. The unweighted number of students enrolled in Adult Secondary Education was 98,503. The unweighted number of students enrolled in English as a Second Language courses was 799,955. Due to missing data in survey items, not all students enrolled in a given type of program are included in the estimates for that program. Standard errors are found in table B.31. For related estimates, see tables 4, 5, 17, 19, and 21 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.10. **Number and percentage of providers that reported aspects of providing adult education and literacy services as "very challenging," by selected aspects of providing services: Program year 2018-19**

Selected aspects of providing services	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Working with local organizations to provide adult education and literacy programming	153	9.4
Working with local organizations to provide occupational skills training	450	27.7
Working with local organizations to provide transition services	241	14.8
Working with local organizations to provide support services	269	16.6
Developing or implementing Integrated Education and Training (IET)	633	39.0
Developing or implementing Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs	285	17.6
Developing or implementing programs to transition learners from adult education to postsecondary education	259	16.0
Including preparation for postsecondary education and careers in English Language Acquisition programs	310	19.1
Getting the technical assistance or professional development needed to implement changes related to new emphases or requirements in the law	277	17.1
Having instructional staff who have the time or expertise to implement changes in the law	634	39.0
Meeting federal performance accountability reporting requirements	434	26.8
Using data to make decisions about how to improve the program	98	6.1

NOTE: Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample sizes for these estimates range from 1,392 to 1,398 depending on item-level missingness. Standard errors are found in table B.32. For related estimates, see table 37 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.11. Number and percentage of providers that reported offering Integrated Education and Training instruction in any programs offered, in all programs offered, and in each program offered, by selected provider characteristics: Program year 2018-19

Selected provider characteristics	Used in any programs		Used in all programs[1]		Used in Adult Basic Education program		Used in Adult Secondary Education program		Used in English as a Second Language program[2]	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Provider type[3]										
Local education agency (LEA)	346	46.8	123	17.1	223	32.0	209	31.8	204	35.1
Community-based organization (CBO)	90	35.8	50	20.5	59	32.7	39	29.5	53	25.5
Community or technical college (CC)	278	58.9	120	26.4	204	45.0	192	47.1	160	41.8
Public or private college or university (not a community, junior, or technical college)	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Correctional institution	23	55.5	14	37.3	21	50.5	18	50.6	‡	‡
Faith-based organization	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Library	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Other	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Provider size[4]										
25th percentile or below (0 to 151)	140	34.6	72	18.5	98	28.6	77	28.2	44	21.7
26th to 50th percentile (152 to 336)	169	43.1	83	21.7	125	35.8	109	35.9	77	25.6
51st to 75th percentile (337 to 765)	207	52.1	70	18.1	139	37.6	122	35.2	126	35.3
76th percentile or above (766+)	267	66.0	104	27.1	170	44.7	170	45.2	197	51.1
Provider setting[5]										
Urban	322	54.3	142	25.0	216	41.4	193	42.1	212	40.7
Suburban/town	340	44.4	139	18.7	228	33.1	205	32.6	187	32.0
Rural	122	50.7	47	20.9	89	37.8	79	37.9	46	31.9

‡ Reporting standards not met. Either there are too few cases for a reliable estimate, or the coefficient of variation (CV) is 50 percent or greater.

[1] A provider could have offered Adult Basic Education (ABE), Adult Secondary Education (ASE), and English as a Second Language (ESL) programs, or any combination of those programs, in program year 2018-19. A provider was considered to have used the selected types of instruction in all programs if they reported using them in every program they offered.

[2] Includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education.

[3] For most providers, this characteristic is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the provider survey conducted as part of the National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education.

[4] This characteristic is based on program year 2018-19 enrollment in adult education programs. For most providers, this characteristic is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the provider survey conducted as part of the National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education.

[5] This characteristic is based on 2019 Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments available from the National Center for Education Statistics.

NOTE: Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted number of providers that offered ABE was 1,316. The unweighted number of providers that offered ASE was 1,240. The unweighted number of providers that offered ESL was 1,135. Due to missing data in survey items, not all providers offering a given type of program are included in the estimates for that program. Standard errors are found in table B.33. For related estimates, see tables 2, 5, and 13 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20; U.S. Department of Education, National Reporting System, 2018-19; and U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments, 2019.

Table B.12. Number and percentage of providers that reported using selected approaches to bridge to occupational skills training or postsecondary education in any programs offered, in all programs offered, and in each program offered, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19

Selected instructional approaches	Used in any programs		Used in all programs[1]		Used in Adult Basic Education program		Used in Adult Secondary Education program		Used in English as a Second Language program[2]	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Any selected bridge to occupational skills training or postsecondary education approach	1,356	85.0	892	61.4	1,128	78.1	1,055	81.5	892	71.4
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short-term and uses related occupational content and materials to prepare learners to transition to occupational skills training (e.g., "bootcamp")	1,080	67.7	585	39.1	813	56.7	766	59.4	663	53.2
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short-term and includes study skills and logistical information to prepare learners to transition to postsecondary education programs (e.g., academic "bridge" courses)	1,300	81.5	799	54.9	1,045	72.7	1,013	78.6	826	66.2

[1] A provider could have offered Adult Basic Education (ABE), Adult Secondary Education (ASE), and English as a Second Language (ESL) programs, or any combination of those programs, in program year 2018-19. A provider was considered to have used the selected types of instruction in all programs if they reported using them in every program they offered.

[2] Includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education.

NOTE: Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted number of providers that offered ABE was 1,316. The unweighted number of providers that offered ASE was 1,240. The unweighted number of providers that offered ESL was 1,135. Due to missing data in survey items, not all providers offering a given type of program are included in the estimates for that program. Standard errors are found in table B.34. For related estimates, see tables 17, 19, and 21 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.13. Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of selected approaches to bridge to occupational skills training or postsecondary education, by program type and selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19

Program type and selected instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half of the courses	About half of the courses	More than half of the courses
Adult Basic Education				
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short term and uses related occupational content and materials to prepare learners to transition to occupational skills training (e.g., bootcamp)	43.3	39.4	9.1	8.2
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short term and includes study skills and logistical information to prepare learners to transition to postsecondary education programs (e.g., academic bridge courses)	27.3	41.6	14.1	17.0
Adult Secondary Education				
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short term and uses related occupational content and materials to prepare learners to transition to occupational skills training (e.g., bootcamp)	40.6	36.5	10.9	12.0
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short term and includes study skills and logistical information to prepare learners to transition to postsecondary education programs (e.g., academic bridge courses)	21.4	39.0	15.5	24.1
English as a Second Language[1]				
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short term and uses related occupational content and materials to prepare learners to transition to occupational skills training (e.g., bootcamp)	46.8	32.6	9.1	11.5
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short term and includes study skills and logistical information to prepare learners to transition to postsecondary education programs (e.g., academic bridge courses)	33.8	42.1	9.3	14.7

[1] Includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education.
NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Estimates are restricted to providers with non-zero enrollment in Adult Basic Education (ABE), Adult Secondary Education (ASE), and English as a Second Language (ESL). Unweighted sample sizes for these estimates range from 1,241 to 1,247 for ABE, 1,113 to 1,118 for ASE, and 1,083 to 1,085 for ESL depending on item-level missingness. Standard errors are found in table B.35. For related estimates, see tables 17, 19, and 21 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.14. **Number and percentage of students estimated to be enrolled in courses using selected approaches to bridge to occupational skills training or postsecondary education in any programs offered, and in each program offered, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19**

Selected instructional approaches	Used in any programs		Used in Adult Basic Education program		Used in Adult Secondary Education program		Used in English as a Second Language program[1]	
	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students
Any selected bridge to occupational skills training or postsecondary education approach	469,876	38.9	217,081	43.5	50,070	50.9	202,725	47.9
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short-term and uses related occupational content and materials to prepare learners to transition to occupational skills training (e.g., "bootcamp")	213,796	17.7	96,117	19.3	22,757	23.1	94,922	22.5
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short-term and includes study skills and logistical information to prepare learners to transition to postsecondary education programs (e.g., academic "bridge" courses)	288,272	23.9	133,322	26.7	33,474	34.0	121,476	28.7

[1] Includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education.

