

National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education: Compendium of Survey Results From 2018-19

NCEE 2023-001c
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

A Publication of the National Center for Education Evaluation at IES



U.S. Department of Education

Miguel Cardona

Secretary

Institute of Education Sciences

Mark Schneider

Director

National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance

Matthew Soldner

Commissioner

Marsha Silverberg

Associate Commissioner

Melanie Ali

Project Officer

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.

This report was prepared for the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) under Contract ED-PEP-16-A-0004-0003 by the American Institutes for Research. The content of the publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

March 2023

This report is in the public domain. Although permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, it should be cited as:

Cronen, S., Diffenderffer, A., & Medway, R. (2023). *National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education: Compendium of survey results from 2018-19* (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>

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



National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education: Compendium of Survey Results From 2018-19

March 2023

Stephanie Cronen
Anne Diffenderffer
Rebecca Medway
American Institutes for Research

Education and training beyond the high school level is increasingly required to succeed in the American workforce,¹ yet many adults in the United States face barriers to attaining that education and training. More than 26 million adults have not yet earned a high school diploma or its equivalent.² Even among those with at least a high school credential, a lack of basic skills in areas such as reading or English proficiency can create barriers to postsecondary education and high-paying jobs. Congress has sought to help individuals address these challenges—and the nation’s workforce development needs—through the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (Title II) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) of 2014.

WIOA mandates an independent national evaluation of adult education programs funded under Title II. As part of the national evaluation, the National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education Under WIOA was designed to provide implementation information on such programs, with a focus on how the priorities within WIOA appear to be shaping the services provided by adult education programs. Conducted by the U.S. Department of Education’s Institute of Education Sciences (IES), the study addresses the following research questions:

1. How—and to what extent—are the changes to adult education policies and practices promoted by WIOA being implemented?
2. Beyond the changes to adult education promoted by WIOA, in what other important ways has implementation evolved since prior to enactment of the law?
3. What challenges do state agencies and local providers currently face in administering and delivering adult education services?

The study was descriptive, and included a survey of the state directors and all of the approximately 1,600 local providers of adult education in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The study also included analyses of provider-level data obtained by states for the federal Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE) National Reporting System (NRS). This included information on the types of organizations providing adult education services and on enrollment in each type of program offered. The surveys and the NRS data focused on program year 2018-19, which is the first year in which local providers across the country were expected to operate under the requirements of WIOA.³ The study therefore represents a snapshot of early implementation under the law. It also reflects the state of the field before the COVID-19 pandemic.

The study also compared some findings from the provider survey with findings from an earlier national survey of providers, conducted in 2003. These analyses assess the extent to which adult education programs have evolved since prior to the enactment of WIOA.

This compendium presents comprehensive information from the study’s surveys and serves as a supplement to study reports such as Cronen, Diffenderffer, & Medway (2023), which provides in-depth findings on local implementation of a set of key practices under WIOA. While the study reports synthesize the data into sets of key findings, this volume provides information about the design, methods, and results of the national surveys of local adult education providers and state directors of adult education, which served as the main data sources for the implementation study. It also includes details on the existing data sources used to supplement the survey data. Chapter 1 provides information on the study methodology, including the samples and data sources used. Chapter 2 presents tables of results for each item in the surveys administered as part of the study. Chapter 3 provides the survey instruments used to collect the study data.

¹ Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce. (2018). *Three educational pathways to good jobs: High school, middle skills, and bachelor's degree*.

² U.S. Census Bureau & U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (Updated in 2020). Current Population Survey, Educational Attainment in the United States, Table 1. <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2020/demo/educational-attainment/cps-detailed-tables.html>

³ Although WIOA was passed in 2014, its requirements were phased in over multiple years. Similarly, different states awarded new grants under WIOA at different times.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. METHODOLOGY.....	11
Overview	12
The Local Provider Survey.....	12
The State Director Survey	16
Other Data Sources.....	16
Reference	18
CHAPTER 2. COMPENDIUM OF DATA TABLES	19
Overview	20
The Local Provider Survey.....	20
Program type and size	21
Funding sources, amounts, and expenditures.....	26
Amount of instruction offered.....	29
Enrollment type(s) offered for courses (open versus managed).....	32
Instructional approaches used	33
Collaboration with workforce development partners	41
Support services offered	44
Professional development and technical assistance received from the provider’s state.....	47
Performance data–frequency of use, importance, and challenges collecting.....	48
Capacity and use of waiting lists	51
Challenges in implementing adult education under WIOA.....	52
Provider survey standard error tables.....	53
The State Director Survey	81
Funding and grantmaking	81
Collaboration with workforce development partners	83
Technical assistance and professional development.....	93
Policies and procedures	96
Monitoring and evaluation	102
Overall challenges under WIOA.....	107
CHAPTER 3. SURVEY INSTRUMENTS.....	108
Overview	109
The Local Provider Survey.....	110
The State Director Survey	140
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	167
DISCLOSURE OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST	167

TABLES

Table 1.	Total number of respondents and response rates for the local provider survey, by state	13
Table 2.	Number of providers and percentage distribution of selected provider characteristics: Program year 2018-19	21
Table 3.	Mean and median number of sites at which providers reported offering services: Program year 2018-19.....	21
Table 4.	Enrollment, percentage of overall enrollment, mean enrollment, and median enrollment, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19	22
Table 5.	Enrollment in Integrated Education and Training, percentage of total enrollment in that program type, mean enrollment, and median enrollment reported by providers, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19.....	23
Table 6.	Enrollment, percentage of overall enrollment, mean enrollment, and median enrollment reported by providers, overall and by entering educational functioning level: Program year 2018-19	24
Table 7.	Enrollment in correctional institutions, percentage of overall enrollment in correctional institutions, mean enrollment, and median enrollment reported by providers, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19.....	25
Table 8.	Total dollar amount of funding, percentage of total population funding, mean dollar amount of funding, mean percentage of total program funding, and percentage with non-zero funding reported by providers, by funding source: Program year 2018-19.....	26
Table 9.	Total dollar expenditure amount, percentage of total population 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	27
Table 10.	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	28
Table 11.	Mean and median reported number of courses offered, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19.....	29
Table 12.	Mean and median number of English as a Second Language courses that providers reported included civics instruction: Program year 2018-19	29
Table 13.	Mean and median reported number of weeks instruction was offered, by program type: Program year 2018-19.....	30
Table 14.	Mean and median percentage of courses that providers reported offering for certain numbers of hours per week, by program type: Program year 2018-19	31

Table 15.	Mean and median percentage of courses that providers reported offering at selected times: Program year 2018-19.....	32
Table 16.	Mean and median percentage of courses that providers reported offering via selected types of enrollment: Program year 2018-19	32
Table 17.	Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of contextualized instructional approaches in Adult Basic Education courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19	33
Table 18.	Percentage distribution of reported extent of inclusion of workforce preparation activities in Adult Basic Education courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19.....	34
Table 19.	Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of contextualized instructional approaches in Adult Secondary Education courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19	35
Table 20.	Percentage distribution of reported extent of inclusion of workforce preparation activities in Adult Secondary Education courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19	36
Table 21.	Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of contextualized instructional approaches in English as a Second Language courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19.....	37
Table 22.	Percentage distribution of reported extent of inclusion of workforce preparation activities in English as a Second Language courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19	38
Table 23.	Number and percentage of providers that reported offering courses that include selected options for accelerating instruction for learners: Program year 2018-19.....	39
Table 24.	Mean and median percentage of courses reported to be delivered face-to-face, through blended learning, and through online/distance education, by program type and delivery type: Program year 2018-19	40
Table 25.	Percentage distribution of extent to which providers reported working with workforce development partners to provide adult education and literacy instruction programming, by selected workforce development partners: Program year 2018-19.....	41
Table 26.	Percentage distribution of extent to which providers reported working with workforce development partners to provide occupational skills training, by selected workforce development partners: Program year 2018-19	42
Table 27.	Percentage distribution of extent to which providers reported working with workforce development partners to provide transition services, by selected workforce development partners: Program year 2018-19	43

Table 28.	Number and percentage of providers that reported resources were provided to help transition learners to the next step in their education, training, or employment, by provider of resources and selected resource types: Program year 2018-19	44
Table 29.	Number and percentage of providers that reported public and private community organizations provided support services to their learners, by selected organization types: Program year 2018-19	45
Table 30.	Number and percentage of providers that reported support services were provided to their learners, by organization providing service and selected service types: Program year 2018-19	46
Table 31.	Percentage of providers that reported receiving technical assistance or professional development support from the state or state contractors/vendors, by selected topic areas: Program year 2018-19	47
Table 32.	Number of providers and percentage distribution of reported frequency of use of performance data to assess program: Program year 2018-19	48
Table 33.	Percentage distribution of reported importance of using performance data, by selected performance improvement purposes: Program year 2018-19	49
Table 34.	Percentage distribution of extent of challenge providers reported for data collection, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19	50
Table 35.	Percentage of providers that reported turning away at least one potential learner, and mean and median reported number of potential learners that were turned away by those providers because there was not enough capacity to serve them, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19	51
Table 36.	Number and percentage of providers that reported maintaining a waiting list for instructional services, by program type: Program year 2018-19	51
Table 37.	Percentage distribution of extent of challenge providers reported in providing adult education and literacy services, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19	52
Table 38.	Number of providers and percentage distribution of provider characteristics: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)	53
Table 39.	Mean and median number of sites at which providers reported offering services: Program year 2018-19 (standard error).....	53
Table 40.	Enrollment, percentage of overall enrollment, mean enrollment, and median enrollment, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	54
Table 41.	Enrollment in Integrated Education and Training, percentage of total enrollment in that program type, mean enrollment, and median enrollment reported by providers, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)	54
Table 42.	Enrollment, percentage of overall enrollment, mean enrollment, and median enrollment reported by providers, overall and by entering educational functioning level: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	55

Table 43.	Enrollment in correctional institutions, percentage of overall enrollment in correctional institutions, mean enrollment, and median enrollment reported by providers, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)	56
Table 44.	Total dollar funding amount, percentage of total population funding, mean dollar funding amount, mean percentage of total program funding, and percentage with non-zero funding reported by providers, by funding source: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)	57
Table 45.	Total dollar expenditure amount, percentage of total population 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).....	58
Table 46.	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).....	59
Table 47.	Mean and median reported number of courses offered, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)	60
Table 48.	Mean and median number of English as a Second Language courses that providers reported included civics instruction: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	60
Table 49.	Mean and median reported number of weeks instruction was offered, by program type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)	60
Table 50.	Mean and median percentage of courses that providers reported offering for certain numbers of hours per week, by program type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	61
Table 51.	Mean and median percentage of courses that providers reported offering at selected times: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)	62
Table 52.	Mean and median percentage of courses that providers reported offering via selected types of enrollment: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	62
Table 53.	Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of contextualized instructional approaches in Adult Basic Education courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	63
Table 54.	Percentage distribution of reported extent of inclusion of workforce preparation activities in Adult Basic Education courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	64
Table 55.	Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of contextualized instructional approaches in Adult Secondary Education courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	65
Table 56.	Percentage distribution of reported extent of inclusion of workforce preparation activities in Adult Secondary Education courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	66

Table 57.	Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of contextualized instructional approaches in English as a Second Language courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)	67
Table 58.	Percentage distribution of reported extent of inclusion of workforce preparation activities in English as a Second Language courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	68
Table 59.	Number and percentage of providers that reported offering courses that include selected options for accelerating instruction for learners: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)	68
Table 60.	Mean and median percentage of courses that were reported to be delivered face-to-face, through blended learning, and through online/distance education, by program type and delivery type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	69
Table 61.	Percentage distribution of extent to which providers reported working with workforce development partners to provide adult education and literacy instruction programming, by selected workforce development partners: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)	70
Table 62.	Percentage distribution of extent to which providers reported working with workforce development partners to provide occupational skills training, by selected workforce development partners: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	71
Table 63.	Percentage distribution of extent to which providers reported working with workforce development partners to provide transition services, by selected workforce development partners: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	72
Table 64.	Number and percentage of providers that reported resources were provided to help transition learners to the next step in their education, training, or employment, by provider of resources and selected resource types: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)	73
Table 65.	Number and percentage of providers that reported public and private community organizations provided support services to their learners, by selected organization types: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)	74
Table 66.	Number and percentage of providers that reported support services were provided to their learners, by organization providing service and selected service types: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	75
Table 67.	Percentage of providers that reported receiving technical assistance or professional development support from the state or state contractors/vendors, by selected topic areas: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)	76
Table 68.	Number of providers and percentage distribution of reported frequency of use of performance data to assess program: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	77
Table 69.	Percentage distribution of reported importance of using performance data, by selected performance improvement purposes: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	77

Table 70.	Percentage distribution of extent of challenge providers reported for data collection, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	78
Table 71.	Percentage of providers that reported turning away at least one potential learner, and mean and median reported number of potential learners that were turned away by those providers because there was not enough capacity to serve them, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	79
Table 72.	Number and percentage of providers that reported maintaining a waiting list for instructional services, by program type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)	79
Table 73.	Percentage distribution of extent of challenge providers reported in providing adult education and literacy services, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors).....	80
Table 74.	Frequency distribution of year states reported holding most recent funding competition for providers of adult education and literacy under Title II (AEFLA): Program year 2018-19	81
Table 75.	Frequency distribution of total number of years states reported in funding cycle for most recent funding competition: Program year 2018-19.....	81
Table 76.	Number of states that reported holding a separate funding competition for Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) offered by providers of adult education and literacy: Program year 2018-19.....	82
Table 77.	Frequency distribution of year states reported holding most recent funding competition for integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE): Program year 2018-19	82
Table 78.	Total, mean, and median dollar amount that states reported their adult education programs received from government and other sources to support Title II adult education and literacy activities and related state leadership activities: Program year 2018-19	82
Table 79.	Frequency distribution of extent to which states reported working with workforce development partners on policies, plans, or activities related to workforce development, by selected workforce development partner types: Program year 2018-19	83
Table 80.	Number of states that reported working with workforce development partners, by selected activities: Program year 2018-19.....	84
Table 81.	Frequency distribution of extent to which states reported working with state workforce development partners to establish and administer a shared workforce development system, by selected topic areas: Program year 2018-19.....	85
Table 82.	Frequency distribution of extent to which states reported working with state workforce development partners to provide adult education and literacy instructional programming, by selected topic areas: Program year 2018-19.....	86
Table 83.	Frequency distribution of extent to which states reported working with state workforce development partners to provide accessibility and support services, by selected topic areas: Program year 2018-19.....	87

Table 84.	Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in working with state workforce development partners to establish and administer a shared workforce development, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19.....	88
Table 85.	Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in working with state workforce development partners to provide adult education and literacy instructional programming, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19.....	89
Table 86.	Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in working with state workforce development partners to provide accessibility and support services, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19.....	90
Table 87.	Number of states that reported their staff worked with local workforce development partners on various activities, by selected activities: Program year 2018-19.....	91
Table 88.	Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in working with local workforce development partners, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19.....	92
Table 89.	Frequency distribution of extent to which states reported providing technical assistance or professional development for adult education providers, by selected topics: Program year 2018-19.....	93
Table 90.	Number of states that reported that particular technical assistance or professional development topics were one of their top three focus areas, by selected topics: Program Year 2018-19.....	94
Table 91.	Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in providing technical assistance or professional development to adult education providers, by selected topics: Program year 2018-19.....	95
Table 92.	Frequency distribution of extent to which states reported discussing or providing training to designated local program staff whose explicit and primary role is to advise learners on career and college planning: Program year 2018-19.....	96
Table 93.	Frequency distribution of extent to which states reported implementing a statewide policy requiring adult education providers to use particular types of programming or services, by selected types of programming or services: Program year 2018-19.....	96
Table 94.	Frequency distribution of extent to which states reported implementing a competitive funding application requiring adult education providers to use particular types of programming or services, by selected types of programming or services: Program year 2018-19.....	97
Table 95.	Frequency distribution of extent of implementation of state-level funding policies or practices that favor or facilitate adult education providers' use of particular types of programming or services, by selected types of programming and services: Program year 2018-19.....	98
Table 96.	Number of states that reported attempting to identify and/or disseminate a promising model of adult education and literacy activities: Program year 2018-19.....	98

Table 97.	Frequency distribution of extent of importance that states reported selected factors had in deciding whether a model of adult education and literacy activities was promising, by selected factors: Program year 2018-19.....	99
Table 98.	Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in identifying and/or disseminating promising models of adult education and literacy activities: Program year 2018-19	99
Table 99.	Number of states that reported identifying and/or disseminating at least one promising model of adult education and literacy activities, by selected topic areas: Program year 2018-19	100
Table 100.	Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in identifying and disseminating promising models of adult education and literacy activities, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19	101
Table 101.	Frequency distribution of how often states reported that they typically assess the performance of adult education providers: Program year 2018-19.....	102
Table 102.	Number of states that reported assessing all adult education providers on the same schedule: Program year 2018-19	102
Table 103.	Frequency distribution of extent of importance states reported for assessing the performance of individual adult education providers, by selected criteria: Program year 2018-19	103
Table 104.	Frequency distribution of extent of importance that states reported for using results from assessment of individual adult education providers' performance, by selected purposes: Program year 2018-19.....	104
Table 105.	Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in using selected criteria for assessing the performance of adult education providers, by selected criteria: Program year 2018-19	105
Table 106.	Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in meeting performance accountability reporting requirements, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19.....	106
Table 107.	Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in providing adult education and literacy services, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19	107

Chapter 1. Methodology

Overview

This chapter provides information on the methodology used to collect local provider and state director survey data, as well as information on other data sources used for the study.

The local provider and state director surveys were administered by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) under contract to the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences (IES) and funded by the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE).

The Local Provider Survey

Questionnaire development

The survey questionnaire covered the following topics: provider type and program sizes, funding sources, instructional services provided, partnerships and collaborations, technical assistance and professional development, demand and waitlists for services, and challenges under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) of 2014. Most survey items on the questionnaire were original, though some items from the 2003 Adult Education Program Survey (AEPS) were incorporated into the questionnaire to enable researchers to measure changes in adult education over the past 15 years.⁴ The questionnaire was pilot tested with nine local providers and revised based on their feedback. Both OCTAE and a technical working group of key stakeholders contributed to the development of the questionnaire. The final questionnaire is provided in chapter 3.

Target population and sampling frame

The local provider survey was a universe survey of every local provider in the 50 states and the District of Columbia that received WIOA Title II funding as a primary grantee in 2018-19 and continued to receive funding in 2019-20. The sample was restricted to providers that received funding in 2018-19 because the survey was focused on provider characteristics and practices in that year. It was further restricted to providers that received funding in 2019-20 to ensure that the provider remained operational and able to respond to the survey when it was administered between October 2019 to March 2020. The sample for the survey was limited to providers within the states and the District of Columbia to allow for comparisons with findings from the 2003 AEPS that was based on the same population, and because adult education programs in the U.S. territories differ in important ways from programs in the states and the District of Columbia.

State directors of adult education provided lists of the local providers in their state that received funding during program year 2018-19, and those lists were compiled to form a comprehensive data file of 1,680 local providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. During survey administration, 44 providers were identified as ineligible because they were subgrantees to other providers, they did not receive funding in 2018-19, or they were no longer operational. One grantee on the list was a duplicate of another. The final survey population included 1,635 local providers.

Data collection

Survey administration began in October 2019 with an email invitation to all local providers, and follow-up attempts were made by email, mail, and telephone. Providers were asked to complete one survey per WIOA Title II grant for which they were the primary grantee. Local providers were offered the option to complete the survey

⁴ The AEPS survey was developed on behalf of the U.S. Department of Education to collect data on how adult education providers implement their programs. A copy of the survey can be found in Tamassia, Lennon, Yamamoto, & Kirsch (2007). *Adult education in America: A first look at results from the Adult Education Program and Learner Surveys*. Educational Testing Service. https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/ETSLITERACY_AEPS_Report.pdf.

online or on paper. The survey ended in March 2020, concluding when the coronavirus pandemic began to affect provider operations.

Response rate

Of the 1,635 local providers that were invited to participate, 1,407 completed the survey, for an overall response rate of 86 percent.⁵ Within each state, the response rate for providers ranged from 49 percent to 100 percent (table 1).

Table 1. Total number of respondents and response rates for the local provider survey, by state

State	Total number of local providers	Number of respondents	Response rate
All providers	1,635	1,407	86
Alabama	26	23	88
Alaska	16	14	88
Arizona	23	21	91
Arkansas	36	32	89
California	196	163	83
Colorado	23	19	83
Connecticut	34	32	94
Delaware	16	16	100
District of Columbia	10	8	80
Florida	69	44	64
Georgia	31	27	87
Hawaii	2	2	100
Idaho	7	7	100
Illinois	76	70	92
Indiana	33	32	97
Iowa	15	14	93
Kansas	20	19	95
Kentucky	27	26	96
Louisiana	25	20	80
Maine	24	22	92
Maryland	26	20	77
Massachusetts	85	71	84
Michigan	86	76	88

⁵ The response rates for this survey were calculated using AAPOR RR5, as described in the American Association for Public Opinion Research Standard Definitions: <https://aapor.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Standard-Definitions20169theditionfinal.pdf>.

