

**Department of Education**  
**ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION**  
**Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Request**

**CONTENTS**

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

State tables reflecting final 2016 allocations and 2017 and 2018 estimates are posted on the Department's webpage at: <https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/statetables/index.html>

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

For carrying out part A of title III of the ESEA, \$735,998,000, which shall become available on July 1, 2018, and shall remain available through September 30, 2019,<sup>1</sup> except that 6.5 percent of such amount shall be available on October 1, 2017, and shall remain available through September 30, 2019, to carry out activities under section 3111(c)(1)(C).<sup>2</sup>

### NOTES

A full-year 2017 appropriation was not enacted at the time the 2018 budget was prepared; therefore, the budget assumes this account is operating under the Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2017 (P.L. 114-254). The amounts included for 2017 reflect the annualized level provided by the continuing resolution.

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><u><sup>1</sup>...which shall become available on July 1, 2018, and shall remain available through September 30, 2019,</u></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><u><sup>2</sup>...except that 6.5 percent of such amount shall be available on October 1, 2017, and shall remain available through September 30, 2019, to carry out activities under section 3111(c)(1)(C):</u></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>

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION**

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

---

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2016	2017 Annualized CR	2018
<b>Discretionary:</b>			
Appropriation .....	\$737,400	\$735,998	\$735,998

---

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION**

**Authorizing Legislation**  
(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2017 Authorized	2017 Annualized CR	2018 Authorized	2018 Request
Language acquisition State grants State grants ( <i>ESEA-III-A</i> )	\$756,332	\$735,998	\$769,568	\$735,998

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
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	737,400 <sup>10</sup>	737,400 <sup>10</sup>	737,400 <sup>10</sup>
2018	735,998			

<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.

<sup>10</sup> The levels for House and Senate allowances reflect Committee action on the regular annual 2017 appropriations bill; the Appropriation reflects the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

---

### Language acquisition State grants

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2018 Authorization: \$769,568

Budget Authority:

<u>2017</u> <u>Annualized CR</u>	<u>2017</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u>
\$735,998	\$737,400	\$735,998	0

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Language Acquisition State Grants program, which is 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 the National Professional Development Project (NPDP) and funding for the National Clearinghouse of English Language Acquisition (NCELA).

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 fiscal year 2017, the Department assigned a weight of 10 percent to State-reported data and 90 percent to ACS data on EL counts. In fiscal year 2018, the Department would increase the weight of State-reported EL counts to 20 percent, per a recommendation from a 2011 National Academy of Sciences (NAS) study that the Department eventually weight ACS and State-reported EL counts at 75 and 25 percent, respectively. This recommendation is based on NAS' determination that State-level data collection and reporting procedures continue to improve. 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 its 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. States may also use up to 5 percent of their allocations for State-level activities, such as professional development, planning, and evaluation, and 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.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

LEAs receiving subgrants must provide effective language instruction educational programs (LIEPs) to improve the education of ELs and immigrant youth by helping them to learn English and meet the same challenging State 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 located in Title III in past law, have been revised and moved to Title I, Part A under the ESEA as reauthorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act (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 to support the teaching, learning, and studying of Native American languages while also increasing the English language proficiency of participating students. 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 NPDP and NCELA. Under the 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 SEAs or LEAs) 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 2017, the Department

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

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.

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 remaining 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)
2013.....	\$693,848
2014.....	723,400
2015.....	737,400
2016.....	737,400
2017.....	737,400

### FY 2018 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2018, the Administration requests \$736 million for English Language Acquisition (ELA) grants, the same as the fiscal year 2017 annualized Continuing Resolution level for this program. The Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2017, provided \$737.4 million for this program. Sustaining a robust investment in ELA grants would maintain Federal support for State and local efforts to help the significant number of ELs in U.S. schools attain ELP and meet challenging State-determined college- and career-ready academic standards, while also assisting States and school districts that have experienced rapid growth in their EL populations.

Despite patterns of growth, significant achievement gaps remain between ELs and their peers. ELs have consistently had markedly lower scores than non-ELs on the National Assessment of Education Progress in reading and math in the fourth and eighth grades. For example, in 2015, only 14 percent of ELs scored proficient or better in fourth grade math, compared to 43 percent of non-ELs. In eighth grade mathematics, 6 percent of ELs scored proficient or better, compared to 35 percent of non-ELs. In fourth and eighth 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 2015 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

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

show that from 2013 to 2015,<sup>1</sup> the EL population increased by 23 percent in Wyoming, 17 percent in the District of Columbia, and 10 percent in Tennessee. In contrast, during that same timeframe, the EL population in California decreased by 5 percent, decreased by 3 percent in Florida, decreased by 8 percent in Illinois, remained stable in New York, and increased by 1 percent in Texas. Since those States with the greatest growth over that 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 their immigrant population based on ACS data from 2015 compared to 2013 counts. North Carolina, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin all experienced more than a 12-percent increase in their immigrant population during this timeframe. These trends 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 2018 Request would support 10 continuation awards for grants to schools operated predominantly for Native American and Alaska Native children. These grants support the development of proficiency in English and Native American languages while achieving the same challenging State academic content and achievement standards for all students. The 2016 cohort of these grants will receive their final awards in 2020. The Department plans to hold a competition for new awards for NAM Grants in 2018.