NOTE: Enrollment in courses that used a particular type of instruction was estimated by multiplying the number of courses in which a provider offered that instruction by the provider's average number of students per course in a given program (Adult Basic Education [ABE], Adult Secondary Education [ASE], and English as a Second Language [ESL]). The number of courses in which a provider offered a particular type of instruction in each program was calculated by multiplying the number of courses offered in a program by the proportion of courses in which a provider reported using a particular type of instruction in that program. The proportion of courses in which a type of instruction was used was based on responses to survey items that used a scale of "No courses," "Less than half of the courses," "About half of the courses," and "More than half of the courses," which were converted to quartile-like values of 0 percent, 25 percent, 50 percent, and 75 percent, respectively, to enable their use in calculations. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted number of students enrolled in Adult Basic Education was 501,437. The unweighted number of students enrolled in Adult Secondary Education was 98,503. The unweighted number of students enrolled in English as a Second Language courses was 799,955. Due to missing data in survey items, not all students enrolled in a given type of program are included in the estimates for that program. Standard errors are found in table B.36. For related estimates, see tables 4, 17, 19, and 21 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.15. Number and percentage of providers that reported using bridge to occupational skills training or postsecondary education in any programs offered, in all programs offered, and in each program offered, by selected provider characteristics: Program year 2018-19

Selected provider characteristics	Used in any programs		Used in all programs[1]		Used in Adult Basic Education program		Used in Adult Secondary Education program		Used in English as a Second Language program[2]	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Provider type[3]										
Local education agency (LEA)	650	87.8	436	64.6	554	79.5	531	80.9	443	76.0
Community-based organization (CBO)	187	75.0	123	53.9	136	76.5	111	84.5	125	60.3
Community or technical college (CC)	413	87.5	262	60.4	351	77.4	334	81.9	276	71.8
Public or private college or university (not a community, junior, or technical college)	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Correctional institution	35	83.8	‡	‡	33	80.8	28	78.2	‡	‡
Faith-based organization	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Library	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Other	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Provider size[4]										
25th percentile or below (0 to 151)	326	80.8	218	61.8	265	77.2	226	83.5	129	63.2
26th to 50th percentile (152 to 336)	329	84.0	221	60.4	275	78.6	251	82.7	203	67.5
51st to 75th percentile (337 to 765)	342	86.1	215	59.9	288	77.9	270	78.3	259	72.4
76th percentile or above (766+)	359	89.2	238	63.3	301	78.7	308	82.1	300	78.1
Provider setting[5]										
Urban	501	84.9	329	60.1	406	78.1	372	81.1	372	71.8
Suburban/town	645	84.4	418	60.6	533	77.3	507	80.7	416	71.4
Rural	210	87.5	145	67.4	189	80.6	177	84.8	103	70.5

‡ Reporting standards not met. Either there are too few cases for a reliable estimate, or the coefficient of variation (CV) is 50 percent or greater.

[1] A provider could have offered Adult Basic Education (ABE), Adult Secondary Education (ASE), and English as a Second Language (ESL) programs, or any combination of those programs, in program year 2018-19. A provider was considered to have used the selected types of instruction in all programs if they reported using them in every program they offered.

[2] Includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education.

[3] For most providers, this characteristic is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the provider survey conducted as part of the National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education.

[4] This characteristic is based on program year 2018-19 enrollment in adult education programs. For most providers, this characteristic is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the provider survey conducted as part of the National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education.

[5] This characteristic is based on 2019 Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments available from the National Center for Education Statistics.

NOTE: Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted number of providers that offered ABE was 1,316. The unweighted number of providers that offered ASE was 1,240. The unweighted number of providers that offered ESL was 1,135. Due to missing data in survey items, not all providers offering a given type of program are included in the estimates for that program. Standard errors are found in table B.37. For related estimates, see tables 2, 5, 17, 19, and 21 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20; U.S. Department of Education, National Reporting System, 2018-19; and U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments, 2019.

Table B.16. Number and percentage of providers that reported working with workforce development partners to implement policies or programming, by selected services and selected workforce development partners: Program year 2018-19

Selected workforce development partners	Any selected service		Adult education and literacy instructional programming		Occupational skills training		Transition services	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Any selected workforce development partner	**1,369**	**84.0**	**1,272**	**78.2**	**1,009**	**62.2**	**1,171**	**72.2**
Local schools (including public technical schools)	803	49.3	694	43.0	369	22.9	517	32.1
Community or technical colleges	1,001	61.6	789	48.8	623	38.5	883	54.6
State or local employment, training, and vocational rehabilitation agencies (including One-Stops/American Job Centers)	930	57.1	754	46.5	580	36.0	712	44.1
Businesses or employers	582	35.8	432	26.8	387	24.0	323	20.1
Labor unions	114	7.1	72	4.5	73	4.5	71	4.4
Workforce Development Boards	706	43.4	596	36.8	461	28.6	510	31.7

NOTE: Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample sizes for these estimates range from 1,383 to 1,401 depending on item-level missingness. Standard errors are found in table B.38. For related estimates, see tables 25, 26, and 27 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.17. Total dollar expenditure amount, percentage of total program funding, mean dollar expenditure amount, mean percentage of total program funding, and percentage with non-zero expenditures reported by providers, by expenditure type: Program year 2018–19

Expenditure type	Total dollar amount	Percentage of total program funding[1]	Mean dollar amount	Mean percentage of program funding	Percentage with non-zero expenditures
Total expenditures	**1,828,519,120.23**	**100.0**	**1,122,380.98**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Administrative staff	231,442,789.83	13.5	154,250.80	16.5	88.9
Instructional staff (creation/delivery of instruction)	975,045,297.68	56.8	649,843.19	53.0	98.3
Counseling staff	64,848,159.05	3.8	43,219.67	4.4	44.2
Other staff	177,500,960.83	10.3	118,299.93	7.9	58.4
Assessment materials	26,333,516.51	1.5	17,550.63	1.8	70.6
Instructional materials/equipment	105,274,222.91	6.1	70,162.62	6.8	94.1
Support services for learners (e.g., childcare, transportation)	15,919,031.72	0.9	10,609.63	1.0	29.2
Infrastructure costs for One-Stops/American Job Centers (nonpersonnel administrative costs)	8,738,029.49	0.5	5,823.68	0.7	25.1
Shared costs for services at One-Stops/American Job Centers	3,452,686.27	0.2	2,301.13	0.4	13.1
Other expenditure	108,343,136.21	6.3	72,207.98	7.5	61.6

[1] Percentages are calculated using only providers that have non-missing data for individual expenditure types, which is a smaller set of providers than those that have non-missing data for total funding. Therefore, percentages do not exactly equal the expenditure-specific dollar amount divided by the dollar amount in the "Total expenditures" row.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding or (in the case of total dollar amounts) missing data in expenditure-specific items. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample size (excluding providers with missing data for the item) is 1,405 for total expenditures and 1,292 for expenditure types. Standard errors are found in table B.39. For related estimates, see table 9 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.18. Number and percentage of providers that reported aspects of data collection as "very challenging," by selected aspects of data collection: Program year 2018-19

Selected aspects of data collection	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Any selected aspect of data collection	**1,050**	**64.5**
Any workforce-related aspect of data collection (postsecondary or employment outcomes)[1]	880	54.1
Getting complete and accurate data on learners' barriers to employment at intake	297	18.3
Getting complete and accurate measurable skill gains data	423	26.1
Having enough information on learners to determine their postsecondary outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	442	27.2
Having enough information on learners to determine their employment outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	523	32.2
Having enough information from supplemental data sources such as surveys to determine learners' follow-up postsecondary or employment outcomes	734	45.6

[1] Includes having enough information on learners to determine their postsecondary outcomes using data matching to existing data sources; having enough information on learners to determine their employment outcomes using data matching to existing data sources; and having enough information from supplemental data sources such as surveys to determine learners' follow-up postsecondary or employment outcomes.

