

National Professional Development (NPD) Program

2016 and 2017 Cohorts

June 2021



This report was produced under U.S. Department of Education Contract No. GS-10F-0201T - National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA) with Manhattan Strategy Group. Melissa Escalante served as the contracting officer's representative. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any product, commodity, service, or enterprise mentioned in this publication is intended or should be inferred.

U.S. Department of Education

Miguel Cardona

Secretary

Office of English Language Acquisition

Supreet Anand

Acting Assistant Deputy Secretary and Director

June 2021

This report is in the public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, the citation should be U.S. Department of Education, Office of the English Language Acquisition, *National Professional Development Program:2016 and 2018 Cohorts*, Washington, D.C., 2020.

This report is available on the Department's website at <https://ncela.ed.gov/native-american-and-alaska-native-children-school-program>

Availability of Alternate Formats

On request, this publication is available in alternate formats, such as Braille, large print, or computer diskette. For more information, please contact the Department's Alternate Format Center at 202-260-0852 or by contacting the 504 coordinator via e-mail at ofc_eaos@ed.gov.

Notice to Limited English Proficient Persons

If you have difficulty understanding English, you may request language assistance services for Department information that is available to the public. These language assistance services are available free of charge. If you need more information about interpretation or translation services, please call 1-800-USA-LEARN (1-800-872-5327) (TTY: 1-800-877-8339), email us at Ed.Language.Assistance@ed.gov, or write to U.S. Department of Education, Information Resource Center, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20202.

This document contains examples and resource materials that are provided for the user's convenience. The inclusion of any material is neither intended to reflect its importance, nor is it intended to endorse any views expressed, or products or services offered. These materials may contain the views and recommendations of various subject matter experts as well as hypertext links, contact addresses and websites to information created and maintained by other public and private organizations. The opinions expressed in any of these materials do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education. The U.S. Department of Education does not control or guarantee the accuracy, relevance, timeliness, or completeness of any outside information included in these materials. Mentions of specific programs or products in these examples are designed to provide clearer understanding and are not meant as endorsements.

Contents

Tables	ii
Key Terms	iv
Executive Summary	1
1. Introduction	3
Government Performance and Results Act	4
2. Overview of the Grantee Cohorts	5
Data Sources and Methodology	5
Characteristics of Grantees	6
Grantee Locations	8
Grant Priorities	9
Project Feature	11
3. Outcomes	11
GPRA Outcomes	12
NPD 2016 Cohort GPRA Measures	12
NPD 2017 Cohort GPRA Measures	13
Progress on Program Goals	14
Challenges Meeting Program Goals	16
Summary	17
Appendix	18

Tables

Table 1.1. Total Proposed Funding NPD 2016 and NPD 2017	4
Table 3.1. Summary of Aggregated GPRA Outcomes Reported by 2016 Cohort	12
Table 3.2. Summary of Aggregated GPRA Outcomes Reported by 2017 Cohort	13
Table 3.3. 2016 Cohort-Reported Progress on Grantee Program Goals (N = 25)	15
Table 3.4. 2017 Cohort-Reported Progress on Grantee Program Goals (N = 25)	16
Table 3.5. School Year 2019–20 NPD Cohort-Reported Program Challenges (N = 50)	17
Table A.1. 2016 Cohort NPD Grantees	18
Table A.2. 2017 Cohort NPD Grantees	20

Figures

Figure 2.1. Number of NPD Grantees	6
Figure 2.2. Minority-Serving Institution Designations of NPD Grantees (N = 49)	7
Figure 2.3. Participants Served by NPD Projects	7
Figure 2.4. NPD Grant Locations 2016 Cohort	8
Figure 2.5. NPD Grant Locations 2017 Cohort	9
Figure 2.6. NPD 2016 and 2017 Grant Competition Priorities	10
Figure 2.7. NPD Grantee-Reported Project Priority Areas.....	10
Figure 2.8. Program Features of NPD Grantee Projects	11

