

Bilingual Education-- Discretionary Grants for Instructional Services--Subpart 1 (CFDA No. 84.003)

I. Legislation

The Bilingual Education Capacity and Demonstration Grants (Title VII, Part A, Subpart 1, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act), as amended (20 U.S.C. 7421-7434) (expires September 30, 1999).

II. Funding History

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Appropriation</u>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Appropriation</u>
1969	\$7,500,000	1987	\$99,161,000
1979	21,250,000	1988	101,198,000
1975	53,370,000	1989	110,761,000
1980	115,863,000	1990	115,779,000
1981	107,017,000	1991	121,038,000
1982	86,579,000	1992	147,407,000
1983	86,526,000	1993	149,696,000
1984	89,567,000	1994	152,728,000
1985	95,099,000	1995	117,190,000
1986	91,010,000	1996	117,100,000

III. Analysis of Program Performance

A. Goals and Objectives

This program is designed (1) to help local education agencies (LEAs), institutions of higher education, and community-based organizations, through competitive grants, provide high-quality instruction through bilingual education or special alternative instruction programs to children and youth with limited English proficiency (LEP); and (2) to help such children and youth develop proficiency in English and, to the extent possible, their native language, and meet the same challenging state content and performance standards in other curricular areas that all other children and youth are expected to do.

B. Strategies to Achieve the Goals

Services Supported

Four types of grants are authorized under this program:

- *Program Development and Implementation Grants* enable LEAs (or institutions of higher education, community-based organizations with or without LEA approval, in collaboration, or a state education agency) to develop and implement new comprehensive, coherent, and successful bilingual education or special alternative instructional programs for LEP students, including

programs of early childhood education, K-12 education, gifted and talented education, and vocational and applied technology education.

- *Program Enhancement Project Grants* enable LEAs (or institutions of higher education, community-based organizations in collaboration with or with LEA approval, or an SEA) to carry out highly focused, innovative, locally designed projects to expand or enhance existing bilingual education or special alternative instructional programs for LEP students.
- *Comprehensive School Grants* provide financial assistance to LEAs (or institutions of higher education, community-based organizations, or an SEA) to implement within an individual school schoolwide bilingual education programs or special alternative instruction programs for reforming, restructuring, and upgrading all relevant programs and operations that serve all or virtually all LEP children and youth in schools with significant concentrations of such students.
- *Systemwide Improvement Grants* provide financial assistance to LEAs (or institutions of higher education, community-based organizations, or an SEA) to implement districtwide bilingual education programs or special alternative instructional programs to improve, reform and upgrade relevant programs and operations, that serve a significant number of LEP children and youth in LEAs that have significant concentrations of such children or youth.

Strategic Initiatives

- Implement grants that support linguistic and academic development of LEP students, with sustained professional development and emphasis on program features that allow grantees to carry on activities after the grant expires. Activities include onsite monitoring of grant sites to ensure high-quality outcomes.
- Coordinate services with other federal programs (1) to serve the maximum number of students with the highest-quality instruction, (2) to strengthen demographic data elements for use by federal programs in regular data collection, and (3) to provide high-quality data needed for accountability and improvement of educational outcomes for LEP students.
- Provide improved customer support by (1) creating a single point of contact with the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs (OBEMLA) in order to ease the administrative burden on grantees, (2) increasing opportunities for grantees to share lessons with each other through Internet “listserv” and other methods, and (3) providing intensive technical assistance for school reform, including dissemination of comprehensive technical assistance criteria for effective programs and the dissemination activities of the National Clearinghouse on Bilingual Education.

C. Program Performance—Indicators of Impact and Effectiveness

Objectives	Indicators
<p>Improve English proficiency and academic achievement of students served by Title VII.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● English proficiency. Students in the program will demonstrate continuous and educationally significant progress on oral or written English proficiency measures each year. ● Other academic achievement. Students in the program will demonstrate continuous and educationally significant progress on appropriate academic achievement measures of language arts, reading, and math each year. ● Success in regular classrooms. By FY 2000 sixth-graders who were identified as LEP in first grade and have been in the program for five years or have successfully exited from the program will perform at a level comparable to that at which other similar students perform. ● Low retention. By FY 1998 LEP students in Title VII programs will be retained in grade at rates comparable to those for similar non-LEP students.
<p>Ensure that LEP students nationwide achieve to high standards (part of Department-wide effort).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Student achievement. Between FY 1997 and FY 1998, the proportion of LEP and former LEP students nationwide who meet or exceed basic and proficient levels on NAEP reading and math will increase. ● Student achievement. By FY 1999 the annual dropout rate for LEP students will decline by 10 percent over the rate for FY 1996. ● Student achievement. By FY 1999 LEP students in Title I, Migrant Education and Indian Education, will perform at a level comparable to that of other similar students in relevant programs. ● Inclusion in state and local plans. By FY 1997 all new state and local consolidated plans for federal programs will include LEP students in framework of standards, assessment, and accountability. ● Participation in other programs. By FY 1998 LEP students will be appropriately served by all federal programs.