NOTE: Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample size for these estimates ranges from 1,385 to 1,400 depending on item-level missingness. Standard errors are found in table B.40. For related estimates, see table 34 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.19. Number of providers and percentage distribution of reported frequency of use of performance data to assess program: Program year 2018-19

Frequency of use of performance data	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
All providers	**1,627**	**100.0**
Once that year	29	1.8
Several times that year	337	20.7
Monthly	367	22.5
Several times a month	421	25.9
Daily to several times a week	462	28.4

NOTE: Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample size for these estimates is 1,400 due to item-level missingness. Standard errors are found in table B.41. For related estimates, see table 32 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.20. Number and percentage of providers that reported the use of performance data as "very important," by selected performance improvement purposes: Program year 2018–19

Selected performance improvement purposes	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Any selected performance improvement purpose	**1,299**	**79.9**
Making decisions about changes needed to curricula	1,051	64.7
Making decisions about staff retention	638	39.3
Making decisions about hiring needs	715	44.0
Making decisions about changes needed in support services	712	43.8
Determining needs for technical assistance or professional development for staff	890	54.9

NOTE: Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample size for these estimates ranges from 1,395 to 1,399 depending on item-level missingness. Standard errors are found in table B.42. For related estimates, see table 33 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.21. Percentage distribution of reported amount of funding for the occupational skills training component of any Integrated Education and Training offered by a provider or by partners, by selected funding sources: Program year 2018-19

Selected funding sources	Any from this source	None from this source	A little from this source (1-25)	Some from this source (26-50)	A lot from this source (51-75)	Almost all from this source (76-100)
Federal funding for workforce development (Title I/III)	24.0	76.0	13.2	4.6	1.8	4.4
Federal funding for adult education (Title II/Adult Education and Family Literacy Act [AEFLA])	71.5	28.5	21.3	14.1	10.9	25.2
Federal funding for vocational rehabilitation (Title IV)	6.1	93.9	4.4	1.0	0.7	#
State funding for workforce development, adult education, or vocational rehabilitation	60.7	39.3	20.6	12.8	8.9	18.4
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Employment & Training funding	7.2	92.8	6.6	0.6	#	#
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) funding for workforce development and adult education	3.7	96.3	3.0	‡	#	‡
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funding for workforce development and adult education	13.1	86.9	11.7	1.2	#	‡
Perkins Career and Technical Education funding for adult and postsecondary education	10.5	89.5	9.4	‡	0.9	#
Fees charged to learners	21.8	78.2	17.8	2.1	1.4	‡
Foundation grants	17.6	82.4	12.8	1.6	0.7	2.4
Employer contributions	6.9	93.1	4.7	1.3	#	0.9
Other source	17.9	82.1	7.2	2.3	3.5	4.9

‡ Reporting standards not met. Either there are too few cases for a reliable estimate, or the coefficient of variation (CV) is 50 percent or greater.

Rounds to zero.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Providers that reported they did not offer Integrated Education and Training in program year 2019-20 are excluded from this analysis. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample sizes for these estimates range from 421 to 455 depending on item-level missingness (except for "Other source," which has a sample size of 353). Standard errors are found in table B.43. For related estimates, see table 10 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.22. Percentage of providers that reported aspects of data collection as "very challenging," by selected aspects of data collection and selected provider characteristics: Program year 2018-19

Selected provider characteristics	Any selected aspect of data collection	Any workforce-related aspect of data collection	Getting complete and accurate data on learners' barriers to employment at intake	Getting complete and accurate measurable skill gains data	Having enough information on learners to determine their postsecondary outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	Having enough information on learners to determine their employment outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	Having enough information from supplemental data sources such as surveys to determine learners' follow-up postsecondary or employment outcomes
Provider type[1]							
Local education agency (LEA)	66.4	59.0	17.1	26.1	32.4	37.3	51.6
Community-based organization (CBO)	61.6	56.6	16.5	22.3	30.8	35.7	47.9
Community or technical college (CC)	65.8	50.5	23.2	30.1	22.3	30.5	45.9
Public or private college or university (not a community, junior, or technical college)	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Correctional institution	49.7	42.3	20.3	20.9	21.4	‡	‡
Faith-based organization	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Library	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Other	60.5	58.6	11.5	20.6	31.3	32.3	54.3
Provider size[2]							
25th percentile or below (0 to 151)	58.4	48.6	15.0	29.6	19.6	24.9	44.5
26th to 50th percentile (152 to 336)	60.5	50.7	15.6	23.8	24.5	29.5	43.3
51st to 75th percentile (337 to 765)	67.3	58.2	17.6	24.3	30.8	36.6	52.7
76th percentile or above (766+)	72.4	65.0	25.3	26.3	39.3	46.0	57.2
Provider setting[3]							
Urban	66.6	58.5	20.1	24.4	33.2	38.1	50.3
Suburban/town	64.3	55.2	19.3	26.6	28.5	32.8	49.6
Rural	61.0	50.5	12.2	29.4	19.4	32.0	46.7

‡ Reporting standards not met. Either there are too few cases for a reliable estimate, or the coefficient of variation (CV) is 50 percent or greater.

[1] For most providers, this characteristic is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the provider survey conducted as part of the National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education.

[2] This characteristic is based on program year 2018-19 enrollment in adult education programs. For most providers, this characteristic is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the provider survey conducted as part of the National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education.

[3] This characteristic is based on 2019 Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments available from the National Center for Education Statistics.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample size for these estimates ranges from 30 to 630 depending on subgroup size and item-level missingness. Standard errors are found in table B.44. For related estimates, see tables 2 and 34 in the study's compendium report (Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway, 2023a).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20; U.S. Department of Education, National Reporting System, 2018-19; and U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments, 2019.

B.2   Standard Error Tables

Table B.23. Number of providers and percentage distribution of provider characteristics: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected provider characteristics	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Provider type		
Local education agency (LEA)	6.8	0.41
Community-based organization (CBO)	5.6	0.34
Community or technical college (CC)	5.9	0.36
Public or private college or university (not a community, junior, or technical college)	1.8	0.11
Correctional institution	2.5	0.15
Faith-based organization	1.7	0.10
Library	2.1	0.13
Other	2.4	0.15
Provider size		
25th percentile or below (0 to 151)	6.2	0.38
26th to 50th percentile (152 to 336)	6.8	0.42
51st to 75th percentile (337 to 765)	6.9	0.43
76th percentile or above (766+)	6.6	0.40
Provider setting		
Urban	7.7	0.47
Suburban/town	8.1	0.49
Rural	5.7	0.35

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.1.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20; U.S. Department of Education, National Reporting System, 2018-19; and U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments, 2019.

Table B.24. Enrollment, percentage of overall enrollment, mean enrollment, and median enrollment, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Program type	Enrollment	Percentage of overall enrollment	Mean enrollment	Median enrollment
Overall	**27,918.5**	**0.00**	**17.2**	**5.0**
Adult Basic Education (ABE)	14,183.5	0.73	9.3	2.4
Adult Secondary Education (ASE)	2,207.4	0.13	1.5	0.6
Combined English as a Second Language (ESL) and Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE)	17,924.2	0.80	13.6	3.2
English as a Second Language (ESL)	11,082.1	0.75	8.7	1.8
Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE)	11,981.5	0.83	21.3	3.0

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.2.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.25. Number and percentage of providers that reported using selected approaches to linked adult basic skills instruction and occupational skills training in any programs offered, in all programs offered, and in each program offered, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected instructional approaches	Used in any programs		Used in all programs		Used in Adult Basic Education program		Used in Adult Secondary Education program		Used in English as a Second Language program	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Any selected linked basic skills and occupational skills instructional approach	**7.8**	**0.48**	**7.4**	**0.48**	**7.8**	**0.51**	**7.8**	**0.54**	**7.5**	**0.56**
Basic skills instruction (e.g., reading, mathematics) taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner (i.e., integrated instruction or co/team-teaching)	7.9	0.49	6.1	0.39	7.1	0.48	6.9	0.51	6.6	0.51
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but NOT in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum (coordinated instruction, or two instructors that co-plan but do not co-teach)	7.8	0.48	5.7	0.36	6.8	0.46	6.7	0.50	6.5	0.50
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously with instruction with an occupational skills training partner that does not use a shared curriculum (i.e., concurrent enrollment)	7.9	0.49	5.8	0.37	7.0	0.48	7.0	0.52	6.5	0.51

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.3.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.26. Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of linked adult basic skills instruction and occupational skills training, by program type and selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018–19 (standard errors)

Program type and selected instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half of the courses	About half of the courses	More than half of the courses
Adult Basic Education				
Basic skills instruction (e.g., reading, mathematics) taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner (i.e., integrated instruction or co/team-teaching)	0.48	0.41	0.21	0.30
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but not in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum (coordinated instruction, or two instructors that co-plan but do not co-teach)	0.46	0.43	0.21	0.20
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously with instruction with an occupational skills training partner that does not use a shared curriculum (i.e., concurrent enrollment)	0.48	0.45	0.19	0.19
Adult Secondary Education				
Basic skills instruction (e.g., reading, mathematics) taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner (i.e., integrated instruction or co/team-teaching)	0.51	0.43	0.26	0.29
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but not in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum (coordinated instruction, or two instructors that co-plan but do not co-teach)	0.50	0.45	0.23	0.22
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously with instruction with an occupational skills training partner that does not use a shared curriculum (i.e., concurrent enrollment)	0.52	0.49	0.23	0.20
English as a Second Language				
Basic skills instruction (e.g., reading, mathematics) taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner (i.e., integrated instruction or co/team-teaching)	0.51	0.45	0.23	0.24
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but not in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum (coordinated instruction, or two instructors that co-plan but do not co-teach)	0.50	0.46	0.22	0.19
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously with instruction with an occupational skills training partner that does not use a shared curriculum (i.e., concurrent enrollment)	0.51	0.47	0.21	0.19

