BILINGUAL EDUCATION INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES PROGRAM

Goal: Help limited-English proficient (LEP) students reach high academic standards.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Bilingual Education Instructional Services programs support Objective 2.4 (special populations receive appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards) by providing grants to improve the quality and availability of teaching and learning for limited-English proficient (LEP) students.

FY 2000—$248,000,000

FY 2001—$296,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: IMPROVE ENGLISH PROFICIENCY AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS SERVED BY TITLE VII OF THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT.

Indicator 1.1 English proficiency: Students in the program will annually demonstrate continuous and educationally significant progress on oral or written English proficiency measures.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of projects in which three-quarters of students made gains in English proficiency

Year	Oral		Written	
	Actual	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**
FY 1998:*	91%		82%	
FY 1999:*	**84%**	**92%**	**70%**	**85%**
FY 2000:		93%		88%
FY 2001:		94%		91%

* Cohorts.

Assessment of Progress

Status: Negative trend away from target.

Explanation: The data indicate that fewer of the projects first funded in FY 1996 could show that most of their students were making gains in either oral or written English proficiency, as compared to the 1995 projects. Our target was to have more projects demonstrating that most students are making gains.

The level of missing data in both groups of reports and its effect on the results are significant concerns. Each set of data comes from a different cohort of grantees, and sets of data may not be comparable. Therefore, it is unclear whether the negative trend reported is an accurate assessment of projects' performance or is an artifact of missing data or noncomparable data.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Contracted synthesis of local project data, first funded in FY 1995 and FY 1996.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: Late 2000.

Validation Procedure: ED attestation process.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: *Limitations:* Operational definitions of LEP students vary; the amount of missing data varies greatly; grantees use different measures to test program objectives. *Planned improvements:* The program office will implement stringent annual evaluation requirements proposed by the Administration in ESEA reauthorization.

The program office will focus technical assistance and monitoring on evaluation and data quality issues, and will step up efforts to obtain missing data from grantees to enable reanalysis of the data reported here.

The program office will conduct a separate analysis on future biennial evaluation reports, separating data from grantees who have already submitted a previous evaluation report and are in their fourth year of operation from those who are submitting their first evaluation report and are in their second year of operation.

The program office continues to support research on what expected gains should be for LEP students in English proficiency, in order to construct a measure that more closely matches the indicator.

Indicator 1.2 Other academic achievement: Students in the program will annually demonstrate continuous and educationally significant progress on appropriate academic achievement measures of language arts, reading, and math.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of projects in which three-quarters of students made gains in academic achievement in language arts, reading, and math

Year	Language arts		Reading		Math	
	Actual	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**
FY 1998:	62%		62%		63%	
FY 1999:	**42%**	**65%**	**53%**	**65%**	**59%**	**66%**
FY 2000:		67%		67%		68%
FY 2001:		70%		70%		70%

Assessment of Progress

Status: Negative trend away from target.

Explanation: The data indicate that fewer of the projects first funded in FY 1996 showed that most of their students were making gains in language arts, reading, and math, as compared to those first funded in FY 1995. Our target was to have more projects showing that most students are making gains in the FY 1996 cohort.

The level of missing data in both groups of reports and its effect on the results are significant concerns. Each set of data comes from a different cohort of grantees, and sets of data may not be comparable. Therefore, it is unclear whether the negative trend reported is an accurate assessment of projects' performance or is an artifact of missing data or noncomparable data.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Contracted synthesis of local project data, first funded in FY 1995 and FY 1996.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: Late 2000.

Validation Procedure: ED attestation process.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:
Limitations: Operational definitions of LEP students vary; amount of missing data varies greatly; and grantees use different measures to test program objectives. *Planned improvements:* The program office will implement stringent annual evaluation requirements proposed by the Administration in ESEA reauthorization.

The program office will focus technical assistance and monitoring on evaluation and data quality issues and will step up efforts to obtain missing data from grantees to enable reanalysis of the data reported here.

The program office will conduct a separate analysis on future biennial evaluation reports, separating data from grantees who have already submitted a previous evaluation report and are in their fourth year of operation from those who are submitting their first evaluation report and are in their second year of operation.