<p>Build capacity of schools in the program to serve LEP students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Programs meeting standards. By FY 1998, 80 percent of students in the program will be in classes aligned with state standards. ● Comprehensive programs. By FY 1998, 75 percent of programs will be comprehensive, integrated with the mainstream of school and district. ● Teacher training. By FY 1999, 80 percent of teachers in OBEMLA programs will receive high-quality preservice or in-service training tailored to meet needs of LEP students. ● Assessments linked to standards. By FY 1999, 50 percent of projects will implement high-quality assessments aligned to high standards tailored to LEP students. ● Effect of federal support. By FY 1998, 80 percent of grantees will maintain program activities after federal funding ends.
<p>Ensure that the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) administers its programs in an efficient and customer service-oriented fashion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Customer satisfaction. By FY 1998, a majority of OBEMLA customers will express satisfaction with administration of Title VII programs. ● Streamlining. Between FY 1996 and FY 1997 the number of steps necessary to award discretionary grants will diminish by 30 percent.

IV. Planned Studies

- The National Academy of Sciences' Committee on Developing a Research Agenda on the Education of Limited English Proficient and Bilingual Students reviewed the wide range of research on linguistic, cognitive, and social development of language-minority children. It calls for moving beyond a narrow focus on language of instruction to develop areas of knowledge firmly grounded in research on second language acquisition and learning. Priority areas for research include content area learning, second language English literacy, intergroup relations, and social context of learning. The committee noted the need for greater inclusion of LEP students in national data bases, including coordination of these activities with all relevant parts of the Department.
- The Schools and Staffing Surveys (SASS) find that many of our nation's schools serve LEP students. Seventy-six percent of public schools with LEP student enrollment provide English as a second language (ESL) programs, and 36 percent have bilingual education programs. Bilingual education programs are generally implemented in schools with higher concentrations of LEP students. About one third of public schools (which enroll 71 percent of LEP students) provide both ESL and bilingual education courses. Some 42 percent of all public school teachers have at least one LEP student in their classes; only 7 percent of these teachers have classes in which over 50 percent of their students are LEP. About 30 percent of public school teachers instructing LEP students have received training for teaching LEP students, but fewer than 3 percent of teachers with LEP students have earned a degree in ESL or bilingual education.
- ESL and particularly bilingual programs are far less commonly found in secondary schools. LEP youth in the National Education Longitudinal Study (NELS88) were much less likely to have followed a rigorous academic or academic track than native English youth. By 1992, students who had been identified as LEP in 1988 were more than four times as likely as native speakers of English to be out of the normal age-grade sequence (17 percent of LEP youth compared with 4 percent of other youth). Only 4 percent of LEP eighth graders said they did not plan to complete high school, but by four years later nearly half of the LEP students had left school without a diploma.
- National studies such as Prospects, studies based on local school system data, and syntheses of research (Collier; National Research Council) find that LEP students develop proficiency in understanding and speaking English more quickly than in other areas such as reading or writing English. Students, on average, require four to seven years to develop full proficiency in English, but the time varies substantially with the individual student's language and educational background.
- Research on effective educational practices and their adaptations for LEP students and analysis of the issues that affect LEP students' academic success have identified the importance of providing substantive lessons in core subjects, actively engaging students in learning, using comprehensible inputs to present lesson content, and offering social environments conducive to learning. Teacher recruitment and ongoing professional development are keys to improving educational outcomes of LEP students (Leighton et al.).

Planned or ongoing studies of Subpart 1 programs are:

- The Prospects final report on LEP students, which is being completed.
- The Benchmark longitudinal study of systemwide bilingual education grants, including information for participating elementary, middle, and high schools.
- OBEMLA analyses of data reported by local projects (1997 and 1999).
- Annual Title VII surveys of SEAs.
- Office of Elementary and Secondary Education and OBEMLA annual review of state and local plans submitted for participation in national education programs.
- OBEMLA analysis of a sample of Title VII grants (1998).
- National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) studies of inclusion of LEP students in NAEP assessments (1997).

V. Sources of Information

1. Program files.
2. Prospects: The Congressionally Mandated Study of Educational Growth and Opportunity: First Year Report on Language Minority and Limited English Proficient Students (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1995).
3. Model Strategies in Bilingual Education: Family Literacy and Parent Involvement (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1993).
4. Model Strategies in Bilingual Education: Professional Development (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1995).
5. Review of the Literature Relevant to the Education of Secondary School Students (Grades 9-12) Who Are Limited in English Proficiency (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1995).
6. A Descriptive Study of the ESEA Title VII Educational Services Provided for Secondary School Limited English Proficient Students (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1996).
7. National Research Council, Improving Schooling for Language Minority Children: A Research Agenda (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1997).
8. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, A Profile of Policies and Practices for Limited English Proficient Students: Screening Methods, Program Support and Teacher Training [SASS 1993-94], NCEES 97-472.

9. Frank J. Bennici William Strang, An Analysis of Language Minority and Limited English Proficient Students from NELS:88. (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, Special Issues Analysis Center, 1995.)
10. Marc Moss and Michael Puma, Prospects: First Year Report on Language Minority and Limited English Proficient Students, for the Planning and Evaluation Service, U.S. Department of Education, 1995.
11. Virginia P. Collier, "Acquiring a Second Language for School" Directions in Language and Education, vol. 1, no. 4 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, Fall 1995).
12. Mary S. Leighton, Amy M. Hightower, Pamela G. Wrigley, Model Strategies in Bilingual Education: Professional Development, for the Planning and Evaluation Service, U.S. Department of Education, 1995.

VI. Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: John Ovard, (202) 205-5576

Program Studies: Jeffery Rodamar, (202) 401-1958