State	Total number of local providers	Number of respondents	Response rate
Minnesota	39	34	87
Mississippi	19	17	89
Missouri	28	27	96
Montana	11	11	100
Nebraska	9	8	89
Nevada	7	6	86
New Hampshire	30	26	87
New Jersey	17	17	100
New Mexico	24	23	96
New York	66	50	76
North Carolina	63	48	76
North Dakota	9	8	89
Ohio	47	41	87
Oklahoma	31	28	90
Oregon	16	15	94
Pennsylvania	43	43	100
Rhode Island	11	9	82
South Carolina	53	46	87
South Dakota	7	6	86
Tennessee	9	6	67
Texas	34	31	91
Utah	16	14	88
Vermont	4	4	100
Virginia	30	29	97
Washington	37	34	92
West Virginia	37	18	49
Wisconsin	23	21	91
Wyoming	9	9	100

Weighting

The survey was administered to all local adult education providers that met the study’s eligibility criteria, rather than just a sample of them. Therefore, it was not necessary to use weights to correct for an unequal likelihood of being selected to participate in the survey. However, for providers in states with a response rate less than 100 percent, a nonresponse weight was calculated to correct for differential response rates across provider subgroups of interest. This weight was created based on a statistical model that predicted each provider’s

likelihood of response. The predictors used in the model were region; provider type; enrollment by program type and educational functioning level; and federal, state, and local funding levels. The regions, provider types, program types, and educational functioning levels used in the model included:

- Regions
 - Midwest
 - Northeast
 - South
 - West
- Provider types
 - Local education agencies
 - Community-based organizations
 - Community or technical colleges
 - All other types of organizations
- Program types (used to disaggregate enrollment)
 - Adult Basic Education (ABE)
 - Integrated Education and Training (IET) as part of ABE
 - Adult Secondary Education (ASE)
 - Integrated Education and Training (IET) as part of ASE
 - English Language Acquisition/English as a Second Language (ELA/ESL)
 - Integrated Education and Training (IET) as part of ELA/ESL
 - Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE)
 - Integrated Education and Training (IET) as part of IELCE
- Educational functioning levels within program types (used to disaggregate enrollment)
 - ABE (including ABE-IET) levels 1-4
 - ASE (including ASE-IET) levels 5-6
 - ELA/ESL (including ELA/ESL-IET and combined with IELCE and IELCE-IET) levels 1-6

A predicted likelihood of response (ranging from 0 to 1) was estimated for each provider, and each provider that responded to the survey was assigned a weight equal to the inverse of this value. These values were then adjusted such that the sum of the weights over all respondents in a state would equal the number of providers in that state.

This type of weighting adjustment can reduce bias, but it can also reduce the precision of the weighted estimates by inflating the variance. A common measure for assessing the effect of weighting on variance is “the unequal weighting effect” (UWE). The UWE approximates the factor by which the variance of a weighted estimate exceeds the variance that would have been obtained by a simple random sample of the same size. For the local

provider survey, the UWE is approximately 1.04, implying that the variance of a weighted estimate is approximately 4 percent higher than the corresponding variance from a simple random sample of the same size. Therefore, the bias reduction did not come at the expense of substantially reduced statistical precision in the weighted estimates.

The State Director Survey

Questionnaire development

The questionnaire asked about the 2018-19 program year and covered the following topics: funding and grantmaking, partnerships and collaborations, technical assistance and professional development, policies and procedures, monitoring and evaluation, and overall challenges under WIOA. The survey items on the questionnaire were original. The questionnaire was pilot tested with six state directors and revised based on their feedback. Both OCTAE and a technical working group of key stakeholders contributed to the development of the questionnaire. The final questionnaire is provided in chapter 3.

Target population

The state director survey was a universe survey and was administered to every state director of adult education in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the six U.S. territories and outlying areas that received WIOA Title II funding. The data received from the U.S. territories were not included in the analyses presented in this volume.⁶

Data collection

Given the small number of state directors, administration of the state survey began later than the provider survey. This later timing was also strategic in that it avoided asking state directors to complete a survey during the timeframe when they were submitting their annual Title II performance data to the federal government. State director survey administration began in February 2020 and ended in October 2020, with a pause from mid-March to mid-July to allow state staff to focus on adapting to provide services during the coronavirus pandemic. State directors were contacted by mail, email, and phone. The survey was administered online.

Response rate

All state directors in the 50 states and the District of Columbia completed the survey, for a response rate of 100 percent.⁷ Directors from two of the six territories or outlying areas completed the survey, for a response rate of 33 percent. Overall, 93 percent of the 57 directors who were invited to participate responded to the survey.

Weighting

Weighting was not required because the state director survey was administered to the universe of state directors and the response rate was 100 percent for the cases that were included in the report analyses (the 50 states and the District of Columbia).

Other Data Sources

Three additional data sources were used to supplement the survey data: Education Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program, National Reporting System for Adult Education Data, and Adult Education Program Survey data. Including these sources allowed the study team to reduce the respondent burden by using

⁶ Data from the U.S. territories are excluded from the national estimates because adult education programs in the U.S. territories differ in important ways from programs in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. For example, their funding and service delivery approaches and the types of interagency relationships that are possible tend to differ from those in the states. Responses to the state director survey received from U.S. territories are available in a restricted-use data file that interested parties can access to analyze and summarize program activities.

⁷ The response rates for this survey were calculated using AAPOR RR5, as described in the American Association for Public Opinion Research Standard Definitions: <https://aapor.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Standard-Definitions20169theditionfinal.pdf>.

existing administrative data rather than collecting information from survey respondents. These data also allowed the study team to further disaggregate findings by provider characteristics and compare estimates from the provider survey to estimates from an earlier survey of local providers.

Education Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE) ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) locale assignments

To report provider-level findings disaggregated by provider setting, the study team created a locale indicator for each provider using ZCTA data released in 2019 by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics.⁸ These data categorize ZIP codes into city, suburban, town, and rural locales. The study team used each provider's ZIP code to determine locale and then collapsed the locale indicators into three categories: urban (city), suburban/town, and rural.

National Reporting System for Adult Education data

In addition to providing lists of their local providers with contact information, state directors in the 50 states and the District of Columbia were asked to submit provider-level performance accountability reporting data from the U.S. Department of Education's National Reporting System (NRS).⁹ These data included

- type of provider,
- enrollment by program type for program year (PY) 2018-19,
- enrollment by educational functioning level for PY 2018-19,
- Integrated Education and Training (IET) enrollment for PY 2018-19, and
- funding amount by government source (federal, state, and local) for PY 2018-19.

The adult education directors for the District of Columbia, Florida, and Kansas could not commit to providing these data in advance of the local provider survey; therefore, the questionnaire sent to providers in those states included additional questions to obtain the information listed above. Those three state directors were then asked to submit as much NRS data as feasible for the providers in their state that did not respond to the provider survey. All other state directors submitted NRS data for all of their providers.

Adult Education Program Survey data

The Adult Education Program Survey (AEPS) was a nationally representative survey of 1,770 adult education programs in the United States. The survey was administered in 2002 and 2003 and collected information for the 2001-02 program year. The AEPS achieved an unweighted response rate of 71 percent. The survey was designed to collect descriptive information from providers, such as provider type and size, and funding and expenditures (Tamassia, Lennon, Yamamoto, & Kirsch, 2007).¹⁰ Survey items from AEPS were included in the current study's provider survey for the purpose of assessing changes in the local implementation of adult education in the following topic areas:

- Types of providers administering adult education programs
- Provider size

⁸ The ZCTA locale assignments can be found here: <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/edge/Geographic/ZCTAAssignments>.

⁹ The NRS is a Department of Education data system that is authorized by WIOA and serves as an accountability system for federally funded adult education programs. More information about the NRS can be found here: <https://nrsweb.org/>.

¹⁰ A copy of the survey can be found in Tamassia, Lennon, Yamamoto, & Kirsch (2007). *Adult education in America: A first look at results from the Adult Education Program and Learner Surveys*. Educational Testing Service. https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/ETSLITERACY_AEPS_Report.pdf.

- Funding and expenditures
- Amount of instruction offered
- Enrollment type(s) offered for courses (open versus managed)

Reference

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 2023-001r). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee>

Chapter 2. Compendium of Data Tables

Overview

This chapter summarizes data from the surveys of local adult education providers and state directors of adult education in the 50 states and the District of Columbia administered in 2019-20.

The Local Provider Survey

This section includes descriptive tables based on data from the local provider survey, supplemented with provider type and enrollment data from NRS. These tables are organized into the following topics:

- Program type and size
- Funding sources, amounts, and expenditures
- Amount of instruction offered
- Enrollment type(s) offered for courses (open versus managed)
- Instructional approaches used
- Collaboration with workforce development partners
- Support services offered
- Professional development and technical assistance received from the provider's state
- Performance data—frequency of use, importance, and challenges collecting
- Capacity and use of waiting lists
- Challenges in implementing adult education under WIOA

The descriptive tables are followed by tables of their standard errors.

Program type and size

Table 2. Number of providers and percentage distribution of selected provider characteristics: Program year 2018-19

Selected provider characteristics	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Provider type¹		
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 ²	32	2.0

¹ For most providers, this characteristic is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in the District of Columbia, 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 Other provider types may include other types of agencies and institutions, such as public housing authorities or medical institutions or other providers of adult education services.

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 38.

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.

Table 3. Mean and median number of sites at which providers reported offering services: Program year 2018-19

	Mean number of sites	Median number of sites
Number of sites	7	4

NOTE: 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.” Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted sample size is 1,373. Standard errors are found in table 39.

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

Table 4. 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
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, this characteristic is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in the District of Columbia, 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. The sum of enrollment by program type differs from the sum of enrollment by educational functioning levels in table 6 due to inconsistent reporting by providers. 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 40.

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.

Table 5. Enrollment in Integrated Education and Training, percentage of total enrollment in that program type, mean enrollment, and median enrollment reported by providers, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19

Program type	Enrollment in Integrated Education and Training	Percentage of total enrollment in that program type ¹	Mean enrollment ²	Median enrollment ³
Overall	59,892	5.0	90	30
As part of an Adult Basic Education program	23,045	4.6	50	13
As part of an Adult Secondary Education program	6,764	6.9	19	6
As part of an English as a Second Language program	4,900	1.2	23	4
As part of an Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education program	24,075	12.9	69	20

¹ The number of learners enrolled in the Integrated Education and Training (IET) program reported for this program type divided by the total number of learners reported for this program type.

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

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

NOTE: For most providers, this is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in the District of Columbia, Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the local provider survey. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Means and medians exclude zeroes. 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 592 overall; 424 for Adult Basic Education; 330 for Adult Secondary Education; 190 for English as a Second Language; and 304 for Integrated Literacy and Civics Education. All sample sizes exclude providers with missing data for the item. Standard errors are found in table 41.

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.

Table 6. Enrollment, percentage of overall enrollment, mean enrollment, and median enrollment reported by providers, overall and by entering educational functioning level: Program year 2018-19

Entering educational functioning level	Enrollment	Percentage of overall enrollment ¹	Mean enrollment ²	Median enrollment ³
Overall	1,195,686	100.0	740	333
Adult Basic Education				
ABE level 1	31,085	2.6	25	8
ABE level 2	129,354	10.8	88	34
ABE level 3	173,814	14.5	116	56
ABE level 4	168,214	14.1	112	57
Adult Secondary Education				
ABE level 5	61,269	5.1	43	19
ABE level 6	35,116	2.9	27	11
English as a Second Language				
ESL level 1	71,874	6.0	63	18
ESL level 2	79,633	6.7	67	22
ESL level 3	109,817	9.2	90	30
ESL level 4	138,189	11.6	113	32
ESL level 5	113,433	9.5	93	26
ESL level 6	83,887	7.0	77	18

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: For most providers, this is based on National Reporting System data. For providers in the District of Columbia, Florida, and Kansas, it is based on provider self-reports in the local provider survey. Respondents were given the following instructions: "Please provide an unduplicated count of all learners (learners who have completed at least 12 contact hours). If you did not have any learners at a particular functioning level, please enter '0' for that level." Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. The sum of enrollment by program type in table 4 differs from the sum of enrollment by educational functioning levels due to inconsistent reporting by providers. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample size for totals and percentages is 1,390. Unweighted sample sizes for means and medians are 1,389 overall; from 1,079 to 1,296 for Adult Basic Education; from 1,101 to 1,240 for Adult Secondary Education; and from 939 to 1,063 for English as a Second Language. All sample sizes exclude providers with missing data for the item. Standard errors are found in table 42.

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.

Table 7. Enrollment in correctional institutions, percentage of overall enrollment in correctional institutions, mean enrollment, and median enrollment reported by providers, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19

Program type	Enrollment in correctional institutions	Percentage of overall enrollment in correctional institutions ¹	Mean enrollment ²	Median enrollment ³
Overall	247,781	100.0	437	135
Adult Basic Education	165,605	66.8	302	97
Adult Secondary Education	40,477	16.3	81	23
English as a Second Language (including Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education programs)	41,700	16.8	218	60

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: Respondents were given the following instructions: “‘Correctional institutions’ include juvenile justice confinement facilities, prisons, jails, and detention centers.” Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Means and medians exclude zeroes. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample size for totals and percentages is 494. Unweighted sample sizes for means and medians are 494 overall; 478 for Adult Basic Education; 430 for Adult Secondary Education; and 165 for English as a Second Language. All sample sizes exclude providers with missing data for the items or to which the items did not apply. Standard errors are found in table 43.

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

Funding sources, amounts, and expenditures

Table 8. Total dollar amount of funding, percentage of total population funding, mean dollar amount of funding, mean percentage of total program funding, and percentage with non-zero funding reported by providers, by funding source: Program year 2018-19

Funding source	Total dollar amount	Percentage of total population funding ¹	Mean dollar amount	Mean percentage of program funding	Percentage with non-zero funding
Total funding	1,828,519,120.23	100.0	1,122,380.98	100.0	100.0
Federal government (all sources) ²	512,996,406.62	28.3	318,499.75	38.6	87.9
State government (all sources)	1,109,462,549.70	61.1	688,822.64	49.4	87.4
Local government (all sources)	102,595,984.72	5.7	63,697.90	5.7	23.1
Foundation grants	15,425,386.64	0.8	9,577.03	1.5	14.6
Corporate giving	3,414,126.69	0.2	2,119.70	0.3	6.4
Civic/individual donations	10,051,900.96	0.6	6,240.84	0.9	10.8
Fees charged to employers for workforce services	1,168,561.88	0.1	725.52	0.1	3.0
Fees charged to learners	18,135,547.52	1.0	11,259.66	0.7	16.3
Other source	42,002,508.74	2.3	26,077.74	2.8	16.4

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.

² The provider survey was only administered to providers receiving federal funding in the 2018-19 program year, as reported by their states. Therefore, provider reports that they received no funding from the federal government were likely due to reporting error.

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “Please include funding for integrated education and training (IET), if applicable.” 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 44.

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

Table 9. Total dollar expenditure amount, percentage of total population 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 population 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., child care, 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 is 1,405 for total expenditures and 1,292 for expenditure types. Standard errors are found in table 45.

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

Table 10. 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 2018-19 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 46.

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

Amount of instruction offered

Table 11. Mean and median reported number of courses offered, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19

Program type	Mean number of courses ¹	Median number of courses ²
Overall	85	28
Adult Basic Education	34	9
Adult Secondary Education	27	8
English as a Second Language ³	41	12

¹ Mean overall number of courses represents the mean of the total number of courses reported by providers. Mean number of courses for each program type represents the mean number of courses reported for that program type among programs that reported having at least one learner enrolled in that program type.

² Median overall number of courses represents the median of the total number of courses reported by providers. Median number of courses for each program type represents the median number of courses reported for that program type among programs that reported having at least one learner enrolled in that program type.

³ Includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education.

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “If your courses include learners from several program types (e.g., ABE and ASE students are in the same class), please enter an unduplicated number of courses in the program type that best captures the levels of the students enrolled. Please count courses as you would for administrative purposes. For example, if you enroll for courses one time per year you may only count them once, whereas if you enroll for courses each term you may count courses by the number of terms in which they are offered.” Means and medians exclude zeroes and exclude providers with no enrollment in the specified program type. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample size is 1,361 overall; 1,239 for Adult Basic Education; 1,112 for Adult Secondary Education; and 1,077 for English as a Second Language. All sample sizes exclude providers with missing data for the item. Standard errors are found in table 47.

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

Table 12. Mean and median number of English as a Second Language courses that providers reported included civics instruction: Program year 2018-19

	Mean number of courses	Median number of courses
Number of courses	24	6

NOTE: Includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted sample size is 1,121. Means and medians include reported zeros. Standard errors are found in table 48.

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

Table 13. Mean and median reported number of weeks instruction was offered, by program type: Program year 2018-19

Program type	Mean number of weeks ¹	Median number of weeks ²
Adult Basic Education (ABE)	43	44
Adult Secondary Education (ASE)	43	44
English as a Second Language (ESL) ³	41	42
Integrated Education and Training (IET)	51	40
IET as part of an ABE program	33	36
IET as part of an ASE program	32	36
IET as part of an ESL program	29	30

¹ Mean number of weeks of instruction for each program type represents the mean number of courses reported for that program type among programs that reported having at least one learner enrolled in that program type.

² Median overall number of weeks of instruction represents the median of the sum of the number of weeks of instruction reported by providers across all program types. Median number of weeks of instruction for each program type represents the median number of weeks of instruction reported for that program type among programs that reported having at least one learner enrolled in that program type.

³ Includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education.

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “Please enter the number of weeks for each type. If this type of instruction is not offered, enter a zero. If this type of instruction is offered for an entire year, enter 52. Please enter the number of weeks separately for each type of instruction offered as part of an IET program.” Means and medians exclude zeroes and exclude providers with no enrollment in the specified program type. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample size is 1,353 overall; 1,216 for ABE; 1,095 ASE; 1,060 for ESL; 474 for IET; 268 for IET as part of ABE; 211 for IET as part of ASE; and 306 for IET as part of ESL. All sample sizes exclude providers with missing data for the item. Standard errors are found in table 49.

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

Table 14. Mean and median percentage of courses that providers reported offering for certain numbers of hours per week, by program type: Program year 2018-19

Number of hours per week	Mean percentage of courses	Median percentage of courses
Adult Basic Education		
3 or fewer hours	7.9	#
4 to 6 hours	34.4	20.0
7 to 12 hours	31.3	15.0
13 to 19 hours	11.9	#
20 or more hours	16.0	#
Adult Secondary Education		
3 or fewer hours	7.9	#
4 to 6 hours	33.2	16.0
7 to 12 hours	29.6	10.0
13 to 19 hours	12.3	#
20 or more hours	18.1	#
English as a Second Language		
3 or fewer hours	8.5	#
4 to 6 hours	41.4	25.0
7 to 12 hours	33.6	15.0
13 to 19 hours	10.0	#
20 or more hours	7.6	#

Rounds to zero.

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “For example, if three-quarters of your ABE courses meet 3 days per week for two hours each day (or 6 hours per week), you would write 75% in the 4-6 hours row; and, if the remaining one-quarter of your ABE courses provide individual tutoring for two days per week for one hour per day (or 2 hours per week), you would write 25% in the 3 or fewer hours rows.” The hours per week for ESL includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE). 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 in program year 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. Means and medians include reported zeros. Low median estimates are due to the high number of reported zeros. Standard errors are found in table 50.

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

Table 15. Mean and median percentage of courses that providers reported offering at selected times: Program year 2018-19

Selected times	Mean percentage of courses	Median percentage of courses
During the work day	59.7	60.0
In the evenings	34.1	32.0
On weekends	1.5	#
At a time of the learner's choosing, not including tutoring (e.g., entirely through distance learning)	4.6	#
Other	0.4	#

Rounds to zero.

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: "Please enter percentages in each row. If none, enter a zero." Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted sample size is 1,402. Means and medians include reported zeros. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Low median estimates are due to the high number of reported zeros. Standard errors are found in table 51.

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

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

Table 16. Mean and median percentage of courses that providers reported offering via selected types of enrollment: Program year 2018-19

Selected types of enrollment	Mean percentage of courses	Median percentage of courses
Open enrollment (open entry/open exit)	56.2	75.0
Managed enrollment (courses with distinct start and end dates)	44.4	29.0

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: "Please enter percentages in each row. If none, enter a zero." Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted sample size ranges from 1,395 to 1,397 due to item-level missingness. Means and medians include reported zeros. Detail may not sum to totals because of item-level missingness. Standard errors are found in table 52.

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

Instructional approaches used

Table 17. Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of contextualized instructional approaches in Adult Basic Education courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19

Selected instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
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)	66.5	19.8	4.2	9.5
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but NOT in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum (coordinated instruction, or two instructors that co-plan but do not co-teach)	70.8	21.0	4.3	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	22.7	3.6	3.5
Basic skills instruction that uses occupational topics as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses literature on health occupations)	20.5	40.1	17.8	21.7
Basic skills instruction that uses academic subjects as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses science texts)	8.2	20.4	21.2	50.2
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”)	43.4	39.2	9.1	8.3
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	41.5	14.1	17.1
Workforce preparation activities (e.g., related to critical thinking, digital literacy, employability skills)	6.1	28.0	18.6	47.3
Career exploration or awareness activities (e.g., visits to worksites)	17.5	38.1	16.7	27.8
Other approach	86.7	6.9	1.5	4.9

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “Please include courses in your estimate that use each of the following approaches as a component of a course, or are used in combination with other approaches below, or are used as the main instructional approach for a course.” 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 Adult Basic Education (ABE) courses in program year 2018-19. The unweighted sample sizes range from 1,259 to 1,265, except for “Other,” which has an unweighted sample size of 868. Standard errors are found in table 53.

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

Table 18. Percentage distribution of reported extent of inclusion of workforce preparation activities in Adult Basic Education courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19

Selected instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
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) that includes workforce preparation activities	18.2	42.2	14.1	25.5
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously but NOT in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner that uses a shared curriculum (coordinated instruction, or two instructors that co-plan but do not co-teach) and that includes workforce preparation activities	16.9	44.6	12.5	25.9

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “The term ‘workforce preparation activities’ means activities, programs, or services designed to help an individual acquire a combination of basic academic skills, critical thinking skills, digital literacy skills, and employability skills. This includes competencies in utilizing resources, using information, working with others, understanding systems, and obtaining skills necessary for successful transition into and completion of postsecondary education or training, or employment.” 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 selected instructional approaches in Adult Basic Education (ABE) courses in program year 2018-19. The unweighted sample sizes range from 388 to 443. Standard errors are found in table 54.