The program office continues to support research on what expected gains should be for LEP students in English proficiency, in order to construct a measure that more closely matches the indicator.

Indicator 1.3 Students exiting programs: Students in Title VII programs who have received bilingual education/ESL services continuously since first grade will exit those programs in 3 years.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** This is a new indicator, and formal data will be collected this coming year. A pilot survey conducted with nine states indicated that most students transition in 3 to 4 years. Program office is developing sources for this indicator.	**Source:** To be determined. *Frequency:* Annually (proposed). *Next Update:* 2001. **Validation Procedure:** N/A. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** *Limitations:* Currently reported data are for states rather than for Title VII grantees. *Planned Improvements:* The department plans to implement language, proposed by the Administration in its ESEA reauthorization proposal, requiring that grantees annually report on reclassification reports.
1999:	**New indicator**	**No target set**		
2000:		No target set		
2001:		No target set		

OBJECTIVE 2: BUILD CAPACITY OF SCHOOLS AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN PROGRAM TO SERVE LEP STUDENTS.

Indicator 2.1 Programs meeting standards: Each year the number of grantees meeting "criteria for model programs" will increase by 20 percent.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Indicator under construction			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Program office is developing criteria for model programs. Final criteria will be available Spring 2000. Initial goal is 20 percent, but the target will be revised based on initial results.	**Source**: Annual Performance Report, June 2000; Biennial Evaluation Reports, 2000. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Late 2000. **Validation Procedure:** N/A. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The department is also considering developing an indicator on students' achievement after reclassification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	**New indicator**	**No target set**		
2000		No target set		
2001		No target set		

Indicator 2.2 Teacher training: Each year, the numbers of teachers in Title VII Systemwide and Comprehensive School Grants Program who receive quality professional development in the instruction of LEP students will increase by 20 percent.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Indicator under construction			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Program office is developing criteria for quality inservice professional development. Final criteria will be available Spring 2000. Initial goal is 20 percent, but the target will be revised based on initial results.	**Source:** Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) study, Summer 2000; Annual Performance Report, June 2000; Biennial Evaluation Reports, 2000. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Late 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Not Applicable **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Measure of high quality needs to be developed.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	**New indicator**	**No target set**		
2000		No target set		
2001		No target set		

OBJECTIVE 3: PROVIDE EFFECTIVE GUIDANCE AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND IDENTIFY AND DISSEMINATE RELIABLE INFORMATION ON EFFECTIVE PRACTICES.

Indicator 3.1 Inquiries to the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE): The number of inquiries to the National Clearinghouse on Bilingual Education (NCBE) will increase 15 percent per year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of hits on NCBE Web site			**Status:** Target exceeded. **Explanation:** The actual increase was 42 percent, exceeding the 15 percent target. The large increase may be based on these facts: (1) NCBE has significantly stepped up its outreach efforts; (2) a new client base, as the number of educational agencies that have little or no prior experience of LEP students continues to increase; and (3) awards and recognitions for the Web site as a high-quality source of information on good pedagogical practices.	**Source:** NCBE Annual Performance Report, 1999. *Frequency*: Annually. *Next Update:* 2001. **Validation Procedure:** ED attestation process. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** *Limitations:* Measure does not address customer satisfaction. *Planned improvements:* Disaggregation of data to examine who uses the NCBE and what types of materials are downloaded.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997-98:	3,100,000			
1998-99:	**4,409,811**	**15% increase**		
1999-00:		15% increase		
2000-01:		15% increase		

Indicator 3.2 More specific reporting: All states will increase their capacity to plan for and provide technical assistance by reporting more specifically on LEP programs designed to meet the educational needs of LEP students, their academic test performance, and grade retention rates.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of state educational agencies (SEAs) reporting more specific demographic and language information when completing annual SEA Title VII Survey			**Status:** Achieved 91 percent of target. **Explanation:** Full analysis in progress. These data represent the first cohort of SEAs reporting on the new form. This figure represents reporting in a new survey form that asks for more information than previous forms did. SEAs often require a period of time to align their own data collection to new surveys.	**Source:** Redesigned Summary Report of the Survey of the States' Limited-English Proficient Students and Available Educational Programs and Services, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Late 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Not Applicable. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Survey relies on self-reports from states; department plans to continue technical assistance on data collection issues.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998-99:	**51**	**56**		
1999-00:		56		
2000-01:		56		

OBJECTIVE 4: IMPROVE THE QUALITY AND QUANTITY OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL SERVING LEP STUDENTS.