Key Terms

- **Characteristics Spreadsheet:** The characteristics spreadsheet collects key information about the grant project, such as public/private partnerships, languages served, personnel/staff served in the project, and project aims. The information in the characteristics spreadsheet provides grantee information discussed in this report and also serves to support the ability of the Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA) to quickly respond to questions from internal and external sources regarding grant implementation and outcomes.
- **Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA):** The national education law that seeks to provide all students opportunities to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education and to close educational achievement gaps.
- **Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA):** Signed into law December 2015, this act reauthorizes the ESEA.
- **The Government Performance Results Act of 1993 (GPRA):** Under GPRA, federal departments and agencies must clearly describe the goals and objectives of programs, identify resources and actions needed to accomplish goals and objectives, develop a means of measuring progress, and regularly report on achievement.
- **Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs):** Institutions of postsecondary education, colloquially known as universities or colleges.
- **Knowledge Management System (KMS):** Refers to an online financial and performance monitoring tool for the U.S. Department of Education's (Department's) discretionary grants. By reporting in the KMS, grantees provide data to demonstrate that they are making substantial progress toward meeting approved goals, objectives, and performance measures to receive continuation funding.
- **Local Educational Agency (LEA):** As defined in the ESEA, a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a state for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary schools or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a state, or for a combination of school districts or counties that is recognized in a state as an administrative agency for its public elementary schools or secondary schools.
- **National Professional Development (NPD) Program:** Provides grants for eligible entities to implement professional development activities intended to improve instruction for English learners (ELs) and assists education personnel working with ELs to meet high professional standards. Professional development activities may include both preservice and in-service activities.
- **State Educational Agency (SEA):** As defined in the ESEA, a state-level government organization within each U.S. state or territory responsible for education, including providing information, resources, and technical assistance on educational matters to schools and residents.

Executive Summary

Educator effectiveness has been shown to be the most important in-school factor affecting student achievement and outcomes beyond test scores.¹ However, data suggest that many teachers arrive in the classroom unprepared to meet the needs of English learners (ELs).² Accordingly, the National Professional Development (NPD) Grant Program provides funding over a five-year period to institutions of higher education (IHE) and/or public or private entities with relevant experience and capacity to support professional development activities that are designed to improve classroom instruction for ELs and assist educational personnel working with such children to meet high professional standards. This program is administered by the U.S. Department of Education's (Department's) Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA).

This document highlights and presents information about the 2016 and 2017 grantee cohorts of the NPD program for 92 grantees in the 2019–20 project year. The data represented capture the grantees' program performance results based on three Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) measures for the 2016 and 2017 cohorts.³ In addition to the required focus on providing professional development to improve instruction for ELs, the NPD program identified priority areas for funded projects that included improving parent, family, and community engagement, supporting development of the early learning education EL workforce, and implementing dual-language approaches. The report also presents descriptions and graphs illustrating grantee program types, project features, and reported program outcomes, progress, and challenges.

Although COVID-19 impacted some planned activities, grantees were still able to report on progress related to their program's performance goals as outlined in the GPRA measures:

- More than 10,000 preK–12 teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, school support staff, and families participated in programs administered by the 2016 and 2017 grantees.
- In addition, more than 1,100 preservice teachers were served in teacher preparation programs administered by the cohorts, with 80% of the grantees meeting their participation and recruitment targets.
- Close to 4,000 in-service teachers participated in programs, on average exceeding grantees' participation targets for in-service teachers.

In addition to reporting on GPRA-related activities, NPD grantees reported on a variety of project-specific measures. Grantees in both cohorts provided teacher/staff professional development, promoted parent and community involvement, developed coursework to better prepare pre- and in-service teachers to work with ELs, and worked toward improving academic outcomes for English learners.

¹ Blazar, D. & Kraft, M. (2017). Teaching and teacher effects on student attitudes and behaviors. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. 39(1), pp.146-170.

² Ballantyne, K.G., Sanderman, A.R., & Levy, J. (2008). Educating English language learners: Building teacher capacity. Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.

³ GPRA measures 4, 5, and 6 were designed to be collected and analyzed by an objective third-party entity. These measures are specific to the effectiveness of the professional development participants receive. Responses to these questions will enable OELA to shape the content of future technical assistance provided to the grantees and inform future competitions. Institute of Education Sciences (IES) is now conducting a program study that will address GPRA measures 4, 5, and 6.

Ninety-five percent of 2016 and 2017 grantees reported that COVID-19 disrupted project activities. Disruptions included an inability to collect student outcome data, shifting activities from in-person to virtual, reduced family engagement opportunities, an inability for teachers to complete certificate or degree requirements, and challenges in recruiting teachers.