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.4.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.27. Number and percentage of students estimated to be enrolled in courses using linked adult basic skills instruction and occupational skills training in any programs offered, and in each program offered, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected instructional approaches	Used in any of the programs		Used in Adult Basic Education program		Used in Adult Secondary Education program		Used in English as a Second Language program	
	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students
Any linked basic skills and occupational skills instructional approach	**15,058.4**	**1.25**	**10,026.6**	**2.01**	**1,524.4**	**1.55**	**7,574.8**	**1.79**
Basic skills instruction (e.g., reading, mathematics) taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner (i.e., integrated instruction or co/team-teaching)	4,097.3	0.34	2,117.4	0.42	454.2	0.46	2,728.1	0.65
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but NOT in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum (coordinated instruction, or two instructors that co-plan but do not co-teach)	5,262.3	0.44	2,432.5	0.49	449.9	0.46	3,250.1	0.77
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously with instruction with an occupational skills training partner that does not use a shared curriculum (i.e., concurrent enrollment)	11,055.3	0.92	8,949.2	1.79	1,204.5	1.22	3,440.2	0.81

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.5.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.28. Number and percentage of providers that reported using linked adult basic skills instruction and occupational skills training in any programs offered, in all programs offered, and in each program offered, by selected provider characteristics: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected provider characteristics	Used in any programs		Used in all programs		Used in Adult Basic Education program		Used in Adult Secondary Education program		Used in English as a Second Language program	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Provider type										
Local education agency (LEA)	6.8	0.73	5.4	0.71	6.3	0.77	6.2	0.80	5.8	0.84
Community-based organization (CBO)	4.1	1.24	3.2	1.16	3.2	1.40	2.8	1.62	3.4	1.34
Community or technical college (CC)	5.5	0.78	4.3	0.88	5.2	0.87	5.0	0.91	4.6	0.99
Public or private college or university (not a community, junior, or technical college)	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Correctional institution	2.1	2.67	1.7	3.19	2.1	2.74	1.9	2.98	†	†
Faith-based organization	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Library	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Other	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Provider size										
25th percentile or below (0 to 151)	5.2	1.03	4.0	0.96	4.7	1.12	4.3	1.25	3.0	1.26
26th to 50th percentile (152 to 336)	5.5	0.98	4.1	0.94	4.8	1.04	4.6	1.11	4.1	1.12
51st to 75th percentile (337 to 765)	5.9	0.95	4.1	0.94	5.1	1.02	5.0	1.07	5.0	1.06
76th percentile or above (766+)	6.2	0.84	4.6	1.01	5.3	1.01	5.4	1.02	5.7	0.99
Provider setting										
Urban	6.8	0.78	5.2	0.80	5.9	0.87	5.8	0.92	5.9	0.88
Suburban/town	7.2	0.71	5.6	0.68	6.4	0.75	6.2	0.79	5.9	0.82
Rural	5.0	1.19	3.4	1.32	4.7	1.30	4.3	1.40	3.1	1.65

† Not applicable.

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.6.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20; U.S. Department of Education, National Reporting System, 2018-19; and U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments, 2019.

Table B.29. Number and percentage of providers that reported offering Integrated Education and Training (IET) instruction in any programs offered, in all programs offered, and in each program offered, by selected IET instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected IET instructional approaches	Used in any programs		Used in all programs		Used in Adult Basic Education program		Used in Adult Secondary Education program		Used in English as a Second Language program	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Any selected IET instructional approach	**7.9**	**0.49**	**6.3**	**0.41**	**7.3**	**0.49**	**7.1**	**0.52**	**6.9**	**0.53**
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner also included workforce preparation activities	7.6	0.47	5.6	0.36	6.7	0.45	6.6	0.49	6.3	0.49
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but NOT in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum also included workforce preparation activities	7.4	0.46	5.2	0.33	6.5	0.44	6.2	0.47	6.0	0.47

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.7.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.30. Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of Integrated Education and Training (IET) instruction, by program type and selected IET instructional approaches: Program year 2018–19 (standard errors)

Program type and selected IET instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half of the courses	About half of the courses	More than half of the courses
Adult Basic Education				
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner also included workforce preparation activities	0.45	0.37	0.22	0.28
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but NOT in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum also included workforce preparation activities	0.44	0.36	0.19	0.28
Adult Secondary Education				
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner also included workforce preparation activities	0.49	0.38	0.25	0.31
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but NOT in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum also included workforce preparation activities	0.47	0.36	0.22	0.30
English as a Second Language				
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner also included workforce preparation activities	0.49	0.37	0.21	0.36
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but NOT in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum also included workforce preparation activities	0.47	0.36	0.19	0.32

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.8.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.31. Number and percentage of students estimated to be enrolled in Integrated Education and Training (IET) courses in any programs offered and in each program offered, by selected IET instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected IET instructional approaches	Any programs		Adult Basic Education program		Adult Secondary Education program		English as a Second Language program	
	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students
Any selected IET instructional approach	**3,715.2**	**0.31**	**1,776.1**	**0.36**	**351.8**	**0.36**	**2,438.9**	**0.58**
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner also included workforce preparation activities	1,690.6	0.14	806.8	0.16	230.0	0.23	1,190.2	0.28
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but NOT in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum also included workforce preparation activities	2,503.6	0.21	1,210.2	0.24	187.4	0.19	1,577.2	0.37

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.9.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.32. Number and percentage of providers that reported aspects of providing adult education and literacy services as "very challenging," by selected aspects of providing services: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected aspects of providing services	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Working with local organizations to provide adult education and literacy programming	4.8	0.30
Working with local organizations to provide occupational skills training	7.4	0.45
Working with local organizations to provide transition services	5.9	0.36
Working with local organizations to provide support services	6.1	0.38
Developing or implementing Integrated Education and Training (IET)	7.8	0.48
Developing or implementing Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs	6.1	0.38
Developing or implementing programs to transition learners from adult education to postsecondary education	6.0	0.37
Including preparation for postsecondary education and careers in English Language Acquisition programs	6.3	0.39
Getting the technical assistance or professional development needed to implement changes related to new emphases or requirements in the law	6.1	0.37
Having instructional staff who have the time or expertise to implement changes in the law	8.0	0.49
Meeting federal performance accountability reporting requirements	7.1	0.44
Using data to make decisions about how to improve the program	3.9	0.24

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.10.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.33. Number and percentage of providers that reported offering Integrated Education and Training instruction in any programs offered, in all programs offered, and in each program offered, by selected provider characteristics: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected provider characteristics	Used in any programs		Used in all programs		Used in Adult Basic Education program		Used in Adult Secondary Education program		Used in English as a Second Language program	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Provider type										
Local education agency (LEA)	6.4	0.75	4.3	0.58	5.5	0.72	5.4	0.74	5.2	0.81
Community-based organization (CBO)	3.6	1.17	2.8	1.02	3.0	1.36	2.4	1.51	2.8	1.18
Community or technical college (CC)	5.2	0.88	3.7	0.77	4.6	0.89	4.5	0.94	4.2	0.96
Public or private college or university (not a community, junior, or technical college)	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Correctional institution	1.8	3.01	1.4	2.99	1.7	3.02	1.6	3.26	†	†
Faith-based organization	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Library	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Other	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Provider size										
25th percentile or below (0 to 151)	4.4	0.97	3.3	0.79	3.8	1.01	3.3	1.09	2.7	1.18
26th to 50th percentile (152 to 336)	4.7	0.98	3.4	0.81	4.1	0.99	3.8	1.07	3.4	1.00
51st to 75th percentile (337 to 765)	5.3	0.99	3.2	0.76	4.3	0.98	4.2	1.01	4.3	1.01
76th percentile or above (766+)	5.8	0.97	3.8	0.89	4.8	1.02	4.8	1.02	5.0	1.03
Provider setting										
Urban	6.2	0.81	4.4	0.71	5.2	0.84	5.0	0.91	5.3	0.86
Suburban/town	6.5	0.72	4.4	0.56	5.5	0.71	5.3	0.74	5.1	0.76
Rural	4.3	1.33	2.7	1.09	3.8	1.31	3.5	1.37	2.7	1.56

† Not applicable.