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

Table 19. Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of contextualized instructional approaches in Adult Secondary Education courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19

Selected instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
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)	67.6	19.5	5.6	7.3
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)	71.0	20.5	4.6	3.9
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously with instruction with an occupational skills training partner that does not use a shared curriculum (i.e., concurrent enrollment)	67.1	24.8	4.6	3.5
Basic skills instruction that uses occupational topics as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses literature on health occupations)	21.3	36.2	19.4	23.1
Basic skills instruction that uses academic subjects as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses science texts)	7.9	19.0	20.5	52.6
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”)	40.9	36.4	10.8	11.9
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)	21.7	38.6	15.7	23.9
Workforce preparation activities (e.g., related to critical thinking, digital literacy, employability skills)	7.1	27.2	17.1	48.6
Career exploration or awareness activities (e.g., visits to worksites)	19.2	33.8	15.8	31.2
Other approach	87.2	5.8	1.1	5.9

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “Include courses in your estimate that use each of the following approaches as a component of a course, or are used in combination with other approaches below, or are used as the main instructional approach for a course.” 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 Adult Secondary Education (ASE) courses in program year 2018-19. The unweighted sample sizes range from 1,165 to 1,172, except for “Other,” which had an unweighted sample size of 820. Standard errors are found in table 55.

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

Table 20. Percentage distribution of reported extent of inclusion of workforce preparation activities in Adult Secondary Education courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19

Selected instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
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) that includes workforce preparation activities	14.4	41.7	15.9	28.0
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) and that includes workforce preparation activities	18.0	39.8	14.4	27.8

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “The term ‘workforce preparation activities’ means activities, programs, or services designed to help an individual acquire a combination of basic academic skills, critical thinking skills, digital literacy skills, and employability skills. This includes competencies in utilizing resources, using information, working with others, understanding systems, and obtaining skills necessary for successful transition into and completion of postsecondary education or training, or employment.” 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 selected instructional approaches in Adult Secondary Education (ASE) courses in program year 2018-19. The unweighted sample sizes range from 361 to 400. Standard errors are found in table 56.
 SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table 21. Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of contextualized instructional approaches in English as a Second Language courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19

Selected instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
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	20.5	4.1	5.3
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)	72.2	21.1	3.8	3.0
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously with instruction with an occupational skills training partner that does not use a shared curriculum (i.e., concurrent enrollment)	72.1	21.0	3.5	3.4
Basic skills instruction that uses occupational topics as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses literature on health occupations)	19.3	32.0	17.1	31.5
Basic skills instruction that uses academic subjects as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses science texts)	18.8	28.5	17.3	35.4
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”)	47.3	32.3	9.1	11.3
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)	34.1	42.0	9.4	14.5
Workforce preparation activities (e.g., related to critical thinking, digital literacy, employability skills)	8.1	25.6	15.8	50.6
Career exploration or awareness activities (e.g., visits to worksites)	21.9	34.0	13.9	30.3
Other approach	87.9	5.5	1.1	5.5

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “Include courses in your estimate that use each of the following approaches as a component of a course, or are used in combination with other approaches below, or are used as the main instructional approach for a course.” 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 English as a Second Language (ESL) courses, including Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) courses, in program year 2018-19. The unweighted sample sizes range from 1,115 to 1,120, except for “Other,” which has an unweighted sample size of 771. Standard errors are found in table 57.

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

Table 22. Percentage distribution of reported extent of inclusion of workforce preparation activities in English as a Second Language courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19

Selected instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
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) that includes workforce preparation activities	13.3	39.2	10.5	37.0
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) and that includes workforce preparation activities	19.0	38.8	11.0	31.2

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “The term ‘workforce preparation activities’ means activities, programs, or services designed to help an individual acquire a combination of basic academic skills, critical thinking skills, digital literacy skills, and employability skills. This includes competencies in utilizing resources, using information, working with others, understanding systems, and obtaining skills necessary for successful transition into and completion of postsecondary education or training, or employment.” Details 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 selected instructional approaches in English as a Second Language (ESL) courses, including Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) courses, in program year 2018-19. The unweighted sample sizes range from 326 to 350. Standard errors are found in table 58.

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

Table 23. Number and percentage of providers that reported offering courses that include selected options for accelerating instruction for learners: Program year 2018-19

Selected options for accelerating instruction	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Compressed schedules compared to similar program offerings (e.g., increasing the number of learning hours in a week and reducing the number of instructional weeks)	620	38.1
Dual enrollment opportunities that allow learners to earn postsecondary credits or credentials as part of their adult education program	725	44.5
Competency-based learning (e.g., learners advance by demonstrating knowledge or skills rather than through seat time) delivered face-to-face or through blended or hybrid instruction	985	60.6
Competency-based learning (e.g., learners advance by demonstrating knowledge or skills rather than through seat time) delivered through distance learning only	585	36.1
Other option	104	9.8

NOTE: Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample sizes for these estimates range from 1,397 to 1,400 depending on item-level missingness (except for “Other,” which has a sample size of 919). Standard errors are found in table 59.

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

Table 24. Mean and median percentage of courses reported to be delivered face-to-face, through blended learning, and through online/distance education, by program type and delivery type: Program year 2018-19

Delivery type	All programs		Adult Basic Education		Adult Secondary Education		English as a Second Language	
	Mean percentage of courses	Median percentage of courses	Mean percentage of courses	Median percentage of courses	Mean percentage of courses	Median percentage of courses	Mean percentage of courses	Median percentage of courses
Face-to-face only	77.7	90.0	77.2	90.0	72.4	86.0	84.2	99.0
Blended learning/hybrid instruction	18.8	6.2	19.5	5.0	22.6	10.0	14.9	#
Online/distance only	3.8	#	3.6	#	5.5	#	1.2	#

Rounds to zero.

NOTE: Means and medians exclude providers with no enrollment in the specified program type. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Unweighted sample sizes range from 1,354 to 1,361 for all programs; 1,238 to 1,251 for Adult Basic Education; 1,116 to 1,125 for Adult Secondary Education; and 1,076 to 1,088 for English as a Second Language. All sample sizes exclude providers with missing data for the item. Standard errors are found in table 60.

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

Collaboration with workforce development partners

Table 25. Percentage distribution of extent to which providers reported working with workforce development partners to provide adult education and literacy instruction programming, by selected workforce development partners: Program year 2018-19

Selected workforce development partners	Not at all	Discussed programming	Drafted policies or plans for providing programming	Implemented programming or related policies
Local schools (including public technical schools)	20.0	30.5	6.6	43.0
Community or technical colleges	11.7	28.8	10.6	48.8
State or local employment, training, and vocational rehabilitation agencies (including One-Stops/American Job Centers)	7.7	29.2	16.6	46.5
Literacy councils/organizations	34.6	31.5	7.8	26.1
Businesses or employers	21.4	42.6	9.2	26.8
Labor unions	80.0	13.1	2.5	4.5
Workforce development boards	17.7	29.1	16.4	36.8
Public libraries	32.7	34.1	6.3	27.0
Correctional facilities	50.9	12.8	4.8	31.5
Reentry organizations	53.3	23.3	5.7	17.8
Other partner	87.7	3.0	1.0	8.4

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “In each row, please select the one response that indicates the highest level of collaboration with the organization.” Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Unweighted sample sizes for these estimates range from 1,387 to 1,399 depending on item-level missingness (except for “Other,” which has a sample size of 914). Standard errors are found in table 61.

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

Table 26. Percentage distribution of extent to which providers reported working with workforce development partners to provide occupational skills training, by selected workforce development partners: Program year 2018-19

Selected workforce development partners	Not at all	Discussed programming	Drafted policies or plans for providing programming	Implemented programming or related policies
Local schools (including public technical schools)	42.4	29.4	5.3	22.9
Community or technical colleges	21.1	30.6	9.8	38.5
State or local employment, training, and vocational rehabilitation agencies (including One-Stops/American Job Centers)	20.4	32.7	11.0	36.0
Literacy councils/organizations	55.8	27.0	4.2	13.0
Businesses or employers	31.2	37.7	7.1	24.0
Labor unions	81.8	11.7	2.0	4.5
Workforce development boards	27.9	32.3	11.3	28.6
Public libraries	59.5	25.8	3.7	11.0
Correctional facilities	63.7	15.5	3.8	17.0
Reentry organizations	66.1	19.6	3.3	11.0
Other partner	93.1	2.2	0.7	4.0

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “In each row, please select the one response that indicates the highest level of collaboration with the organization.” Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. For specific workforce development partners, 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 sizes for these estimates range from 1,384 to 1,396 depending on item-level missingness (except for “Other,” which has a sample size of 933). Standard errors are found in table 62.

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

Table 27. Percentage distribution of extent to which providers reported working with workforce development partners to provide transition services, by selected workforce development partners: Program year 2018-19

Selected workforce development partners	Not at all	Discussed programming	Drafted policies or plans for providing programming	Implemented programming or related policies
Local schools (including public technical schools)	34.0	27.5	6.4	32.1
Community or technical colleges	10.9	24.4	10.1	54.6
State or local employment, training, and vocational rehabilitation agencies (including One-Stops/American Job Centers)	14.9	28.9	12.0	44.1
Literacy councils/organizations	53.6	26.5	4.4	15.4
Businesses or employers	36.7	37.0	6.2	20.1
Labor unions	83.4	11.1	1.0	4.4
Workforce development boards	26.7	31.2	10.4	31.7
Public libraries	58.6	25.9	2.8	12.7
Correctional facilities	59.6	17.5	4.1	18.8
Reentry organizations	61.3	21.1	3.9	13.8
Other partner	92.9	2.6	0.4	4.1

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “Transition services are services that promote movement from adult education courses to post-adult education activities, including postsecondary education, occupational skills training, integrated employment, and continuing and adult education. In each row, please select the one response that indicates the highest level of collaboration with the organization.” Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample sizes for these estimates range from 1,383 to 1,396 depending on item-level missingness (except for “Other,” which has a sample size of 937). Standard errors are found in table 63.

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

Support services offered

Table 28. Number and percentage of providers that reported resources were provided to help transition learners to the next step in their education, training, or employment, by provider of resources and selected resource types: Program year 2018-19

Selected resource types	Provided by provider		Provided by partner		Provided by either provider or partner	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Formal referrals to other education or training providers	1,448	88.5	570	35.1	1,541	94.3
Foreign transcript review to apply education credits earned in other countries	433	26.6	410	25.3	784	48.2
Help identifying or accessing financial supports for education	1,222	75.0	761	46.8	1,513	92.7
Facilitating the postsecondary admissions or registration process	1,216	74.6	733	45.1	1,506	92.2
Support developing study skills	1,502	92.0	297	18.3	1,550	94.8
Career exploration activities or counseling (e.g., interest assessments, career fairs)	1,455	89.1	655	40.3	1,569	96.0
Help developing individualized career plans	1,365	83.7	561	34.5	1,516	92.8
Support developing employability skills (e.g., communication training, working in teams, problem solving)	1,484	90.8	521	32.1	1,558	95.3
Work-based learning opportunities (e.g., internships, pre-apprenticeships)	536	32.9	756	46.4	1,085	66.5
Job search assistance	1,168	71.6	869	53.3	1,529	93.5
Job placement assistance	702	43.1	1,000	61.4	1,397	85.5
Support for advancing in current employment (e.g., obtaining needed certifications and skills for higher-paying positions)	1,079	66.3	740	45.3	1,395	85.3
Other resource	104	6.4	24	1.5	115	7.1

NOTE: Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample sizes for these estimates range from 1,394 to 1,407 depending on item-level missingness. Standard errors are found in table 64.

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

Table 29. Number and percentage of providers that reported public and private community organizations provided support services to their learners, by selected organization types: Program year 2018-19

Selected organization types	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Local schools (including public technical schools)	822	50.9
Community or technical colleges	1,121	69.2
State or local employment, training, and vocational rehabilitation agencies (including One-Stops/American Job Centers)	1,343	82.9
Literacy councils/organizations	700	43.4
Businesses or employers	771	47.7
Labor unions	142	8.8
Workforce development boards	936	57.7
Public libraries	794	49.1
Correctional facilities	542	33.6
Reentry organizations	545	33.8
Other organization	139	13.4

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “Support services are services such as childcare, transportation, psychological counseling, housing placement assistance.” Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample sizes for these estimates range from 1,386 to 1,399 depending on item-level missingness (except for “Other,” which has a sample size of 891). Standard errors are found in table 65.

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

Table 30. Number and percentage of providers that reported support services were provided to their learners, by organization providing service and selected service types: Program year 2018-19

Selected service types	Provided by provider		Provided by partner		Provided by either provider or partner	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Child care	340	20.9	743	45.7	1,002	61.5
Health services	150	9.2	829	50.8	941	57.6
Housing search/placement	298	18.3	924	56.7	1,096	67.1
Psychological counseling or other mental health services	298	18.4	952	58.3	1,141	69.9
Transportation	542	33.4	860	52.8	1,183	72.5
Translator services	662	40.7	482	29.7	972	59.7
Legal services	104	6.4	616	37.9	695	42.7
Help obtaining public assistance	616	37.9	1,020	62.5	1,330	81.4
Disability screening	391	24.1	858	52.7	1,096	67.2
Support groups	265	16.3	759	46.7	900	55.3
Mentoring	792	48.7	618	38.0	1,109	68.1
Other service	50	3.1	30	1.8	70	4.3

NOTE: Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample sizes for these estimates range from 1,393 to 1,406 depending on item-level missingness. Standard errors are found in table 66.

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

Professional development and technical assistance received from the provider's state

Table 31. Percentage of providers that reported receiving technical assistance or professional development support from the state or state contractors/vendors, by selected topic areas: Program year 2018-19

Selected topic areas	Received support	Did not receive and did not need support	Did not receive support but would have liked to
Aligning curricula and instruction to state-adopted academic standards for adult education	80.3	12.4	7.3
Incorporating the essential components of reading instruction	67.4	22.0	10.6
Becoming an effective One-Stop/American Job Center partner to provide adult learners with access to employment, education, and training services	56.2	24.3	19.5
Developing or implementing workforce preparation activities	68.8	16.3	14.9
Developing or implementing Integrated Education and Training	60.6	21.7	17.7
Developing or implementing Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education programs	48.9	36.4	14.7
Developing or implementing programs and partnerships to transition learners from adult education to postsecondary education	64.5	19.0	16.6
Expanding the focus of English as a Second Language programs to include preparation for postsecondary education and careers (e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways)	54.0	28.1	17.8
Developing or implementing distance, blended, or hybrid learning courses	56.3	25.5	18.3
Using technology for noninstructional purposes (e.g., for recruitment, screening, assessment)	53.7	25.3	20.9
Developing materials, tools, or services to help adult learners progress on a career path (e.g., through career navigators, transition advisors)	64.7	16.9	18.4
Meeting federal performance accountability reporting requirements	84.1	8.8	7.1
Other topic area	26.6	53.0	20.4

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: "If your program received support at any point throughout the year on a topic (e.g., online courses or guidelines available on the web), select 'We received support.' If your program received support before July 1, 2018 but not during July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, please select 'We did not receive and did not need support' or 'We did not receive support but would have liked to.'" 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 sizes for these estimates range from 1,388 to 1,396 depending on item-level missingness (except for "Other," which has a sample size of 824). Standard errors are found in table 67.

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

Performance data—frequency of use, importance, and challenges collecting

Table 32. 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
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 68.

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

Table 33. Percentage distribution of reported importance of using performance data, by selected performance improvement purposes: Program year 2018-19

Selected performance improvement purposes	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important
Making decisions about changes needed to curricula	2.5	10.2	22.6	64.7
Making decisions about staff retention	13.5	21.5	25.7	39.3
Making decisions about hiring needs	11.0	18.9	26.1	44.0
Making decisions about changes needed in support services	6.2	18.4	31.6	43.8
Determining needs for technical assistance or professional development for staff	3.3	12.1	29.7	54.9
Reporting program performance to local partners, including the local workforce development board	8.6	18.6	27.0	45.9
Marketing or publicizing programs to potential partners, funders, or learners	5.9	17.7	31.1	45.4
Other performance improvement purpose	80.2	1.4	2.4	16.0

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “Performance data here is used to refer to program enrollment and outcomes reported for federal accountability.” 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 sizes for these estimates range from 1,391 to 1,398 depending on item-level missingness (except for “Other,” which has a sample size of 648). Standard errors are found in table 69.

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

Table 34. Percentage distribution of extent of challenge providers reported for data collection, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19

Selected challenges	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging	Not applicable
Getting complete and accurate data on learners’ barriers to employment at intake (e.g., displaced homemaker, ex-offender status, etc.)	19.9	28.2	32.2	18.3	1.4
Getting complete and accurate measurable skill gains data (e.g., obtaining high post-testing rates)	19.2	24.7	29.6	26.1	0.5
Having enough information on learners (e.g., date of birth, SSN) to determine their postsecondary outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	20.2	25.5	21.6	27.2	5.6
Having enough information on learners (e.g., date of birth, SSN) to determine their employment outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	15.0	23.8	21.9	32.2	7.1
Having enough information from supplemental data sources such as surveys to determine learners’ follow-up postsecondary or employment outcomes	7.0	16.0	23.7	45.6	7.7
Other aspect of data collection	30.7	1.2	3.2	7.0	57.9

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “By ‘challenging’ we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.” 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 sizes for these estimates range from 1,385 to 1,399 depending on item-level missingness (except for “Other,” which has a sample size of 649). Standard errors are found in table 70.

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

Capacity and use of waiting lists

Table 35. Percentage of providers that reported turning away at least one potential learner, and mean and median reported number of potential learners that were turned away by those providers because there was not enough capacity to serve them, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19

Program type	Percentage of providers that turned away at least one potential learner	Mean number of potential learners that were turned away ¹	Median number of potential learners that were turned away ²
Overall	26.6	172	57
Adult Basic Education	12.2	86	25
Adult Secondary Education	9.7	65	25
English as a Second Language ³	29.2	130	50

¹ Mean overall number of potential learners represents the mean of the total number of potential learners reported by providers. Mean number of potential learners for each program type represents the mean number of potential learners reported for that program type among programs that reported having at least one learner enrolled in that program type.

² Median overall number of potential learners represents the median of the total number of potential learners reported by providers. Median number of potential learners for each program type represents the median number of courses reported for that program type among programs that reported having at least one learner enrolled in that program type.

³ Includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education programs.

NOTE: Means and medians exclude zeroes and exclude providers with no enrollment in the specified program type. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample size for percentages is 1,389 overall; 1,301 for Adult Basic Education; 1,223 for Adult Secondary Education; and 1,126 for English as a Second Language. Unweighted sample size for means and medians is 372 overall; 160 for Adult Basic Education; 120 for Adult Secondary Education; and 327 for English as a Second Language. All sample sizes exclude providers with missing data for the item. Standard errors are found in table 71.

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

Table 36. Number and percentage of providers that reported maintaining a waiting list for instructional services, by program type: Program year 2018-19

Program type	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
At least one program	576	35.6
Adult Basic Education	280	18.5
Adult Secondary Education	235	16.5
English as a Second Language ¹	489	37.6
Other program type	75	9.0

¹ Includes Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education programs.

NOTE: Estimates for Adult Basic Education, Adult Secondary Education, and English as a Second Language are restricted to providers with non-zero enrollment in the specified program. Estimates are based on providers in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unweighted sample sizes are 1,391 for “At least one program”; 1,302 for Adult Basic Education; 1,227 for Adult Secondary Education; 1,129 for English as a Second Language; and 716 for “Other.” All sample sizes exclude providers with missing data for the item. Standard errors are found in table 72.

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

Challenges in implementing adult education under WIOA

Table 37. Percentage distribution of extent of challenge providers reported in providing adult education and literacy services, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19

Selected challenges	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging	Not applicable
Working with local organizations to provide adult education and literacy programming	30.8	29.7	24.1	9.4	5.9
Working with local organizations to provide occupational skills training	12.8	20.0	28.3	27.7	11.1
Working with local organizations to provide transition services	19.1	28.4	30.7	14.8	7.0
Working with local organizations to provide support services	20.7	29.7	29.3	16.6	3.7
Developing or implementing Integrated Education and Training	5.3	12.2	21.5	39.0	21.9
Developing or implementing Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE; Sec. 243) programs	12.9	17.0	16.1	17.6	36.5
Developing or implementing programs to transition learners from adult education to postsecondary education	18.3	30.5	31.1	16.0	4.2
Including preparation for postsecondary education and careers in English as a Second Language programs	12.6	23.4	25.5	19.1	19.3
Getting the technical assistance or professional development needed to implement changes related to new emphases or requirements in the law	24.2	27.1	27.2	17.1	4.4
Having instructional staff who have the time or expertise to implement changes in the law (e.g., IET or IELCE [Sec. 243])	8.0	17.1	27.0	39.0	8.7
Meeting federal performance accountability reporting requirements	13.9	26.2	31.5	26.8	1.5
Using data to make decisions about how to improve the program	32.3	38.6	22.5	6.1	0.5
Other aspect of providing adult education and literacy services	19.2	1.6	1.6	6.7	70.9

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “By ‘challenging’ we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.” 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 sizes for these estimates range from 1,392 to 1,398 depending on item-level missingness (except for “Other,” which has a sample size of 645). Standard errors are found in table 73.