1. Introduction

The National Professional Development (NPD) Grant Program is administered by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA). The NPD Grant Program supports professional development activities that are designed to improve classroom instruction for English learners (ELs) and assist educational personnel working with such children to meet high professional standards. These standards include certification and licensure for teachers who work in language instruction educational programs or who serve ELs. Entities eligible to apply for NPD grants are institutions of higher education (IHEs) or public or private entities with relevant experience and capacity, in consortia with local educational agencies (LEAs) or state educational agencies (SEAs).

Grants awarded under this program may be used for one or more of the following activities: (1) preservice professional development programs that will assist schools and IHEs to upgrade the qualifications and skills of educational personnel who are not certified or licensed, especially educational paraprofessionals; (2) the development of program curricula appropriate to the needs of the consortia participants involved; and (3) financial assistance to pay for tuition, fees, and books for enrolling in courses required to complete the degree involved or to meet certification or licensing requirements for teachers who work in language instruction educational programs or serve ELs. IHEs may design program activities that focus on the following:

- High-quality professional development (PD) for content teachers and administrators
- Induction programs for new teachers
- Development for higher education faculty
- Career ladder programs for paraprofessionals
- Certification-oriented coursework for English language development (ELD) specialist
- PD for other educational personnel, such as administrators, school counselors, and school psychologists

All NPD grantees must submit an annual performance report (APR) that provides the most current performance and financial expenditure information. The APR must include information on performance outcomes related to the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), as well as project-specific performance measures. The U.S. Department of Education (the Department) will consider this data in making annual continuation awards. At the end of the project period, grantees must submit a final performance report, including financial information, goal attainment, and program evaluation.

Approximately \$46 million is available for NPD grantees annually. The average award amount for the 2016 cohort was \$483,291, with awards ranging from \$185,046 to \$659,720. For the 2018 cohort, the average award amount was \$504,431, with the awards ranging from \$215,158 to \$568,923.

Table 1.1. Total Proposed Funding NPD 2016 and NPD 2017

Cohort	Years completed	Total funding ⁴	Number of awards
2016 Cohort	4 of 5	\$236,812,690	49
2017 Cohort	3 of 5	\$211,860,831	43

Government Performance and Results Act

The GPRA of 1993 requires federal agencies to prepare a strategic plan covering a multiyear period and to submit an annual performance plan and an APR. The Government Performance and Results Modernization Act of 2010 updated some aspects of the GPRA of 1993 and placed emphasis on the use and analysis of goals and measures to improve outcomes of federally funded programs.

The Department developed six GPRA performance measures for evaluating the overall effectiveness of the NPD program, and all institutions receiving federal funds under the NPD program must report on their progress toward meeting these performance measures:

- **Measure 1:** The number and percentage of program participants who complete the preservice program. Completion is defined by the applicant in the submitted application.
- **Measure 2:** The number and percentage of program participants who complete the in-service program. Completion is defined by the applicant in the submitted application.
- **Measure 3:** The number and percentage of program completers, as defined by the applicant under measures 1 and 2, who are state-certified, licensed, or endorsed in EL instruction.
- **Measure 4*:** The percentage of program completers who rate the program as effective in preparing them to serve EL students.
- **Measure 5*:** The percentage of school leaders, other educators, and employers of program completers who rated the program as effective in preparing their teachers, or other educators, to serve ELs or improve their abilities to serve ELs effectively.
- **Measure 6*:** For projects that received competitive preference points for Competitive Preference Priority 2 (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.

* GPRA measures 4, 5, and 6 were designed to be collected and analyzed by an objective third-party entity. These measures are specific to the effectiveness of the professional development participants receive. Responses to these questions will enable OELA to shape the content of future technical assistance provided to the grantees and inform future competitions. IES is now conducting a program study that will address GPRA measures 4, 5, and 6.

⁴ Total proposed funding for NPD cohorts 2016 and 2017 can be found here: <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/nfdp/index.html>.

2. Overview of the Grantee Cohorts

Data Sources and Methodology

This section of the report provides a profile of the NPD program based on information received through numerous data sources. It conveys a profile of important characteristics of these grantee institutions through tabular and graphic presentations of key information related to the characteristics of institutions and grant activities. All available electronic data (partial and completed surveys) residing in the sources outlined in the box below were used in the analysis.