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.11.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20; U.S. Department of Education, National Reporting System, 2018-19; and U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments, 2019.

Table B.34. Number and percentage of providers that reported using selected approaches to bridge to occupational skills training or postsecondary education in any programs offered, in all programs offered, and in each program offered, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018–19 (standard errors)

Selected instructional approaches	Used in any programs		Used in all programs		Used in Adult Basic Education program		Used in Adult Secondary Education program		Used in English as a Second Language program	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Any selected bridge to occupational skills training or postsecondary education approach	**6.2**	**0.37**	**8.1**	**0.51**	**7.4**	**0.44**	**7.8**	**0.44**	**7.8**	**0.52**
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short-term and uses related occupational content and materials to prepare learners to transition to occupational skills training (e.g., "bootcamp")	7.7	0.47	7.8	0.50	7.9	0.52	8.1	0.55	7.8	0.57
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short-term and includes study skills and logistical information to prepare learners to transition to postsecondary education programs (e.g., academic "bridge" courses)	6.7	0.40	8.1	0.52	7.7	0.47	7.9	0.46	7.8	0.54

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.12.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.35. Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of selected approaches to bridge to occupational skills training or postsecondary education, by program type and selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Program type and selected instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half of the courses	About half of the courses	More than half of the courses
Adult Basic Education				
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short term and uses related occupational content and materials to prepare learners to transition to occupational skills training (e.g., bootcamp)	0.52	0.51	0.30	0.29
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short term and includes study skills and logistical information to prepare learners to transition to postsecondary education programs (e.g., academic bridge courses)	0.47	0.52	0.37	0.40
Adult Secondary Education				
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short term and uses related occupational content and materials to prepare learners to transition to occupational skills training (e.g., bootcamp)	0.55	0.54	0.34	0.37
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short term and includes study skills and logistical information to prepare learners to transition to postsecondary education programs (e.g., academic bridge courses)	0.46	0.54	0.40	0.48
English as a Second Language				
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short term and uses related occupational content and materials to prepare learners to transition to occupational skills training (e.g., bootcamp)	0.57	0.54	0.31	0.37
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short term and includes study skills and logistical information to prepare learners to transition to postsecondary education programs (e.g., academic bridge courses)	0.54	0.56	0.32	0.41

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.13.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.36. Number and percentage of students estimated to be enrolled in courses using selected approaches to bridge to occupational skills training or postsecondary education in any programs offered and in each program offered, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected instructional approaches	Used in any programs		Used in Adult Basic Education program		Used in Adult Secondary Education program		Used in English as a Second Language program	
	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students	Number of students	Percentage of students
Any selected bridge to occupational skills training or postsecondary education approach	11,808.0	0.98	5,127.2	1.03	1,147.6	1.17	7,375.1	1.74
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short-term and uses related occupational content and materials to prepare learners to transition to occupational skills training (e.g., "bootcamp")	5,914.0	0.49	2,619.2	0.52	665.2	0.68	3,738.5	0.88
Basic skills instruction that is designed to be short-term and includes study skills and logistical information to prepare learners to transition to postsecondary education programs (e.g., academic "bridge" courses)	6,890.9	0.57	3,085.3	0.62	786.5	0.80	4,223.9	1.00

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.14.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.37. Number and percentage of providers that reported using bridge to occupational skills training or postsecondary education in any programs offered, in all programs offered, and in each program offered, by selected provider characteristics: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

	Used in any programs		Used in all programs		Used in Adult Basic Education program		Used in Adult Secondary Education program		Used in English as a Second Language program	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Provider type										
Local education agency (LEA)	6.9	0.53	6.7	0.77	6.9	0.65	6.8	0.66	6.5	0.74
Community-based organization (CBO)	4.8	1.11	4.1	1.29	4.2	1.22	3.8	1.21	4.1	1.35
Community or technical college (CC)	5.8	0.58	5.2	0.92	5.7	0.74	5.5	0.75	5.2	0.89
Public or private college or university (not a community, junior, or technical college)	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Correctional institution	2.2	2.38	†	†	2.2	2.54	2.0	2.73	†	†
Faith-based organization	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Library	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Other	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Provider size										
25th percentile or below (0 to 151)	5.8	0.80	5.1	1.05	5.4	0.94	5.2	0.95	4.2	1.33
26th to 50th percentile (152 to 336)	6.3	0.78	5.4	1.03	5.8	0.88	5.6	0.86	5.2	1.11
51st to 75th percentile (337 to 765)	6.4	0.72	5.3	1.04	6.0	0.88	5.9	0.92	5.8	0.95
76th percentile or above (766+)	6.4	0.64	5.5	1.01	6.1	0.85	6.1	0.81	6.0	0.88
Provider setting										
Urban	7.4	0.62	6.4	0.84	6.8	0.75	6.7	0.77	6.7	0.81
Suburban/town	7.9	0.54	7.0	0.75	7.5	0.64	7.5	0.63	7.0	0.75
Rural	5.3	0.87	4.6	1.29	5.1	1.03	5.0	1.01	3.8	1.49

† Not applicable.

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.15.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20; U.S. Department of Education, National Reporting System, 2018-19; and U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments, 2019.

Table B.38. Number and percentage of providers that reported working with workforce development partners to implement policies or programming, by selected services and selected workforce development partners: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected workforce development partners	Any selected service		Adult education and literacy instructional programming		Occupational skills training		Transition services	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Any selected workforce development partner	**5.9**	**0.36**	**6.7**	**0.41**	**7.9**	**0.49**	**7.3**	**0.45**
Local schools (including public technical schools)	8.1	0.50	8.0	0.50	6.9	0.42	7.6	0.47
Community or technical colleges	7.8	0.48	7.9	0.49	7.6	0.47	8.0	0.49
State or local employment, training, and vocational rehabilitation agencies (including One-Stops/American Job Centers)	8.1	0.50	8.1	0.50	7.8	0.48	8.1	0.50
Businesses or employers	7.8	0.48	7.2	0.45	6.9	0.43	6.5	0.41
Labor unions	4.2	0.26	3.4	0.21	3.4	0.21	3.4	0.21
Workforce Development Boards	8.0	0.49	7.8	0.48	7.4	0.46	7.6	0.47

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.16.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.39. Total dollar expenditure amount, percentage of total program funding, mean dollar expenditure amount, mean percentage of total program funding, and percentage with non-zero expenditures reported by providers, by expenditure type: Program year 2018–19 (standard errors)

Expenditure type	Total dollar amount	Percentage of total program funding	Mean dollar amount	Mean percentage of program funding	Percentage with non-zero expenditures
Total expenditures	**80,561,778.344**	**0.00**	**49,433.666**	**0.00**	**0.00**
Administrative staff	9,509,924.245	0.21	6,320.859	0.16	0.30
Instructional staff (creation/delivery of instruction)	64,423,010.949	1.17	42,896.060	0.20	0.12
Counseling staff	1,999,419.053	0.20	1,326.365	0.07	0.46
Other staff	5,772,019.078	0.45	3,835.763	0.11	0.48
Assessment materials	1,231,934.116	0.05	819.132	0.03	0.45
Instructional materials/equipment	4,279,051.916	0.16	2,842.881	0.08	0.26
Support services for learners (e.g., childcare, transportation)	720,577.228	0.06	479.481	0.04	0.45
Infrastructure costs for One-Stops/American Job Centers (nonpersonnel administrative costs)	572,014.897	0.04	380.815	0.03	0.42
Shared costs for services at One-Stops/American Job Centers	205,071.185	0.01	136.500	0.02	0.33
Other expenditure	3,379,721.871	0.34	2,243.249	0.12	0.50

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.17.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.40. Number and percentage of providers that reported aspects of data collection as "very challenging," by selected aspects of data collection: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected aspects of data collection	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Any selected aspect of data collection	**7.6**	**0.47**
Any workforce-related aspect of data collection	7.9	0.49
Getting complete and accurate data on learners' barriers to employment at intake	6.2	0.38
Getting complete and accurate measurable skill gains data	7.0	0.43
Having enough information on learners to determine their postsecondary outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	7.0	0.43
Having enough information on learners to determine their employment outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	7.4	0.45
Having enough information from supplemental data sources such as surveys to determine learners' follow-up postsecondary or employment outcomes	8.0	0.50