Indicator 4.1 New teachers: At least 4,000 teachers per year will complete high-quality bilingual education/English as a Second Language (ESL) certification or degree programs through the Bilingual Education Professional Development programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** The new baseline is based on the first cohort of submitted biennial evaluation reports and replaces a previous baseline calculated from a 1991 study and grantee applications from 1995. The new baseline was calculated based on data from projects originally funded in 1995.	**Source:** Contracted synthesis of project data. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Late 2000. **Validation Procedure:** None. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** *Limitations:* Data based on a sample of reports; program office has to develop criteria for "high quality." *Planned improvements:* Implementing proposed new evaluation requirements; developing criteria for "high quality"; verifying data through periodic monitoring; providing guidance and technical assistance to grantees to improve the timeliness and quality of source data; and improving timeliness of data through the reauthorization proposal to replace the biennial evaluation requirement with an annual evaluation requirement.
1997:	989*			
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**4,000**		
2000:		6,000		
2001:		6,000		
***Note:** According to a 1999 analysis of biennial evaluation reports from a sample of grantees first funded in FY 1995, the $5 million 1997 appropriation helped an estimated 989 teachers complete certification or degree programs.				

Indicator 4.2 Bilingual fellowship program: Bilingual fellows who have completed their studies will be employed in training classroom teachers or in other positions directly related to serving LEP students.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Progress toward target. **Explanation:** The high rate of employment of bilingual fellows in training classroom teachers and other areas directly related to serving LEP students is yet more evidence of the critical shortage of teachers trained to serve LEP students.	**Source:** Program database updated several times a year. Since participants are required to serve LEP students or repay the amount of the fellowship, the department maintains employment data on past fellowship participants. **Validation Procedure:** Employer confirmation obtained as necessary. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data from fellows who finished in calendar year 1999 not yet in database because of change to new software. Both 1999 and 2000 data will be entered as soon as change is complete.
1997:	92%			
1998:	92%			
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**93%**		
2000:		93%		
2001:		93%		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To strengthen and improve the quality of data and performance information submitted by grantees, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs will:
  - Provide training to project directors and their staff in using the Guide to Evaluation for Title VII Projects through the Regional Comprehensive Centers, Improving America's Schools conferences, and the OBEMLA Institute at the annual National Association of Bilingual Education conference.
  - Conduct a conference for evaluators and directors of Title VII projects and include training on applying the Guide to Evaluation for Title VII Projects to their performance reports and biennial evaluations.
- To further enhance and strengthen collaborative efforts, electronic links will be established between the OBEMLA Web site and those of major professional organizations.
- To better support and encourage project quality, program will strengthen technical assistance, monitoring instruments, and procedures for monitoring grants to ensure that programs focus on outcomes and accountability.
- To foster and strengthen capacity building with all grantees, technical assistance will be targeted to emphasize program features that will allow grantees to demonstrate that the support for LEP students will not diminish after the grant expires.
- To encourage and strengthen grantee efforts to improve literacy and assessment for LEP students, information on these two areas will be disseminated through the Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers and the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE).
- To inform what should be appropriate gains in academic achievement and language proficiency, we will monitor and report on continuing analyses of "expected gains studies" of Limited English Proficiency students.
- To continue to monitor the academic achievement of LEP students in Title VII programs, we will continue yearly studies, aggregating project evaluation data.
- Technical assistance will be expanded to grantees to promote
  - Incorporation of LEP educational issues into the general teacher training curriculum; and
  - Partnerships between teacher training institutions and school districts.
- To continue to monitor the academic achievement of LEP students in Title VII programs, we will continue yearly studies, aggregating project evaluation data.
- Technical assistance will be expanded to grantees to promote
  - Incorporation of LEP educational issues into the general teacher training curriculum; and
  - Partnerships between teacher training institutions and school districts.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To strengthen grantee ability to share and draw upon the experiences of one another, a resource database is being established on bilingual and ESL programs.
