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**SUPPORTING STATEMENT**

**FOR *PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT* SUBMSSION**

**INTRODUCTION**

The National Professional Development (NPD) program provides professional development activities intended to improve instruction for students with limited English proficiency (LEP) and assists education personnel working with such children to meet high professional standards. The NPD program office is submitting this application to request approval to collect information from NPD grantees. The proposed data collection serves two purposes. First, the data are necessary to assess the performance of the NPD program on *Government Performance Results Act (GPRA)* measures. Second, budget information and data on project-specific performance measures are collected from NPD grantees for project-monitoring information.

This application contains the justification for this request. The proposed data collection form is the Grantee Annual Performance Report. This form will be completed annually and serves as the grantee’s annual performance report (APR) which is submitted at the end of each program year. The grantee will also use this form for their final performance report. The form and its instructions are contained in Appendix C.

**A. JUSTIFICATION**

**A1. Circumstances Making the Collection of Information Necessary**

Information in the NPD grantee performance report is being collected in compliance with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as reauthorized by the *No Child Left Behind Act of* *2001*, Title III, Sec.3131; 20 USC 6861 shown in Appendix A), the *Government Performance Results Act (GPRA) of 1993*, Section 4 (1115) (shown in Appendix B), and the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), 34 CFR 75.253. EDGAR states that recipients of multi-year discretionary grants must submit an APR demonstrating that substantial progress has been made towards meeting the approved objectives of the project. In addition, discretionary grantees are required to report on their progress toward meeting the performance measures established for the U.S. Department of Education (ED) grant program.

The *GPRA* performance objective for the program is *to improve the quality of teachers of LEP students.* There are six performance measures associated with each NPD cohort, with this objective. They are:

**2016 NPD *GPRA* Performance Measures**

ED has developed the following *GPRA* performance measures for evaluating the outcomes of the NPD program:

**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 Priority 2, 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.

A customized grantee performance report that goes beyond the ED 524B APR is requested to facilitate the collection of more standardized and comprehensive data to address the program’s *GPRA* measures, to improve the overall quality of data collected, and to increase the quality of data that can be used to inform policy decisions.

**A2. Purposes and Uses of the Data**

In 1993, *GPRA* was passed, requiring that federally funded agencies develop and implement an accountability system based on performance measurement. Grantees are required to report on their progress toward meeting the objectives and goals established for each ED grant program.

The purpose of this data collection is to obtain the data necessary for *GPRA* reporting and project monitoring. NPD grantees will submit these data annually to the Office of English Language Acquisition program office. Grantees will provide targets for their performance data in the APR. Grantees will report actual performance data and progress towards reaching their targets in the APR.

The program office staff will aggregate and report the actual *GPRA* performance data to ED’s Budget Service. This information supports ED’s budget request for programs, ensures program implementation is focused on results, aids the Department in planning technical assistance activities, and ensures that performance is measured by outcomes achieved. The aggregated actual performance data will also be included in ED’s annual Program Performance Report.

The program office staff will also examine each grantee’s performance data against project objectives and targets to determine the grantee’s progress toward meeting its own goals. Grantees are also to report budget information, which the program office uses for monitoring purposes. The proposed data collection form provided via G5 will facilitate the collection of more standardized and comprehensive data for project monitoring. For grantees in their final year of funding, the proposed data collection form also serves as their final performance report.

**A3. Use of Technology to Reduce Burden**

The grantee performance report will be completed and submitted electronically via G5. This may improve the timeliness of submission, accuracy of data, and reduce cost or burden associated with regular mail.

**A4. Efforts to Identify Duplication**

There is no duplication of reporting. The information requested for this reporting is not collected or reported elsewhere.

**A5.**  **Methods to Minimize Burden on Small Entities**

The data collection does not involve small businesses or other small entities.

**A6.**  **Consequences of Not Collecting Data**

Annual or periodic performance reporting is stipulated in *GPRA* 1993, Section 4. Reporting via the data collection form provides a standardized means for grantees to report on project activities and outcomes as described in their grant proposal and reduce variation in data provided on program outcomes.

**A7. Special Circumstances**

There are no special circumstances that would require the collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with OMB guidelines.

**A8. *Federal Register* Comments and Persons Consultants Outside the Agency**

OELA published a 60-and-30-day Federal Register Notice, with no public comments.

**A9. Payments or Gifts**

There are no payments or gifts to grantees in support of the data collection.

**A10. Assurances of Confidentiality**

There are no assurances of confidentiality to grantees.

**A11. Justification of Sensitive Questions**

There are no questions of a sensitive nature.

**A12. Estimates of Hour Burden**

Exhibit A-1 below presents a summary of the annual estimated response burden for the APR and CDR in terms of both total estimated hours and total estimated cost.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Data Source** | **Estimated Number of Respondents** | **Estimated Annual Burden** **(in Hours)** | **Total Estimated Annual Cost****(in Dollars)**1 |
| **APR submission (due in the spring)** |
|  Current grantees | 138 | 50 | $57,500 |
| **CDR submission (due in the fall)** |
|  Current grantees | 138 | 50 | $230,000 |
| **Total** | 138 | 6900 | $287,500 |

1Based on an estimated hourly rate of $50.

**A13. Estimate of Cost Burden to Respondents**

There are no additional costs to respondents or record-keepers resulting from each collection other than that already reported in A12 and A14, including capital or start-up costs, or operation, maintenance, or purchase of services.

**A14. Estimate of Annual Cost to the Federal Government**

The NPD program office staff will conduct the data collections for the grantee annual performance report. There are currently 121 grantees. It should take approximately three hours to assess the completeness and quality of each grantee’s annual performance report. Program officers reviewing the annual performance report range from GS12-14. Using the hourly rate from GSA salary table for the Washington DC metro area, the total annualized federal cost for both data collections will be approximately 17879.37

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | # of grants | Total cost per PO to review APR @3 hours per grant | GS level |
|   | 21 | 2884.77 | 12 |
|   | 3 | 485.19 | 14 |
|   | 21 | 2884.77 | 12 |
|   | 17 | 2777.46 | 13 |
|   | 15 | 3088.8 | 14 |
|   | 21 | 2341.71 | 12 |
|   | 21 | 3041.01 | 12 |
|   | 2 | 375.66 | 14 |
| Total | 121 | 17879.37 |   |

**A15. Program Changes or Adjustments**

There is no request for change or adjustment to collection process. In previous years, the program office collected similar information through the ED 524B. The reporting templates provided via G5 in the grantee performance report will increase data quality and will allow the program office to aggregate information for reporting on the program’s *GPRA* measures.

**A16. Plans for Tabulation and Publication of Results**

There are no plans for publication beyond reporting results to ED’s Budget Service for compliance with *GPRA* and publication in ED’s Annual Program Performance Report. Should this opportunity arise, the program office will follow OMB recommended steps to ensure information quality. Following this, the program office will engage in peer review by Education Department colleagues as well as experts in the field for any publication of analyses resulting from APRs.

**A17. Approval to Not Display the OMB Expiration Date**

The OMB number and expiration date will be displayed on the data collection form.

**A18. Explanation of Exceptions**

There are no exceptions to the certification statement.