Some NPD grantee institutions have more than one NPD grant. Since a grantee institution is required to submit a report for each NPD grant awarded to that institution, this results in a higher number of grantees (grant awards) than the number of grantee institutions. This variation affects different sections of this report. Data on grant activities and expenditures are based on the number of total grants from grantee institutions that submitted an online KMS report (see information box for more details on the KMS). This variation should be noted when comparing this information to the number of NPD grantee institutions.

Frequencies were generated for all data elements, and summative reports on key continuous variables for the program were developed. Key variables presented in this report include the following:

- Location of grantees
- Minority-serving institution designations of grantees
- Priorities addressed by the grantees
- Grant-funded activities and outcomes reported by the grantees
- Student-level data in partnering LEAs or SEAs
- Project-level and aggregated GPRA measures

Data for the development of this report were collected from four primary sources:


- **Knowledge Management System (KMS) Data:** The KMS provides the majority of program- and grant-specific information. On this online platform, grantees report on project measures for individual grant activities and outcomes for the entire grant.
- **Characteristics Spreadsheet:** This provides some program- and grant-specific information, such as (1) the name of the applicant; (2) the partner LEAs or SEAs; (3) the title of the proposed project; (4) which, if any, of the competitive and invitational priorities a project is addressing; (5) a brief project description, including a description of major project activities; (6) the number and type of participants projected to be served by the project (i.e., preservice teachers, in-service teachers, school administrators, other school personnel, parents, community members); (7) project goals, objectives, and performance outcomes; and (8) contact information, such as the project director's name, telephone, and email.
- **GPRA Data:** The overall effectiveness of the NPD program is measured by six GPRA measures for the 2016 and 2017 cohorts. All NPD grantees report their progress toward meeting these performance measures each year.
- **The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS):** This is a system of interrelated surveys conducted annually by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). IPEDS gathers information from every college, university, and technical and vocational institution that participates in federal student financial aid programs.

We closely examined the occurrence and distribution of missing data and data values that appeared inconsistent and out-of-range. In all cases, data were aggregated and analyzed at the appropriate levels.

Characteristics of Grantees

All 92 grantees funded in 2016 and 2017 are included in this report. Currently there are two cohorts of NPD grantees, as shown in Figure 2.1. In 2016, 49 grantees received funds and completed the fourth year of their grants in school year (SY) 2019–20. In 2017, 43 grantees received funds and completed the third year of their grants in SY 2019–20.

Figure 2.1. Number of NPD Grantees



Grantees include personnel from IHEs and from public or private entities that work with SEAs or LEAs. The number of LEAs involved in a partnership with the grantees ranges from 1 to 143 for the 2016 and 2017 grantees. In addition, several grantees report the SEA as the partner in grant activities (Nevada, Rhode Island, Virginia, West Virginia). A complete list of the entities awarded an NPD grant in 2016 and 2017 can be found in the Appendix.

Across both cohorts, 10% of the IHEs have a Hispanic-serving institution designation and 6% are designated as institutions serving Asian American/Pacific Islanders or Native Americans (see Figure 2.2).



Figure 2.2. Minority-Serving Institution Designations of NPD Grantees (N = 49)⁵

Figure 2.3 illustrates the type and percentage of participants served by the NPD grantees. Grantees may serve several types of participants throughout the life of their grant. Grantees from the 2016 cohort report they will serve more than 6,400 participants, and grantees from the 2017 cohort report they will serve more than 4,000 participants.

In-service teachers, or teachers currently teaching, are participants in more than 90% of the grantees' projects. More than half of all grantees also work with preservice teachers. In addition, grantees from the 2017 cohort serve a high percentage of parents and the community through their projects (60%).

Figure 2.3. Participants Served by NPD Projects

⁵ No 2017 grant recipients report having a minority-serving designation.

Grant Priorities

competitive priority: parent, family, and community engagement. Moreover, fewer than half of the 2016 and 2017 grantees addressed the invitational priorities to improve educator preparation and provide professional learning regarding dual language implementation models.