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

Provider survey standard error tables

Table 38. 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

NOTE: Response data are found in table 2.

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

Table 39. Mean and median number of sites at which providers reported offering services: Program year 2018-19 (standard error)

	Mean number of sites	Median number of sites
Number of sites	0.1	0.3

NOTE: Response data are found in table 3.

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

Table 40. 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
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 4.

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

Table 41. Enrollment in Integrated Education and Training, percentage of total enrollment in that program type, mean enrollment, and median enrollment reported by providers, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Program type	Enrollment in Integrated Education and Training	Percentage of total enrollment in that program type	Mean enrollment	Median enrollment
Overall	2,285.5	0.19	3.3	0.8
As part of an Adult Basic Education program	942.7	0.21	2.0	0.5
As part of an Adult Secondary Education program	317.6	0.33	0.8	0.0
As part of an English as a Second Language program	512.0	0.12	2.3	0.3
As part of an Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education program	1,676.3	1.00	4.6	1.0

NOTE: Response data are found in table 5.

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.

Table 42. Enrollment, percentage of overall enrollment, mean enrollment, and median enrollment reported by providers, overall and by entering educational functioning level: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Entering educational functioning level	Enrollment	Percentage of overall enrollment	Mean enrollment	Median enrollment
Overall	27,822.7	0.00	17.2	4.9
Adult Basic Education (ABE)				
ABE level 1	1,981.5	0.14	1.6	0.0
ABE level 2	3,526.8	0.21	2.4	0.5
ABE level 3	4,070.6	0.21	2.7	0.5
ABE level 4	5,391.5	0.28	3.6	1.0
Adult Secondary Education (ASE)				
ABE level 5	1,386.3	0.09	1.0	0.3
ABE level 6	861.0	0.05	0.7	0.3
English as a Second Language (ESL)				
ESL level 1	2,187.7	0.16	1.9	0.3
ESL level 2	2,566.6	0.16	2.1	0.5
ESL level 3	3,189.8	0.16	2.6	1.0
ESL level 4	5,015.6	0.26	4.1	0.8
ESL level 5	3,842.0	0.19	3.1	0.5
ESL level 6	3,324.1	0.19	3.1	0.3

NOTE: Response data are found in table 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.

Table 43. Enrollment in correctional institutions, percentage of overall enrollment in correctional institutions, mean enrollment, and median enrollment reported by providers, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Program type	Enrollment in correctional institutions	Percentage of overall enrollment in correctional institutions	Mean enrollment	Median enrollment
Overall	15,073.1	0.00	25.8	4.8
Adult Basic Education	12,568.7	1.48	22.5	4.1
Adult Secondary Education	2,871.6	0.78	5.6	1.3
English as a Second Language (including Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education programs)	2,474.4	1.21	11.4	5.6

NOTE: Response data are found in table 7.

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

Table 44. Total dollar funding amount, percentage of total population funding, mean dollar funding amount, mean percentage of total program funding, and percentage with non-zero funding reported by providers, by funding source: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Funding source	Total dollar amount	Percentage of total population funding	Mean dollar amount	Mean percentage of program funding	Percentage with non-zero funding
Total funding	80,561,778.344	0.00	49,433.666	0.00	0.00
Federal government (all sources)	12,615,971.344	1.06	7,813.075	0.27	0.31
State government (all sources)	74,282,026.919	1.49	46,109.547	0.29	0.32
Local government (all sources)	4,332,913.020	0.33	2,689.096	0.13	0.38
Foundation grants	706,690.731	0.05	438.760	0.06	0.35
Corporate giving	245,958.476	0.02	152.686	0.02	0.24
Civic/individual donations	743,951.478	0.05	461.906	0.05	0.31
Fees charged to employers for workforce services	81,135.082	0.01	50.372	0.01	0.17
Fees charged to learners	1,612,707.775	0.10	1,000.921	0.03	0.34
Other source	3,021,683.748	0.19	1,876.028	0.09	0.36

NOTE: Response data are found in table 8.

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

Table 45. Total dollar expenditure amount, percentage of total population 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 population 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., child care, 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 9.

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

Table 46. 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. Estimate either rounds to zero or cannot be reported because reporting standards are not met.

NOTE: Response data are found in table 10.

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

Table 47. Mean and median reported number of courses offered, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Program type	Mean number of courses	Median number of courses
Overall	1.8	0.5
Adult Basic Education	0.8	0.3
Adult Secondary Education	0.7	0.3
English as a Second Language ³	1.1	0.3

NOTE: Response data are found in table 11.

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

Table 48. Mean and median number of English as a Second Language courses that providers reported included civics instruction: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

	Mean number of courses	Median number of courses
Number of courses	0.8	0.3

NOTE: Response data are found in table 12.

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

Table 49. Mean and median reported number of weeks instruction was offered, by program type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Program type	Mean number of weeks	Median number of weeks
Adult Basic Education (ABE)	0.1	0.0
Adult Secondary Education (ASE)	0.1	0.0
English as a Second Language (ESL) ³	0.1	0.0
Integrated Education and Training (IET)	0.6	0.5
IET as part of an ABE program	0.3	0.0
IET as part of an ASE program	0.4	0.5
IET as part of an ESL program ³	0.3	0.2

NOTE: Response data are found in table 13.

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

Table 50. Mean and median percentage of courses that providers reported offering for certain numbers of hours per week, by program type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Number of hours per week	Mean percentage of courses	Median percentage of courses
Adult Basic Education		
3 or fewer hours	0.22	†
4 to 6 hours	0.37	1.27
7 to 12 hours	0.38	1.27
13 to 19 hours	0.28	†
20 or more hours	0.35	†
Adult Secondary Education		
3 or fewer hours	0.23	†
4 to 6 hours	0.39	1.27
7 to 12 hours	0.39	1.27
13 to 19 hours	0.29	†
20 or more hours	0.38	†
English as a Second Language		
3 or fewer hours	0.26	†
4 to 6 hours	0.45	1.02
7 to 12 hours	0.43	2.04
13 to 19 hours	0.28	†
20 or more hours	0.28	†

† Not applicable. Estimate rounds to zero.

NOTE: Response data are found in table 14.

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

Table 51. Mean and median percentage of courses that providers reported offering at selected times: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected times	Mean percentage of courses	Median percentage of courses
During the work day	0.23	0.76
In the evenings	0.22	0.51
On weekends	0.05	†
At a time of the learner's choosing, not including tutoring (e.g., entirely through distance learning)	0.11	†
Other	0.04	†

† Not applicable. Estimate rounds to zero.

NOTE: Response data are found in table 15.

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

Table 52. Mean and median percentage of courses that providers reported offering via selected types of enrollment: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected types of enrollment	Mean percentage of courses	Median percentage of courses
Open enrollment (open entry/open exit)	0.38	1.27
Managed enrollment (courses with distinct start and end dates)	0.39	1.27

NOTE: Response data are found in table 16.

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

Table 53. Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of contextualized instructional approaches in Adult Basic Education courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
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	0.40	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	0.42	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	0.44	0.19	0.19
Basic skills instruction that uses occupational topics as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses literature on health occupations)	0.42	0.52	0.39	0.43
Basic skills instruction that uses academic subjects as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses science texts)	0.29	0.42	0.43	0.53
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”)	0.51	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	0.51	0.37	0.40
Workforce preparation activities (e.g., related to critical thinking, digital literacy, employability skills)	0.26	0.47	0.41	0.52
Career exploration or awareness activities (e.g., visits to worksites)	0.40	0.51	0.39	0.47
Other approach	0.44	0.32	0.16	0.28

NOTE: Response data are found in table 17.

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

Table 54. Percentage distribution of reported extent of inclusion of workforce preparation activities in Adult Basic Education courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
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) that includes workforce preparation activities	0.71	0.87	0.59	0.75
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) and that includes workforce preparation activities	0.72	0.95	0.60	0.83

NOTE: Response data are found in table 18.

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

Table 55. Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of contextualized instructional approaches in Adult Secondary Education courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
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)	0.50	0.42	0.25	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 (coordinated instruction, or two instructors that co-plan but do not co-teach)	0.48	0.44	0.22	0.21
Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously with instruction with an occupational skills training partner that does not use a shared curriculum (i.e., concurrent enrollment)	0.50	0.47	0.22	0.20
Basic skills instruction that uses occupational topics as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses literature on health occupations)	0.44	0.53	0.43	0.46
Basic skills instruction that uses academic subjects as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses science texts)	0.29	0.43	0.44	0.55
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”)	0.53	0.53	0.33	0.36
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)	0.45	0.53	0.40	0.46
Workforce preparation activities (e.g., related to critical thinking, digital literacy, employability skills)	0.29	0.49	0.41	0.55
Career exploration or awareness activities (e.g., visits to worksites)	0.43	0.52	0.41	0.50
Other approach	0.44	0.30	0.12	0.32

NOTE: Response data are found in table 19.

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

Table 56. Percentage distribution of reported extent of inclusion of workforce preparation activities in Adult Secondary Education courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
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) that includes workforce preparation activities	0.68	0.91	0.67	0.82
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) and that includes workforce preparation activities	0.77	0.97	0.67	0.88

NOTE: Response data are found in table 20.

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

Table 57. Percentage distribution of reported extent of use of contextualized instructional approaches in English as a Second Language courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
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)	0.50	0.45	0.23	0.25
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)	0.50	0.46	0.21	0.20
Basic skills instruction that uses occupational topics as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses literature on health occupations)	0.44	0.52	0.42	0.52
Basic skills instruction that uses academic subjects as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses science texts)	0.44	0.51	0.42	0.54
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”)	0.56	0.53	0.31	0.36
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)	0.53	0.55	0.31	0.40
Workforce preparation activities (e.g., related to critical thinking, digital literacy, employability skills)	0.31	0.49	0.40	0.56
Career exploration or awareness activities (e.g., visits to worksites)	0.47	0.53	0.39	0.51
Other approach	0.45	0.32	0.14	0.31

NOTE: Response data are found in table 21.

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

Table 58. Percentage distribution of reported extent of inclusion of workforce preparation activities in English as a Second Language courses, by selected instructional approaches: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected instructional approaches	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
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) that includes workforce preparation activities	0.71	0.98	0.62	0.97
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) and that includes workforce preparation activities	0.86	1.01	0.62	0.96

NOTE: Response data are found in table 22.

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

Table 59. Number and percentage of providers that reported offering courses that include selected options for accelerating instruction for learners: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected options for accelerating instruction	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Compressed schedules compared with similar program offerings (e.g., increasing the number of learning hours in a week and reducing the number of instructional weeks)	7.9	0.48
Dual enrollment opportunities that allow learners to earn postsecondary credits or credentials as part of their adult education program	7.9	0.49
Competency-based learning (e.g., learners advance by demonstrating knowledge or skills rather than through seat time) delivered face-to-face or through blended or hybrid instruction	7.8	0.48
Competency-based learning (e.g., learners advance by demonstrating knowledge or skills rather than through seat time) delivered through distance learning only	7.7	0.47
Other option	4.0	0.36

NOTE: Response data are found in table 23.

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

Table 60. Mean and median percentage of courses that were reported to be delivered face-to-face, through blended learning, and through online/distance education, by program type and delivery type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Delivery type	All programs		Adult Basic Education		Adult Secondary Education		English as a Second Language	
	Mean percentage of courses	Median percentage of courses	Mean percentage of courses	Median percentage of courses	Mean percentage of courses	Median percentage of courses	Mean percentage of courses	Median percentage of courses
Face-to-face only	0.28	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.36	1.21	0.30	0.26
Blended learning/ hybrid instruction	0.27	0.37	0.31	0.00	0.34	0.00	0.30	†
Online/distance only	0.11	†	0.11	†	0.15	†	0.04	†

† Not applicable. Estimate rounds to zero.

NOTE: Response data are found in table 24.

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

Table 61. Percentage distribution of extent to which providers reported working with workforce development partners to provide adult education and literacy instruction programming, by selected workforce development partners: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected workforce development partners	Not at all	Discussed programming	Drafted policies or plans for providing programming	Implemented programming or related policies
Local schools (including public technical schools)	0.39	0.46	0.25	0.50
Community or technical colleges	0.32	0.45	0.31	0.49
State or local employment, training, and vocational rehabilitation agencies (including One-Stops/American Job Centers)	0.27	0.46	0.37	0.50
Literacy councils/organizations	0.46	0.47	0.27	0.43
Businesses or employers	0.41	0.50	0.29	0.45
Labor unions	0.39	0.33	0.17	0.21
Workforce development boards	0.37	0.45	0.38	0.48
Public libraries	0.47	0.48	0.24	0.44
Correctional facilities	0.47	0.34	0.21	0.43
Reentry organizations	0.48	0.42	0.23	0.38
Other partner	0.42	0.22	0.13	0.35

NOTE: Response data are found in table 25.

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

Table 62. Percentage distribution of extent to which providers reported working with workforce development partners to provide occupational skills training, by selected workforce development partners: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected workforce development partners	Not at all	Discussed programming	Drafted policies or plans for providing programming	Implemented programming or related policies
Local schools (including public technical schools)	0.48	0.46	0.23	0.42
Community or technical colleges	0.40	0.46	0.31	0.47
State or local employment, training, and vocational rehabilitation agencies (including One-Stops/American Job Centers)	0.40	0.48	0.31	0.48
Literacy councils/organizations	0.49	0.45	0.20	0.34
Businesses or employers	0.47	0.49	0.27	0.43
Labor unions	0.38	0.32	0.15	0.21
Workforce development boards	0.44	0.47	0.32	0.46
Public libraries	0.50	0.44	0.20	0.32
Correctional facilities	0.46	0.36	0.19	0.38
Reentry organizations	0.47	0.41	0.18	0.31
Other partner	0.31	0.18	0.11	0.24

NOTE: Response data are found in table 26.

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

Table 63. Percentage distribution of extent to which providers reported working with workforce development partners to provide transition services, by selected workforce development partners: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected workforce development partners	Not at all	Discussed programming	Drafted policies or plans for providing programming	Implemented programming or related policies
Local schools (including public technical schools)	0.47	0.45	0.25	0.47
Community or technical colleges	0.32	0.43	0.30	0.49
State or local employment, training, and vocational rehabilitation agencies (including One-Stops/American Job Centers)	0.36	0.46	0.33	0.50
Literacy councils/organizations	0.49	0.45	0.21	0.35
Businesses or employers	0.49	0.49	0.24	0.41
Labor unions	0.37	0.31	0.11	0.21
Workforce development boards	0.43	0.47	0.30	0.47
Public libraries	0.50	0.45	0.16	0.34
Correctional facilities	0.47	0.39	0.20	0.39
Reentry organizations	0.48	0.41	0.19	0.34
Other partner	0.32	0.21	0.08	0.24

NOTE: Response data are found in table 27.

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

Table 64. Number and percentage of providers that reported resources were provided to help transition learners to the next step in their education, training, or employment, by provider of resources and selected resource types: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected resource types	Provided by provider		Provided by partner		Provided by either provider or partner	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Formal referrals to other education or training providers	5.3	0.33	7.6	0.47	4.0	0.24
Foreign transcript review to apply education credits earned in other countries	7.0	0.43	7.1	0.43	7.9	0.48
Help identifying or accessing financial supports for education	7.1	0.44	8.1	0.50	4.5	0.27
Facilitating the postsecondary admissions or registration process	7.1	0.44	8.0	0.49	4.5	0.28
Support developing study skills	4.5	0.28	6.3	0.39	3.7	0.23
Career exploration activities or counseling (e.g., interest assessments, career fairs)	5.2	0.31	7.9	0.49	3.4	0.21
Help developing individualized career plans	6.0	0.36	7.6	0.47	4.3	0.26
Support developing employability skills (e.g., communication training, working in teams, problem solving)	4.8	0.29	7.6	0.47	3.6	0.22
Work-based learning opportunities (e.g., internships, pre-apprenticeships)	7.6	0.46	7.9	0.48	7.7	0.47
Job search assistance	7.3	0.45	8.0	0.49	4.2	0.26
Job placement assistance	8.0	0.49	7.8	0.48	5.8	0.35
Support for advancing in current employment (e.g., obtaining needed certifications and skills for higher-paying positions)	7.7	0.47	8.0	0.49	5.8	0.36
Other resource	4.0	0.25	2.1	0.13	4.2	0.26

NOTE: Response data are found in table 28.

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

Table 65. Number and percentage of providers that reported public and private community organizations provided support services to their learners, by selected organization types: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected organization types	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Local schools (including public technical schools)	8.0	0.49
Community or technical colleges	7.4	0.46
State or local employment, training, and vocational rehabilitation agencies (including One-Stops/American Job Centers)	6.4	0.39
Literacy councils/organizations	7.9	0.49
Businesses or employers	8.2	0.50
Labor unions	4.6	0.28
Workforce development boards	7.8	0.48
Public libraries	8.2	0.50
Correctional facilities	7.2	0.44
Reentry organizations	7.5	0.46
Other organization	4.6	0.43

NOTE: Response data are found in table 29.

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

Table 66. Number and percentage of providers that reported support services were provided to their learners, by organization providing service and selected service types: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected service types	Provided by provider		Provided by partner		Provided by either provider or partner	
	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
Child care	6.3	0.39	7.8	0.48	7.8	0.47
Health services	4.8	0.30	8.1	0.50	8.0	0.49
Housing search/placement	6.2	0.38	8.1	0.49	7.7	0.47
Psychological counseling or other mental health services	6.2	0.38	8.0	0.49	7.5	0.46
Transportation	7.4	0.45	8.0	0.49	7.2	0.44
Translator services	7.7	0.47	7.3	0.45	7.7	0.47
Legal services	4.1	0.25	7.7	0.47	7.8	0.48
Help obtaining public assistance	7.8	0.48	7.8	0.48	6.5	0.40
Disability screening	7.0	0.43	8.0	0.49	7.5	0.46
Support groups	6.0	0.37	8.2	0.50	8.2	0.50
Mentoring	8.2	0.50	8.0	0.49	7.7	0.47
Other service	2.8	0.18	2.1	0.13	3.3	0.20

NOTE: Response data are found in table 30.

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

Table 67. Percentage of providers that reported receiving technical assistance or professional development support from the state or state contractors/vendors, by selected topic areas: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected topic areas	Received support	Did not receive and did not need support	Did not receive support but would have liked to
Aligning curricula and instruction to state-adopted academic standards for adult education	0.38	0.33	0.25
Incorporating the essential components of reading instruction	0.44	0.40	0.31
Becoming an effective One-Stop/American Job Center partner to provide adult learners with access to employment, education, and training services	0.49	0.43	0.40
Developing or implementing workforce preparation activities	0.45	0.37	0.36
Developing or implementing Integrated Education and Training	0.44	0.38	0.38
Developing or implementing Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education programs	0.49	0.47	0.36
Developing or implementing programs and partnerships to transition learners from adult education to postsecondary education	0.47	0.38	0.37
Expanding the focus of English as a Second Language programs to include preparation for postsecondary education and careers (e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways)	0.48	0.44	0.38
Developing or implementing distance, blended, or hybrid learning courses	0.46	0.43	0.39
Using technology for noninstructional purposes (e.g., for recruitment, screening, assessment)	0.48	0.43	0.40
Developing materials, tools, or services to help adult learners progress on a career path (e.g., through career navigators, transition advisors)	0.46	0.37	0.39
Meeting federal performance accountability reporting requirements	0.36	0.28	0.26
Other topic area	0.58	0.66	0.53

NOTE: Response data are found in table 31.

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

Table 68. 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
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 32.

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

Table 69. Percentage distribution of reported importance of using performance data, by selected performance improvement purposes: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected performance improvement purposes	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important
Making decisions about changes needed to curricula	0.16	0.31	0.42	0.48
Making decisions about staff retention	0.34	0.41	0.43	0.48
Making decisions about hiring needs	0.32	0.39	0.44	0.48
Making decisions about changes needed in support services	0.24	0.39	0.47	0.50
Determining needs for technical assistance or professional development for staff	0.18	0.33	0.46	0.49
Reporting program performance to local partners, including the local workforce development board	0.28	0.40	0.45	0.50
Marketing or publicizing programs to potential partners, funders, or learners	0.23	0.39	0.47	0.49
Other purpose	0.58	0.18	0.22	0.53

NOTE: Response data are found in table 33.

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

Table 70. Percentage distribution of extent of challenge providers reported for data collection, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected challenges	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging	Not applicable
Getting complete and accurate data on learners' barriers to employment at intake (e.g., displaced homemaker, ex-offender status, etc.)	0.40	0.45	0.47	0.38	0.12
Getting complete and accurate measurable skill gains data (e.g., obtaining high post-testing rates)	0.39	0.43	0.46	0.43	0.07
Having enough information on learners (e.g., date of birth, SSN) to determine their postsecondary outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	0.40	0.43	0.41	0.43	0.23
Having enough information on learners (e.g., date of birth, SSN) to determine their employment outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	0.35	0.42	0.41	0.45	0.25
Having enough information from supplemental data sources such as surveys to determine learners' follow-up postsecondary or employment outcomes	0.26	0.37	0.43	0.50	0.26
Other aspect of data collection	0.68	0.15	0.26	0.37	0.73

NOTE: Response data are found in table 34.

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

Table 71. Percentage of providers that reported turning away at least one potential learner, and mean and median reported number of potential learners that were turned away by those providers because there was not enough capacity to serve them, overall and by program type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Program type	Percentage of providers that turned away at least one potential learner	Mean number of potential learners that were turned away	Median number of potential learners that were turned away
Overall	0.42	5.8	2.6
Adult Basic Education	0.32	5.1	0.1
Adult Secondary Education	0.30	4.5	2.5
English as a Second Language	0.48	4.0	0.0

NOTE: Response data are found in table 35.

