

**Department of Education**  
**ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION**  
**Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request**  
**CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Appropriations language .....	G-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	G-2
Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers .....	G-3
Summary of Changes .....	G-4
Authorizing Legislation .....	G-5
Appropriations History.....	G-6
Activity:	
Language acquisition State grants.....	G-7
State table*	

\*State tables reflecting 2015 allocations and 2016 and 2017 estimates are posted on the Department's Web page at:  
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/statetables/index.html>

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

For carrying out part A of title III of the ESEA, [~~\$737,400,000~~] \$800,400,000, which shall become available on July 1, [~~2016~~]2017, and shall remain available through September 30, [~~2017~~]2018,<sup>1</sup> except that 6.5 percent of such amount shall be available on October 1, [~~2015~~]2016, and shall remain available through September 30, [~~2017~~]2018, to carry out activities under section 3111(c)(1)(C):<sup>2</sup> [*Provided*, That the Secretary shall use estimates of the American Community Survey child counts for the most recent 3-year period available to calculate allocations under such part.]<sup>3</sup> *Provided*, That the Secretary may use \$10,000,000 of funds available under section 3111(c)(1)(C) to award grants on a competitive basis to local educational agencies and local partnerships with other government or non-profit entities to develop effective multi-generational approaches to improve academic and career outcomes for English learners and their families and for the robust evaluation of such activities carried out under such section:<sup>4</sup> *Provided further*, That recipients of such grants shall secure matching contributions of at least 25 percent, in funds or in-kind, from State, local, and/or private sources.<sup>5</sup> (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2016*)

### NOTE

Each language provision that is followed by a footnote reference is explained in the Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes document, which follows the appropriation language.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>1</sup> ...which shall become available on July 1, [2016]2017, and shall remain available through September 30, [2017]2018,</p>	<p>This language provides for a portion of the funds for English Language Acquisition State Grants to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis. The forward-funded portion includes the amount of funds that are distributed to the States under the State grants formula and the Native American discretionary grants.</p>
<p><sup>2</sup>...except that 6.5 percent of such amount shall be available on October 1, [2015]2016, and shall remain available through September 30, [2017]2018, to carry out activities under section 3111(c)(1)(C):</p>	<p>This language provides for 6.5 percent of the funds for the English Language Acquisition State Grants to be appropriated on a 2-year basis. The 6.5 percent represents funds that are used for national activities (National Professional Development grants and National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition) under section 3111(c)(1)(C).</p>
<p><sup>3</sup>[... the Secretary shall use estimates of the American Community Survey child counts for the most recent 3-year period available to calculate allocations under such part.]</p>	<p>In fiscal year 2017, the Administration would use the statutory authority in Title III, Part A to use a combination of data sources, including child counts from the American Community Survey, to calculate the State allocations.</p>
<p><sup>4</sup><u>... the Secretary may use \$10,000,000 of funds available under section 3111(c)(1)(C) to award grants on a competitive basis to local educational agencies and local partnerships with other government or non-profit entities to develop effective multi-generational approaches to improve academic and career outcomes for English learners and their families and for the robust evaluation of such activities carried out under such section:</u></p>	<p>This language provides for a portion of the funds set aside for national activities to support local multi-generational strategies to improve outcomes for English learner students and their families on a competitive basis. In addition, the Department would use a portion of these funds to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of funded strategies.</p>
<p><sup>5</sup><u>... recipients of such grants shall secure matching contributions of at least 25 percent, in funds or in-kind, from State, local, and/or private sources.</u></p>	<p>This language establishes a program requirement that grantees secure matching funds of at least 25 percent of the Federal award to support grant activities and ensure sustainability.</p>

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION**

**Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers**  
(dollars in thousands)

---

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2015	2016	2017
<b>Discretionary:</b>			
Appropriation .....	\$737,400	\$737,400	\$800,400

---

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION**

**Summary of Changes**  
(dollars in thousands)

---

2016.....	\$737,400
2017.....	<u>800,400</u>
Net change .....	+63,000

---

<b>Increases:</b>	<u>2016 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Increase to provide for a more robust National Professional Development competition and to provide additional support to States as they help the significant number of English Learners in U.S. schools attain English language proficiency.	\$737,400	+ <u>\$63,000</u>
Subtotal, increases		+63,000

---

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Authorizing Legislation (dollars in thousands)

Activity	2016 Authorized	2016 Estimate	2017 Authorized	2017 Request
Language acquisition State grants State grants ( <i>ESEA-III-A</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	\$737,400	\$756,332	\$800,400

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in fiscal year 2016 through appropriations language.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2008	\$670,819	\$774,614	\$670,819	\$700,395
2009	730,000	730,000 <sup>1</sup>	730,000 <sup>1</sup>	730,000
2010	730,000	760,000	750,000 <sup>2</sup>	750,000
2011	800,000	750,000 <sup>3</sup>	800,000 <sup>2</sup>	733,350 <sup>4</sup>
2012	750,000	733,531 <sup>5</sup>	733,530 <sup>5</sup>	732,144
2013	732,144	732,144 <sup>6</sup>	732,144 <sup>6</sup>	693,848
2014	732,144	N/A <sup>7</sup>	730,680 <sup>2</sup>	723,400
2015	732,400	N/A <sup>7</sup>	723,400 <sup>8</sup>	737,400
2016	773,400	737,400 <sup>9</sup>	712,021 <sup>9</sup>	737,400
2017	800,400			

<sup>1</sup> The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2009 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress only through the House Subcommittee and the Senate Committee.