Figure 2.6. NPD 2016 and 2017 Grant Competition Priorities


NPD 2016 Grant Competition Priorities:

- **Absolute Priority:** Providing Professional Development to Improve Instruction for English Learners (ELs)
- **Competitive Preference Priority 1:** Moderate Evidence of Effectiveness
- **Competitive Preference Priority 2:** Improving Parent, Family, and Community Engagement
- **Invitational Priority 1:** Dual Language Approaches
- **Invitational Priority 2:** Supporting the Early Learning Workforce to Serve ELs

NPD 2017 Grant Competition Priorities

- **Absolute Priority:** Providing Professional Development to Improve Instruction for English Learners (ELs)
- **Competitive Preference Priority 1:** Moderate Evidence of Effectiveness
- **Competitive Preference Priority 2:** Improving Parent, Family, and Community Engagement
- **Invitational Priority 1:** Dual Language Approaches
- **Invitational Priority 2:** Supporting the Early Learning Workforce to Serve ELs and Apply the Same Developmental Learning Content to all Levels of Teacher Preparation, or content about how to support a child's reading development or provide family literacy activities (as defined in section 203(9) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act).


Figure 2.7. NPD Grantee-Reported Project Priority Areas



Project Features

NPD projects implement unique activities or features to support the program goals. Figure 2.8 shows the various program features reported by the 2016 and 2017 grantees. The most widely reported features for the 2016 and 2017 grantees include promoting dual language/bilingual education and providing certification. Grantees who fall in the “Other” category reported such features as early childhood, science-focused training, and micro-credentialing.

Figure 2.8. Program Features of NPD Grantee Projects



† No grantees reported this feature in the respective cohort year.

3. Outcomes

Using the KMS online reporting system, the grantees submitted quarterly reports in SY 2019–20. The data reported included GPRA targets and other information (e.g., financial expenditures). This report focuses on data collected from the fourth year of grant implementation for the 2016 cohort and the third year for the 2017 cohort.

The following sections provide detailed information regarding how each GPRA outcome was calculated for the 2016 and 2017 NPD cohorts, including the number and percentage of grantees serving the participant type and the number and percentage of completers.⁷ Notes are included where the COVID-19 pandemic impacted some grantee activities.

Grantees who reported no data (for target or outcomes) often gave reasoning in notes. Examples of reasons cited include the cancellation of student assessment due to COVID-19, the

⁷ For calculations, all columns under each GPRA measure (target number and outcome number) were summed individually. The sum of the outcome column was divided by the sum of the target column, then multiplied by 100 to produce a percentage.

postponement of workshops until schools resume in person, and that certain GPRA measures apply only to the completion of the grant.

GPRA Outcomes

As required by the APR, grantees are required to submit both numerical responses for the GPRA measures and short narratives to describe (a) the strategies used to meet the GPRA measures and (b) the extent to which the program met the GPRA measures.

Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 summarize aggregated GPRA outcomes reported by the 49 grantees in the 2016 cohort and 43 grantees in the 2017 cohort.

Some grantees reported higher numbers of program completers than target outcomes and provided reasoning in the notes.

NPD 2016 Cohort GPRA Measures⁸

Table 3.1. Summary of Aggregated GPRA Outcomes Reported by 2016 Cohort⁹

	GPRA Measures	Percentage ¹⁰	Basis of Calculations	COVID-19 Impact
1	The number and percentage of program participants who complete the preservice program as defined by the applicant in the application	67%	Of the 49 grantees that could report, 779 of the targeted 1,165 have completed the preservice program to date.	N/A
2	The number and percentage of program participants who complete the in-service program as defined by the applicant in the application	113%	Of the 49 grantees that could report, 2,204 of the targeted 1,947 participants completed the in-service program.	N/A

⁸ GPRA measures 4, 5, and 6 were designed to be collected and analyzed by an objective third-party entity. These measures are specific to the effectiveness of the professional development participants receive. Responses to these questions will enable OELA to shape the content of future technical assistance provided to the grantees and inform future competitions. IES is now conducting a program study that will address GPRA measures 4, 5, and 6.

⁹ Source: Knowledge Management System (KMS): Refers to an online financial and performance monitoring tool for the Department's discretionary grants.

¹⁰ In instances where grantees reported more than 100%, this is due to such reasons as grantees having recruited more participants than expected or more participants having participated in that GPRA measure than initially targeted.