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

Table 72. Number and percentage of providers that reported maintaining a waiting list for instructional services, by program type: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Program type	Number of providers	Percentage of providers
At least one program	7.4	0.45
Adult Basic Education	5.8	0.38
Adult Secondary Education	5.4	0.37
English as a Second Language	7.0	0.52
Other program type	3.4	0.40

NOTE: Response data are found in table 36.

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

Table 73. Percentage distribution of extent of challenge providers reported in providing adult education and literacy services, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19 (standard errors)

Selected challenges	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging	Not applicable
Working with local organizations to provide adult education and literacy programming	0.46	0.46	0.43	0.30	0.24
Working with local organizations to provide occupational skills training	0.34	0.40	0.45	0.45	0.30
Working with local organizations to provide transition services	0.39	0.45	0.47	0.36	0.26
Working with local organizations to provide support services	0.41	0.46	0.46	0.38	0.18
Developing or implementing Integrated Education and Training	0.22	0.33	0.41	0.48	0.38
Developing or implementing Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE; Sec. 243) programs	0.34	0.38	0.37	0.38	0.46
Developing or implementing programs to transition learners from adult education to postsecondary education	0.39	0.47	0.47	0.37	0.21
Including preparation for postsecondary education and careers in English as a Second Language programs	0.33	0.42	0.44	0.39	0.38
Getting the technical assistance or professional development needed to implement changes related to new emphases or requirements in the law	0.42	0.45	0.45	0.37	0.21
Having instructional staff who have the time or expertise to implement changes in the law (e.g., IET or IELCE [Sec. 243])	0.28	0.37	0.45	0.49	0.28
Meeting federal performance accountability reporting requirements	0.34	0.44	0.47	0.44	0.13
Using data to make decisions about how to improve the program	0.47	0.49	0.42	0.24	0.08
Other aspect of providing adult education and literacy services	0.59	0.19	0.19	0.38	0.68

NOTE: Response data are found in table 37.

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

The State Director Survey

This section includes descriptive tables based on data from the state director survey. These tables are organized into the following topics:

- Funding and grantmaking
- Collaboration with workforce development partners
- Technical assistance and professional development
- Policies and procedures
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Overall challenges under WIOA

Funding and grantmaking

Table 74. Frequency distribution of year states reported holding most recent funding competition for providers of adult education and literacy under Title II (AEFLA): Program year 2018-19

Year competition held	Number of states
2019	5
2018	13
2017	22
2016	1

NOTE: Unweighted estimates. "States" include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size is 41 due to item-level missingness.

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

Table 75. Frequency distribution of total number of years states reported in funding cycle for most recent funding competition: Program year 2018-19

Number of years in funding cycle ¹	Number of states
2 years of funding	2
3 years of funding	30
4 years of funding	11
5 years of funding	8
Other	0

¹ Includes base and optional years.

NOTE: Unweighted estimates. "States" include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size is 51.

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

Table 76. Number of states that reported holding a separate funding competition for Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) offered by providers of adult education and literacy: Program year 2018-19

	Number of states
Held separate funding competition for IELCE	27

NOTE: Unweighted estimates. "States" include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size is 51.

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

Table 77. Frequency distribution of year states reported holding most recent funding competition for integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE): Program year 2018-19

Year competition held	Number of states
2019	7
2018	6
2017	9

NOTE: Unweighted estimates. "States" include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Analysis is limited to states that reported holding a separate funding competition for IELCE. Sample size is 22.

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

Table 78. Total, mean, and median dollar amount that states reported their adult education programs received from government and other sources to support Title II adult education and literacy activities and related state leadership activities: Program year 2018-19

Statistic	Dollar amount
Total	1,389,175,675.00
Mean	28,350,523.98
Median	9,335,014.00

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: "Include full state and local funding and other state line item funding, including funds beyond those reported for federal match." Unweighted estimates. "States" include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size is 49 due to item-level missingness.

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

Collaboration with workforce development partners

Table 79. Frequency distribution of extent to which states reported working with workforce development partners on policies, plans, or activities related to workforce development, by selected workforce development partner types: Program year 2018-19

Selected workforce development partner types	Not at all	Discussed policies or plans	Drafted policies or plans	Implemented policies or practices	Not applicable ¹
State workforce development board ²	2	27	6	15	0
State labor agency ³	7	19	7	18	†
State vocational rehabilitation agency ³	4	24	12	11	†
Postsecondary education providers ³	6	20	7	17	†
Local workforce development boards ²	7	22	7	14	†
Businesses, employers, or representatives (e.g., Chamber of Commerce) ³	11	25	4	11	†
Other partner type	2	2	0	2	†

† The “Not applicable” response option was not offered for this partner type.

¹ Entity does not exist in the state.

² Including subcommittees or working groups.

³ Independent of a workforce development board.

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “In each row, please select the one response that indicates the highest level of collaboration.” Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size for each workforce development partner type ranges from 50 to 51 due to item-level missingness, except for “Other,” which has a sample size of six.

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

Table 80. Number of states that reported working with workforce development partners, by selected activities: Program year 2018-19

Selected activities	Number of states
Served as the official representative for adult education on the state’s workforce development board (WDB) ¹	19
Served as an official member on any subcommittees or working groups of the state’s WDB ¹	34
Participated in the state’s WDB or subcommittee/working group activities but did not serve as an official member ¹	30
Participated in working groups or collaborations with core partners <i>independent of</i> state WDB activities ²	48
Participated in working groups or collaborations that included postsecondary education providers <i>independent of</i> state WDB activities	44
Attended meetings of one or more <i>local</i> WDBs or any of their subcommittees or working groups	35
Participated in business roundtables or other types of working groups that include employers at the state or local level	34

¹ Was not asked of states that reported that they do not have a state WDB.

² Core partners are those listed in the states’ unified or combined state plans.

NOTE: Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size for each activity ranges from 49 to 51 due to item-level missingness.

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

Table 81. Frequency distribution of extent to which states reported working with state workforce development partners to establish and administer a shared workforce development system, by selected topic areas: Program year 2018-19

Selected topic areas	Not at all	Discussed policies or practices	Drafted policies or practices	Implemented policies or practices
Supporting state-level staff training (e.g., training on each partner’s roles and responsibilities under WIOA or training on shared data systems)	4	19	4	24
Putting agreements in place to operate and fund the local workforce development (One-Stop) delivery system (e.g., for infrastructure cost sharing)	4	9	9	29
Putting agreements in place to provide shared instructional services (e.g., for sharing the cost of instructional programming, for co-enrollment policies and procedures)	9	21	5	16
Aligning technology and data systems across One-Stop partner programs (e.g., using a common intake system)	9	28	4	10

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “State workforce development partners include all those identified in your unified or combined state plan, and other state-level agencies or organizations that support workforce development (e.g. through Temporary Assistance for Needy Families [TANF], postsecondary education, or other resources). This excludes local entities, such as local workforce development boards. In each row, please select the one response that indicates the highest level of collaboration.” Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size for each topic area is 51.

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

Table 82. Frequency distribution of extent to which states reported working with state workforce development partners to provide adult education and literacy instructional programming, by selected topic areas: Program year 2018-19

Selected topic areas	Not at all	Discussed policies or practices	Drafted policies or practices	Implemented policies or practices
Identifying or developing programming designed to enhance digital literacy skills	16	16	3	16
Identifying or developing short-term programs to assist participants with transitioning to occupational skills training programs (e.g., “bootcamps”)	12	15	2	22
Identifying or developing short-term programs to assist participants with transitioning to postsecondary programs (e.g., bridge courses)	9	20	2	20
Identifying or developing strategies to accelerate instruction (e.g., through compressed schedules)	16	16	3	16
Identifying or developing strategies to reduce the time or cost to earn a recognized postsecondary credential	15	22	0	14
Developing Integrated Education and Training programs	7	14	2	28
Providing English language acquisition (ELA/ESL) instruction for participants	10	9	3	29
Expanding the focus of ELA/ESL programs to include preparation for postsecondary education and careers (e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways, etc.)	12	11	5	22

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “In each row, please select the one response that indicates the highest level of collaboration.” Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size for each topic area ranges from 50 to 51 due to item-level missingness.

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

Table 83. Frequency distribution of extent to which states reported working with state workforce development partners to provide accessibility and support services, by selected topic areas: Program year 2018-19

Selected topic areas	Not at all	Discussed policies or plans	Drafted policies or plans	Implemented activities or policies
Conducting outreach to individuals who could benefit from program activities and services	8	17	5	21
Making the internet accessible to participants living in remote areas (e.g., providing hotspots, having statewide broadband initiatives)	20	19	2	10
Making assistive technology available to participants with disabilities (e.g., through device lending libraries, accessible One-Stop websites and services)	13	15	4	18
Providing support services for participants with disabilities or other barriers to employment (e.g., childcare, transportation, career counseling)	10	15	4	22
Providing career services for job seekers (e.g., individualized career plans, job search assistance)	8	16	5	22

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “In each row, please select the one response that indicates the highest level of collaboration.” Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size for each topic area ranges from 50 to 51 due to item-level missingness.

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

Table 84. Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in working with state workforce development partners to establish and administer a shared workforce development, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19

Selected challenges	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging
Supporting state-level staff training (e.g., training on each partner’s roles and responsibilities under WIOA or training on shared data systems)	9	18	11	9
Putting agreements in place to operate and fund the local workforce development (One-Stop) delivery system (e.g., for infrastructure cost sharing)	3	20	14	10
Putting agreements in place to provide shared instructional services (e.g., for sharing the cost of instructional programming, for co-enrollment policies and procedures)	6	11	14	11
Aligning technology and data systems across One-Stop partner programs (e.g., using a common intake system)	2	3	9	28
Other challenge	2	0	2	2

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “By ‘challenging’ we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.” Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. States that reported they did not work at all with state workforce development partners on policies, plans, or activities related to a particular topic were not asked about challenges for that topic. Sample size for each challenge ranges from 42 to 47, except for “Other,” which has a sample size of six.

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

Table 85. Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in working with state workforce development partners to provide adult education and literacy instructional programming, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19

Selected challenges	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging
Identifying or developing programming designed to enhance digital literacy skills	12	8	13	2
Identifying or developing short-term programs to assist participants with transitioning to occupational skills training programs (e.g., “bootcamps”)	6	17	13	2
Identifying or developing short-term programs to assist participants with transitioning to postsecondary programs (e.g., bridge courses)	5	15	17	5
Identifying or developing strategies to accelerate instruction (e.g., through compressed schedules)	6	10	17	2
Identifying or developing strategies to reduce the time or cost to earn a recognized postsecondary credential	4	7	16	9
Developing Integrated Education and Training programs	2	11	19	12
Providing English language acquisition instruction for participants	14	19	5	2
Other challenge	1	3	1	2

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “By ‘challenging’ we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.” Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. States that reported they did not work at all with state workforce development partners on policies, plans, or activities related to a particular topic were not asked about challenges for that topic. Sample size for each challenge ranges from 35 to 44, except for “Other,” which has a sample size of seven.

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

Table 86. Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in working with state workforce development partners to provide accessibility and support services, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19

Selected challenges	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging
Conducting outreach to individuals who could benefit from program activities and services	6	16	15	6
Making the internet accessible to participants living in remote areas (e.g., providing hotspots, having statewide broadband initiatives)	5	4	8	14
Making assistive technology available to participants with disabilities (e.g., through device lending libraries, accessible One-Stop websites and services)	7	8	18	4
Providing support services for participants with disabilities or other barriers to employment (e.g., childcare, transportation, career counseling)	5	10	15	11
Providing career services for job seekers (e.g., individualized career plans, job search assistance)	11	16	14	2
Other challenge	1	0	0	1

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “By ‘challenging’ we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.” Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. States that reported they did not work at all with state workforce development partners on policies, plans, or activities related to a particular topic were not asked about challenges for that topic. Sample size for each challenge ranges from 31 to 43, except for “Other,” which has a sample size of two.

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

Table 87. Number of states that reported their staff worked with local workforce development partners on various activities, by selected activities: Program year 2018-19

Selected activities	Number of states
Supporting local-level staff training about WIOA and the roles and responsibilities of workforce development partners	33
Putting agreements in place to operate and fund the local workforce development (One-Stop) delivery system (e.g., infrastructure cost sharing)	39
Putting agreements in place to provide shared instructional services (e.g., for sharing the cost of instructional services, for co-enrollment policies and procedures)	20
Aligning curricula or credentials offered with local workforce development plans or needs expressed by employers (e.g., through funding IET, apprenticeship, or postsecondary bridge programs to prepare learners for pathways into high-demand occupations)	29

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “Local workforce development partners include local workforce development boards, One-Stop/American Job Center operators, employers, postsecondary education and training providers, and other local agencies or organizations that support workforce development.” Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. States were instructed to exclude adult education grantees. Sample size for each activity is 51.

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

Table 88. Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in working with local workforce development partners, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19

Selected challenges	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging
Supporting local-level staff training about WIOA and the roles and responsibilities of workforce development partners	7	15	10	1
Putting agreements in place to operate and fund the local workforce development (One-Stop) delivery system (e.g., infrastructure cost sharing)	3	16	13	7
Putting agreements in place to provide shared instructional services (e.g., for sharing the cost of instructional services, for co-enrollment policies and procedures)	3	8	7	2
Aligning curricula or credentials offered with local workforce development plans or needs expressed by employers (e.g., through funding IET, apprenticeship, or postsecondary bridge programs to prepare learners for pathways into high-demand occupations)	3	9	10	7
Other challenge	1	0	0	2

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “By ‘challenging’ we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.” Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. States that reported they did not work at all with local workforce development partners on an activity were not asked about challenges for that activity. Sample size for each challenge ranges from 20 to 39, except for “Other,” which has a sample size of three.

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

Technical assistance and professional development

Table 89. Frequency distribution of extent to which states reported providing technical assistance or professional development for adult education providers, by selected topics: Program year 2018-19

Selected topics	Did not discuss or provide technical assistance or professional development	Discussed providing technical assistance or professional development	Developed technical assistance or professional development	Provided technical assistance or professional development
Aligning curricula and instruction to state-adopted academic standards for adult education	2	4	2	43
Incorporating the essential components of reading instruction	5	7	0	39
Becoming an effective One-Stop/American Job Center partner to provide adult learners with access to employment, education, and training services	10	12	3	26
Developing or implementing workforce preparation activities	4	9	0	38
Developing or implementing Integrated Education and Training (IET) programs	2	4	4	41
Developing or implementing Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs	3	2	4	42
Developing or implementing programs and partnerships to transition learners from adult education to postsecondary education	7	10	2	32
Expanding the focus of English language acquisition (ELA/ESL) programs to include preparation for postsecondary education and careers (e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways, etc.)	5	15	4	27
Developing or implementing distance, blended, or hybrid learning courses	5	11	3	32
Using technology for noninstructional purposes (e.g., for recruitment, screening, assessment)	12	11	1	27
Developing materials, tools, or support services to help adult learners progress on a career path (e.g., through career navigators, transition advisors, etc.)	6	9	7	29
Meeting federal performance accountability reporting requirements	1	2	2	46
Other topic	2	0	1	1

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “If your state program had supports in place at any point throughout the year on a topic (e.g., online courses or guidelines available on the web), select ‘We provided technical assistance or professional development on this topic.’ If your state program provided support before July 1, 2018 but not during July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, please select ‘We did not discuss or provide technical assistance or professional development on this topic.’” Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size for each topic is 51, except for “Other,” which has a sample size of four.

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

Table 90. Number of states that reported that particular technical assistance or professional development topics were one of their top three focus areas, by selected topics: Program Year 2018-19

Selected topics	One of top three focus areas
Aligning curricula and instruction to state-adopted academic standards for adult education	22
Incorporating the essential components of reading instruction	9
Becoming an effective One-Stop/American Job Center partner to provide adult learners with access to employment, education, and training services	3
Developing or implementing workforce preparation activities	7
Developing or implementing Integrated Education and Training (IET) programs	30
Developing or implementing Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs	17
Developing or implementing programs and partnerships to transition learners from adult education to postsecondary education	6
Expanding the focus of English language acquisition (ELA/ESL) programs to include preparation for postsecondary education and careers (e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways, etc.)	4
Developing or implementing distance, blended, or hybrid learning courses	11
Using technology for noninstructional purposes (e.g., for recruitment, screening, assessment)	1
Developing materials, tools, or services to help adult learners progress on a career path (e.g., through career navigators, transition advisors, etc.)	7
Meeting federal performance accountability reporting requirements	27
Other topic	0

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “By ‘focus,’ we mean where your state program invested the most resources (e.g., staff time, funding). Please select up to three only.” Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The survey was programmed so that states that reported they did not discuss or provide TA or PD on a specific topic were not presented with that topic as a potential focus area. Sample size is 51.

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

Table 91. Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in providing technical assistance or professional development to adult education providers, by selected topics: Program year 2018-19

Selected topics	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging
Aligning curricula and instruction to state-adopted academic standards for adult education	15	17	11	5
Incorporating the essential components of reading instruction	15	19	6	5
Becoming an effective One-Stop/American Job Center partner to provide adult learners with access to employment, education, and training services	5	14	14	8
Developing or implementing workforce preparation activities	17	22	5	2
Developing or implementing Integrated Education and Training (IET) programs	7	11	19	12
Developing or implementing Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs	7	14	15	11
Developing or implementing programs and partnerships to transition learners from adult education to postsecondary education	8	14	18	4
Expanding the focus of English language acquisition (ELA/ESL) programs to include preparation for postsecondary education and careers	8	16	14	8
Developing or implementing distance, blended, or hybrid learning courses	12	18	10	6
Using technology for noninstructional purposes (e.g., for recruitment, screening, assessment)	10	17	6	6
Developing materials, tools, or services to help adult learners progress on a career path	12	17	13	3
Meeting federal performance accountability reporting requirements	12	21	10	7
Other topic	0	0	0	0

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “By ‘challenging’ we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.” Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. States that reported they did not discuss or provide TA or PD on a topic were not asked about challenges for that topic area. Sample size for each topic ranges from 39 to 50, except for “Other,” which has a sample size of zero.

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

Table 92. Frequency distribution of extent to which states reported discussing or providing training to designated local program staff whose explicit and primary role is to advise learners on career and college planning: Program year 2018-19

	Number of states
Provided training	23
Drafted training plans and/or materials	1
Discussed providing training	15
Did not discuss or provide training	11

NOTE: Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size is 50 due to item-level missingness.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Policies and procedures

Table 93. Frequency distribution of extent to which states reported implementing a statewide policy requiring adult education providers to use particular types of programming or services, by selected types of programming or services: Program year 2018-19

Selected types of programming or services	Did not discuss or implement a policy	Discussed a policy	Drafted a policy	Implemented a policy
Instruction that integrates occupational skills training with adult education (e.g., IET)	6	14	4	27
Postsecondary transition programming	12	23	4	11
English language acquisition (ELA/ESL) programs that include preparation for postsecondary education and careers (e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways, etc.)	8	18	2	22
Programming delivered through distance, blended, or hybrid learning	8	6	4	31
Designated staff (such as career navigators) whose explicit and primary role is to advise learners on career and college planning, including how to select and apply for appropriate course work to progress on a career path, and how to access financial aid	14	14	4	18

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “If your state had a policy at any point throughout the year requiring a particular type of programming or service, select ‘We implemented a policy for this.’” Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size for each type of programming or services ranges from 49 to 51 due to item-level missingness.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table 94. Frequency distribution of extent to which states reported implementing a competitive funding application requiring adult education providers to use particular types of programming or services, by selected types of programming or services: Program year 2018-19

Selected types of programming or services	Did not discuss or require	Discussed requiring	Prepared for requiring	Required
Instruction that integrates occupational skills training with adult education (e.g., IET)	16	6	8	21
Postsecondary transition programming	18	11	8	14
English language acquisition (ELA/ESL) programs that include preparation for postsecondary education and careers (e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways, etc.)	13	7	6	25
Programming delivered through distance, blended, or hybrid learning	16	8	7	20
Designated staff (such as career navigators) whose explicit and primary role is to advise learners on career and college planning, including how to select and apply for appropriate course work to progress on a career path, and how to access financial aid	22	13	5	11

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “If your state program had a competitive funding application requirement in place at any point throughout the year for a particular type of programming or service, select ‘We required this.’ If your state program had a competitive funding application requirement for a particular type of programming or service before July 1, 2018 but not during July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, please select ‘We did not discuss or require this.’” Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size for each type of programming or services is 51.

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

Table 95. Frequency distribution of extent of implementation of state-level funding policies or practices that favor or facilitate adult education providers' use of particular types of programming or services, by selected types of programming and services: Program year 2018-19

Selected types of programming or services	Did not discuss or implement	Discussed policies or practices	Drafted policies or practices	Implemented policies or practices
Instruction that integrates occupational skills training with adult education (e.g., IET)	13	10	4	23
Postsecondary transition programming	16	13	3	19
English language acquisition (ELA/ESL) programs that include preparation for postsecondary education and careers (e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways, etc.)	16	12	1	22
Programming delivered through distance, blended, or hybrid learning	16	14	6	15
Designated staff (such as career navigators) whose explicit and primary role is to advise learners on career and college planning, including how to select and apply for appropriate course work to progress on a career path, and how to access financial aid	19	14	3	15

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: "If your state program had other state-level funding policies or practices in place at any point throughout the year for a particular type of programming or service, select 'We implemented other state-level funding policies or practices for this.' If your state program had other state-level funding policies or practices in place before July 1, 2018 but not during July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, please select 'We did not discuss or implement other state-level funding policies or practices for this.'" "Other state-level funding policies or practices" were intended to include policies or practices other than a statewide policy (table 93) or competitive funding application (table 94) requiring particular types of programming or services. Unweighted estimates. "States" include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size for each type of programming or services ranges from 50 to 51 due to item-level missingness. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table 96. Number of states that reported attempting to identify and/or disseminate a promising model of adult education and literacy activities: Program year 2018-19

	Number of states
Identified and/or disseminated at least one promising model	39

NOTE: Unweighted estimates. "States" include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. A definition for a "promising model" was not provided within the survey. Sample size is 51. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education, 2019-20.

