

Department of Education
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Fiscal Year 2019 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: | G-6 |
| English language acquisition | G-6 |
| State Table * | |

*State tables reflecting final 2017 allocations and 2018 and 2019 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, \$737,400,000, which shall become available on July 1, 2019, and shall remain available through September 30, 2020,¹ except that 6.5 percent of such amount shall be available on October 1, 2018, and shall remain available through September 30, 2020, to carry out activities under section 3111(c)(1)(C).²

NOTES

A full-year 2018 appropriation was not enacted at the time the 2019 budget was prepared; therefore, the budget assumes this account is operating under the Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 (Division D of P.L. 115-56). The amounts included for 2018 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 appropriations language.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

| Language Provision | Explanation |
|---|---|
| ¹ ... <u>which shall become available on July 1, 2019, and shall remain available through September 30, 2020,</u> | This language provides for a portion of the funds for English Language Acquisition to be available 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. |
| ² ... <u>except that 6.5 percent of such amount shall be available on October 1, 2018, and shall remain available through September 30, 2020, to carry out activities under section 3111(c)(1)(C):</u> | This language provides for 6.5 percent of the funds for English Language Acquisition to be available for 2 years. The 6.5 percent represents funds that are used for national activities (National Professional Development grants and National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition). |

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Appropriation, Adjustments, and Transfers (dollars in thousands)

| Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers | 2017 | 2018 Annualized CR | 2019 |
|--|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|
| Discretionary: | | | |
| Appropriation | \$737,400 | 0 | \$737,400 |
| Annualized CR (P.L. 115-56) | <u>0</u> | <u>\$732,392</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Total, discretionary appropriation | 737,400 | 732,392 | 737,400 |

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Authorizing Legislation (dollars in thousands)

| Activity | 2018 Authorized | 2018 Annualized CR | 2019 Authorized | 2019 Request |
|--|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| English language acquisition State grants (<i>ESEA-III-A</i>) | \$769,568 | \$732,392 | \$784,960 | \$737,400 |

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

| Year | Budget Estimate to Congress | House Allowance | Senate Allowance | Appropriation |
|------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| 2010 | \$730,000 | \$760,000 | \$750,000 ¹ | \$750,000 |
| 2011 | 800,000 | 750,000 ² | 800,000 ¹ | 733,350 ³ |
| 2012 | 750,000 | 733,531 ⁴ | 733,530 ⁴ | 732,144 |
| 2013 | 732,144 | 732,144 ⁵ | 732,144 ⁵ | 693,848 |
| 2014 | 732,144 | N/A ⁶ | 730,680 ¹ | 723,400 |
| 2015 | 732,400 | N/A ⁶ | 723,400 ⁷ | 737,400 |
| 2016 | 773,400 | 737,400 ⁸ | 712,021 ⁸ | 737,400 |
| 2017 | 800,400 | 737,400 ⁹ | 712,021 ⁹ | 737,400 ⁹ |
| 2018 | 735,998 | 737,400 ¹⁰ | 737,400 ¹⁰ | 732,392 ¹⁰ |
| 2019 | 737,400 | | | |

¹ The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.

² The level for the House allowance reflects the House-passed full-year Continuing Resolution.

³ The level for the appropriation reflects the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 112-10).

⁴ The level for the House allowance reflects an introduced bill; the level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Committee action only.

⁵ The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2013 appropriations bill, which proceeded the 112th Congress only through the House Subcommittee and the Senate Committee.

⁶ The House allowance is shown as N/A because there was no Subcommittee action.

⁷ The level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Subcommittee action only.

⁸ The levels for House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2016 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 114th Congress only through the House Committee and Senate Committee.

⁹ The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect Committee action on the regular annual 2017 appropriations bill; the Appropriation reflects the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017.

¹⁰ The levels for the House reflect floor action on an Omnibus appropriation bill; Senate allowances reflect Committee action on the regular annual 2018 appropriations bill; the Appropriation reflects the annualized Continuing Resolution level.