	GPRA Measures	Percentage ¹⁰	Basis of Calculations	COVID-19 Impact
3	The number and percentage of program completers, as defined by the applicant under measures 1 and 2, who are state-certified, licensed, or endorsed in EL instruction	86%	Of the 49 grantees that could report, 1,307 of the targeted 1,525 participants are state-certified, licensed, or endorsed in EL instruction.	N/A

NPD 2017 Cohort GPRA Measures¹¹

Table 3.2. Summary of Aggregated GPRA Outcomes Reported by 2017 Cohort¹²

	GPRA Measures	Percentage ¹³	Basis of Calculations	COVID-19 Impact
1	The number and percentage of program participants who complete the preservice program as defined by the applicant in the application	92%	Of the 43 grantees that could report, 416 out of the targeted 454 have completed the preservice program to date.	N/A
2	The number and percentage of program participants who complete the in-service program	146%	Of the 43 grantees that could report, 1,642 of the targeted 1,123 participants completed the in-service program.	COVID-19 impacted Measure 2 for 0.2% of grantees.
3	The number and percentage of program completers, as defined by the applicant under measures 1 and 2, who are state-certified, licensed, or endorsed in EL instruction	149%	Of the 43 grantees that could report, 720 of the targeted 484 participants are state-certified, licensed, or endorsed in EL instruction.	N/A

¹¹ GPRA measures 4, 5, and 6 were designed to be collected and analyzed by an objective third-party entity. These measures are specific to the effectiveness of the professional development participants receive. Responses to these questions will enable OELA to shape the content of future technical assistance provided to the grantees and inform future competitions. IES is now conducting a program study that will address GPRA measures 4, 5, and 6.

¹² Source: Knowledge Management System (KMS): Refers to an online financial and performance monitoring tool for the Department's discretionary grants.

¹³ In instances where grantees reported more than 100%, this is due to reasons such as grantees having recruited more participants than expected or more participants having participated in that GPRA measure than first targeted.

Progress on Program Goals

In addition to GPRA outcomes, grantees also establish and report on the progress they make toward goals specific to their projects.

Tables 3.3 and 3.4 showcase 2016 and 2017 NPD project measures that grantees worked toward in SY 2019–20. As each grantee can specify their own project measures, data in these tables are derived from a qualitative analysis of the grantee-reported, project-specific measures and accompanying grantee notes from the KMS update 3 reporting period. Using a purposeful sampling method,¹⁴ the qualitative analysis yielded six broad themes that grantees are working toward: enhancing the relevance of university coursework; offering graduate degrees or certificates; increasing English language achievement; increasing educator efficacy; enhancing the ability of educators to work with EL families; and enhancing the relevance of professional development for EL stakeholders. It is important to note that while all grantees had intended to report on project-specific goals, only some grantees could complete activities due to the school closures that resulted from the COVID-19 pandemic.

As Table 3.3 and Table 3.4 show, grantees made significant progress toward many of their GPRA measures. In SY 2019–20, more than 1,100 preservice teachers participated in teacher preparation programs administered by the 2016 and 2017 grantees, with 80% of the grantees meeting their participation and recruitment targets. In addition, nearly 4,000 in-service teachers participated in the program for the 2016 and 2017 cohorts combined, with grantees on average exceeding their participation targets for in-service teachers. Moreover, grantees in both cohorts combined reported that more than 2,000 participants completed their program in SY 2019–20, with many of the grantees exceeding their targets, particularly in the 2017 cohort (147%). The table below also outlines to what extent grantees reported that the COVID-19 pandemic affected their ability to reach GPRA measures.

¹⁴ To ensure a representative sample, 25 grantees from each cohort were chosen to reflect all geographic regions in the U.S.