Table 97. Frequency distribution of extent of importance that states reported selected factors had in deciding whether a model of adult education and literacy activities was promising, by selected factors: Program year 2018-19

Selected factors	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important
Model was identified as promising by OCTAE ¹ or through national technical assistance projects	3	4	8	24
Model was identified as effective or based on “best practices” in one or more research articles	3	5	14	17
Model showed evidence of improved outcomes for adult learners compared to other instruction models based on an analysis of state or local data	2	1	4	32
Other factor	0	0	1	2

¹ Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education

NOTE: Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. A definition for a “promising model” was not provided within the survey. Analysis was limited to states that reported attempting to identify and/or disseminate a promising model of education and literacy activities during program year 2018-19. Sample size for each factor is 39 due to item-level missingness, except for “Other,” which has a sample size of three.

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

Table 98. Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in identifying and/or disseminating promising models of adult education and literary activities: Program year 2018-19

	Number of states
Not at all challenging	8
Slightly challenging	11
Moderately challenging	15
Very challenging	5

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “By ‘challenging’ we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.” Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. A definition for a “promising model” was not provided within the survey. Analysis was limited to states that reported attempting to identify and/or disseminate a promising model of education and literacy activities during program year 2018-19. Sample size is 39.

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

Table 99. Number of states that reported identifying and/or disseminating at least one promising model of adult education and literacy activities, by selected topic areas: Program year 2018-19

Selected topic areas	Identified and/or disseminated at least one promising model
Instruction that integrates occupational skills training with adult education (e.g., IET)	30
Postsecondary transition programming	21
English language acquisition (ELA/ESL) programs that include preparation for postsecondary education and careers (e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways, etc.)	26
Programming delivered through distance, blended, or hybrid learning	29
Supports designed to help adult learners progress on a career path (e.g., assistance in career planning, accessing financial supports for education, and developing study and work skills)	20
Other promising model	7

NOTE: Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. A definition for a “promising model” was not provided within the survey. Analysis was limited to states that reported attempting to identify and/or disseminate a promising model of education and literacy activities during program year 2018-19. Sample size for each topic area ranges from 36 to 38, except for “Other,” which has a sample size of 20.

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

Table 100. Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in identifying and disseminating promising models of adult education and literacy activities, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19

Selected challenges	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging	We did not do this
Identifying models that have a research base	8	12	10	7	0
Identifying promising models that apply to particular types of adult learners (e.g., English language learners, ex-offenders)	11	9	12	5	0
Programming delivered through distance, blended, or hybrid learning	8	15	10	4	0
Disseminating promising models effectively	9	9	12	6	0
Providing training on promising models	4	7	13	9	0
Convincing program providers to use promising models	0	0	1	0	0
Other challenge	0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: “By ‘challenging’ we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.” Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. A definition for a “promising model” was not provided within the survey. Analysis was limited to states that reported identifying and/or disseminating a promising model of education and literacy activities during program year 2018-19. Sample size for each challenge ranges from 1 to 37, except for “Other,” which has a sample size of 0.

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

Monitoring and evaluation

Table 101. Frequency distribution of how often states reported that they typically assess the performance of adult education providers: Program year 2018-19

	Number of states
Every other year	2
Once a year	5
Several times a year	20
Monthly	19
Several times a month	1
Other frequency	3

NOTE: Unweighted estimates. "States" include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size is 51.

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

Table 102. Number of states that reported assessing all adult education providers on the same schedule: Program year 2018-19

Assess performance	Number of states
Assess all adult education providers on the same schedule	48

NOTE: Unweighted estimates. "States" include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size is 51.

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

Table 103. Frequency distribution of extent of importance states reported for assessing the performance of individual adult education providers, by selected criteria: Program year 2018-19

Selected criteria	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important
Provider’s performance based on federal accountability measures	1	1	4	44
Whether the provider’s instruction is based on state-adopted standards	2	5	15	28
Provider’s progress in planning for or implementing programs that integrate adult education and occupational skills training (i.e., IET and/or IELCE)	2	11	15	22
Provider’s progress in planning for or implementing programs designed to help adult learners transition to or participate in postsecondary education	2	14	17	17
Number and type of professional development activities available to program staff	2	15	13	20
Number and type of support services offered to adult learners	1	17	14	18
Level of intensity of instructional services provided	2	2	19	27
Whether offerings demonstrate responsiveness to local employer needs based on employer surveys or other sources of feedback	6	18	13	12
Provider’s fiscal performance and procedures	1	5	12	32
Other criterion	1	0	0	3

NOTE: Unweighted estimates. “States” include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size for each criterion ranges from 49 to 50 due to item-level missingness, except for “Other,” which has a sample size of four.

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

Table 104. Frequency distribution of extent of importance that states reported for using results from assessment of individual adult education providers' performance, by selected purposes: Program year 2018-19

Selected purposes	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important
Informing future decisions to fund the adult education provider	2	6	14	28
Providing technical assistance or professional development to address the adult education provider's weakness(es)	1	0	8	41
Modifying or expanding technical assistance or professional development offerings to address common weaknesses among adult education providers	1	2	8	39
Modifying the grant application process to improve program performance	6	8	8	28
Modifying the funding formula to improve program performance	10	9	6	25
Publicizing high-performing adult education providers to potential partners, funders, or learners	12	11	14	12
Other purpose	1	0	0	0

NOTE: Unweighted estimates. "States" include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size for each purpose ranges from 49 to 50 due to item-level missingness, except for "Other," which has a sample size of one.

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

Table 105. Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in using selected criteria for assessing the performance of adult education providers, by selected criteria: Program year 2018-19

Selected criteria	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging	We did not do this
Providers' performance based on federal accountability measures	25	13	7	4	0
Whether the providers' instruction is based on state-adopted standards	12	15	14	5	0
Providers' progress in planning for or implementing programs that integrate adult education and occupational skills training (i.e., IET and/or IELCE)	7	11	20	11	0
Providers' progress in planning for or implementing programs designed to help adult learners transition to or participate in postsecondary education	7	13	21	8	0
Number and type of professional development activities available to program staff	24	15	5	4	0
Number and type of support services offered to adult learners	11	15	16	7	0
Level of intensity of instructional services provided	14	19	13	4	0
Whether offerings demonstrate responsiveness to local employer needs based on employer surveys or other sources of feedback	6	11	12	12	0
Providers' fiscal performance and procedures	16	22	9	3	0
Other criterion	1	0	0	0	0

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: "By 'challenging' we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced." Unweighted estimates. "States" include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size for each criterion ranges from 46 to 50 due to item-level missingness, except for "Other," which has a sample size of one.

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

Table 106. Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in meeting performance accountability reporting requirements, by selected challenges: Program year 2018-19

Selected challenges	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging	We did not do this
Getting complete and accurate data from providers on their learners' barriers to employment at intake (e.g., displaced homemaker, ex-offender status, etc.)	8	19	16	8	0
Getting complete and accurate measurable skill gains data from providers (e.g., obtaining high post-testing rates)	18	17	9	6	0
Having enough information on learners (e.g., date of birth, SSN) to determine their postsecondary outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	10	17	16	8	0
Obtaining postsecondary outcomes data from existing sources for learners who leave the state	7	1	13	25	0
Having enough information on learners (e.g., date of birth, SSN) to determine their employment outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	7	16	14	12	0
Obtaining employment outcomes data from existing sources for learners who leave the state	3	5	7	24	0
Having enough information from supplemental data sources such as surveys to determine learners' follow-up postsecondary or employment outcomes	2	6	7	18	0
Other challenge	2	1	1	0	0

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: "By 'challenging' we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced." Unweighted estimates. "States" include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size for each challenge ranges from 33 to 51 due to item-level missingness, except for "Other," which has a sample size of four.

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

Overall challenges under WIOA

Table 107. Frequency distribution of extent of challenge states reported in providing adult education and literacy services, by selected challenges: Program year 2018–19

Selected challenges	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging
Working with state workforce development partners to establish and administer a shared workforce development system	6	14	18	13
Working with state workforce development partners to provide adult education and literacy instructional programming	12	17	15	7
Working with state workforce development partners to provide accessibility and support services	8	17	18	8
Developing or implementing Integrated Education and Training (IET) programs	4	13	19	15
Developing or implementing Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs	6	13	20	12
Developing or implementing programs and partnerships to transition learners from adult education to postsecondary education	6	20	17	7
Expanding the focus of English language acquisition (ELA/ESL) programs to include preparation for postsecondary education and careers	7	13	23	8
Putting funding policies or practices in place to require or encourage providers' use of particular types of programming or services	8	12	17	14
Identifying or disseminating promising models of adult education and literacy activities	12	20	16	3
Assessing the performance of adult education providers	18	23	8	2
Meeting performance accountability reporting requirements	10	22	10	9
Other challenge	1	0	2	1

NOTE: Respondents were given the following instructions: "By 'challenging' we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced." Unweighted estimates. "States" include the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Sample size for each challenge ranges from 50 to 51 due to item-level missingness, except for "Other," which has a sample size of four.

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

Chapter 3. Survey Instruments

Overview

This chapter includes a copy of the paper questionnaire that was sent to local providers and a copy of the paper questionnaire that was sent to state directors.

National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education



National Assessment of Adult Education

Adult Education Provider Survey

REFERENCE COPY ONLY – COMPLETE SURVEY ONLINE

Instructions: The information collected through this survey will help us understand how adult education is being implemented, and what types of challenges providers face under WIOA.

- Please answer questions about the services you provided to LEARNERS OR STUDENTS WHO YOU REPORTED TO YOUR STATE FOR THE NATIONAL REPORTING SYSTEM (NRS) DURING THE PROGRAM YEAR JULY 1, 2018 TO JUNE 30, 2019.
- You may provide services to adults that are not funded through federal and/or state adult education grants. However, we are interested only in the parts of your program that serve learners supported by and reported to the state for the National Reporting System.

Information collected for this study comes under the confidentiality and data protection requirements of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, Title I, Part E, Section 183. Responses to this data collection will be used only for statistical purposes. The reports prepared for this study will summarize findings by state and for the nation as a whole and will not associate responses with a specific provider or individual. We will not provide information that identifies you to anyone outside the study team, except as required by law.

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1850-0948. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including the time needed to review instructions, search existing data sources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to: Melanie Ali, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, 550 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20004. Do not return the completed form to this address.

7150_05/19

Key Terms

In the survey we refer to specific terms from the federal legislation for adult education and workforce development—WIOA. These are listed here so that all respondents are applying the same definition to these terms.

Integrated Education and Training (IET): A service approach that provides adult education and literacy activities concurrently and contextually with workforce preparation activities and workforce training for a specific occupation or occupational cluster for the purpose of educational and career advancement.

Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE; Sec. 243): A service provided to English language learners that includes instruction in literacy and English language acquisition and instruction on the rights and responsibilities of citizenship and civic participation and may include workforce training.

One-Stop Centers (also called American Job Centers or Career Centers): Local, co-located employment service providers that offer a range of assistance to job seekers. One-Stops offer access to training programs and activities, career counseling, job listings, and similar employment-related services either in person or online.

Workforce Development: Activities and services made available through the One-Stops and other partners to support employment and training.

Workforce Preparation Activities: Activities, programs, or services designed to help an individual acquire a combination of basic academic skills, critical thinking skills, digital literacy skills, and employability skills. This includes competencies in utilizing resources, using information, working with others, understanding systems, and obtaining skills necessary for successful transition into and completion of postsecondary education or training, or employment.

Provider Type and Program Sizes

Please answer questions about the services you provided to LEARNERS OR STUDENTS WHO YOU REPORTED TO YOUR STATE FOR THE NATIONAL REPORTING SYSTEM (NRS) FOR THE PROGRAM YEAR JULY 1, 2018 TO JUNE 30, 2019, unless otherwise noted.

Q1. What type of adult education provider are you? **[SKIP if NRS data is provided.]**

Please select one response.

- 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

(Please specify) _____

Q2. At how many sites did you provide services from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

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.

Enter number in box. SITES

Q3. What was your total enrollment in each of the following programs in the program year from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019? **[SKIP if NRS data is provided.]**

- Please provide an unduplicated count of all learners (learners who have completed at least 12 contact hours).
- Please enter the IET enrollment separately for each type of program.
- For this item, do not count those enrolled in Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs (Sec. 243 of WIOA) in the count of ELA/ESL learners. Count learners in IELCE programs separately.
- Please include enrollment in correctional institutions.
- If you did not have any learners enrolled in a particular program, please enter "0".

Program Type	Number
a. Adult Basic Education (ABE), ABE level 1-4	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
a_1. IET as part of an ABE program	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
b. Adult Secondary Education (ASE), ABE level 5-6	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
b_1. IET as part of an ASE program	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
c. English Language Acquisition (ELA/ESL), level 1-6	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
c_1. IET as part of an ELA/ESL program	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
d. Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) Sec. 243	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
d_1. IET as part of an IELCE Sec. 243 program	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
TOTAL ENROLLMENT	_ _ _ ; _ _ _

Q4. What was your total enrollment by educational functioning level at intake in the program year from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019? **[SKIP if NRS data is provided.]**

- Please provide an unduplicated count of all learners (learners who have completed at least 12 contact hours).
- If you did not have any learners at a particular functioning level, please enter "0" for that level.

Entering Education Functioning Level	Number
a. ABE Level 1	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
b. ABE Level 2	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
c. ABE Level 3	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
d. ABE Level 4	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
e. ABE Level 5	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
f. ABE Level 6	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
g. ESL Level 1	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
h. ESL Level 2	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
i. ESL Level 3	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
j. ESL Level 4	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
k. ESL Level 5	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
l. ESL Level 6	_ _ _ ; _ _ _
TOTAL ENROLLMENT	_ _ _ ; _ _ _

Q5. In the program year from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, did you offer instruction in correctional institutions?

- "Correctional institutions" include juvenile justice confinement facilities, prisons, jails, and detention centers.
- Yes
- No → **GO TO Q6**

Q5a. For each program type, what was the total enrollment in correctional institutions in the program year from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- If you did not have any learners enrolled in a particular program, please enter "0" for that program.
- For this item, do not count those enrolled in Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs (Sec. 243 of WIOA) in the count of ELA/ESL learners. Count learners in IELCE programs separately.

Program Type	Number
a. Adult Basic Education (ABE), ABE level 1-4	_ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _
b. Adult Secondary Education (ASE), ASE level 5-6	_ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _
c. English Language Acquisition (ELA/ESL), level 1-6	_ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _
d. Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) Sec. 243	_ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _
TOTAL ENROLLMENT	_ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _

Funding Sources and Expenditures

Q6. Of your budget for ABE, ASE, ELA/ESL, and IELCE received for the program year from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, approximately how much came from each of the following sources?

- **Please check to make sure that the total sum at the bottom represents the total amount of funding your program received.**
- Please include funding for integrated education and training (IET), if applicable.
- Please answer using dollars **OR** as a percentage, whichever is easier.

	Dollars	Percentage
a. Federal government (all sources)	\$ _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
b. State government (all sources)	\$ _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
c. Local government (all sources)	\$ _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
d. Foundation grants	\$ _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
e. Corporate giving	\$ _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
f. Civic/individual donations	\$ _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
g. Fees charged to employers for workforce services	\$ _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
h. Fees charged to learners	\$ _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
i. Other (please specify)	\$ _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
<hr style="width: 20%; margin-left: 0;"/>		
TOTAL PROGRAM FUNDING	\$ _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	100%

Q7. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, how much of the total program funding dollar amount listed in **Q6** did you spend on the following items?

- Please include funding for all programs regardless of whether the learners or students are reported for the NRS.
- Answer using dollars or as a percentage, whichever is easier. If answering in dollars, total should equal amount reported in **Q6**.
- If you did not spend money on an item, please enter "0."

	Dollars	Percentage
a. Administrative staff	\$ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
b. Instructional staff (creation/delivery of instruction)	\$ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
c. Counseling staff	\$ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
d. Other staff	\$ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
e. Assessment materials	\$ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
f. Instructional materials/equipment	\$ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
g. Support services for learners (child care, transportation, etc.)	\$ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
h. Infrastructure costs for One-Stops/American Job Centers (non-personnel administrative costs)	\$ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
i. Shared costs for services at One-Stops/American Job Centers	\$ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
j. Other (please specify)	\$ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	_ _ %
TOTAL PROGRAM FUNDING	\$ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ , _ _ _ _ .00	100%

Q8. For the **occupational skills training component of any IET** offered by you or your partners, approximately how much funding came from the following sources for the program year from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- Please include funding for you or your partners.
- Please include any IET offered with ABE, ASE, ESL, or IELCE.

Our program did not offer IET → GO TO Q9

	None from this source (0%)	A little from this source (1-25% of occupational skills training costs)	Some from this source (26-50% of occupational skills training costs)	A lot from this source (51-75% of occupational skills training costs)	Almost all from this source (76-100% of occupational skills training costs)
a. Federal funding for workforce development (Title I/III)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Federal funding for adult education (Title II/AEFLA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Federal funding for vocational rehabilitation (Title IV)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. State funding for workforce development, adult education or vocational rehabilitation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Employment & Training funding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) funding for workforce development and adult education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funding for workforce development and adult education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Perkins Career and Technical Education funding for adult and postsecondary education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Fees charged to learners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Foundation grants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Employer contributions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Other source (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Instructional Services Provided

Please answer questions about the services you provided to LEARNERS OR STUDENTS WHO YOU REPORTED TO YOUR STATE FOR THE NATIONAL REPORTING SYSTEM (NRS) DURING THE PROGRAM YEAR JULY 1, 2018 TO JUNE 30, 2019.

For the purpose of this section, “courses” are defined as any size group of learners taught or facilitated by an instructor. Please include distance learning programming in the numbers you report.

Q9. How many courses did you offer for each program type in the program year from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- If your courses include learners from several program types (e.g., ABE and ASE students are in the same class), please enter an unduplicated number of courses in the program type that best captures the levels of the students enrolled.
- Please count courses as you would for administrative purposes. For example, if you enroll for courses one time per year you may only count them once, whereas if you enroll for courses each term you may count courses by the number of terms in which they are offered.

Program Type	Number of Courses
a. Adult Basic Education (ABE), ABE level 1-4	_ _ _
b. Adult Secondary Education (ASE), ABE level 5-6	_ _ _
c. English Language Acquisition (ELA/ESL), level 1-6 <i>Please include Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs (Sec. 243 of WIOA) courses</i>	_ _ _
TOTAL	_ , _ _ _

Q9a. Approximately how many of the ELA/ESL courses included civics instruction?

Number of Courses |_|_|_|

Q10. How many weeks were the following types of instruction offered in your program during the 52 weeks from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- Please enter the number of weeks for each type. If this type of instruction is not offered, enter a zero. If this type of instruction is offered for an entire year, enter 52.
- Please enter the number of weeks separately for each type of instruction offered as part of an IET program.

	Number of weeks
a. Adult Basic Education (ABE), ABE level 1-4	_ _
a_1. IET as part of an ABE program	_ _
b. Adult Secondary Education (ASE), ABE level 5-6	_ _
b_1. IET as part of an ASE program	_ _
c. English Language Acquisition (ELA/ESL), level 1-6	_ _
c_1. IET as part of an ELA/ESL program	_ _
<i>Please include Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs (Sec. 243 of WIOA) courses</i>	

Q11a. What percentage of any Adult Basic Education (ABE Levels 1-4) courses provided were offered for the following number of hours during a typical week from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- For example, if three-quarters of your ABE courses meet 3 days per week for two hours each day (or 6 hours per week), you would write 75% in the 4-6 hours row; and, if the remaining one-quarter of your ABE courses provide individual tutoring for two days per week for one hour per day (or 2 hours per week), you would write 25% in the 3 or fewer hours row.

Our program did not offer Adult Basic Education Courses → GO TO Q11b

	ABE courses offered
a. 3 or fewer hours per week	_ _ _ %
b. 4 to 6 hours per week	_ _ _ %
c. 7 to 12 hours per week	_ _ _ %
d. 13 to 19 hours per week	_ _ _ %
e. 20 or more hours per week	_ _ _ %
TOTAL COURSES	100%

Q11b. What percentage of any Adult Secondary Education (ASE Level 5-6) courses provided were offered for the following number of hours during a typical week from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- For example, if three-quarters of your ASE courses meet 3 days per week for two hours each day (or 6 hours per week), you would write 75% in the 4-6 hours row; and, if the remaining one-quarter of your ASE courses provide individual tutoring for two days per week for one hour per day (or 2 hours per week), you would write 25% in the 3 or fewer hours row.

Our program did not offer Adult Secondary Education Courses → GO TO Q11c

	ASE courses offered
a. 3 or fewer hours per week	____ %
b. 4 to 6 hours per week	____ %
c. 7 to 12 hours per week	____ %
d. 13 to 19 hours per week	____ %
e. 20 or more hours per week	____ %
TOTAL COURSES	100%

Q11c. What percentage of any English Language Acquisition (ELA/ESL) courses provided were offered for the following number of hours during a typical week from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- Please include Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs (Sec. 243 of WIOA) courses.
- For example, if three-quarters of your ELA/ESL courses meet 3 days per week for two hours each day (or 6 hours per week), you would write 75% in the 4-6 hours row; and, if the remaining one-quarter of your ELA/ESL courses provide individual tutoring for two days per week for one hour per day (or 2 hours per week), you would write 25% in the 3 or fewer hours row.