English language acquisition

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2019 Authorization: \$784,960

Budget Authority:

| | 2018 | | Change from |
|--|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| | <u>Annualized CR</u> | <u>2019</u> | <u>Annualized CR</u> |
| | \$732,392 | \$737,400 | +5,008 |

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The English Language Acquisition program 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 for 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 2018, the Department plans to assign a weight of 20 percent to State-reported data and 80 percent to ACS data on EL counts. In fiscal year 2019, the Department would increase to 25 percent the weight of State-reported EL counts, per the 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, based on NAS's expectation that State-level data collection and reporting procedures continue to improve. Consistent with the NAS recommendations, the Department would continue to use ACS data only 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) 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, 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.

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

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

immigrant students; carry out innovative, locally designed activities that improve or expand existing programs for ELs and immigrant students; or implement school- or LEA-wide reforms to 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.

States receiving Title III funds must also 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 systems required by Title I, Part A. 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, under the Native American and Alaska Native Children in Schools program (NAM), to tribes, schools funded by the 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. NCELA collects, analyzes, synthesizes, and disseminates research-based information about instructional methods, strategies, and programs for ELs.

State formula grants and NAM 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.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

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

| Fiscal Year | (dollars in thousands) |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 2014..... | \$723,400 |
| 2015..... | 737,400 |
| 2016..... | 737,400 |
| 2017..... | 737,400 |
| 2018..... | 732,392 |

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$737.4 million for fiscal year 2019 for English Language Acquisition, an increase of \$5 million, to restore funding to the fiscal year 2017 level. Sustaining a robust investment in English language acquisition 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 LEAs that have experienced rapid growth in their EL populations.

Significant achievement gaps remain between ELs and their peers. ELs have consistently had markedly lower scores than non-ELs on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading and math in the fourth and eighth grades. For example, in 2015, only 14 percent of ELs scored proficient or better (a score of 250 or above) in fourth grade math, compared to 43 percent of non-ELs. In eighth grade mathematics, just 6 percent of ELs scored proficient or better (a score of 300 or above), 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.

A closer look at NAEP scores within the EL subgroup highlights the challenges faced by States, LEAs, and schools in helping to ensure that all ELs meet the same academic standards as other students. In fourth grade math, for example, the mean score for ELs was 218 (compared to 243 for non-ELs) but large variations become apparent when disaggregating the EL subgroup by race/ethnicity. The gap between Asian and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander EL students, for example, is over 30 points. Similar trends run through the disaggregated results for fourth grade reading as well as eighth grade math and reading results. Further information is included in the following tables.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

2015 NAEP Results—Fourth Grade Mathematics

| Disaggregated EL Subgroup | Average Scale Score (proficient at 250) | Percentage of EL population tested |
|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| White | 228 | 1% |
| Black | 212 | 3 |
| Hispanic | 216 | 34 |
| Asian | 235 | 19 |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 210 | 11 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 203 | 10 |
| Two or more races | 229 | 2 |
| Full EL subgroup | 218 | |

2015 NAEP Results—Fourth Grade Reading

| Disaggregated EL Subgroup | Average Scale Score (proficient at 240) | Percentage of EL population tested |
|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| White | 205 | 1% |
| Black | 187 | 2 |
| Hispanic | 186 | 33 |
| Asian | 208 | 19 |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 176 | 11 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 178 | 13 |
| Two or more races | 191 | 1 |
| Full EL subgroup | 189 | |

2015 NAEP Results—Eighth Grade Mathematics

| Disaggregated EL Subgroup | Average Scale Score (proficient at 300) | Percentage of EL population tested |
|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| White | 254 | 1% |
| Black | 234 | 2 |
| Hispanic | 243 | 19 |
| Asian | 269 | 12 |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 237 | 7 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 232 | 7 |
| Two or more races | NAEP reporting standards not met | 1 |
| Full EL subgroup | 246 | |

2015 NAEP Results—Eighth Grade Reading

| Disaggregated EL Subgroup | Average Scale Score (proficient at 280) | Percentage of EL population tested |
|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| White | 234 | 1% |
| Black | 222 | 2 |
| Hispanic | 221 | 19 |
| Asian | 236 | 11 |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 219 | 7 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 215 | 10 |
| Two or more races | NAEP reporting standards not met | 1 |
| Full EL subgroup | 223 | |

To continue to address the nuanced needs of the EL population, it is integral that the Department maintain its investment in Title III, Part A grants.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

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. California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Texas continue to 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, from 2015 to 2016,¹ the EL population increased by 12 percent in the District of Columbia, 6 percent in Idaho, and 9 percent in Wyoming. In contrast, during that same timeframe, the EL population decreased by 3 percent in California, 1 percent in Florida, and 7 percent in Illinois, 1 percent in New York, and 1 percent in Texas. Since the States with the greatest recent growth in the EL population 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; for example, Connecticut, Maine, Nebraska, North Carolina, Vermont, and Wisconsin experienced an increase of more than 10 percent in their immigrant student population from 2015 to 2016—Maine in particular experienced an increase of 25 percent. Overall, the immigrant student population grew by 5 percent across the Nation. 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.

NAM Grants

The \$5 million set aside for NAM Grants would support approximately 18 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 for these children while also promoting mastery of the same challenging State academic content and achievement standards for all students. The Department made 10 awards in the 2016 competition and expects to make eight new NAM awards in the 2018 competition.

National Activities

The 2019 Request would support 92 continuation awards for NPDP grants. The Department awarded 49 new NPDP grants in 2016 and 43 new NPDP grants in 2017. Fiscal year 2019 funds would support continuation awards for both cohorts of awards. 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 2019, the Department would use up to 0.5 percent of the request for Title III, Part A funds to support ongoing evaluation activities.

¹ ACS data for 2015 and 2016 are estimates from a 5-year period, meaning that the 2015 data include information from 2011-2015 and the 2016 data include information from 2012-2016.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

| <u>Output Measures</u> | <u>2017</u> | <u>2018</u> | <u>2019</u> |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| State formula grants | | | |
| English language acquisition State grants | \$684,469 | \$676,363 | \$681,022 |
| Number of States | 56 | 56 | 56 |
| NAM Grants | | | |
| Grant award funds (new) | 0 | \$1,945 | 0 |
| Grant award funds (continuations) | \$5,000 | 3,005 | \$5,000 |
| Peer review of new award applications | <u>0</u> | <u>50</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Total | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 |
| Number of new awards | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Number of continuation awards | 22 | 10 | 18 |
| National Activities | | | |
| NPDP grant funds (new) | \$22,059 | 0 | 0 |
| NPDP grant funds (continuation) | 24,302 | \$45,367 | \$45,691 |
| Clearinghouse | <u>1,570</u> | <u>2,000</u> | <u>2,000</u> |
| Total | 47,691 | 47,367 | \$47,691 |
| Number of NPDP Grant awards (new) | 43 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of NPDP grant awards (continuations) | 49 | 92 | 92 |
| Pooled Evaluation | 0 | \$3,662 | \$3,687 |

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 did not reserve funds for this purpose from Title III grants in fiscal year 2017 but expects to do so in fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

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 fiscal year 2019 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

State Grant Program

States report their data for the English 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. The Department may revise the performance measures that will be used for this program for new grants in response to the changes made to the ESEA by the Every Student Succeeds Act (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 English Language Acquisition State Grants program.

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 65% | 50% |
| 2015 | 65 | 47 |
| 2016 | 65 | 43 |
| 2017 | 65 | |
| 2018 | 65 | |
| 2019 | 65 | |

Additional information: The percentage is calculated by taking the total number of EL 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.

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 35% | 25% |
| 2015 | 35 | 24 |
| 2016 | 35 | 25 |
| 2017 | 35 | |
| 2018 | 35 | |
| 2019 | 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 receiving Title III services who attain ELP, according to the State's ELP assessment, and dividing that number by the number of students tested.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 38% | 37% |
| 2015 | 38 | 24 |
| 2016 | 38 | 29 |
| 2017 | 38 | |
| 2018 | 38 | |
| 2019 | 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. Changes in assessments in many States are the likely reason for 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 |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 66% | 64% |
| 2015 | 66 | 49 |
| 2016 | 66 | 57 |
| 2017 | 66 | |
| 2018 | 66 | |
| 2019 | 66 | |

Additional information: Prior to reauthorization by the ESSA, a monitored former EL was a student who was identified as limited English proficient or EL in the prior 2 years but who no longer met the State's definition of limited English proficient or EL. Under the ESSA, a monitored former EL is a student who was identified as limited English proficient or EL in the prior 4 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 2015-2016, prior to States' shift to ESSA, so the Department uses the former definition of "monitored former EL" when discussing this metric. Changes in assessments in many States are the likely reason for 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.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

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 | 39 |
| 2017 | 30 | |
| 2018 | 32 | |
| 2019 | 32 | |

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 | 47 |
| 2017 | 47 | |
| 2018 | 47 | |
| 2019 | 47 | |

NPDP Grant Program

The Department established the following measures for NPDP Grants.

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 55.5% | 54.7% |
| 2015 | 65.5 | 60.3 |
| 2016 | 75.5 | 77.5 |
| 2017 | 75.5 | |
| 2018 | 75.5 | |
| 2019 | 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.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 72% | 55.9% |
| 2015 | 52 | 37.2 |
| 2016 | 62 | 55.3 |
| 2017 | 62 | |
| 2018 | 62 | |
| 2019 | 62 | |

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 37.2 percent reported for 2015 reflects a 2011 cohort that reported just 23.9 percent of its preservice program graduates getting placed in instructional settings serving ELs within one year of graduation and a 2012 cohort that reported 56.2 percent. In contrast, the 2016 reported percentage includes data only 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 | |
| 2019 | | |

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 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 |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 100% | 86.8% |
| 2015 | 100 | 14.5 |
| 2016 | 100 | 58.4 |
| 2017 | 100 | |
| 2018 | 100 | |
| 2019 | 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

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

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 |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 70% | 79.4% |
| 2015 | 75 | 72.3 |
| 2016 | 80 | 89.4 |
| 2017 | 80 | |
| 2018 | 80 | |
| 2019 | 80 | |

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.

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 80% | 89.7% |
| 2015 | 85 | 95.6 |
| 2016 | 90 | 90.7 |
| 2017 | 90 | |
| 2018 | 90 | |
| 2019 | 90 | |

Additional information: In calculating this measure, the denominator is the number of 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 six new measures for the 2016 cohort of NPDP grantees. The Department expects to have performance data from the 2016 cohort in spring 2018. The measures are included below.

- 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.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

- The number and percentage of program completers, as defined by the applicant under the first two measures above, 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.

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 |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 40% | 29.2% |
| 2015 | 35 | 26.4 |
| 2016 | 40 | |
| 2017 | 40 | |
| 2018 | 40 | |
| 2019 | 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 due in part to limited access to technology in the rural, remote areas served by the program. The Department continues to provide assistance to improve data collection and reporting methods.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

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 |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 73% | 49.3% |
| 2015 | 73 | 39.1 |
| 2016 | 73 | |
| 2017 | 73 | |
| 2018 | 73 | |
| 2019 | 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 due in part to limited access to technology in the rural, remote areas served by the program. 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 attaining proficiency in English as measured by the State ELP assessment.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 15% | 22.4% |
| 2015 | 20 | 16.5 |
| 2016 | 25 | |
| 2017 | 25 | |
| 2018 | 25 | |
| 2019 | 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 due in part to limited access to technology in the rural, remote areas served by the program. The Department continues to provide assistance to improve data collection and reporting methods.

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.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

- 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.
- 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 such issues as 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>.