**Table 3.3. 2016 Cohort-Reported Progress on Grantee Program Goals
(N = 25)**

Program Goals	Number of Grantees	Sample and Summary of Activities
University Coursework	7	<p>Created seven online modules.</p> <p>Worked to infuse more dual language content into coursework.</p> <p>Revised syllabi to align with ESOL standards.</p>
Graduate Degrees/Certification	6	<p>Ninety percent of participants received their master's certification.</p> <p>More than 90% of participants took and passed the Praxis.</p> <p>More than 30 paraprofessionals recruited for certification program.</p>
EL Achievement	3	<p>Could not collect student data due to COVID-19.</p>
Family/Community Connections	9	<p>More than 95% of participants took part in at least one family engagement workshop.</p> <p>More than 95% of parents were satisfied with the teachers' relationships with the family.</p> <p>More than 80% of the surveyed teachers said the program helped them connect with EL families.</p>
EL Stakeholder Professional Development	8	<p>More than 40 teachers were provided with coaching.</p> <p>More than 300 teachers participated in teaching simulation events.</p> <p>Workshops were provided on Response to Intervention.</p>
EL Educator Efficacy	11	<p>More than 80% of teachers rated their self-efficacy as EL educators as high after two years in the program.</p> <p>Seventy-five percent of teacher participants were rated as highly effective on evaluations conducted by school administrator.</p> <p>During exit interviews, 100% of participating teachers were rated effective in the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol Model.</p>

**Table 3.4. 2017 Cohort-Reported Progress on Grantee Program Goals
(N = 25)**

Program Goals	Number of Grantees	Sample and Summary of Activities
University Coursework	6	<p>Created and delivered two online modules.</p> <p>Developed three courses for a bilingual endorsement.</p> <p>Adjusted courses and scheduling to better fit participants' work schedules.</p>
Graduate Degrees/Certification	18	<p>Forty-three percent of participants on track for bilingual certification.</p> <p>Thirteen participants took and passed the Praxis.</p> <p>Fifty teachers recruited for masters in TESOL program, and all teachers completed four courses.</p>
EL Achievement	1	<p>Nineteen percent of ELs in treatment condition were reclassified, whereas only 12% of ELs in the control group were reclassified in the same time period.</p>
Family/Community Connections	11	<p>Teachers received PD on family outreach and engagement.</p> <p>Worked with more than 125 EL parents before the pandemic.</p> <p>Family engagement workshops were embedded into service learning.</p> <p>Seventy-five percent of participants said the PD helped them better engage their EL families.</p>
EL Stakeholder Professional Development	15	<p>Provided virtual PD sessions.</p> <p>Differentiated technical assistance provided to school staff on a variety of topics.</p> <p>Nearly 100 teachers participated in workshops on student trauma and personal learning networks.</p>
EL Educator Efficacy	8	<p>More than 70% of participants developed culturally responsive lessons for their students.</p> <p>After participating in the program, 100% of participants indicated they were more prepared to work with ELs.</p> <p>More than 80% of administrators indicated their teachers were better prepared to work with ELs because of program activities.</p>

Challenges Meeting Program Goals

The COVID-19 pandemic greatly impacted the ability of NPD 2016 and 2017 grantees to complete project program goals. Ninety-five percent of the sampled 2016 and 2017 grantees made references to COVID-19 disrupting project program goals, whereas only three grantees mentioned the pandemic disrupting activities related to GPRA. Examples of COVID-19

disruptions included the inability to collect student outcome data, shifting activities from in-person to virtual, cancelling professional development activities, reducing family engagement opportunities, the inability of participants to complete degrees/certifications as planned, and reduced recruitment numbers (Table 3.5). However, some grantees reported on instances where project activities persevered, or even thrived, despite the hardships the pandemic presented. For example, some grantees reported the ability to provide more targeted and one-on-one professional development to participants in a virtual format, some grantees were able to provide professional learning on how to teach remotely, and others reported regrouping in the summer to help participants prepare for school closures in SY 2020–21.

Table 3.5. School Year 2019–20 NPD Cohort-Reported Program Challenges (N = 50)

Program Challenges	Number of Grantees
Converting In- Person Activities to Virtual Platforms	28
Inability to Collect Data	16
Degree/Certificate Completion Issues	7
Family Engagement	8
Recruitment Issues	4

Summary

NPD 2016 and 2017 grantees made significant progress toward both GPRA measures and project-specific measures, with 2016 grantees reporting the most progress on GPRA measures related to in-service teacher completion of activities and 2017 grantees reporting the most progress on program completers. The NPD 2016 and 2017 grantees made the least progress on GPRA measures related to preservice completers. Grantees in both cohorts reported COVID-19 impacting their project-specific measures, with more than 50% of sampled grantees reporting that the pandemic resulted in redesigning, rescheduling, or reducing the number of in-person activities conducted by the project. In addition, 32% of grantees reported that the pandemic impacted their ability to collect outcome data related to project-specific measures.