Our program did not offer English Language Acquisition Courses → GO TO Q12

	ELA/ESL courses offered
a. 3 or fewer hours per week	____ %
b. 4 to 6 hours per week	____ %
c. 7 to 12 hours per week	____ %
d. 13 to 19 hours per week	____ %
e. 20 or more hours per week	____ %
TOTAL COURSES	100%

Q12. Considering all instruction provided by your program in a typical week in the program year from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, what percentage of your courses were offered...?

• Please enter percentages in each row. If none, enter a zero.

- | | |
|---|---------|
| a. During the work day, | _ _ _ % |
| b. In the evenings, | _ _ _ % |
| c. On weekends, | _ _ _ % |
| d. At a time of the learner's choosing, not including tutoring (e.g., entirely through distance learning), or | _ _ _ % |
| e. Other (please specify) | _ _ _ % |

TOTAL COURSES	100%
---------------	------

Q13. Considering all instructional services provided by your program from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, what percentage of your courses were...

• Please enter percentages. If none, enter a zero.

- | | |
|--|---------|
| a. Open enrollment (open entry/open exit) | _ _ _ % |
| b. Managed enrollments (courses with distinct start and end dates) | _ _ _ % |

TOTAL COURSES	100%
---------------	------

Q14. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, how many of the Adult Basic Education (ABE Level 1-4) courses provided by your program used any of the following contextualized instructional approaches?

- Please think specifically about level 1 through 4 ABE instruction, not adult education in general.

Our program did not offer level 1 through 4 ABE courses → GO TO Q15

- Please include courses in your estimate that use each of the following approaches as a component of a course, or are used in combination with other approaches below, or are used as the main instructional approach for a course.

Please select one response per row.

	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
a. 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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. 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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously with instruction with an occupational skills training partner that does not use a shared curriculum (i.e., concurrent enrollment)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Basic skills instruction that uses occupational topics as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses literature on health occupations)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Basic skills instruction that uses academic subjects as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses science texts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. 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”).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. 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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Workforce preparation activities (e.g., related to critical thinking, digital literacy, employability skills)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Career exploration or awareness activities (e.g., visits to worksites)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
j. Other approach (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[If Q14a is not equal to “None”] Q14a.1 In the program year from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, how many of your level 1 through 4 ABE courses that provide instruction offered simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner also **included workforce preparation activities**?

- Please think specifically about level 1 through 4 ABE instruction, not adult education in general.
- The term “workforce preparation activities” means activities, programs, or services designed to help an individual acquire a combination of basic academic skills, critical thinking skills, digital literacy skills, and employability skills. This includes competencies in utilizing resources, using information, working with others, understanding systems, and obtaining skills necessary for successful transition into and completion of postsecondary education or training, or employment.

Please select one response.

No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[If Q14b is not equal to “None”] Q14b.1. In the program year from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, how many of your level 1 through 4 ABE courses that provide instruction 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**?

- Please think specifically about level 1 through 4 ABE instruction, not adult education in general.
- The term “workforce preparation activities” means activities, programs, or services designed to help an individual acquire a combination of basic academic skills, critical thinking skills, digital literacy skills, and employability skills. This includes competencies in utilizing resources, using information, working with others, understanding systems, and obtaining skills necessary for successful transition into and completion of postsecondary education or training, or employment.

Please select one response per row.

No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q15. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, how many of the Adult Secondary Education (ABE Level 5-6) courses provided by your program used any of the following contextualized instructional approaches?

- Please think specifically about ASE instruction (ABE Level 5-6), not adult education in general.

Our program did not offer ASE courses → GO TO Q16

- Include courses in your estimate that use each of the following approaches as a component of a course, or are used in combination with other approaches below, or are used as the main instructional approach for a course.

Please select one response per row.

	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
a. 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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. 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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Basic skills instruction taught simultaneously with instruction with an occupational skills training partner that does not use a shared curriculum (i.e., concurrent enrollment)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Basic skills instruction that uses occupational topics as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses literature on health occupations)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Basic skills instruction that uses academic subjects as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses science texts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. 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).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. 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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Workforce preparation activities (e.g., related to critical thinking, digital literacy, employability skills)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Career exploration or awareness activities (e.g., visits to worksites)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
j. Other approach (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[If 15a is not equal to “None”] Q15a.1. In the program year from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, how many of your level ASE courses (ABE Level 5-6) that provide instruction offered simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner also **included workforce preparation activities?**

- Please think specifically about ASE instruction (ABE Level 5-6), not adult education in general.
- The term “workforce preparation activities” means activities, programs, or services designed to help an individual acquire a combination of basic academic skills, critical thinking skills, digital literacy skills, and employability skills. This includes competencies in utilizing resources, using information, working with others, understanding systems, and obtaining skills necessary for successful transition into and completion of postsecondary education or training, or employment.

Please select one response.

No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[If Q15b is not equal to “None”] Q15b.1. In the program year from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, how many of your level 5 and 6 ASE courses that provide instruction 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?**

- Please think specifically about ASE instruction (ABE Level 5-6), not adult education in general.
- The term “workforce preparation activities” means activities, programs, or services designed to help an individual acquire a combination of basic academic skills, critical thinking skills, digital literacy skills, and employability skills. This includes competencies in utilizing resources, using information, working with others, understanding systems, and obtaining skills necessary for successful transition into and completion of postsecondary education or training, or employment.

Please select one response.

No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q16. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, how many of the English Language Acquisition (ELA)/English as a Second Language (ESL) courses provided by your program used any of the following contextualized instructional approaches?

- Please think specifically about ELA/ESL instruction including IELCE (Sec. 243), not adult education in general.

Our program did not offer ELA/ESL courses → GO TO Q17

- Include courses in your estimate that use each of the following approaches as a component of a course, or are used in combination with other approaches below, or are used as the main instructional approach for a course.

Please select one response per row.

	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
a. Basic skills instruction (e.g., ELA/ESL) taught simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner (i.e., integrated instruction or co/team-teaching)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Basic skills instruction (e.g., ELA/ESL) 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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Basic skills instruction (e.g., ELA/ESL) taught simultaneously with instruction with an occupational skills training partner that does not use a shared curriculum (i.e., concurrent enrollment)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Basic skills instruction (e.g., ELA/ESL) that uses occupational topics as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses literature on health occupations)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Basic skills instruction (e.g., ELA/ESL) that uses academic subjects as context (e.g., reading instruction that uses science texts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. 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).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. 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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Workforce preparation activities (e.g., related to critical thinking, digital literacy, employability skills)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
i. Career exploration or awareness activities (e.g., visits to worksites)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Other approach (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[If Q16a is not equal to “None”] Q16a.1. In the program year from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, how many of your ELA/ESL courses that provide instruction simultaneously and in the same classroom as instruction with an occupational skills training partner also **included workforce preparation activities**?

- Please think specifically about ELA/ESL instruction, not adult education in general.
- The term “workforce preparation activities” means activities, programs, or services designed to help an individual acquire a combination of basic academic skills, critical thinking skills, digital literacy skills, and employability skills. This includes competencies in utilizing resources, using information, working with others, understanding systems, and obtaining skills necessary for successful transition into and completion of postsecondary education or training, or employment.

Please select one response.

No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[If Q16b is not equal to “None”] Q16b.1. In the program year from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, how many of your ELA/ESL courses that provide instruction 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**?

- Please think specifically about ELA/ESL instruction, not adult education in general.
- The term “workforce preparation activities” means activities, programs, or services designed to help an individual acquire a combination of basic academic skills, critical thinking skills, digital literacy skills, and employability skills. This includes competencies in utilizing resources, using information, working with others, understanding systems, and obtaining skills necessary for successful transition into and completion of postsecondary education or training, or employment.

Please select one response.

No courses	Less than half	About half	More than half
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q17. Did any of your courses include any of the following options for accelerating instruction for learners in the program year from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

Please select one response per row.

	Yes	No
a. Compressed schedules (compared to similar program offerings), e.g. increasing the number of learning hours in a week and reducing the number of instructional weeks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Dual enrollment opportunities that allow learners to earn postsecondary credits or credentials as part of their adult education program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Competency-based learning (e.g., learners advance by demonstrating knowledge or skills rather than through seat time) delivered face-to-face or through blended or hybrid instruction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Competency-based learning (e.g., learners advance by demonstrating knowledge or skills rather than through seat time) delivered through distance learning only	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other options (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q18. What percentage of your courses in the program year starting July 1, 2018 and ending June 30, 2019 was delivered strictly face-to-face, through blended learning (some instruction and activities delivered face-to-face and some online/through distance education), or through purely online/distance education?

- Please enter percentages for each program type. If none, enter a zero.

	ABE	ASE	ELA/ESL
a. Face-to-face only	____ %	____ %	____ %
b. Blended learning/ hybrid instruction	____ %	____ %	____ %
c. Online/Distance only	____ %	____ %	____ %
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%

Partnerships and Collaborations

Q19. To what extent did you or your staff work with the following organizations on policies, plans or activities related to **providing adult education and literacy instructional programming** from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- In each row, please select the one response that indicates the highest level of collaboration with the organization.

	From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019			
	Not at all	We <u>discussed</u> this programming	We <u>drafted</u> policies or plans for providing this programming	My program or this organization <u>implemented</u> the programming or related policies
a. Local schools (including public technical schools)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Community or technical colleges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. State or local employment, training and vocational rehabilitation agencies (including One-Stops/American Job Centers)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Literacy councils/organizations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Businesses or employers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Labor unions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Workforce Development Boards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Public libraries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Correctional facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Reentry organizations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Other (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q20. To what extent did you or your staff work with the following organizations on policies, plans or activities related to ***providing occupational skills training in your programs*** from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- In each row, please select the one response that indicates the highest level of collaboration with the organization.

	From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019			
	Not at all	We <u>discussed</u> this programming	We <u>drafted</u> policies or plans for providing this programming	My program or this organization <u>implemented</u> the programming or related policies
a. Local schools (including public technical schools)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Community or technical colleges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. State or local employment, training and vocational rehabilitation agencies (including One-Stops/American Job Centers)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Literacy councils/organizations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Businesses or employers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Labor unions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Workforce Development Boards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Public libraries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Correctional facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Reentry organizations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Other (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q21. To what extent did you or your staff work with the following organizations on policies, plans or activities related to **providing transition services** from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- *Transition services are services that promote movement from adult education courses to post-adult education activities, including postsecondary education, occupational skills training, integrated employment, and continuing and adult education .*
- *In each row, please select the one response that indicates the highest level of collaboration with the organization.*

	From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019			
	Not at all	We <u>discussed</u> this programming	We <u>drafted</u> policies or plans for providing this programming	My program or this organization <u>implemented</u> the programming or related policies
a. Local schools (including public technical schools)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Community or technical colleges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. State or local employment, training and vocational rehabilitation agencies (including One-Stops/American Job Centers)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Literacy councils/organizations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Businesses or employers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Labor unions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Workforce Development Boards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Public libraries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Correctional facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Reentry organizations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Other (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q22. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, did your program or one of your partners provide any of the following resources to help transition at least some of your learners to the next step in their **education, training, or employment** (e.g., occupational skills training, postsecondary education, credential attainment)?

Please select all that apply.

	Yes, we provided	Yes, partner provided	No
a. Formal referrals to other education or training providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Foreign transcript review to apply education credits earned in other countries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Help identifying or accessing financial supports for education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Facilitating the postsecondary admissions or registration process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Support developing study skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Career exploration activities or counseling (e.g., interest assessments, career fairs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Help developing individualized career plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Support developing employability skills (e.g., communication training, working in teams, problem solving)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Work-based learning opportunities (e.g., internships, pre-apprenticeships)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Job search assistance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Job placement assistance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Support for advancing in current employment (e.g., obtaining needed certifications and skills for higher-paying positions)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Other (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q23. In the program year from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, which of the following types of public and private community organizations **provided support services** to your learners?

- *Support services are services such as child care, transportation, psychological counseling, housing placement assistance.*

Please select one response per row.

	Provided services	Did not provide services
a. Local schools (including public technical schools)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Community or technical colleges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. State or local employment, training and vocational rehabilitation agencies (including One-Stops/American Job Centers)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Literacy councils/organizations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Businesses or employers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Labor unions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Workforce Development Boards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Public libraries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Correctional facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Reentry organizations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Other (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q24. Did your program or one of your partners provide learners with the following services in the program year from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

Please select all that apply.

	Yes, we provided	Yes, partner provided	No
a. Child care	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Health services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Housing search/placement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Psychological counseling or other mental health services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Translator services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Legal services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Help obtaining public assistance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Yes, we provided	Yes, partner provided	No
i. Disability screening	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Support groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Mentoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Other (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Technical Assistance and Professional Development

Q25. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, did you receive technical assistance or professional development support from your state or their contractors/vendors in the following areas?

- If your program received support at any point throughout the year on a topic (e.g., online courses or guidelines available on the web), select “We received support.”
- If your program received support before July 1, 2018 but not during July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, please select “We did not receive and did not need support” or “We did not receive support but would have liked to.”

Please select one response per row.

	We received support	We did not receive and did not need support	We did not receive support but would have liked to
a. Aligning curricula and instruction to state-adopted academic standards for adult education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Incorporating the essential components of reading instruction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Becoming an effective One-Stop/American Job Center partner to provide adult learners with access to employment, education, and training services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Developing or implementing workforce preparation activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Developing or implementing integrated education and training (IET) programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Developing or implementing Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Developing or implementing programs and partnerships to transition learners from adult education to postsecondary education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	We received support	We did not receive and did not need support	We did not receive support but would have liked to
h. Expanding the focus of English Language Acquisition (ELA/ESL) programs to include preparation for postsecondary education and careers (e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Developing or implementing distance, blended or hybrid learning courses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Using technology for noninstructional purposes (e.g., for recruitment, screening, assessment)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Developing materials, tools or services to help adult learners progress on a career path (e.g., through career navigators, transition advisors, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Meeting federal performance accountability reporting requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Another area of TA/PD provided to adult education providers (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Collecting and Using Data

Q26. How often did you or your staff use performance data to assess your program from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- *Performance data here is used to refer to program enrollment and outcomes reported for federal accountability.*

Please select one response.

- Once that year
- Several times that year
- Monthly
- Several times a month
- Daily to several times a week
- Other (please specify): _____

Q27. How important to your program was using results from the assessment of your performance data for the following purposes from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- *Performance data here is used to refer to program enrollment and outcomes reported for federal accountability.*

Please select one response per row.

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important
a. Making decisions about changes needed to curricula	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Making decisions about staff retention	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Making decisions about hiring needs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Making decisions about changes needed in support services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Determining needs for technical assistance or professional development for staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Reporting program performance to local partners, including the local WDB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Marketing or publicizing programs to potential partners, funders, or learners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other (please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q28. How challenging were these aspects of **collecting data** from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- By “challenging” we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.

	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging	Not applicable
a. Getting complete and accurate data on learners’ barriers to employment at intake (e.g., displaced homemaker, ex-offender status, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Getting complete and accurate measurable skill gains data (e.g., obtaining high post-testing rates)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Having enough information on learners (e.g., date of birth, SSN) to determine their postsecondary outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Having enough information on learners (e.g., date of birth, SSN) to determine their employment outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Having enough information from supplemental data sources such as surveys to determine learners’ follow-up postsecondary or employment outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other (please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Demand and Waitlists for Services

Q29. What was the estimated number of potential learners from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 that your program turned away because there was not enough capacity to serve them?

- Enter number for each program. If none, enter 0.

	Not enough capacity
a. ABE, ABE level 1-4	_ _ _
b. ASE, ABE level 5-6	_ _ _
c. ELA/ESL, level 1-6 <i>Please include Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs (Sec. 243 of WIOA)</i>	_ _ _

Q30. Did your program maintain a waiting list for any of the following instructional services from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

Please select one response per row.

	Yes	No
a. ABE, ABE level 1-4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. ASE, ABE level 5-6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. ELA/ESL, level 1-6 <i>Please include Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs (Sec. 243 of WIOA)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Other (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Challenges Under the New Adult Education Law (WIOA)

Q31. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, how challenging were these aspects of providing adult education and literacy services?

- By “challenging” we mean the complexity in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.

	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging	Not applicable
a. Working with local organizations to provide adult education and literacy programming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Working with local organizations to provide occupational skills training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Working with local organizations to provide transition services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Working with local organizations to provide support services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Developing or implementing integrated education and training (IET) programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Developing or implementing Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE; Sec. 243) programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Developing or implementing programs to transition learners from adult education to postsecondary education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Including preparation for postsecondary education and careers in English Language Acquisition programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Getting the technical assistance or professional development needed to implement changes related to new emphases or requirements in the law (e.g., IET, instruction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging	Not applicable
aligned to state-approved content standards, changes to performance measures)					
j. Having instructional staff who have the time or expertise to implement changes in the law (e.g., IET or IELCE [Sec. 243])	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Meeting federal performance accountability reporting requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Using data to make decisions about how to improve your program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Other (please specify):	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The State Director Survey

National Study of the Implementation of Adult Education



National Assessment of Adult Education

Adult Education State Director Survey

REFERENCE COPY ONLY – COMPLETE SURVEY ONLINE

Instructions: Please answer questions about THE PROGRAM YEAR JULY 1, 2018 TO JUNE 30, 2019.

Information collected for this study comes under the confidentiality and data protection requirements of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, Title I, Part E, Section 183. Responses to this data collection will be used only for statistical purposes. The reports prepared for this study will provide state-level information on the implementation of adult education. Although your name will not be released, data displayed by state will be attributed to the state agency and could be attributed to an individual respondent by readers of the report.

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1850-0948. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including the time needed to review instructions, search existing data sources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to: Melanie Ali, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, 550 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20004. Do not return the completed form to this address.

7150_05/19

Key Terms

In the survey we refer to specific terms from the federal legislation for adult education and workforce development—WIOA. These are listed here so that all state directors are applying the same definition to these terms.

Adult Education and Literacy Activities: Programs, activities, and services that include adult education, literacy, workplace adult education and literacy activities, family literacy activities, English language acquisition activities, integrated English literacy and civics education, workforce preparation activities, or integrated education and training.

Core Partners: The state agencies defined as core partners in your unified or combined state plan that are responsible for administering adult education and training activities, and employment and vocational rehabilitation services under WIOA.

Integrated Education and Training (IET): A service approach that provides adult education and literacy activities concurrently and contextually with workforce preparation activities and workforce training for a specific occupation or occupational cluster for the purpose of educational and career advancement.

Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE; Sec. 243): A service provided to English language learners that includes instruction in literacy and English language acquisition and instruction on the rights and responsibilities of citizenship and civic participation and may include workforce training.

One-Stop Centers (also called American Job Centers or Career Centers): Local, co-located employment service providers that offer a range of assistance to job seekers. One-Stops offer access to training programs and activities, career counseling, job listings, and similar employment-related services either in person or online.

Workforce Development: Activities and services made available through the core program partners and other One-Stop partners to support employment and training.

Workforce Preparation Activities: Activities, programs, or services designed to help an individual acquire a combination of basic academic skills, critical thinking skills, digital literacy skills, and employability skills. This includes competencies in utilizing resources, using information, working with others, understanding systems, and obtaining skills necessary for successful transition into and completion of postsecondary education or training, or employment.

Workforce Development Partners: *State* workforce development partners include all those identified in your unified or combined state plan, and other state-level agencies or organizations that support workforce development (e.g., through Temporary Assistance for Needy Families [TANF], postsecondary education, or other resources). *Local* workforce development partners include local workforce development boards, One-Stop/American Job Center operators, employers, postsecondary education and training providers, and other local agencies or organizations that support workforce development.

Funding and Grantmaking

Q1. For what program year did your state hold its most recent funding competition for providers of adult education and literacy under Title II (AEFLA)?

20|_|_| Year

Q2. What was the total number of years in the funding cycle for the most recent competition, including any base and optional years?

- 2 years of funding
- 3 years of funding
- 4 years of funding
- 5 years of funding
- Other (please specify): _____

Q3. Does your state hold a separate funding competition for integrated English literacy and civics education (IELCE) offered by providers of adult education and literacy under Sec. 243 of Title II (AEFLA)?

- Yes → GO TO Q4
- No → GO TO Q5

Q4. For what program year did your state hold its most recent funding competition for IELCE?

20|_|_| Year

Q5. What was the total dollar amount your state's adult education program received from governmental and other sources (e.g., foundations) to support Title II adult education and literacy activities and related state leadership activities from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- *Include full state and local funding and other state line item funding, including funds beyond those reported for federal match.*

Enter dollar amount. \$|_|_|_|,|_|_|_|,|_|_|_|.00

Partnerships and Collaborations

Q6. To what extent did you or your adult education staff work on policies, plans, or activities related to workforce development with each of the entities below from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- In each row, please select the one response that indicates the highest level of collaboration.

	From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019				
	Not at all	We discussed policies or plans	We drafted policies or plans	My program or this entity implemented the activities or policies	This entity does not exist in my state
a. State Workforce Development Board (including subcommittees or working groups)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. State labor agency (<i>independent of a workforce development board</i>)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c. State vocational rehabilitation agency (<i>independent of a workforce development board</i>)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
d. Postsecondary education providers (<i>independent of a workforce development board</i>)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
e. Local Workforce Development Boards (including subcommittees or working groups)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
f. Businesses, employers or representatives (e.g., Chamber of Commerce) (<i>independent of a workforce development board</i>)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
g. Other, please specify: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

REFERENCE COPY ONLY – COMPLETE SURVEY ONLINE

Q7. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, did you or your adult education staff participate in any of the following ways with workforce development entities?

The state's workforce development board is established under WIOA Sec. 101. It may have a different name in your state.