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.18.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.41. Number of providers and percentage distribution of reported frequency of use of performance data to assess program: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Frequency of use of performance data	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
All providers	**1.1**	**0.00**
Once that year	2.3	0.14
Several times that year	6.3	0.38
Monthly	6.8	0.42
Several times a month	7.1	0.44
Daily to several times a week	6.8	0.42

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.19.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.42. **Number and percentage of providers that reported that using performance data was "very important," by selected performance improvement purposes: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)**

Selected performance improvement purposes	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Any selected performance improvement purpose	**6.6**	**0.40**
Making decisions about changes needed to curricula	7.8	0.48
Making decisions about staff retention	7.8	0.48
Making decisions about hiring needs	7.9	0.48
Making decisions about changes needed in support services	8.1	0.50
Determining needs for technical assistance or professional development for staff	8.0	0.49

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.20.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table B.43. Percentage distribution of reported amount of funding for the occupational skills training component of any Integrated Education and Training offered by a provider or by partners, by selected funding sources: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected funding sources	Any from this source	None from this source	A little from this source (1-25)	Some from this source (26-50)	A lot from this source (51-75)	Almost all from this source (76-100)
Federal funding for workforce development (Title I/III)	0.75	0.75	0.58	0.38	0.22	0.38
Federal funding for adult education (Title II/Adult Education and Family Literacy Act [AEFLA])	0.77	0.77	0.72	0.62	0.52	0.70
Federal funding for vocational rehabilitation (Title IV)	0.45	0.45	0.39	0.18	0.14	†
State funding for workforce development, adult education, or vocational rehabilitation	0.85	0.85	0.72	0.59	0.52	†
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Employment & Training funding	0.49	0.49	0.47	0.14	†	0.00
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) funding for workforce development and adult education	0.35	0.35	0.32	†	†	†
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funding for workforce development and adult education	0.59	0.59	0.58	0.18	†	†
Perkins Career and Technical Education funding for adult and postsecondary education	0.54	0.54	0.52	†	0.17	†
Fees charged to learners	0.75	0.75	0.70	0.28	0.22	†
Foundation grants	0.68	0.68	0.60	0.24	0.15	0.29
Employer contributions	0.46	0.46	0.38	0.22	†	0.17
Other source	0.77	0.77	0.53	0.31	0.37	0.44

† Not applicable.
NOTE: Response data are found in table B.21.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20

Table B.44. Percentage of providers that reported aspects of data collection as "very challenging," by selected aspects of data collection and selected provider characteristics: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected provider characteristics	Any selected aspect of data collection	Any workforce-related aspect of data collection	Getting complete and accurate data on learners' barriers to employment at intake	Getting complete and accurate measurable skill gains data	Having enough information on learners to determine their postsecondary outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	Having enough information on learners to determine their employment outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	Having enough information from supplemental data sources such as surveys to determine learners' follow-up postsecondary or employment outcomes
Provider type							
Local education agency (LEA)	0.74	0.77	0.58	0.67	0.74	0.77	0.80
Community-based organization (CBO)	1.21	1.27	0.96	1.03	1.24	1.30	1.33
Community or technical college (CC)	0.87	0.93	0.78	0.85	0.79	0.89	0.96
Public or private college or university (not a community, junior, or technical college)	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Correctional institution	3.11	3.27	2.66	2.75	2.89	†	†
Faith-based organization	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Library	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Other	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Provider size							
25th percentile or below (0 to 151)	1.01	1.06	0.75	0.95	0.86	0.95	1.08
26th to 50th percentile (152 to 336)	1.00	1.03	0.76	0.86	0.93	1.00	1.06
51st to 75th percentile (337 to 765)	0.97	1.03	0.78	0.88	0.98	1.04	1.08
76th percentile or above (766+)	0.94	1.01	0.90	0.92	1.04	1.07	1.08
Provider setting							
Urban	0.80	0.84	0.67	0.72	0.83	0.86	0.89
Suburban/town	0.71	0.74	0.60	0.65	0.69	0.73	0.77
Rural	1.31	1.36	0.85	1.23	1.10	1.32	1.42

† Not applicable.

NOTE: Response data are found in table B.22.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20; U.S. Department of Education, National Reporting System, 2018-19; and U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments, 2019.

B.3   *T*-test Tables

Table B.45. Number and percentage of providers that reported using linked adult basic skills instruction and occupational skills training in any programs offered, by selected provider characteristics: Program year 2018-19 (*t*-tests)

Selected provider characteristics	*t* statistic
Provider type	
Local education agency (LEA) vs. community-based organization (CBO)	11.11*
LEA vs. community or technical college (CC)	10.67*
LEA vs. correctional institution	3.38*
CBO vs. CC	18.72*
CBO vs. correctional institution	8.60*
CC vs. correctional institution	0.75
Provider size	
25th percentile or below vs. 26th to 50th percentile	6.35*
25th percentile or below vs. 51st to 75th percentile	11.86*
25th percentile or below vs. 76th percentile or above	21.50*
26th to 50th percentile vs. 51st to 75th percentile	5.53*
26th to 50th percentile vs. 76th percentile or above	15.10*
51st to 75th percentile vs. 76th percentile or above	9.44*
Provider setting	
Urban vs. suburban/town	7.13*
Urban vs. rural	3.85*
Suburban/town vs. rural	9.37*

* The difference is statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20; U.S. Department of Education, National Reporting System, 2018-19; and U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments, 2019.

Table B.46. Number and percentage of providers that reported offering Integrated Education and Training instruction in any programs offered, by selected provider characteristics: Program year 2018–19 (*t*-tests)

Selected provider characteristics	*t* statistic
Provider type	
Local education agency (LEA) vs. community-based organization (CBO)	7.90 *
LEA vs. community or technical college (CC)	10.43 *
LEA vs. correctional institution	2.79 *
CBO vs. CC	15.73 *
CBO vs. correctional institution	6.08 *
CC vs. correctional institution	1.08
Provider size	
25th percentile or below vs. 26th to 50th percentile	6.19 *
25th percentile or below vs. 51st to 75th percentile	12.58 *
25th percentile or below vs. 76th percentile or above	22.86 *
26th to 50th percentile vs. 51st to 75th percentile	6.42 *
26th to 50th percentile vs. 76th percentile or above	16.58 *
51st to 75th percentile vs. 76th percentile or above	9.98 *
Provider setting	
Urban vs. suburban/town	9.11*
Urban vs. rural	2.30*
Suburban/town vs. rural	4.17*

* The difference is statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20; U.S. Department of Education, National Reporting System, 2018-19; and U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments, 2019.

Table B.47. Number and percentage of providers that reported using bridge to occupational skills training or postsecondary education in any programs offered, by selected provider characteristics: Program year 2018-19 (*t*-tests)

Selected provider characteristics	*t* statistic
Provider type	
Local education agency (LEA) vs. community-based organization (CBO)	10.40*
LEA vs. community or technical college (CC)	0.44
LEA vs. correctional institution	1.65
CBO vs. CC	9.93*
CBO vs. correctional institution	3.33*
CC vs. correctional institution	1.50
Provider size	
25th percentile or below vs. 26th to 50th percentile	2.89*
25th percentile or below vs. 51st to 75th percentile	4.93*
25th percentile or below vs. 76th percentile or above	8.14*
26th to 50th percentile vs. 51st to 75th percentile	1.97*
26th to 50th percentile vs. 76th percentile or above	5.10*
51st to 75th percentile vs. 76th percentile or above	3.20*
Provider setting	
Urban vs. suburban/town	0.63
Urban vs. rural	2.47*
Suburban/town vs. rural	3.09*

* The difference is statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20; U.S. Department of Education, National Reporting System, 2018-19; and U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Locale Assignments, 2019.

APPENDIX C. TABLES OF COMPARISONS WITH 2001-02

This appendix includes tables with comparisons of estimates from national surveys of adult education providers for program years 2001-02 and 2018-19, using a shared set of measures included in both the 2003 Adult Education Program Survey (AEPS) and the 2019 provider survey. The purpose of these comparisons is to assess changes in the local implementation of adult education in the following topic areas:

- Types of providers administering adult education programs

- Provider size

- Funding and expenditures

- Amount of instruction offered

- Enrollment type(s) offered for courses (open versus managed)

Table C.1.   Percentage distribution of provider type: Program years 2001–02 and 2018–19

Provider type[1]	2001–02	2018–19	*t* statistic
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**	†
Local education agency	53.8	45.9	1.46
Community-based organization	24.2	16.1	2.51 *
Community college	16.9	29.4	6.40 *
Correctional institution	2.4	2.5	0.30
Other	2.6	6.0	5.25 *

* The difference is statistically significant at the *p* < 0.05 level.