<sup>2</sup> The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.

<sup>3</sup> The level for the House allowance reflects the House-passed full-year Continuing Resolution.

<sup>4</sup> The level for the appropriation reflects the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 112-10).

<sup>5</sup> The level for the House allowance reflects an introduced bill; the level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Committee action only.

<sup>6</sup> The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2013 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress only through the House Subcommittee and the Senate Committee.

<sup>7</sup> The House allowance is shown as N/A because there was no Subcommittee action.

<sup>8</sup> The level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Subcommittee action only.

<sup>9</sup> The levels for House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2016 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress only through the House Committee and Senate Committee.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

#### Language acquisition State grants

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title III, Part A)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2017 Authorization: \$756,332

Budget Authority:

<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$737,400	\$800,400	+\$63,000

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Funding for Language Acquisition State Grants, which are authorized by Title III, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), supports formula grants to States to serve English Learners (ELs) as well as competitive awards for a variety of national activities.

The Department uses 92.5 percent of program funds to make formula grants to States based on each State's share of the Nation's EL and recent immigrant student populations, with 80 percent of allocations based on State shares of ELs and 20 percent based on State shares of recent immigrant students. The Department may use American Community Survey (ACS) data provided by the Census Bureau, State-provided data, or data from a combination of these two sources, to determine the counts of both EL and immigrant students. In recent years, the Department has been using 3-year estimates of State shares of EL students derived from ACS data while seeking authority from Congress (through appropriations language) to implement the recommendations of a 2011 National Academy of Sciences (NAS) study that it use a combination of ACS data and State-reported data to determine each State's EL count and continue using ACS data for the State count of immigrant students. The reauthorization of the ESEA by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015 provided authority to implement the NAS recommendations, and in fiscal year 2017 the Department would assign a weight of 10 percent to State-reported data and 90 percent to ACS data on EL counts. In fiscal year 2018, the Department anticipates increasing the weighting of State-reported EL counts to 20 percent, depending on its estimation of the quality of those data at that time. Also consistent with the NAS recommendations, the Department would continue to use ACS data to determine the State counts of immigrant students for the allocations.

States must use at least 95 percent of their formula funds for subgrants to eligible entities, (local educational agencies (LEAs) or consortia of LEAs), based primarily on each subgrantee's share of the State's ELs and a plan submitted by the subgrantee to the State on how it will assist ELs in achieving English language proficiency (ELP) based on the State's assessment and consistent with the State's long-term goals as part of the State's accountability system (Title I, Part A, Section 1111). States must provide additional funding to subgrantees that have experienced a significant increase in the percentage or number of recent immigrant students over the preceding 2 years, and may use up to 15 percent of their awards for this purpose.



## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

States may also use up to 5 percent of their allocations for State-level activities, such as professional development, planning, and evaluation, as well as the provision of technical assistance. State-level planning and direct administrative costs may not exceed 50 percent of the State set-aside, or \$175,000, whichever is greater.

LEAs receiving subgrants must provide effective language instruction educational programs to improve the education of ELs and immigrant youth by helping them to learn English and meet the same challenging college- and career-ready academic standards as other students. LEAs must use funds to: develop and implement new language and academic content programs for ELs and immigrant students; carry out innovative and locally designed activities that improve or expand existing programs for ELs and immigrant students; or implement school- or LEA-wide transformations that would restructure, reform, and upgrade language and academic content programs. Further, LEAs must: demonstrate their success in increasing ELP and academic achievement for ELs and immigrant students; provide effective professional development to educators that is designed to improve instruction and assessment for ELs; provide and implement other effective strategies to support language instruction of ELs; engage parents and families; and coordinate, where appropriate, with other programs that are aligned with the LEA's efforts to improve the education of ELs and immigrant students. LEAs awarded funds based on a substantial increase in the number of immigrant children and youth must use funds for activities that provide enhanced instructional opportunities, which may include parent training, tutorials, mentoring, and career counseling.

States must develop, in meaningful consultation with geographically-diverse LEAs, statewide entrance and exit procedures for EL status, including an assurance that students who may be ELs be assessed within 30 days of enrolling in school. States must also ensure that their subgrantees annually assess the English proficiency of the ELs they serve.

Some accountability provisions related to ELP, which were previously located in Title III in past law, have been revised and moved to Title I, Part A under ESSA. Despite this change, States receiving Title III funds must design plans that incorporate accountability provisions described in Title I, Part A. Specifically, States must set long-term, ambitious goals and timelines for students to become proficient in English and measure student progress toward these goals annually based on interim indicators as part of their State accountability system required by Title I, Part A. Under Title III, States must assist LEAs in meeting the State's long-term goals and interim targets, monitor progress, and respond appropriately if an LEA's strategy proves ineffective in helping ELs make progress and achieve content and language proficiency.

The Department must reserve 0.5 percent of the appropriation, or \$5.0 million, whichever is greater, for schools operated predominately for Native American and Alaska Native children. Under this set-aside, the Department makes competitive awards to tribes, schools funded by the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education, and other qualifying entities. The Department must also set aside 0.5 percent of the appropriation for the Outlying Areas.

The statute further requires the Department to reserve 6.5 percent of the appropriation for the National Professional Development project (NPDP) and the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs (NCELA). Under the

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

NPDP, the Department makes 5-year awards to institutions of higher education or public or private entities with relevant experience and capacity (in partnership with State or local educational agencies) to provide professional development that will improve instruction for ELs, increase the pool of certified or licensed teachers prepared to serve ELs, and enhance the skills of teachers already serving them. In fiscal year 2016, the Department will give priority to NPDP applicants that propose strategies that are evidence-based, and also will encourage applicants to rigorously evaluate their activities. NCELA collects, analyzes, synthesizes, and disseminates research-based information about instructional methods, strategies, and programs for ELs. Under the Title III program statute that was in effect through fiscal year 2016, the Department may use up to 0.5 percent of the appropriation for evaluation activities. Beginning in fiscal year 2017, the Department has the same authority under section 8601 of the ESEA, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015.

In 2015, the Consolidated Appropriations Act provided \$14 million to States that have experienced a recent and significant increase in the numbers of immigrant children served by school districts, resulting in part from the arrival of unaccompanied children placed in local communities in 2014 by the Department of Health and Human Service's Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR). Using ORR data on placements beginning January 1, 2014, the Department awarded these supplemental funds in early calendar year 2015 to States with at least one county where 50 or more unaccompanied children were placed with sponsors while their immigration cases are processed.

State formula grants and Native American grants are forward-funded, with funds becoming available on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year. National activities funds are available for 24 months, from October 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated through September 30 of the following fiscal year.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2012.....	\$732,144
2013.....	693,848
2014.....	723,400
2015.....	737,400
2016.....	737,400

### FY 2017 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2017, the Administration requests \$800.4 million for English Language Acquisition (ELA) grants, \$63 million over the fiscal year 2016 appropriation. The Request includes appropriations language that would override the authorization level for this program. The proposed increase would address the growing demands on States and school districts, including those States and school districts that have experienced rapid growth in their EL

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

populations, to help the significant number of ELs in U.S. schools attain ELP and meet challenging State-determined college- and career-ready academic standards.

Despite patterns of growth, significant achievement gaps remain between ELs and their peers. For example, the high school graduation rate in the 2013–14 school year was 62.6 percent for ELs, compared to 82 percent for all students. In the 2013–2014 school year, ELs graduated high school at lower rates than every other reported subgroup, a pattern that has continued over the past several years. ELs have consistently had markedly lower scores than non-ELs on the National Assessment of Education Progress in reading and math in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades. For example, in 2015 14 percent of ELs scored proficient or better in 4<sup>th</sup> grade math, compared to 43 percent of non-ELs. In 8<sup>th</sup> grade mathematics, 6 percent of ELs scored proficient or better, compared to 35 percent of non-ELs. In 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading, the gap between ELs and non-ELs is even larger. In general, scores in math and reading for ELs were unchanged from 2013 to 2015. State data paint a similar picture.

Furthermore, the Census Bureau's ACS data in recent years have highlighted the growing numbers of school-aged ELs in States and school districts with little experience in serving such students previously. ACS data from 2013 show that California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Texas enroll 60 percent of the Nation's ELs (excluding Puerto Rico), but the growth rate in the EL student population in other States has exceeded that of these five. For example, ACS data show that from 2010 to 2013<sup>1</sup>, the EL population increased by 21 percent in West Virginia, 13 percent in Hawaii and North Dakota, and 12 percent in Iowa. In contrast, during that same timeframe, the EL population in California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Texas changed by -18 percent, -8 percent, -15 percent, -1 percent, and -5 percent respectively. Since those States with the greatest growth over that 3-year period are not the traditional immigrant gateway States, they often lack the infrastructure and service capacity compared to States with a longer history of high EL and immigrant student enrollment.

In addition, some States have experienced large increases in this population over a very short period of time. Alaska, the District of Columbia, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Iowa, Maine, and Nebraska all experienced more than a 16-percent increase in their immigrant population during the 2010 to 2013 timeframe. These demographic trends—the overall increase in ELs over the past three decades (from less than 1 million in 1980 to over 4.2 million in 2013), the rapid recent growth of the EL and immigrant populations in States lacking an infrastructure for serving them—underscore an ongoing need for Federal support, particularly in preparing educators to meet the unique and diverse needs of ELs and to generate information on effective instructional practices to ensure that ELs have access to a high quality education.

### Native American and Alaska Native Children in School (NAM) Grants

The \$5 million set aside for NAM Grants under the 2017 Request would support an estimated 25 continuation awards for grants to schools operated predominantly for Native American and Alaska Native children. The 2011 cohort of these grants received their final awards in 2015,

---

<sup>1</sup> ACS data are estimates from a 3-year period (2008, 2009, and 2010, and 2011, 2012, and 2013, respectively).

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

and the Department plans to hold a competition for new 5-year awards for NAM Grants in 2016. The Department is in the process of redesigning the competition for 2016 with a revised set of priorities, selection criteria, and performance measures intended to strengthen the implementation and outcomes of these projects. In accordance with its recently released tribal consultation policy, the Department recently consulted with tribal leaders to discuss ways to improve the program. Fiscal year 2017 funds would support continuation awards for the 2013 and 2016 cohorts.

### National Activities

The Department believes that increasing the supply of teachers with the training and experience to serve ELs effectively is key to improving classroom instruction for ELs, helping them to achieve ELP, and enabling them to reach high academic standards. Yet many States have reported to the Department consistent shortages in their supply of teachers for ELs (including bilingual teachers, English as a Second Language teachers, or teachers of English as a new language). In some cases SEAs and LEAs have had such serious shortages that they must partner with countries other than the U.S. to bring in teachers to serve ELs. For example, the State of Delaware has entered into Memoranda of Understanding with Spain and China to support its EL instruction programs. Accordingly for fiscal year 2017, the Department would use \$40 million for NPDP and \$2 million for NCELA to help States and school districts meet these challenges. In addition, the Department would use \$10 million to pilot an initiative that would support multi-generational learning as a strategy for improving academic and career outcomes for ELs and immigrant students as well as improved parent/family engagement.

Besides growing and improving the supply of teachers of ELs, there is a great need for State and district capacity-building for meeting the needs of ELs, especially for the States and districts with rapidly emerging communities of ELs and immigrant children and youth. In 2017, the Department intends to respond to this demand by evaluating the particular needs of these communities, the characteristics of the EL populations therein (such as students with interrupted formal education), and the current academic outcomes of ELs. Utilizing these data, the Department intends to provide targeted technical assistance and support to these States or districts in order to improve services and promote greater academic achievement and long-term success for ELs. This effort will include dissemination of evidence-based practices for serving ELs and evaluation of the extent to which technical assistance positively impacts EL achievement in these particular communities.

Of the \$40 million proposed for NPDP grants, the Department would use \$22.8 million to make an estimated 40 continuation awards to fiscal year 2016 grantees and the remaining \$17.2 million to either hold a new competition or fund further down the 2016 slate for an estimated 32 additional new grants. These new grants will help grow teacher capacity to serve ELs and improve their academic outcomes. The Department redesigned the 2016 competition to strengthen NPDP projects by, for example, giving competitive preference to teacher preparation or professional development projects that will (1) improve academic outcomes for ELs using strategies supported by moderate evidence of effectiveness and (2) strengthen parent, family, and community engagement in the education of their children. The Department also revised the performance measures for the program to collect more meaningful data from

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

grantees on the effectiveness of their projects. Finally, the Department encouraged applicants to design rigorous evaluations for their projects in order to grow the evidence base about effective professional development practices for teachers of ELs.

In addition, the Department would use \$10 million to pilot an initiative that would support multi-generational approaches to dramatically improve the educational attainment, language proficiency, and economic well-being of children, youth, and adults who are ELs. The \$10 million requested for this pilot would support 2–3 competitive grants to LEAs and local partnerships and a robust evaluation to determine the impact of multi-generational approaches on educational and employment outcomes. In 2013, 17.4 million children under age 18 lived with at least one immigrant parent—25 percent of the total 69.9 million children in the United States. More than two million of those children were themselves immigrants and were born outside of the United States to foreign-born parents. While 83 percent of children of immigrants are English proficient, nearly half of all children of immigrants have no English proficient parent. Data suggest that the educational attainment and employment conditions of immigrant parents have tangible implications, as higher proficiency in English among immigrant parents is associated with greater academic and economic success of their children. Studies have shown that immigrants who are proficient in English earn more than those who are ELs. Depending on location, immigrant workers proficient in English earn from 17 percent to 135 percent more than workers who are ELs.<sup>1</sup> Researchers have posited that two-generation approaches can more effectively impact low-income children's lives by simultaneously targeting the child and the child's home environment. When parental stress is reduced through adult services like workforce development and continuing education opportunities, roadblocks to child development are removed, interventions have a more sustained impact, and resilience is promoted.<sup>2</sup> While existing Federal programs, such as the Department's adult education programs and the Department of Health and Human Services' Head Start program, address some of these challenges and allow grantees to implement strategies that support multiple generations, grantees in these programs typically focus on meeting the needs of their primary populations. This request would allow the Department to provide funding to support communities that implement specifically multi-generational approaches to improve academic and life outcomes for ELs of all ages.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ross, Tracey. "The Case for a Two-Generation Approach for Educating English Language Learners". Center for American Progress, May 6 2015. Accessed August 24, 2015.

<sup>2</sup> Chase-Lansdale, P. Lindsay and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. "Two-Generation Programs in the Twenty-First Century". *The Future of Children*: Vol. 24 / No. 1, Spring 2014.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

As such, the Department would award 2–3 grants competitively to LEAs and local partnerships with community/faith-based organizations, institutes of higher education, libraries, business, and industry, as appropriate, to develop effective multi-generational approaches to improve academic outcomes for ELs and their families and combat poverty. Grantees would be required to secure a matching contribution of at least 25 percent in funds or in-kind, from State, local, and/or private sources. Grantees would be required to serve at least two generations within a family. The Department would also fund a robust evaluation of the pilot to learn the effects of multi-generational approaches on educational and employment outcomes.

### Evaluation Set-Aside (Section 8601)

In fiscal year 2017, the Department would use up to 0.5 percent of the total request for Title III, Part A funds to support ongoing evaluation activities (described below) and provide technical assistance to NPDP grantees that carry out rigorous evaluations of their projects.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
<b>Total Appropriation</b>	\$737,400	\$737,400	\$800,400
<b>State formula grants</b>			
Language acquisition State grants	\$670,469	\$684,469	\$739,372
Number of States	56	56	56
Supplemental immigrant State grants	14,000	0	0
Number of States	35	0	0
<b>NAM Grants</b>			
Grant award funds(new)	0	\$4,182	0
Grant award funds (continuations)	\$5,000	798	\$5,000
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	5,000	5,000	5,000
Number of new awards	0	12	0
Number of continuation awards	25	15	25
<b>National Activities</b>			
NPDP grant funds (new)	\$1,401	\$22,807	\$17,219
NPDP grant funds (continuation)	41,340	19,822	22,807
Peer review of new award applications	0	50	0
Clearinghouse	1,503	1,565	2,000
Multi-generational learners pilot	0	0	10,000

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
Evaluation (see below)	<u>3,687</u>	<u>3,687</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	\$47,931	\$47,931	\$52,026
Number of NPDP Grant awards (new)	0	40	32
Number of NPDP grant awards (continuations)	114	72	40
<b>Evaluation Set-aside (Section 8601)</b>	0	0	\$4,002

NOTE: The ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, authorizes the Department to pool funds reserved for evaluation under section 8601, including Title III funds, and use those pooled funds to evaluate any ESEA program. The Department may pool Title III funds in fiscal year 2017.

## PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2017 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

### State Grant Program

States report their data for the Language Acquisition State grants program annually through the ESEA Consolidated State Performance Reports (CSPRs). Over the years the Department has worked to respond to States' questions about the data collection requirements as well as to clear up data discrepancies. Note that flexibility within the previous law permitted States to define "making progress" and "attaining proficiency" differently, even when they used the same assessments. All of these factors affect the targets set for the measures below. In 2013, all 52 entities, including DC and Puerto Rico, reported data for all performance measures. The Department may revise the performance measures that will be used for this program for new grants made in fiscal year 2017 and future years in response to the changes made by the ESSA.

**Goal: To help English Learners learn English and reach high academic standards.**

**Objective:** *To improve the English proficiency and academic achievement of students served by the Language Acquisition State Grants program.*

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

**Measure:** The percentage of ELs receiving Title III services who are making progress in learning English.

Year	Target	Actual
2012	65%	54%
2013	65	49
2014	65	50
2015	65	
2016	65	
2017	65	

**Additional information:** The percentage is calculated by taking the total number of students who are making progress in learning English, according to the State's ELP assessment, and dividing that number by the number of students tested who have two data points. Students without two data points are not included in this measure. All 52 entities, including 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, reported data for the 2013–2014 school year.

**Measure:** The percentage of ELs receiving Title III services who have attained ELP.

Year	Target	Actual
2012	35%	27%
2013	35	28
2014	35	25
2015	35	
2016	35	
2017	35	

**Additional information:** Students who are counted in the denominator for this measure include students who are new to this country and have had very little exposure to English. The percentage is calculated by dividing the total number of students who attain ELP, according to the State's ELP assessment, and dividing that number by the number of students tested. All 52 entities, including 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, reported data for the 2013–2014 school year.

**Measure:** The percentage of ELs who score proficient or above on State reading assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2012	36%	38%
2013	38	36
2014	38	37
2015	38	
2016	38	
2017	38	

**Additional information:** States are required to report data on the performance of the EL subgroup on State reading/language arts assessments for both Title I and Title III of the ESEA. The percentage is calculated by dividing the number of ELs that scored proficient or above on



## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

State reading assessments by the number of ELs tested. Fifty-one entities, including 49 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, reported data for the 2013–2014 school year. One State (Kansas) was not able to report assessment data in the 2013–2014 school year due to cybersecurity issues.

**Measure:** The percentage of monitored former ELs who score proficient or above on State reading assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2012	66%	72%
2013	66	67
2014	66	64
2015	66	
2016	66	
2017	66	

**Additional information:** Under past law, a monitored former EL is a student who was identified as limited English proficient or EL in the prior two years but who no longer meets the State's definition of limited English proficient or EL. Note that under ESSA, a monitored former EL is a student who was identified as limited English proficient or EL in the prior four years but who no longer meets the State's definition of limited English proficient or EL. Because these performance data are calculated based on the definition of the term under past law, the Department uses that term when discussing this metric. The success of States on this measure may be an indicator of the improved quality of language instruction educational programs. Fifty entities, including 48 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, reported data for the 2013–2014 school year. One State (Kansas) was not able to report assessment data in the 2013–2014 school year due to cybersecurity issues and another (California) was not able to report assessment data because of its participation in the Smarter Balanced field test.

### ELA Grant Program Efficiency Measures

The Department has developed two efficiency measures for this program. These measures address the Department's emphasis on the timely and effective use of Federal funds.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

**Measure:** The number of States receiving Title III funds that took 45 days or less to make subgrants to subgrantees.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	28	34
2015	28	
2016	28	
2017	30	

**Measure:** The number of States that spend 99 percent or more of their Title III subgrant funds on services to EL students within 27 months of their grant award.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	45	47
2015	45	
2016	46	
2017	47	

**Additional information:** This measure was introduced in 2014 after Departmental review of the preceding performance measure (the annual cost per EL attaining ELP). This measure is based on the Department's review and empirical data and was approved by the Office of Management and Budget in August 2014.

### NPDP Grant Program

The Department established the following measures for the 2011 and 2013 cohorts of the NPDP Grants. The data and targets shown are for the two cohorts combined. Accordingly, for 2012, the data and targets pertain only to the 2011 cohort; and for 2016, they pertain only to the 2013 cohort.

**Measure:** The percentage of preservice program graduates who are certified, licensed, or endorsed in English language acquisition instruction.

Year	Target	Actual
2012	72.1%	38.1%
2013	72.1	63.4
2014	55.5	54.7
2015	65.5	60.3
2016	75.5	
2017	75.5	

**Additional information:** In calculating this measure, the denominator consists of preservice graduates who received training during the project year; the numerator is the number of these participants who actually became certified, licensed, or endorsed in English language acquisition instruction during the project year, as a result of the training provided. Sixty-five grantees reported data for the 2013–2014 academic year. Of the 734 preservice graduates who are certified, licensed, or endorsed in English language acquisition instruction (out of 1,217 total

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

graduates), 250 are from the 2011 cohort of NPDP grantees and 484 are from the 2012 cohort.

**Measure:** The percentage of preservice program graduates who are placed in instructional settings serving EL students within one year of graduation.

Year	Target	Actual
2012	84.1%	0.0%
2013	84.1	71.0
2014	72.0	55.9
2015	52.0	37.2
2016	62.0	
2017	62.0	

**Additional information:** In calculating this measure, the denominator consists of preservice graduates who received training during the previous project year; the numerator is the number of these who were placed in instructional settings serving EL students. No data were available for this metric in 2012 because a new cohort of grantees had just begun their projects the preceding fiscal year. Forty-seven grantees reported data for the 2013–2014 academic year. Of the 430 graduates who were placed in instructional settings serving EL students (out of 1,157 total graduates), 211 are from the 2011 cohort of NPDP grantees and 219 are from the 2012 cohort.

**Measure:** The percentage of preservice program graduates who are providing instructional services to EL students 3 years after graduation.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	Baseline year	65.1%
2016	70.0	
2017	70.0	

**Additional information:** In calculating this measure, the denominator consists of the number of preservice program graduates from 3 years prior to the reporting year; the numerator is the number of these graduates who are providing instructional services to EL students. Twelve grantees reported data for the 2013–2014 project year. Of the 162 graduates who are providing instructional services to ELs 3 years after graduation (out of 249 total graduates), 146 were from the 2011 cohort of NPDP grantees and 16 were from the 2012 cohort.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

**Measure:** The percentage of paraprofessional program completers who meet State qualifications for paraprofessionals working with EL students.

Year	Target	Actual
2012	100%	100.0%
2013	100	63.6
2014	100	86.8
2015	100	14.5
2016	100	
2017	100	

**Additional information:** In calculating this measure, the denominator consists of the number of paraprofessional program completers at the end of the project year; the numerator is the number of those who met State qualifications for paraprofessionals working with LEP students. Twelve grantees reported data for the 2013–2014 academic year. Of the 45 completers who met State qualifications (out of 311 total completers), 5 were from the 2011 cohort of NPDP grantees and 40 were from the 2012 cohort. In 2012, many paraprofessional program completers started work in States that do not offer State qualifications for paraprofessionals working with EL students, contributing to the low percentage reported in 2015.

**Measure:** The percentage of in-service teacher program completers who complete certification, licensure or endorsement requirements in EL instruction.

Year	Target	Actual
2012	56.8%	19.8%
2013	56.8	71.1
2014	70.0	79.4
2015	75.0	72.3
2016	80.0	
2017	80.0	

**Additional information:** In calculating this measure, the denominator is the number of in-service teacher completers during the project year in service programs designed to lead to State and/or local certification, endorsement, or licensure. The numerator is the number of those who completed certification, licensure, or endorsement requirements. Seventy-two grantees reported data for the 2013–2014 academic year. Of the 1,188 completers who are certified, licensed, or endorsed in EL instruction (out of 1,643 total completers), 332 are from the 2011 cohort of NPDP grantees and 856 are from the 2012 cohort.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

**Measure:** The percentage of in-service teacher completers who are providing instructional services to EL students.

Year	Target	Actual
2013	88.0%	81.0%
2014	80.0	89.7
2015	85.0	95.6
2016	90.0	
2017	90.0	

**Additional information:** In calculating this measure, the denominator is the number of in-service completers during the project year who served in-service (but not preservice) teachers in programs both designed, and not designed, to lead to State and/or local certification, licensure, or endorsement in EL instruction. The numerator is the number of these completers who actually provided instructional services to EL students during the project year.

Sixty-two grantees reported data for the 2013–2014 academic year. Of the 5,641 in-service teacher completers who are providing instruction services to ELs (out of 5,898 total completers), 2,026 are from the 2011 cohort of NPDP grantees and 3,615 are from the 2012 cohort.

In addition, the Department has established 6 new measures for the 2016 cohort of NPDP grantees:

- The number and percentage of program participants who complete the preservice program.
- The number and percentage of program participants who complete the inservice program.
- The number and percentage of program completers, as defined by the applicant under the measures 1 and 2, who are State certified, licensed, or endorsed in EL instruction.
- The percentage of program completers who rate the program as effective in preparing them to serve EL students.
- The percentage of school leaders, other educators, and employers of program completers who rate the program as effective in preparing their teachers, or other educators, to serve ELs or improve their abilities to serve ELs effectively.
- For projects that will focus on improving parent, family, and community engagement, the percentage of program completers who rated the program as effective, as defined by the grantees, in increasing their knowledge and skills related to parent, family, and community engagement.

### Native American Grants Program

The Department established the following three performance measures for the 2011 and 2013 cohorts of the Native American Grants. Data are not provided because only about a

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

quarter (26 percent) of grantees reported data on these measures. The Department is working with grantees to improve the data reporting response rate.

- The percentage of EL students served by the Native American and Alaska Native Children in School Program who score proficient or above on the state reading assessment.
- The percentage of EL students served by the Native American and Alaska Native Children in School Program who are making progress in English as measured by the State ELP assessment.
- The percentage of EL students served by the Native American and Alaska Native Children in School Program who are attaining proficiency in English as measured by the State ELP assessment.

### Other Performance-Related Information

Previous law provided a set-aside for evaluation activities equal to 0.5 percent of the total appropriation for this program. In fiscal year 2017, the Department will continue to support evaluation activities for Title III programs using a similar evaluation authority in Section 8601 of the ESEA as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015. However, section 8601 permits the pooling of funds reserved for evaluation from ESEA programs and the use of pooled funds to evaluate any ESEA program; the newly authorized applicability of this pooling authority to Title III programs may result in reduced support for Title III evaluation and related activities in fiscal year 2017 and future years. Current and recently completed Title III evaluation activities include the following studies, which are supported by funds from previous fiscal years:

- Updating the EL Practice Guide. The Department used fiscal year 2009 funds to update the 2007 EL practice guide to reflect advances in the field over the past 5 years. The updated guide, "Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School," was published in April 2014 and may be accessed at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=19>. In fiscal year 2016, NPDP applicants are encouraged to review this practice guide when designing their proposed projects.
- A Study of School Turnaround. The Department is conducting case studies for an in-depth examination of the school turnaround process in a diverse sample of schools receiving Title I School Improvement Grants (SIG) over 3 years. The studies will describe the schools' context, the decisions and strategies the schools and their school districts undertake (and why), and the challenges they face as they attempt to improve school performance. Fiscal year 2009 Title III funds supported the inclusion of data collections focused on schools with high EL populations. Descriptive analyses of State SIG applications and SIG-eligible and SIG-awarded schools are available for the first and second cohorts of SIG grantees (fiscal year 2010 and 2011 competitions) at <http://ies.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=NCEE20114019> and <http://ies.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=NCEE20124060>. Reports on findings for the case-study SIG schools, which will include two evaluation briefs focused on SIG schools

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

with a high proportion of ELs, are being released in phases. The first brief was released in April 2014 and can be accessed at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20144014/>. The second brief was released in November 2014 and can be accessed at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20154004/>. Key findings related to ELs are summarized at these two sites. In addition, in May 2014, the Department released the first full report on the Study of School Turnaround: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20144015/>. This report showed that the schools for which respondents described improvements in the greatest number of areas had higher levels of principal strategic leadership (referring to the ability of principals to formulate a strategy for school improvement and translate that strategy into concrete priorities and specific actions) and were more likely to have experienced a disruption from past practices (defined as visible changes on at least four of eight indicators relating to school operation); however, for most of the schools, respondents did not perceive their SIG grant as the primary impetus for the change strategies that had been adopted. In addition, the report found that three improvement actions noted by respondents in the greatest number of schools were expanding professional development activities, replacing the principal, and increasing learning time.

- An Evaluation of State and Local Implementation of Title III Standards, Assessments, and Accountability Systems. This study was intended to provide an in-depth picture of the implementation of provisions under previous law relating to the education of ELs. The study drew upon data collected during the 2009–10 school year through telephone interviews with all State Title III directors, a survey of a nationally representative sample of 1,528 Title III subgrantees, case studies of a purposive sample of 12 districts nested within five States, and student-level assessment data in a small number of States and districts. The study was supported with funding from fiscal years 2008–2011. The study’s main report on “State and Local Implementation,” as well as two supplemental reports on “Exploring Approaches to Setting English Language Proficiency Performance Criteria and Monitoring EL Progress” and “A Survey of States’ English Language Proficiency Standards,” was released in 2012. In addition, in 2010 the Department released three policy briefs prepared under this study: “Title III Policy: State of the States,” “Title III Accountability: Behind the Numbers,” and “Title III Accountability and District Improvement Efforts: A Closer Look.” These reports and policy briefs served as resources for the Administration, Congress, and other key stakeholders to inform the development of Title III reauthorization proposals. An additional report, “English Learner Student Achievement in Four Jurisdictions,” is in progress and is examining student-level assessment data for cohorts of ELs, former ELs, and non-ELs that were followed over a period of at least 3 years; this report is expected to be released in early 2016.
- A Study of the Implementation and Impact Evaluation of the Race to the Top (RTT) and School Improvement Grants (SIG) programs. Fiscal year 2011 Title III funds supported an increased focus in this study on how the implementation and impacts of the programs by States, districts, and schools are related to EL students’ needs and outcomes. For instance, the evaluation is examining the extent to which States have adopted common academic standards; the changes in practice that have been instituted statewide and at the local level to implement these new standards, including the extent to which supports have been provided for ELs; the strategies and practices being used to support schools in transitioning

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

to new standards; and the lessons to be learned from the transition. Two reports on findings, which will include ELs, are expected to be released in phases later in 2016.