	Yes	No
a. Served as the official representative for adult education on the state's workforce development board (WDB)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Served as an official member on any subcommittees or working groups of the state's WDB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Participated in the state's WDB or subcommittee/working group activities but did not serve as an official member	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Participated in working groups or collaborations with core partners <i>independent of</i> state WDB activities (core partners are those listed in your unified or combined state plan)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Participated in working groups or collaborations that included postsecondary education providers <i>independent of</i> state WDB activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Attended meetings of one or more <i>local</i> WDBs or any of their subcommittees or working groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Participated in business roundtables or other types of working groups that include employers at the state or local level	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Collaborating with State Workforce Development Partners

Q8. To what extent did you or your adult education staff work with any state workforce development partners on policies, plans, or activities related to **establishing and administering a shared workforce development system** from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019? Specifically, to what extent did you work together on...

- *State workforce development partners include all those identified in your unified or combined state plan, and other state-level agencies or organizations that support workforce development (e.g., through Temporary Assistance for Needy Families [TANF], postsecondary education, or other resources). This excludes local entities, such as local workforce development boards.*
- *In each row, please select the one response that indicates the highest level of collaboration.*

	From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019			
	Not at all	We discussed policies or plans	We drafted policies or plans	My program or our partner(s) implemented the activities or policies)
a. Supporting state-level staff training (e.g., training on each partner's roles and responsibilities under WIOA or training on shared data systems)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Putting agreements in place to operate and fund the local workforce development (One-Stop) delivery system (e.g., for infrastructure cost sharing)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Putting agreements in place to provide shared instructional services (e.g., for sharing the cost of instructional programming, for co-enrollment policies and procedures)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Aligning technology and data systems across One-Stop partner programs (e.g., using a common intake system)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q9. To what extent did you or your adult education staff work with any state workforce development partners on policies, plans, or activities related to **providing adult education and literacy instructional programming** from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019? Specifically, to what extent did you work together on...

- In each row, please select the one response that indicates the highest level of collaboration.

	From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019			
	Not at all	We discussed policies or plans	We drafted policies or plans	My program or our partner(s) implemented the activities or policies
a. Identifying or developing programming designed to enhance digital literacy skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Identifying or developing short-term programs to assist participants with transitioning to occupational skills training programs (e.g., bootcamps)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Identifying or developing short-term programs to assist participants with transitioning to postsecondary programs (e.g., bridge courses)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Identifying or developing strategies to accelerate instruction (e.g., through compressed schedules)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Identifying or developing strategies to reduce the time or cost to earn a recognized postsecondary credential	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Developing Integrated Education and Training programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Providing English language acquisition (ELA/ESL) instruction for participants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Expanding the focus of ELA/ESL programs to include preparation for postsecondary education and careers (e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q10. To what extent did you or your adult education staff work with any state workforce development partners on policies, plans, or activities related to **providing accessibility and support services** from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019? Specifically, to what extent did you work together on...

- In each row, please select the one response that indicates the highest level of collaboration.

	From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019			
	Not at all	We discussed policies or plans	We drafted policies or plans	My program or our partner(s) implemented the activities or policies
a. Conducting outreach to individuals who could benefit from program activities and services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Making the internet accessible to participants living in remote areas (e.g., providing hotspots, having statewide broadband initiatives)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Making assistive technology available to participants with disabilities (e.g., through device lending libraries, accessible One-Stop web sites and services)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Providing support services for participants with disabilities or other barriers to employment (e.g., childcare, transportation, career counseling)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Providing career services for job seekers (e.g., individualized career plans, job search assistance)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q11. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, how challenging was it to work with your state workforce development partners on these activities related to **establishing and administering a shared workforce development system?**

- By “challenging” we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.

	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging
a. Supporting state-level staff training (e.g., training on each partner’s roles and responsibilities under WIOA or training on shared data systems)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Putting agreements in place to operate and fund the local workforce development (One-Stop) delivery system (e.g., for infrastructure cost sharing)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Putting agreements in place to provide shared instructional services (e.g., for sharing the cost of instructional programming, for co-enrollment policies and procedures)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Aligning technology and data systems across One-Stop partner programs (e.g., using a common intake system)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other, please specify:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q12. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, how challenging was it to work with your state workforce development partners on these activities related to **providing adult education and literacy instructional programming**?

- By “challenging” we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.

	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging
a. Identifying or developing programming designed to enhance digital literacy skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Identifying or developing short-term programs to assist participants with transitioning to occupational skills training programs (e.g., bootcamps)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Identifying or developing short-term programs to assist participants with transitioning to postsecondary programs (e.g., bridge courses)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Identifying or developing strategies to accelerate instruction (e.g., through compressed schedules)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Identifying or developing strategies to reduce the time or cost to earn a recognized postsecondary credential	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Developing Integrated Education and Training programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Providing English language acquisition instruction for participants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other, please specify:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q13. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, how challenging was it to work with your state workforce development partners on these activities related to **providing accessibility and support services**?

- By “challenging” we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.

	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging
a. Conducting outreach to individuals who could benefit from program activities and services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Making the internet accessible to participants living in remote areas (e.g., providing hotspots, having statewide broadband initiatives)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Making assistive technology available to participants with disabilities (e.g., through device lending libraries, accessible One-Stop web sites and services)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Providing support services for participants with disabilities or other barriers to employment (e.g., childcare, transportation, career counseling)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Providing career services for job seekers (e.g., individualized career plans, job search assistance)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other, please specify:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Collaborating with Local Workforce Development Partners

Q14. Did you or your adult education staff work with local workforce development partners, excluding your adult education grantees, on any of the following activities from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- *Local workforce development partners include local workforce development boards, One-Stop/American Job Center operators, employers, postsecondary education and training providers, and other local agencies or organizations that support workforce development.*

	Yes	No
a. Supporting local-level staff training about WIOA and the roles and responsibilities of workforce development partners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Putting agreements in place to operate and fund the local workforce development (One-Stop) delivery system (e.g., infrastructure cost sharing)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Putting agreements in place to provide shared instructional services (e.g., for sharing the cost of instructional services, for co-enrollment policies and procedures)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Aligning curricula or credentials offered with local workforce development plans or needs expressed by employers (e.g., through funding IET, apprenticeship or postsecondary bridge programs to prepare learners for pathways into high-demand occupations)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q15. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, how challenging was it to work with local workforce development partners on the following activities?

- *By “challenging” we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.*

	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging
a. Supporting local-level staff training about WIOA and the roles and responsibilities of workforce development partners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Putting agreements in place to operate and fund the local workforce development (One-Stop) delivery system (e.g., infrastructure cost sharing)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Putting agreements in place to provide shared instructional services (e.g., for sharing the cost of instructional services, for co-enrollment policies and procedures)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Aligning curricula or credentials offered with local workforce development plans or needs expressed by employers (e.g., through funding IET, apprenticeship or postsecondary bridge programs to prepare learners for pathways into high-demand occupations)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other, please specify:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging

Technical Assistance and Professional Development

Q16. To what extent did your state program discuss, develop, or provide technical assistance (TA) or professional development (PD) for adult education providers on the following topics from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- If your state program had supports in place at any point throughout the year on a topic (e.g., online courses or guidelines available on the web), select “We provided TA or PD on this topic.”
- If your state program provided support before July 1, 2018 but not during July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, please select “We did not discuss or provide TA or PD on this topic.”

	From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019			
	We did not discuss or provide TA or PD on this topic	We discussed providing TA or PD on this topic	We developed TA or PD on this topic	We provided TA or PD on this topic
a. Aligning curricula and instruction to state-adopted academic standards for adult education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Incorporating the essential components of reading instruction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Becoming an effective One-Stop/American Job Center partner to provide adult learners with access to employment, education, and training services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Developing or implementing workforce preparation activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Developing or implementing integrated education and training (IET) programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Developing or implementing Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Developing or implementing programs and partnerships to transition learners from adult education to postsecondary education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Expanding the focus of English language acquisition (ELA/ESL) programs to include preparation for postsecondary education and careers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019			
	We did not discuss or provide TA or PD on this topic	We discussed providing TA or PD on this topic	We developed TA or PD on this topic	We provided TA or PD on this topic
(e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways, etc.)				
i. Developing or implementing distance, blended or hybrid learning courses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Using technology for noninstructional purposes (e.g., for recruitment, screening, assessment)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Developing materials, tools or support services to help adult learners progress on a career path (e.g., through career navigators, transition advisors, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Meeting federal performance accountability reporting requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Other, please specify:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q17. On which three technical assistance or professional development topics did your state program focus most of its efforts from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- *By “focus”, we mean where your state program invested the most resources (e.g., staff time, funding).*
- *Please select up to three only.*
- Aligning curricula and instruction to state-adopted academic standards for adult education
- Incorporating the essential components of reading instruction
- Becoming an effective One-Stop/American Job Center partner to provide adult learners with access to employment, education, and training services
- Developing or implementing workforce preparation activities
- Developing or implementing integrated education and training (IET) programs
- Developing or implementing Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs
- Developing or implementing programs and partnerships to transition learners from adult education to postsecondary education
- Expanding the focus of English language acquisition (ELA/ESL) programs to include preparation for postsecondary education and careers (e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways, etc.)
- Developing or implementing distance, blended or hybrid learning courses
- Using technology for noninstructional purposes (e.g., for recruitment, screening, assessment)
- Developing materials, tools or support services to help adult learners progress on a career path (e.g., through career navigators, transition advisors, etc.)
- Meeting federal performance accountability reporting requirements
- Other, please specify: _____

Q18. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, how challenging was it for your state program to provide technical assistance or professional development to adult education providers on the following topics?

- By “challenging” we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.

	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging
a. Aligning curricula and instruction to state-adopted academic standards for adult education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Incorporating the essential components of reading instruction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Becoming an effective One-Stop/American Job Center partner to provide adult learners with access to employment, education, and training services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Developing or implementing workforce preparation activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Developing or implementing integrated education and training (IET) programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Developing or implementing Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Developing or implementing programs and partnerships to transition learners from adult education to postsecondary education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Expanding the focus of English language acquisition (ELA/ESL) programs to include preparation for postsecondary education and careers (e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Developing or implementing distance, blended or hybrid learning courses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Using technology for noninstructional purposes (e.g., for recruitment, screening, assessment)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Developing materials, tools or support services to help adult learners progress on a career path (e.g., through career navigators, transition advisors, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Meeting federal accountability reporting requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Other, please specify:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q18a. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, to what extent did your state discuss providing or provide **training** to designated local program staff (such as career navigators) whose explicit and primary role is to advise

learners on career and college planning (e.g., how to select and apply for appropriate course work to progress on a career path, how to access financial aid)?

- We did not discuss or provide training for this
- We discussed providing training for this
- We drafted training plans and/or materials for this
- We provided training for this

Policies and Procedures

Q19. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, to what extent did your state discuss or implement a **statewide policy** requiring adult education providers to use the following types of programming or services?

- *If your state had a policy in place at any point throughout the year requiring a particular type of programming or service, select “We implemented a policy for this.”*

	From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019			
	We did not discuss or implement a policy for this	We discussed a policy for this	We drafted a policy for this	We implemented a policy for this
a. Instruction that integrates occupational skills training with adult education (e.g., IET)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Postsecondary transition programming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. English language acquisition (ELA/ESL) programs that include preparation for postsecondary education and careers (e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Programming delivered through distance, blended or hybrid learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Designated staff (such as career navigators) whose explicit and primary role is to advise learners on career and college planning, including how to select and apply for appropriate course work to progress on a career path, and how to access financial aid	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q20. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, to what extent did your state program discuss or put in place a **competitive funding application that requires** adult education providers to use the following types of programming or services?

- *If your state program had a competitive funding application requirement in place at any point throughout the year for a particular type of programming or service, select “We required this.”*

REFERENCE COPY ONLY – COMPLETE SURVEY ONLINE

- If your state program had a competitive funding application requirement for a particular type of programming or service *before* July 1, 2018 but not during July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, please select “We did not discuss or require this.”

	From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019			
	We did not discuss or require this	We discussed requiring this	We prepared for requiring this	We required this
a. Instruction that integrates occupational skills training with adult education (e.g., IET)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Postsecondary transition programming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. English Language acquisition (ELA/ESL) programs that include preparation for postsecondary education and careers (e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Programming delivered through distance, blended or hybrid learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Designated staff (such as career navigators) whose explicit and primary role is to advise learners on career and college planning, including how to select and apply for appropriate course work to progress on a career path, and how to access financial aid	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q21. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, to what extent did your state program discuss or put in place **other state-level funding policies or practices** (e.g., funding formulas, allocation models, awarding additional points in competitive funding applications, use of in-kind resources) that favor or facilitate adult education providers’ use of the following types of programming or services?

- If your state program had other state-level funding policies or practices in place at any point throughout the year for a particular type of programming or approach, select “We implemented other state-level funding policies or practices for this.”
- If your state program had other state-level funding policies or practices in place *before* July 1, 2018 but not during July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, please select “We did not discuss or implement other state-level funding policies or practices for this.”

	From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019			
	We did not discuss or implement this	We discussed policies or practices for this	We drafted policies or practices for this	We implemented policies or practices for this
a. Instruction that integrates occupational skills training with adult education (e.g., IET)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Postsecondary transition programming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019			
	We did not discuss or implement this	We discussed policies or practices for this	We drafted policies or practices for this	We implemented policies or practices for this
c. English Language acquisition (ELA/ESL) programs that include preparation for postsecondary education and careers (e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Programming delivered through distance, blended or hybrid learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Designated staff (such as career navigators) whose explicit and primary role is to advise learners on career and college planning, including how to select and apply for appropriate course work to progress on a career path, and how to access financial aid	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q22. Did your state program attempt to identify and/or disseminate any promising models of adult education and literacy activities during the time period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- Yes → **GO TO Q23**
- No → **GO TO Q27**

Q23. How important were the following factors in deciding if a model of adult education and literacy activities was “promising” during the time period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important
a. Model was identified as promising by OCTAE or through national technical assistance projects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Model was identified as effective or based on “best practices” in one or more research articles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Model showed evidence of improved outcomes for adult learners compared to other instruction models based on an analysis of state or local data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Other, please specify: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q24. How challenging was it to identify and/or disseminate any promising models of adult education and literacy activities during the time period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- *By “challenging” we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.*
- Not at all challenging
- Slightly challenging

- Moderately challenging
- Very challenging

Q25. Did your state program identify and/or disseminate at least one promising model of adult education and literacy activities during the time period of July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2019?

- Yes → GO TO Q25b
- No → GO TO Q26

Q25b. Did your state program identify and/or disseminate at least one promising model of adult education and literacy activities in any of the following areas during the time period of July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2019?

	Yes	No
a. Instruction that integrates occupational skills training with adult education (e.g., IET)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Postsecondary transition programming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. English Language acquisition (ELA/ESL) programs that include preparation for postsecondary education and careers (e.g., use of state content standards, links to career pathways, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Programming delivered through distance, blended or hybrid learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Supports designed to help adult learners progress on a career path (e.g., assistance in career planning, accessing financial supports for education, and developing study and work skills)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other promising model, please specify: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q26. How challenging were the following aspects of identifying and disseminating promising models of adult education and literacy activities for your state program during the time period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- By “challenging” we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.

	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging	We did not do this
a. Identifying models that have a research base	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Identifying promising models that apply to particular types of adult learners (e.g., English language learners, ex-offenders)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Programming delivered through distance, blended or hybrid learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging	We did not do this
d. Disseminating promising models effectively	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Providing training on promising models	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Convincing program providers to use promising models	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Other, please specify: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Monitoring and Evaluation

Q27. How often does your state program typically assess the performance of each adult education provider?

- Every other year
- Once a year
- Several times a year
- Monthly
- Several times a month
- Other (please specify): _____

Q28. Are all adult education providers assessed on this schedule?

- Yes
- No

Q29. How important to your state program were the following criteria for assessing the performance of individual providers from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important
a. Provider's performance based on federal accountability measures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Whether the provider's instruction is based on state-adopted standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Provider's progress in planning for or implementing programs that integrate adult education and occupational skills training (i.e., IET and/or IELCE)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Provider's progress in planning for or implementing programs designed to help adult learners transition to or participate in postsecondary education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REFERENCE COPY ONLY – COMPLETE SURVEY ONLINE

Adult Education State Director Survey

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important
e. Number and type of professional development activities available to program staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Number and type of support services offered to adult learners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Level of intensity of instructional services provided	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Whether offerings demonstrate responsiveness to local employer needs based on employer surveys or other sources of feedback	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Provider's fiscal performance and procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Other, please specify: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REFERENCE COPY ONLY – COMPLETE SURVEY ONLINE*Adult Education State Director Survey*

Q30. How important to your state program was using the results from your assessment of individual providers' performance for the following purposes from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

	From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019			
	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important
a. Informing future decisions to fund the adult education provider	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Providing technical assistance or professional development to address the adult education provider's weakness(es)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Modifying or expanding technical assistance or professional development offerings to address common weaknesses among adult education providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Modifying the grant application process to improve program performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Modifying the funding formula to improve program performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Publicizing high performing adult education providers to potential partners, funders, or learners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Other, please specify: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q31. How challenging was using the following criteria for **assessing the performance of adult education providers** during the time period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- By “challenging” we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.

	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging	We did not do this
a. Providers’ performance based on federal accountability measures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Whether the providers’ instruction is based on state-adopted standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Providers’ progress in planning for or implementing programs that integrate adult education and occupational skills training (i.e., IET and/or IELCE)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Providers’ progress in planning for or implementing programs designed to help adult learners transition to or participate in postsecondary education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Number and type of professional development activities available to program staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Number and type of support services offered to adult learners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Level of intensity of instructional services provided	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Whether offerings demonstrate responsiveness to local employer needs based on employer surveys or other sources of feedback	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Providers’ fiscal performance and procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Other, please specify: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q32. How challenging were the following aspects of **meeting performance accountability reporting requirements** during the time period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019?

- By “challenging” we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.

	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging	We did not do this
a. Getting complete and accurate data from providers on their learners' barriers to employment at intake (e.g., displaced homemaker, ex-offender status, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Getting complete and accurate measurable skill gains data from providers (e.g., obtaining high post-testing rates)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Having enough information on learners (e.g., date of birth, SSN) to determine their postsecondary outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Obtaining postsecondary outcomes data from existing sources for learners who leave the state	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Having enough information on learners (e.g., date of birth, SSN) to determine their employment outcomes using data matching to existing data sources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Obtaining employment outcomes data from existing sources for learners who leave the state	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Having enough information from supplemental data sources such as surveys to determine learners' follow-up postsecondary or employment outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other, please specify: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall Challenges Under WIOA

Q33. From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, how challenging were these aspects of providing adult education and literacy services?

- By “challenging” we mean the complexity involved in tackling an issue, the level of effort required, or the number of obstacles you faced.

	Not at all challenging	Slightly challenging	Moderately challenging	Very challenging
a. Working with state workforce development partners to establish and administer a shared workforce development system	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Working with state workforce development partners to provide adult education and literacy instructional programming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Working with state workforce development partners to provide accessibility and support services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Developing or implementing integrated education and training (IET) programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Developing or implementing Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Developing or implementing programs and partnerships to transition learners from adult education to postsecondary education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Expanding the focus of English Language Acquisition (ELA/ESL) programs to include preparation for postsecondary education and careers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Putting funding policies or practices in place to require or encourage providers’ use of particular types of programming or services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Identifying or disseminating promising models of adult education and literacy activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Assessing the performance of adult education providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Meeting performance accountability reporting requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Other (please specify):	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was made possible through the contributions of many individuals at multiple organizations. We are especially grateful for the partnership of the state and local adult education providers that collaborated with us to provide feedback on draft surveys and the data needed for the study. A core group of American Institutes for Research (AIR) and Safal Partners staff contributed to the development of the study's surveys, including conducting cognitive interviews. They included Deanna Achorn and Samantha Lilly at AIR and Margaret Patterson and Michelle Carson at Safal Partners.

Teams of staff from both AIR and Reconnaissance Market Research (ReconMR) worked to establish partnerships with local providers to participate in the study. They included Evan Nielson, Semret Yibass, Cecile Johnson, Alex Mendoza, and Kayleigh Mann at AIR and the staff at ReconMR. Mechelle Timmons and Daniel Hoover at DataForce Survey and Study Management provided mailing and data capture services. A team of staff from AIR analyzed administrative and survey data for the study. This team included Amber Bloomfield, Emily Isenberg, Mickey Jackson, Cecile Johnson, and Amani Talwar.

Many people contributed to the study design, survey content, and interpretation of the study's findings and to the production of this report. The study team received useful advice from our technical working group, which included Carol Clymer, William Durden, Daphne Greenberg, Amanda Harrison, Sheryl Hart, Leicester Johnson, John Kerr, Kathy Olesen-Tracey, Kristen Olsen, Kathleen Porter, Steve Reder, Gilda Rubio-Festa, and Reecie Stagnolia. Judith Alamprese from Abt Associates provided examples of linked instruction and IET programs.

Larry Condelli and Michael Garet from AIR provided important input on the study design, draft surveys, analysis plans, and report. Amy Dalsimer and Elizabeth Zachry Rutschow from AIR provided substantive expertise to help guide survey content and describe the context and issues related to linked instruction. Finally, Cheryl Keenan and Chris Coro from the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education's Division of Adult Education and Literacy provided invaluable assistance in obtaining the data needed for the study and feedback on draft surveys.

DISCLOSURE OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The research team for this evaluation included staff from the American Institutes for Research and its subcontractor, Safal Partners. None of the research team members has financial interests that could be affected by findings from this study. No members of the technical working group, convened twice by the research team over the course of the study to provide advice and guidance, have financial interests that could be affected by findings from the evaluation.