† Not applicable

[1] In 2001-02, provider type is based on a survey question. In 2018-19, for most providers, it is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the provider survey conducted as part of the National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample size is 1,407 in 2018-19 and is unavailable in 2001-02.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Adult Education Program Study, 2002-03 (report table 1.1); and U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table C.2. Percentage of adult education program sites administered, mean number of reported sites administered, and median number of reported sites administered, by provider type: Program years 2001-02 and 2018-19

Provider type[1]	Percentage distribution of total sites[2]			Mean number of reported sites			Median number of reported sites		
	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic
Overall	**100.0**	**100.0**	**†**	**9.7**	**6.8**	**4.77 ***	**4.2**	**4.0**	**0.18**
Local education agencies	54.2	43.0	3.09 *	8.9	6.4	2.79 *	4.2	4.0	0.19
Community-based organizations	23.8	11.6	3.66 *	10.8	5.0	4.42 *	2.9	3.0	0.31
Community colleges	16.9	35.1	8.49 *	12.0	8.0	5.45 *	8.1	6.0	6.49 *
Correctional institutions	2.4	3.4	2.18 *	6.5	8.9	2.15 *	2.2	4.0	0.93
Other	2.7	7.0	4.58 *	5.5	8.0	2.31 *	5.1	3.0	2.25 *

* The difference is statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

† Not applicable

[1] In 2001-02, provider type is based on a survey question. In 2018-19, for most providers, it is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the provider survey conducted as part of the National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education.

[2] For example, in 2001-02, 54.2 percent of sites were operated by providers that were local education agencies.

NOTE: In program year 2001-02, respondents were giving the following instructions: "Sites are defined as geographic locations." In program year 2018-19, respondents were given the following instructions: "A site is a geographic location. Please do not include virtual-only sites. If your program is a co-op or a consortium, please include all of your member sites in your responses." Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted sample size in program year 2018-19 is 1,373, and the unweighted sample size in 2001-02 is unavailable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Adult Education Program Study, 2002-03 (report table 1.1); and U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table C.3. Percentage distribution of adult education program enrollment, mean reported enrollment, and median reported enrollment, by provider type: Program years 2001-02 and 2018-19

Provider type[1]	Percentage distribution of total enrollment			Mean reported enrollment			Median reported enrollment		
	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic
Overall	100.0	100.0	†	878.0	742.5	2.17 *	318.0	336.0	0.76
Local education agencies	60.0	45.4	4.00 *	979.0	728.0	2.13 *	336.0	345.0	0.39
Community-based organizations	8.1	7.5	0.33	294.0	349.6	1.09	169.0	185.0	0.70
Community colleges	27.1	34.0	2.73 *	1,410.0	850.7	3.48 *	702.0	465.0	3.81 *
Correctional institutions	3.3	6.8	2.57 *	1,188.0	1,954.2	2.04 *	461.0	250.0	0.64
Other	1.4	6.3	5.60 *	486.0	792.7	2.27 *	306.0	304.0	0.02

* The difference is statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

† Not applicable

[1] In 2001-02, provider type is based on a survey question. In 2018-19, for most providers, it is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the provider survey conducted as part of the National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education.

NOTE: Enrollment is limited to those participants who received at least 12 hours of services. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted sample size in program year 2018-19 is 1,390, and the unweighted sample size in 2001-02 is unavailable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Adult Education Program Study, 2002-03 (report table 1.1); and U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table C.4.   Adult education program reported enrollment, by program type: Program years 2001–02 and 2018–19

Program type	Mean reported enrollment[1]			Median reported enrollment[2]		
	2001–02	2018–19	*t* statistic	2001–02	2018–19	*t* statistic
Overall	**878.0**	**742.5**	**2.17** *	**318.0**	**336.0**	**0.76**
Adult Basic Education	338.5	326.8	0.88	132.1	162.0	2.05 *
Adult Secondary Education	162.6	68.3	9.80 *	50.8	32.0	9.00 *
English as a Second Language[3]	377.0	466.3	1.86	43.0	164.0	15.72 *

* The difference is statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

† Not applicable

[1] Mean overall enrollment represents the mean of the total number of learners reported by providers. In 2018-19, mean enrollment for each program type represents the mean number of learners reported for that program type among providers that reported having at least one learner enrolled in that program type. The source for the 2001-02 estimates does not indicate how mean enrollment was calculated for each program type.

[2] Median overall enrollment represents the median of the total number of learners reported by providers. In 2018-19, median enrollment for each program type represents the median number of learners reported for that program type among programs that reported having at least one learner enrolled in that program type. The source for the 2001-02 estimates does not indicate how median enrollment was calculated for each program type.

[3] In 2018-19, English as a Second Language includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education.

NOTE: Enrollment is limited to those participants who received at least 12 hours of services. For most providers in 2018-19, enrollment is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the provider survey conducted as part of the National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. In program year 2018-19, the unweighted sample size is 1,399 overall, 1,316 for Adult Basic Education, 1,240 for Adult Secondary Education, and 1,093 for English as a Second Language. In program year 2001-02, the unweighted sample size is unavailable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Adult Education Program Study, 2002-03 (report table 1.2); and U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table C.5. Percentage distribution of total reported adult education funding across all sources, mean reported funding across all sources, and median reported funding across all sources, by provider type: Program years 2001–02 and 2018–19

Provider type[1]	Percentage distribution of total reported adult education funding across all sources[2]			Mean reported funding amount across all sources[3]			Median reported funding amount across all sources[3]		
	2001–02	2018–19	t statistic	2001–02	2018–19	t statistic	2001–02	2018–19	t statistic
Overall	**100.0**	**100.0**	**†**	**757.5**	**1,122.40**	**4.51** *	**283.3**	**478.9**	**11.53** *
Local education agencies	57.9	46.1	2.67 *	813.0	1,131.15	2.55 *	273.4	490.0	7.36 *
Community-based organizations	11.6	8.9	1.66	361.6	615.13	9.17 *	172.3	361.3	7.02 *
Community colleges	19.6	25.2	2.30 *	877.1	960.45	4.22 *	481.2	583.7	3.07 *
Correctional institutions	8.8	14.2	1.07	2,770.7	6,277.31	2.16 *	287.6	415.6	1.45
Other	2.1	5.6	4.80 *	622.2	1,038.45	3.75 *	239.2	427.6	2.47 *

* The difference is statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

† Not applicable

[1] In 2001-02, provider type is based on a survey question. In 2018-19, for most providers, it is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in Washington, D.C., Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the provider survey conducted as part of the National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education.

[2] For example, in 2001-02, 57.9 percent of adult education funding was received by providers that were local education agencies.

[3] In thousands of dollars.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Estimates for 2001-02 are inflation adjusted to 2019 dollars. Unweighted sample size is 1,405 in 2018-19 and is unavailable in 2001-02.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Adult Education Program Study, 2002-03 (report table 1.1); and U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table C.6. Mean and median reported percentage of total budget from selected funding sources, by selected funding sources: Program years 2001–02 and 2018-19

Selected funding sources	Mean reported percentage of total funding[1]			Median reported percentage of total funding[2]		
	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic
Federal government (all sources)	38.6	38.6	0.00	32.8	32.5	0.12
State government (all sources)	49.4	49.4	0.00	47.7	53.6	1.45
Local government (all sources)	8.6	5.7	4.72 *	0.1	0.0	0.47
Foundation grants	1.6	1.5	0.48	0.0	0.0	0.00
Corporate giving	0.5	0.3	1.96 *	0.0	0.0	0.00
Civic/individual donations	1.6	0.9	2.30 *	0.0	0.0	0.00
Fees charged to employers for workforce services	1.3	0.1	5.99 *	0.0	0.0	0.00
Fees charged to learners	1.4	0.7	23.33 *	0.0	0.0	0.00

* The difference is statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

[1] For example, in 2001-02, providers reported receiving, on average, 38.6 percent of their funding from federal government sources.