- Conferences will be conducted on improving the quality of professional development programs, to strengthen program quality and to pursue opportunities to prepare and encourage other institutions of higher education to develop programs for training bilingual and ESL teachers.
- To review the current research regarding reading in LEP students and encourage bilingual education researchers to focus their own research in this critical and priority area, OBEMLA will conduct a research symposium on literacy.
- To further strengthen and focus grantee efforts on effective project performance, OBEMLA proposed an annual evaluation requirement, through the reauthorization proposal, to ensure more frequent data for subpart 1 (Instructional services) and subpart 3 (Professional development) programs.
- To improve the bilingual education/ESL community's access to all education research, OBEMLA will work with NCBE to link the field with Department-wide research.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- To promote the highest quality in assessment and to eliminate duplication and confusion of effort, both at the Federal and the grantee level, OBEMLA is collaborating with Title I to establish and provide the best possible guidance on assessing LEP students.
- To further strengthen and promote projects of high quality, OBEMLA is sharing best practices information for serving LEP students through Title I and Migrant Education programs.
- To better assist grantees to serve LEP students with disabilities, OBEMLA is working with the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services to
  - Conduct joint research projects to strengthen and expand the knowledge database for working with LEP students with disabilities; and
  - Conduct joint conference institutes to provide grantees with technical assistance for serving LEP students with disabilities.
- To augment OBEMLA's ability to provide quality support and research, staff are working jointly with the Office of Educational Research and Improvement on projects that address LEP students, such as the NICHD/OERI project on Developing English Literacy in Spanish-speaking Students.
- To strengthen the field's capacity to address literacy needs, we are collaborating with the Reading Excellence Act (REA) to provide technical assistance to the field on helping LEP students attain literacy.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- High population mobility makes it difficult to measure program impact.
- Increasing population has brought significant demographic changes, including newer language groups and growing LEP populations in districts and states with little or no experience in serving them.
- State requirements for defining, serving, and teaching LEP students vary widely.
- Flexibility in the statute limits program office ability to direct grantees to conduct specific activities, such as training teachers under subpart 1 programs.
- Appropriate assessments for LEP students continue to be a challenge, and state policies for assessing LEP students continue to be refined.
- The extent to which issues relating to LEP students have been addressed in state standards and the alignment between those standards and programs serving LEP students vary widely.
- Lack of data around the academic achievement of former LEP students after they exit bilingual or ESL programs.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 3.2 (More specific reporting: All states will increase their capacity to plan for and provide technical assistance by reporting more specifically on LEP programs designed to meet the educational needs of LEP students, their academic test performance, and grade retention rates) was reworded to make it clearer. The first part of the sentence, "All states will increase their capacity to plan for and provide technical assistance," clarifies the usefulness and purpose of more specific reporting.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.3 (Success in regular classrooms: For students who have been in the program for at least 3 years, the district will report data on achievement of LEP students compared with that of non-LEP students, and the two groups will be performing comparably) was dropped because no data or research inform whether this goal is realistic. Research shows that, on average, it takes an LEP student 3 to 5 years to attain English proficiency (depending on student characteristics). However, research does not address how long it takes LEP students to master content areas. The program office is conducting a research study to determine what gains should be expected for LEP students in English and in content areas to inform this indicator. This indicator will be revisited once study results are available.
- Indicator 2.2 (Assessments linked to standards: The number of projects that report appropriate assessments aligned to state or local standards tailored to LEP students will increase) was dropped because the indicator is premature; it needs to build on recent department work on what constitutes aligned assessments. Program office needs to develop a process for measuring this indicator. To do this, it is necessary to build on the department's guidance on alignment of standards and assessments, which has only recently been finalized. The program office plans to use this indicator for internal program monitoring purposes.
- Indicator 3.1 (Federal technical assistance: An increasing percentage of local project directors will express satisfaction with technical assistance and guidance) was dropped because it is more suited for internal management purposes than for inclusion in a public document, as it does not provide information on programs. Rather, the indicator will be incorporated into internal processes to improve the program office's capacity to provide technical assistance to clients.

New—None.