### National Activities

The 2018 Request would support an estimated 90 continuation awards for NPDP grants. The Department awarded 49 NPDP grants in 2016 and anticipates awarding 44 NPDP grants in 2017. Fiscal year 2018 funds would support continuation awards for both cohorts, which will receive their final awards in 2020 and 2021, respectively. In addition, the Department would use up to \$2 million for NCELA to analyze and disseminate information on best practices for teachers of ELs.

### Evaluation

In 2018, the Department would use up to 0.5 percent of the request for Title III, Part A funds to support ongoing evaluation activities. The Department may also elect to pool these funds with funds from other ESEA programs that are set aside for evaluation activities in order to fund broader evaluations that are relevant to ESEA programs.

---

<sup>1</sup> ACS data for 2013 are estimates from a 3-year period (2011, 2012, and 2013) and data for 2015 are estimates from a 5-year period (2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015).

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017 Annualized CR</u>	<u>2018</u>
<b>Total Appropriation</b>	\$737,400	\$735,998	\$735,998
<b>State formula grants</b>			
Language acquisition State grants	\$684,469	\$681,022	\$679,742
Number of States	56	56	56
<b>NAM Grants</b>			
Grant award funds (new)	\$2,997	0	\$1,945
Grant award funds (continuations)	\$2,003	\$5,000	\$3,005
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>\$50</u>
Total	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
Number of new awards	10	0	8
Number of continuation awards	12	22	10
<b>National Activities</b>			
NPDP grant funds (new)	\$22,162	\$22,218	0
NPDP grant funds (continuation)	\$20,731	\$23,733	\$45,601
Peer review of new award applications	\$300	\$80	0
Clearinghouse	\$1,785	\$1,570	\$2,000
Evaluation (see below)	<u>\$2,953</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	\$47,931	\$47,601	\$47,601
Number of NPDP Grant awards (new)	49	44	0
Number of NPDP grant awards (continuations)	72	49	90
<b>Evaluation (Section 8601)</b>	0	\$3,680	\$3,680

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including Title III, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. The Department may pool Title III funds in fiscal years 2017 and 2018 and the table above reflects the intention to pool 0.5 percent from each program within Title III. Prior to 2017, when the Department began to implement the ESSA, the ESEA, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act, authorized the Department to use Title III National Activities funds for evaluation activities.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information and results based on GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2018 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 ESSA.

**Goal:** To help ELs 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.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2013	65%	49%
2014	65	50
2015	65	47
2016	65	
2017	65	
2018	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. Three States did not submit data for this measure for the 2014-2015 school year. Eleven States met their targets for the 2014-2015 school year.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

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

Year	Target	Actual
2013	35%	28%
2014	35	25
2015	35	24
2016	35	
2017	35	
2018	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. Three States did not submit data for this measure for the 2014-2015 school year. One State met its targets for the 2014-2015 school year.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2013	38%	36%
2014	38	37
2015	38	24
2016	38	
2017	38	
2018	38	

**Additional information:** States are required to report data on the performance of the EL subgroup on State reading/language arts assessments. The percentage is calculated by dividing the number of ELs that scored proficient or above on State reading assessments by the number of ELs tested. Eight States met their targets for the 2014-2015 school year. Proficiency measures have changed due to new assessments in many States, resulting in the drop in performance from 2014 to 2015.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2013	66%	67%
2014	66	64
2015	66	49
2016	66	
2017	66	
2018	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

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

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. The most recent year for which performance data are available is school year 2014-2015, prior to the enactment of ESSA, so the Department uses the former definition of "monitored former EL" when discussing this metric. Thirteen States met their targets in the 2014-2015 school year. Proficiency measures have changed due to new assessments in many States, resulting in the drop in performance from 2014 to 2015.

#### State 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.

**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	38
2016	28	
2017	30	
2018		

**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	50
2016	46	
2017	47	
2018		

#### NPDP Grant Program

The Department established the following measures for the 2013 cohort of the NPDP Grants.

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

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

Year	Target	Actual
2013	72.1%	63.4%
2014	55.5	54.7
2015	65.5	60.3
2016	75.5	77.5
2017	75.5	
2018	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.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2013	84.1%	71.0%
2014	72.0	55.9
2015	52.0	37.2
2016	62.0	55.3
2017	62.0	
2018	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. Fluctuation in performance from year to year is due in part to the aggregation of performance data across multiple cohorts of grantees. For example, the 2015 reported percentage of 37.2 percent includes data from the 2011 and 2012 cohorts; while the 2011 cohort reported just 23.9 percent of its preservice program graduates getting placed in instructional settings serving ELs within one year of graduation, the 2012 cohort reported 56.2 percent. In contrast, the 2016 reported percentage only includes data from the 2012 cohort, as the final reports from the 2011 cohort were not yet available.

**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	39.6
2017	70.0	
2018	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. Grantees

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

reported difficulty collecting data on former students who participated in their grant-funded teacher preparation activities 3 years after they have completed the preparation program.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2013	100%	63.6%
2014	100	86.8
2015	100	14.5
2016	100	58.4
2017	100	
2018	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 EL students. 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. Despite improved performance in 2016, the program still fell far below its target due to the number of program completers who work in States that do not offer State qualifications.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2013	56.8%	71.1%
2014	70.0	79.4
2015	75.0	72.3
2016	80.0	89.4
2017	80.0	
2018	80.0	

**Additional information:** In calculating this measure, the denominator consists of 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.

## 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	90.7
2017	90.0	
2018	90.0	

**Additional information:** In calculating this measure, the denominator is the number of in-service completers during the project year who participated in in-service (but not preservice) 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.

### 2016 NPDP Cohort

In addition, the Department has established 6 new measures for the 2016 cohort of NPDP grantees. The Department expects to have performance data from the 2016 cohort in spring 2018. The new measures are:

- The number and percentage of program participants who complete the preservice program.
- The number and percentage of program participants who complete the in-service 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.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

#### NAM Program

The Department established the following three performance measures for the 2013 cohort of the NAM program.

**Measure:** The percentage of EL students served by the NAM program who score proficient or above on the State reading assessment.

Year	Target	Actual
2013	56%	32.1%
2014	40	29.2
2015	35	26.4
2016	40	
2017	40	
2018	40	

**Additional information:** Each grantee must report to the Department its target and actual numbers of students who score proficient or above on the State's reading assessment. The Department then works with NCELA to aggregate and report these data. While NCELA works with grantees to resolve data quality issues, data collection continues to be an issue for grantees in this program. Many grantees are located in rural, remote areas with limited access to technology. The Department continues to provide assistance to improve data collection and reporting methods.

**Measure:** The percentage of EL students served by the NAM program who are making progress in English as measured by the State ELP assessment.

Year	Target	Actual
2013	73%	82.8%
2014	73	49.3
2015	73	39.1
2016	73	
2017	73	
2018	73	

**Additional information:** Each grantee must report to the Department its target and actual numbers of students who are making progress in English. The Department then works with NCELA to aggregate and report these data. While NCELA works with grantees to resolve data quality issues, data collection continues to be an issue for grantees in this program. Many grantees are located in rural, remote areas with limited access to technology. The Department continues to provide assistance to improve data collection and reporting methods. Changes in grantee reporting rate from year to year may account for fluctuations in the reported actual percentage over the past three years. In addition, in order to calculate a student's growth toward English proficiency over time, grantees need to be able to consider at least two data points per student. Thus, data reported for this measure only encapsulate the progress of students for which two data points are available within the reporting year.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

**Measure:** The percentage of EL students served by the NAM program who are attaining proficiency in English as measured by the State ELP assessment.

Year	Target	Actual
2013	12%	7.9%
2014	15	22.4
2015	20	16.5
2016	25	
2017	25	
2018	25	

**Additional information:** Each grantee must report to the Department its target and actual percentage of students who attain English proficiency. Grantees calculate the percentage by dividing the number of students who attain English proficiency by the number of students who were assessed at least once for English proficiency. The Department then works with NCELA to aggregate and report these data. While NCELA works with grantees to resolve data quality issues, data collection continues to be an issue for grantees in this program. Many grantees are located in rural, remote areas with limited access to technology. The Department continues to provide assistance to improve data collection and reporting methods. Changes in grantee reporting rate from year to year may account for fluctuations in the reported actual percentage over the past three years.

#### 2016 NAM Cohort

In addition, in 2016 the Department added six performance measures to the three measures discussed above. The 2016 cohort will report data on the three pre-existing measures and the following new measures:

- The number and percentage of students served by the program who are enrolled in Native American language instruction programs.
- The number and percentage of students making progress in learning a Native American language, as determined by each grantee, including through measures such as performance tasks, portfolios, and pre- and post-tests.
- The number and percentage of students who are attaining proficiency in a Native American language, as determined by each grantee, including through measures such as performance tasks, portfolios, and pre- and post-tests.
- For programs that received competitive preference points, the number and percentage of preschool children ages three and four enrolled in the program.
- For programs that received competitive preference points, the number and percentage of preschool children ages three and four who are screened for developmental or cognitive delays.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Language acquisition State grants

---

- For programs that received competitive preference points, the number and percentage of coordination contacts between elementary schools and early learning programs to improve coordination and transition of children from preschool to kindergarten.

### Other Performance-Related Information

Over the past several years, Title III funds have contributed to research and evaluation efforts focused on, for example: EL and dual language learner instructional practices, parenting practices for young ELs, identification of ELs with disabilities, exiting ELs with disabilities from LIEPs, and EL students' understanding and command of academic language. Completed work on a range of topics related to supporting EL students is available on the Office of English Language Acquisition's website at <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oela/resources.html>.