[2] For example, in 2001-02, the median percentage of their funding that providers reported receiving from federal government sources was 32.8 percent.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding and because categories that are not equivalent in the two surveys are excluded. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample size is 1,292 in 2018-19 and is unavailable in 2001-02.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Adult Education Program Study, 2002-03 (report table 1.3); and U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table C.7. Percentage distribution of amount of budget that providers reported came from selected funding sources, by selected funding sources: Program years 2001-02 and 2018-19

Selected funding sources	Percentage of providers that received 0 percent of total budget from this source[1]			Percent of providers that received between 1 and 50 percent of total budget from this source[1]			Percentage of providers that received more than 50 percent of total budget from this source[1]		
	2001-02	2018-19	t statistic	2001-02	2018-19	t statistic	2001-02	2018-19	t statistic
Federal government (all sources)[2]	20.5	12.1	5.16 *	46.0	57.3	8.07 *	33.1	30.7	1.7
State government (all sources)	11.1	12.7	1.63	41.9	35.2	3.78 *	46.6	52.1	3.1 *
Local government (all sources)	68.0	77.5	5.40 *	26.8	19.0	4.75 *	4.7	3.6	1.8
Foundation grants	83.2	86.9	3.00 *	16.4	12.9	2.84 *	0.1	0.2	2.3 *
Corporate giving	89.3	94.4	6.16 *	10.4	5.6	5.80 *	0.0	0.0	†
Civic/individual donations	85.1	91.5	4.78 *	14.5	8.4	4.93 *	0.2	0.1	0.8
Fees charged to employers for workforce services	94.7	97.5	5.38 *	5.0	2.5	4.80 *	0.0	0.0	†
Fees charged to learners	92.3	85.7	8.39 *	7.3	14.3	8.89 *	0.0	0.0	†

* The difference is statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

[1] For example, in 2001-02, 20.5 percent of providers reported receiving no funding from federal government sources, 46.0 percent reported receiving between 1 and 50 percent of their budget from federal government sources, and 33.1 percent reported receiving more than 50 percent of their budget from federal government sources.

[2] All providers that were included in the surveys were receiving federal funding under Title II of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, based on reports from state directors of adult education. Therefore, provider reports that they received no funding from the federal government were likely due to reporting errors.

NOTE: In 2001-02, detail does not sum to totals (100) for an unavailable reason. In 2018-19, detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample size is 1,390 in 2018-19 and is unavailable in 2001-02.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Adult Education Program Study, 2002-03 (report table 1.3); and U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table C.8. Mean and median reported percentage of budget allocated to expenditures, by selected expenditures: Program years 2001-02 and 2018-19

Selected expenditures	Mean reported percentage of total budget			Median reported percentage of total budget		
	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic
Administrative staff	14.5	16.5	3.22 *	10.2	12.0	6.26 *
Instructional staff (creation/delivery of instruction)	53.6	53.0	0.73	54.8	53.0	1.33
Counseling staff	2.4	4.4	9.44 *	0.1	0.0	0.43
Other staff	6.6	7.9	4.07 *	4.3	3.0	1.93
Instructional materials/equipment	6.8	6.8	0.00	4.9	4.5	2.82 *

* The difference is statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

NOTE: Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample size is 1,292 in 2018-19 and is unavailable in 2001-02.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Adult Education Program Study, 2002-03 (report table 1.4); and U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table C.9. Mean and median reported number of weeks instruction was offered, by program type: Program years 2001-02 and 2018-19

	Adult Basic Education			Adult Secondary Education			English as a Second Language[1]		
	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic
Mean	43.0	42.8	0.19	37.4	42.8	4.63 *	35.1	41.3	5.08 *
Median	46.2	44.0	1.47	44.1	44.0	0.50	41.8	42.0	0.10

* The difference is statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

[1] In program year 2018-19, English as a Second Language includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics programs.

NOTE: Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. In program year 2018-19, the unweighted sample size is 1,216 for Adult Basic Education, 1,095 for Adult Secondary Education, and 1,060 for English as a Second Language. In program year 2001-02, the unweighted sample size is unavailable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Adult Education Program Study, 2002-03 (report table 1.9); and U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table C.10. Mean reported percentage of courses that providers reported offering for certain numbers of hours per week, by program type: Program years 2001-02 and 2018-19

	Adult Basic Education[1]			Adult Secondary Education			English as a Second Language[2]		
	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic
3 or fewer hours	15.0	7.9	6.30 *	10.7	7.9	2.53 *	14.3	8.5	5.14 *
4 to 6 hours	31.4	34.4	2.57 *	26.2	33.2	5.14 *	33.5	41.4	4.45 *
7 to 12 hours	17.6	31.3	13.94 *	16.2	29.6	14.92 *	16.2	33.6	21.04 *
13 to 19 hours	10.3	11.9	2.47 *	9.6	12.3	4.00 *	6.0	10.0	6.98 *
20 or more hours	22.3	16.0	5.88 *	20.6	18.1	2.55 *	9.0	7.6	1.66

* The difference is statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

[1] For example, in 2018-19, providers of Adult Basic Education, on average, reported that 15.0 percent of their courses were offered for 3 or fewer hours per week.

[2] In program year 2018-19, English as a Second Language includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics programs.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia that reported offering each type of course. Estimates for each program type are limited to providers who reported that type of instruction. In 2018-19, the unweighted sample size is 1,254 for Adult Basic Education, 1,187 for Adult Secondary Education, and 1,128 for English as a Second Language. In program year 2001-02, the unweighted sample size is unavailable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Adult Education Program Study, 2002-03 (report table 1.9); and U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table C.11. Mean percentage of courses that providers reported offering with open or managed enrollment, by provider type and enrollment type: Program years 2001-02 and 2018-19

Selected provider types	Open enrollment[1]			Managed enrollment[1]		
	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic	2001-02	2018-19	*t* statistic
Overall	**78.8**	**56.2**	**23.13 ***	**20.9**	**44.4**	**23.96 ***
Local education agencies	82.2	64.6	16.22 *	17.8	36.0	16.73 *
Community-based organizations	75.4	55.8	7.38 *	23.5	45.2	7.15 *
Community colleges	71.8	42.9	12.35 *	28.3	57.7	12.55 *
Correctional institutions	84.5	80.7	0.78	15.5	19.3	0.78

* The difference is statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

[1] For example, in program year 2001-02, local education agencies reported offering open enrollment for 82.2 percent of courses, on average. They reported offering managed enrollment for 17.8 percent of courses, on average.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted sample is 1,397 in program year 2018-19 and is unavailable in 2001-02.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Adult Education Program Study, 2002-03 (report table 1.10); and U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table C.12. Percentage of providers that did not offer courses with open or managed enrollment and the percentage of providers that offered each type of enrollment for more than 80 percent of courses offered, by provider type: Program years 2001-02 and 2018-19

Selected provider types	Open enrollment						Managed enrollment					
	Method not offered			Method offered for more than 80 percent of courses			Method not offered			Method offered for more than 80 percent of courses		
	2001-02	2018-19	t statistic	2001-02	2018-19	t statistic	2001-02	2018-19	t statistic	2001-02	2018-19	t statistic
Overall	**11.5**	**22.2**	**11.80** *	**70.3**	**46.0**	**18.64** *	**59.4**	**35.9**	**18.10** *	**14.1**	**31.8**	**16.02** *
Local education agencies	8.7	14.1	5.16 *	73.1	51.0	14.61 *	59.4	39.0	11.51 *	11.0	21.8	9.13 *
Community-based organizations	16.9	29.6	4.32 *	70.5	47.8	7.41 *	62.9	40.4	5.93 *	18.6	38.2	5.42 *
Community colleges	13.5	32.1	7.89 *	60.8	33.4	9.32 *	51.9	25.3	8.30 *	18.7	45.7	10.53 *
Correctional institutions	10.7	14.9	0.90	77.3	74.4	0.50	75.9	69.5	1.16	12.0	14.9	0.59

* The difference is statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

NOTE: Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted sample size is 1,397 in program year 2018-19 and is unavailable in 2001-02.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Adult Education Program Study, 2002-03 (report table 1.10); and U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

ENDNOTES

[1] Cronen, S., Diffenderffer, A., & Medway, R. (2023a). *National study of the implementation of adult education: Compendium of survey results* (NCEE 2023-001c). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee

[2] The 2003 data were no longer available at the time this study was conducted. Therefore, all comparisons were based on the tables of estimates and standard errors included in the original AEPS report, available at https://www.ets.org/research/policy_research_reports/publications/report/2007/dcjr. Some estimates of interest (for example, total funding, total enrollment) did not have standard errors available in the report; those estimates were excluded from analyses. Other missing information from AEPS includes sample sizes for each set of estimates.

[3] Available at https://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm.

[4] Cronen, S., Diffenderffer, A., & Medway, R. (2023b). *Linking adult education to workforce development in 2018-19: Early implementation of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act at the local level* (NCEE 2023-001r). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee