

**Department of Education**  
**ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION**  
**Fiscal Year 2020 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:	
English language acquisition .....	G-6
State Table*	

State tables reflecting final 2018 allocations and 2019 and 2020 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] 2020, and shall remain available through September 30, [2020] 2021,<sup>1</sup> except that 6.5 percent of such amount shall be available on October 1, [2018] 2019, and shall remain available through September 30, [2020] 2021, to carry out activities under section 3111(c)(1)(C).<sup>2</sup> (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2019.*)

### 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 appropriations language.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<sup>1</sup> ...which shall become available on July 1, [2019] <u>2020</u> , and shall remain available through September 30, [2020] <u>2021</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.
<sup>2</sup> ...except that 6.5 percent of such amount shall be available on October 1, [2018] <u>2019</u> , and shall remain available through September 30, [2020] <u>2021</u> , to carry out activities under section 3111(c)(1)(C):	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	2018	2019	2020
<b>Discretionary:</b>			
Appropriation .....	<u>\$737,400</u>	<u>\$737,400</u>	<u>\$737,400</u>
Total, discretionary appropriation .....	737,400	737,400	737,400

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION**

**Authorizing Legislation**  
(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2019 Authorized	2019 Estimate	2020 Authorized	2020 Request
English language acquisition State grants ( <i>ESEA-III-A</i> ).....	\$784,960	\$737,400	\$884,960	\$737,400

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2011	\$800,000	\$750,000 <sup>1</sup>	\$800,000 <sup>2</sup>	\$733,350 <sup>3</sup>
2012	750,000	733,531 <sup>4</sup>	733,530 <sup>4</sup>	732,144
2013	732,144	732,144 <sup>5</sup>	732,144 <sup>5</sup>	693,848
2014	732,144	N/A <sup>6</sup>	730,680 <sup>2</sup>	723,400
2015	732,400	N/A <sup>6</sup>	723,400 <sup>7</sup>	737,400
2016	773,400	737,400 <sup>8</sup>	712,021 <sup>8</sup>	737,400
2017	800,400	737,400 <sup>9</sup>	712,021 <sup>9</sup>	737,400 <sup>9</sup>
2018	735,998	737,400 <sup>10</sup>	737,400 <sup>10</sup>	737,400 <sup>10</sup>
2019	737,400	737,400 <sup>11</sup>	737,400 <sup>11</sup>	737,400 <sup>11</sup>
2020	737,400			

<sup>1</sup> The level for the House allowance reflects the House-passed full-year continuing resolution.

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

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

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

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

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

<sup>7</sup> The level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Subcommittee action only.

<sup>8</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>9</sup> 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.

<sup>10</sup> The level for the House allowance reflects floor action on the Omnibus appropriations bill; the Senate allowance reflects Committee action on the regular annual 2018 appropriations bill; the Appropriation reflects the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115-141).

<sup>11</sup> The levels for the House and Senate allowance reflect Committee action on the regular annual 2019 appropriations bill; the Appropriation reflects enactment of the Department of Defense and Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 115-245).

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

---

### English language acquisition

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2020 Authorization: \$884,959.6

Budget Authority:

<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$737,400	\$737,400	0

---

### 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 Program (NPD) and provides 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 EL and immigrant students. In fiscal year 2019 and in future years, the Department plans to assign a weight of 25 percent to State-reported data and 75 percent to ACS data on EL counts. This approach is consistent with the recommendation from a 2011 National Academy of Sciences (NAS) study that the Department 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

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

---

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, 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 that are 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 national activities, which consist of the NPD and NCELA. Under the NPD, 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, funds for the Outlying Areas, and NAM grants are forward-funded, with funds becoming available on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

---

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)
2015.....	\$737,400
2016.....	737,400
2017.....	737,400
2018.....	737,400
2019.....	737,400

### FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$737.4 million for English Language Acquisition State grants in fiscal year 2020, the same as the fiscal year 2019 appropriation. The request would maintain critical 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.

According to the most recent Biennial Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Title III State Formula Grant Program, virtually all public school students who are identified as ELs receive services in Title III-supported LIEPs.<sup>1</sup> However, significant achievement gaps remain between ELs and their peers. ELs have consistently attained 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 2017, 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 36 percent of non-ELs. Similarly troubling gaps exist with respect to fourth and eighth grade reading. 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 challenging academic standards. In fourth grade math, for example, the mean score for ELs was 217 (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.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://ncela.ed.gov/files/uploads/3/BiennialReportToCongress.pdf>.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

---

### 2017 NAEP Results—Fourth Grade Mathematics

Disaggregated EL Subgroup	Average Scale Score (proficient at 250)	Percentage of Subgroup that is EL
White	223	1%
Black	208	3
Hispanic	214	33
Asian	233	20
American Indian/Alaska Native	205	10
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	203	17
Two or more races	226	1
Full EL subgroup	217	

### 2017 NAEP Results—Fourth Grade Reading

Disaggregated EL Subgroup	Average Scale Score (proficient at 240)	Percentage of Subgroup that is EL
White	198	1%
Black	188	3
Hispanic	186	33
Asian	206	19
American Indian/Alaska Native	166	10
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	184	18
Two or more races	200	1
Full EL subgroup	189	

### 2017 NAEP Results—Eighth Grade Mathematics

Disaggregated EL Subgroup	Average Scale Score (proficient at 300)	Percentage of Subgroup that is EL
White	253	1%
Black	236	2
Hispanic	243	19
Asian	270	12
American Indian/Alaska Native	240	8
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	238	10
Two or more races	NAEP reporting standards not met	1
Full EL subgroup	246	

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### 2017 NAEP Results—Eighth Grade Reading

Disaggregated EL Subgroup	Average Scale Score (proficient at 280)	Percentage of Subgroup that is EL
White	233	1%
Black	217	2
Hispanic	224	19
Asian	238	13
American Indian/Alaska Native	220	8
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	221	12
Two or more races	NAEP reporting standards not met	1
Full EL subgroup	226	

In addition to the NAEP data, 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 prior experience serving EL students. California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Texas continue to enroll roughly 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 2016 to 2017,<sup>1</sup> the EL population increased by 9 percent in Louisiana and 11 percent in Tennessee. In contrast, during that same timeframe, the EL population stayed relatively stable or slightly decreased in California, Florida, New York, and Texas, and decreased by 6 percent in Illinois. 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, 15 States experienced increases of more than 10 percent in their immigrant population from 2016 to 2017. In particular, Mississippi experienced an increase of almost 18 percent. Overall, the immigrant student population grew by nearly 7 percent across the Nation. These trends underscore the need for continuing 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 would support 17 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 their mastery of challenging State academic content and achievement standards. The Department made 10 awards in the 2016 competition and seven new NAM awards in the 2018 competition.

### **National Activities**

The fiscal year 2020 request would support 92 continuation awards for NPD grants awarded in fiscal years 2016 (49 grantees) and 2017 (43 grantees). In addition, the Department would use

<sup>1</sup> ACS data for 2016 and 2017 are estimates from a 5-year period, meaning that the 2016 data include information from 2012-2016 and the 2017 data include information from 2013-2017.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

---

up to \$2 million for NCELA to analyze and disseminate information on best practices for teachers of ELs. The Department and NCELA work together to provide a wide variety of resources to districts, schools, teachers, and families to ensure that EL students receive appropriate support in attaining English language proficiency. For example, since the reauthorization of the ESEA in late 2015, NCELA has updated its EL toolkit in 10 topic areas relevant to EL students: identifying EL students; providing EL students with language assistance programs; staffing and supporting EL programs; providing meaningful access to core curricular programs; creating inclusive environments for ELs; addressing ELs with disabilities; serving ELs who opt out of EL programs; monitoring and exiting ELs; evaluating the effectiveness of a district's EL program; and ensuring meaningful communication with parents of ELs. Most recently, in 2018, NCELA produced the Biennial Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Title III State Formula Grant Program.

### **Evaluation**

In fiscal year 2020, the Department would use up to \$3.7 million of the request for Title III, Part A funds to support ongoing evaluation activities. For example, the Department intends to use a portion of these funds to support the final year of an ongoing impact study, conducted by the Institute of Education Sciences, on how EL students learn and use academic language. Research suggests that in order to be college- and career-ready, students must be proficient in comprehending complex informational text independently and in a variety of content areas. This study is expected to provide useful information on how well select instructional strategies are implemented in the classroom; the impact of academic language instruction on student learning outcomes on State assessments; and the extent to which the instructional strategies are woven into teachers' general instructional practices across subject areas.

In addition, the Department may conduct a new impact study in fiscal year 2020 that examines the effect of Title III-funded LIEPs on ELs, disaggregated by the major race and ethnicity categories in the Decennial Census. An implementation study of Title III-funded LIEPs planned for 2019 will inform the potential design for a future impact study.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
<b>State formula grants</b>			
English language acquisition State grants	\$681,022	\$681,022	\$681,022
Number of States	56	56	56
<b>NAM Grants</b>			
Grant award funds (new)	\$2,122	0	0
Grant award funds (continuations)	2,864	\$5,000	\$5,000
Peer review of new award applications	<u>14</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	5,000	5,000	5,000
Number of new awards	7	0	0
Number of continuation awards	10	17	17
<b>National Activities</b>			
NPD grant funds (continuation)	\$45,816	\$45,691	\$45,691
Clearinghouse	<u>1,875</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>
Total	47,691	47,691	47,691
Number of NPD grant awards (continuations)	92	92	92
<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>\$3,687</b>	<b>\$3,687</b>	<b>\$3,687</b>

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 pool funds from Title III grants in fiscal year 2018 but may do so in fiscal years 2019 and 2020.

### 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 2020 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

#### 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

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

---

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 2018, the Department revised 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). The Department will begin to use these performance measures in fiscal year 2019 and will develop targets for each measure after baseline data are collected.

The new performance measures are:

- The number of States increasing the percentage of ELs making progress in achieving ELP in LEAs that receive Title III funds.
- The percentage of ELs attaining proficiency on the annual ELP assessment in LEAs that receive Title III funds.
- The number of States decreasing the percentage of ELs who have not attained ELP within 5 years of initial classification as an EL in LEAs that receive Title III funds.
- The number of States increasing the percentage of ELs who, having exited English LIEPs in LEAs that receive Title III funds, score proficient or above on State reading/language arts assessments in the fourth year after exiting.

The measures below are those established and reported on prior to the reauthorization of the ESEA by the 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
2015	65%	47%
2016	65	43
2017	65	36

**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.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	35%	24%
2016	35	25
2017	35	22

**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.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	38%	24%
2016	38	29
2017	38	20

**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.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	66%	49%
2016	66	57
2017	66	58

**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.

### 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

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

subgrants to subgrantees.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	28	38
2016	28	39
2017	30	39

**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
2015	45	50
2016	46	47
2017	47	49

### NPD Grant Program

The Department established the following measures for NPD Grants for the fiscal year 2012 cohort. The last year of the grant period for this cohort was fiscal year 2017, but 95 percent of the grantees are currently completing their work under no-cost extensions. Due to the limited number of grantees that completed their projects in fiscal year 2017, the Department is not reporting performance data for the last year of the cohort.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	65.5%	60.3%
2016	75.5	77.5
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.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	52%	37.2%
2016	62	55.3
2017	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

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

multiple cohorts of grantees—in fiscal years 2015 and 2016, the 2011 and 2012 cohorts were both active. 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	

**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
2015	100%	14.5%
2016	100	58.4
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 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
2015	75%	72.3%
2016	80	89.4
2017	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

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

---

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
2015	85%	95.6%
2016	95	90.7
2017	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 NPD Cohort

In addition, the Department has established six new measures for the 2016 cohort of NPD grantees. The 2016 grantees reported performance data for their first year of implementation in fiscal year 2018, and the Department is currently working with them to establish consistent guidelines for reporting. 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.
- 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 NAM program.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

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

Year	Target	2013 Cohort Actual	2016 Cohort Actual
2015	35%	26.4%	
2016	40	24.8	
2017	40	32.7	9.32%
2018	40		
2019	40		
2020	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. The difference between the 2013 and 2016 cohorts’ performance on this measure in 2017 is due in large part to the different places each cohort is currently at in their grant projects.

**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	2013 Cohort Actual	2016 Cohort Actual
2015	73%	39.1%	
2016	73	58.7	
2017	73	40.2	9.8%
2018	73		
2019	73		
2020	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. The difference between the 2013 and 2016 cohorts’ performance on this measure in 2017 is due in large part to the different places each cohort is currently at in their grant projects.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

**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	2013 Cohort Actual	2016 Cohort Actual
2015	20%	16.5%	
2016	25	15.7	
2017	25	47.3	2.92%
2018	25		
2019	25		
2020	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. The difference between the 2013 and 2016 cohorts' performance on this measure in 2017 is due in large part to the different places each cohort is currently at in their grant projects.

### 2016 NAM Cohort

In addition, in 2016 the Department added six performance measures to the three measures discussed above. The Department is in the process of establishing targets for future years for this cohort.

**Measure:** The percentage of students served by the program who are enrolled in Native American language instruction programs.

Year	Target	Actual
2017	Baseline	42.5%
2018		
2019		
2020		

**Measure:** The 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.

Year	Target	Actual
2017	Baseline	50.3%
2018		
2019		
2020		

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

**Measure:** The 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.

Year	Target	Actual
2017	Baseline	18.7%
2018		
2019		
2020		

**Measure:** For programs that received competitive preference points, the number and percentage of preschool children ages three and four enrolled in the program.

Year	Target	Actual
2017	Baseline	84.8%
2018		
2019		
2020		

**Measure:** 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.

Year	Target	Actual
2017	Baseline	92.1%
2018		
2019		
2020		

**Measure:** 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.

Year	Target	Actual
2017	Baseline	97.0%
2018		
2019		
2020		

### 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>