Appendix

Table A.1. 2016 Cohort NPD Grantees

Grantee Number	Institution
T365Z160002	University of Colorado Boulder, School of Education BUENO Center
T365Z160006	University of Alabama at Birmingham
T365Z160008	New Mexico Highlands University
T365Z160009	The Regents of the University of Colorado
T365Z160016	Texas Woman's University-PIONERAS
T365Z160017	Texas Woman's University-ELLevate!
T365Z160021	Salisbury University
T365Z160027	Brown University
T365Z160034	Washington State University
T365Z160061	Hamline University
T365Z160071	The College of New Jersey
T365Z160082	University of Memphis
T365Z160084	University of Minnesota Twin Cities
T365Z160094	University of Florida
T365Z160106	Southern Methodist University
T365Z160110	University of Iowa
T365Z160111	Eastern Michigan University
T365Z160115	Regents of the University of Minnesota
T365Z160116	Research Foundation of CUNY/Lehman College
T365Z160134	Oregon State University
T365Z160146	California State University (CSU), Chancellors Office
T365Z160151	Old Dominion University
T365Z160155	Butler University
T365Z160159	Temple University
T365Z160163	Montana State University
T365Z160166	University of Alabama at Birmingham
T365Z160177	Houston Baptist University
T365Z160178	Boise State University
T365Z160187	University of North Texas
T365Z160194	The George Washington University
T365Z160205	Missouri State University
T365Z160212	Georgia State University Research Foundation, Inc.
T365Z160222	Texas A&M University
T365Z160228	California State University, San Marcos
T365Z160229	Texas A&M University

Grantee Number	Institution
T365Z160230	Aquinas College
T365Z160244	University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA)
T365Z160249	Loyola Marymount University
T365Z160263	Board of Regents, University of Nevada Las Vegas
T365Z160269	The Research Foundation CUNY - The City College
T365Z160278	Winthrop University
T365Z160292	University of California, Davis
T365Z160305	The University of Central Florida Board of Trustees
T365Z160307	University of Central Oklahoma
T365Z160311	Pennsylvania State University
T365Z160324	Regents of the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
T365Z160339	University of North Florida
T365Z160351	University of Nebraska, Lincoln
T365Z180002	Mercy College

Table A.2. 2017 Cohort NPD Grantees

Grantee Number	Institution
T365Z170007	University of Washington
T365Z170037	Webster University
T365Z170048	The Ohio State University
T365Z170058	University of Washington
T365Z170065	The Regents of the University of Colorado
T365Z170070	President and Board of Trustees of Santa Clara College
T365Z170071	Northern Arizona University
T365Z170072	Purdue University
T365Z170073	Texas A&M University
T365Z170074	The Regents of the University of Colorado
T365Z170082	Los Angeles County Office of Education
T365Z170089	California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE)
T365Z170104	Kanu o ka 'Āina Learning Ohana
T365Z170114	Teachers College, Columbia University
T365Z170121	University of Kentucky Research Foundation
T365Z170122	The University of Akron
T365Z170126	Grand View University
T365Z170135	The Curators of the University of Missouri on behalf of UMSL
T365Z170138	Lesley University
T365Z170160	Framingham State University
T365Z170162	University of Louisiana at Lafayette
T365Z170163	CSU Chico, Research Foundation
T365Z170170	AZ Board of Regents on behalf of Arizona State University
T365Z170181	University of North Texas
T365Z170189	Towson University
T365Z170190	University of Arkansas
T365Z170192	Texas A&M University
T365Z170196	Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles
T365Z170197	Kansas State University
T365Z170203	The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
T365Z170213	Purdue University
T365Z170217	Western Michigan University
T365Z170221	Texas Wesleyan University
T365Z170223	The Regents of the University of California
T365Z170226	Indiana University
T365Z170233	University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc.
T365Z170235	University of Arkansas

Grantee Number	Institution
T365Z170236	The University of Central Florida Board of Trustees
T365Z170246	Georgia State University Research Foundation, Inc.
T365Z170251	California League of Middle Schools
T365Z170256	Roosevelt University
T365Z170267	Regents of New Mexico State University
T365Z170272	University of Arkansas