- An Exploratory Study on Identifying English Learners with Disabilities. This study paid for with fiscal year 2010 funds is examining issues regarding the identification of ELs for special education services, based on a review of previous research as well as case studies in six school districts. The report will discuss: (1) procedures, practices, and instruments used to assess and identify ELs with disabilities and how these differ from those used with non-ELs; (2) roles and qualifications of school and district personnel involved in the assessment and identification of ELs with disabilities; and (3) procedures and practices used to exit ELs with disabilities from language instruction education programs. The literature review was completed in February 2012 and is being used by Department staff for internal purposes. The final report is expected in early 2016.
- Recommendations to the U.S. Department of Education Related to the Peer Review of State Implementation of the Title III Assessment and Accountability Provisions of ESEA. Under the ESEA prior to enactment of the ESSA, States were required to have in place ELP assessments that demonstrate technical quality for their intended use and to use appropriate measures for determining the progress and attainment of English by Title III-served students. Currently, there are no tools available to evaluate the technical quality of State ELP assessments. Using fiscal year 2012 funds, the Department awarded a contract in September 2013, to evaluate State and local implementation of Title III assessment and accountability systems and to produce a technical guide, checklist, a literature review, and a crosswalk document that will assist State educational agencies and other stakeholders to prepare ELP assessment materials for peer review. The documents are expected in early 2016.
- A Study of Teacher Preparation Experiences and Early Teacher Effectiveness. The Department awarded a contract in late fiscal year 2011 for a study of teacher preparation experiences and their relationship to student achievement outcomes. The study explores whether the instructional skills that teacher candidates learn about and have opportunities to practice in their teacher preparation programs are associated with teachers' effectiveness during their early years in the classroom. The study will include a focus on English Learners and the preparation experiences of their teachers. Fiscal year 2010 and fiscal year 2011 funds support this study, which will issue a report in late 2017.

In fiscal year 2015 the Department launched an impact evaluation of interventions aimed at improving student understanding and use of academic language (defined as the language used in textbooks, in classrooms, and on tests) in order to improve the effectiveness of local programs supported through Titles I and III. This evaluation will be supported jointly with Title III evaluation funds from fiscal years 2014, 2015, and 2016 and other ESEA evaluation funding.

Title III evaluation funds will also support several additional studies beginning in late 2015, including:



## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

- A descriptive study to examine how Native American program grantees (1) address the instructional needs of students and communities and develop student proficiency in both English and (optionally) native languages; (2) plan, implement, and evaluate their respective projects; (3) coordinate and prioritize the use of Native American funds in relation to other Federal, State and local resources; and (4) use data and evidence to inform program implementation and meet Department reporting requirements. Findings will be used to inform the technical assistance provided to grantees and the next round of grant making for the program.
- A descriptive study to examine how LEAs are using digital learning resources to support the English language acquisition and academic achievement of ELs in K–12 education, with a focus on digital learning resources that may be considered “apps” for enhancing instruction for EL students, including computer software, online programs, websites, mobile applications, and mobile computing devices. The study will culminate in a final report that presents findings from the study, as well as two short field-focused toolkits or guides for educators and technology developers that present key information from the study in a manner that will be accessible and useful for those audiences.
- An Exploratory Study on the Identification of English Learners in Gifted and Talented Programs. The Department partnered with the National Center for Research on Gifted Education to expand on the study to address identification issues for all underserved students including English Learners. Fiscal year 2014 funds support this study and the report will be issued in early 2017.

Finally, the Department continues to explore possible additional topics to address the needs of ELs and educators of ELs. Such topics under consideration for support in fiscal year 2016 include:

- Exiting English Learners with Disabilities (EL/SWDs) from Language Instruction Educational Programs (LIEPs). The Department may conduct a survey of existing State policies on how and when to exit English Learners with disabilities, and recommendations for developing assessment policies and guidelines for participation, accommodations, reporting, and accountability that include all students.
- Quality Early Learning Online Toolkit for Parents. This proposed toolkit would be intended to serve as a national public one-stop-shop website to find information on high-quality early learning programs. It would consist of a resource-rich website and accompanying mobile application developed through a collaborative effort between ED and HHS. The Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA) is collaborating with Office of Early Learning (OEL) on translating portions of the information to make it accessible to parents of English Learners who may also be English Learners themselves, and to ensure that the content is relevant to the parents and families of ELs. The Department would begin with a Spanish translation (considering it is the language primarily spoken by ELs nationally) but may consider other languages in the future.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

- English Learners in Preschool. Early childhood education can play an essential role in preparing young ELs for later success in school, which has been demonstrated by recent research. To learn more about how ELs are served in early childhood education programs, the Department may conduct a case study of a small number of districts to examine the characteristics of preschool programs that address the needs of ELs.

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION**

**Language acquisition State grants**

---