

Archived Information

BILINGUAL EDUCATION INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES PROGRAM

Goal: To help limited-English proficient (LEP) students reach high academic standards.	Funding History (\$ in millions)			
	Fiscal Year	Appropriation	Fiscal Year	Appropriation
Legislation: Bilingual Education Program (Title VII, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)), as amended (20 U.S.C. 7451-7456 and 7471-7491).	1985	\$135	2000	\$248
	1990	\$159	2001	\$296
	1995	\$157	2002 (Requested)	\$0

Program Description

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.

Title VII, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorizes three kinds of assistance to LEAs, SEAs, and to institutions of higher education for the improvement of educational services for language learning in different contexts. These include:

- instructional support services (Program Development and Implementation grants; Program Enhancement Project grants; Comprehensive School grants; Systemwide Improvement grants)
- support services to educators of LEP students (Field-initiated research; Academic Excellence Award; State grant programs, and the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education), and
- professional development (Training for All Teachers program, Bilingual Education Teachers and Personnel grants, the Bilingual Career Ladder program, and Graduate Fellowships in Bilingual Education).

For more information, please visit the program Web site at: <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OBEMLA/>

Program Performance

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						Assessment of Progress					Sources and Data Quality				
<i>Percentage of projects in which three-quarters of student groups made gains in English proficiency</i>						Status: Unable to judge. Explanation: (1) Original “actual” data was based on a sample of 40 projects, “actual” data was never revised to include information from all 232 projects; target performance should be based on “percentage of projects in which three-quarters of the student <i>groups</i> made gains in English proficiency.” (2) The numbers of projects with missing data in all groups of reports and the effect on the results are significant concerns. (3) FY2000 synthesis of local project data is incomplete. (4) FY1998 and FY1999 project reports are from different cohorts; FY2000 project reports include a new cohort as well as 2 nd reports from CS and SW projects that first reported in FY1998. Therefore, it is unclear whether any trend reported is an accurate assessment of projects’ performance or is an artifact of missing data or noncomparable data. (5) Analyzing data within cohorts, by program, provides best comparison (e.g., cohort 1 of SW projects moved from 50 percent of groups showing improvement in written proficiency in FY98 to 100 percent showing improvement in FY00 reports). Note that a decreased percentage may be due to more projects reporting data, not due to decreasing effectiveness.					Source: Contracted synthesis of local project data, first funded in FY 1995. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> Late 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> Unknown. Validation Procedure: ED attestation process. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: <i>Limitations:</i> Operational definitions of LEP students vary; the amount of missing data varies greatly across projects and cohorts of projects; grantees use different measures and different scoring mechanisms to test program objectives.				
Year	Actual		Target		Actual							Target			
	Oral				Written										
FY 1998:	91%				82%										
FY 1999:	84%		92%		70%							85%			
FY 2000:			93%									88%			
FY 2001:			94%									91%			
FY 2002:															
<i>Comparison within cohorts</i>															
	Oral					Written									
FY 98:	COHORT 1 (Actual)														
	Enh1-89%	CS1-94%	SW1-66%	Enh1-100%	CS1-77%	SW1-50%									
FY 99:	COHORT 2 (Actual)														
	PDI-82%		CS2-82%		PDI-91%		CS2-82%								
FY 00:	**COHORT 3 (Actual)														
	Enh3	CS1-	CS3-	SW1	SW2	Enh3	CS1-	CS3-	SW1-	SW2-					
	-87%	86%	83%	-	-	--	86%	75%	100%	75%					
			100	100	57%										
			%	%											
FY 01:															
FY 02:															
Note: Enh = Enhancement program, PDI = Program Development and Implementation program, CS = Comprehensive School program, SW = Schoolwide Improvement; 1, 2, and 3 refer to cohorts so Enh1 is Enhance program, cohort 1 (first funded in FY95, first biennial reports due FY97, first GPRA summary due FY98. **Percentages for COHORT 3 are based on partial data. For CS1 and SW1 projects (FY95), 42% of the evaluation reports have been read, as of this reporting date. For CS3 and SW3 projects (FY95), 21% of the evaluation reports have been read.															

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

Targets and Performance Data											Assessment of Progress					Sources and Data Quality				
<i>Percentage of projects in which three-quarters of student groups made gains in academic achievement in language arts, reading, and math.</i>											Status: Unable to judge.					Source: Contracted synthesis of local project data, first funded in FY 1995. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> Late 2001. (current update will be complete 2/01). <i>Date to be reported:</i> Unknown.				
Year	Actual			Target			Actual			Target			Actual			Target				
	Language arts			Reading			Math			Language arts			Reading			Math				
FY 1998:	62%						62%						63%							
FY 1999:	42%			65%			53%			65%			59%			66%				
FY 2000:				67%						67%						68%				
FY 2001:				70%						70%						70%				
FY 2002:																				
<i>Comparison within cohorts</i>																				
Language arts					Reading					Math										
FY 98:	COHORT 1 (Actual)																			
	Enh1-72%	CS1-64%	SW1-50%	Enh1-78%	CS1-59%	SW1-53%	Enh1-63%	CS1-70%	SW1-43%											
FY 99:	COHORT 2 (Actual)																			
	PDI-47%		CS2-41%		PDI-50%		CS2-56%		PDI-68%		CS2-48%									
FY 00:	**COHORT 3 (Actual)																			
	Enh3-80%	CS1-53%	CS3-72%	SW1-75%	SW2-82%	Enh3-61%	CS1-61%	CS3-64%	SW1-88%	SW2-62%	Enh3-76%	CS1-76%	CS3-62%	SW1-63%	SW2-73%					
FY 01:																				
FY 02:																				

Explanation: (1) Original “actual” data was based on a sample of 40 projects, “actual” data was never revised to include information from all projects and target performance should be based on “percentage of projects in which three-quarters of the student groups made gains in academic achievement ...” (2) The numbers of projects with missing data in all groups of reports and the effect on the results are significant concerns. (3) FY2000 synthesis of local project data is incomplete. (4) FY1998 and FY1999 project reports are from different cohorts; FY2000 project reports include a new cohort as well as 2nd reports from some of those reported in FY1998. Therefore, it is unclear whether any trend reported is an accurate assessment of projects’ performance or is an artifact of missing data or noncomparable data. (5) Analyzing data within cohorts, by program, provides best comparison (e.g., cohort 1 of SW projects moved from 50 percent of groups showing improvement in written proficiency in FY98 to 100 percent showing improvement in FY00 reports). Note that a decreased percentage may be due to more projects reporting data, not due to decreasing effectiveness.

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 across projects; grantees use different measures and different scoring mechanisms to test program objectives.

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	<p>Status: Unable to judge.</p> <p>Explanation: The following are in-progress and should provide data to set targets and identify performances -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Forms for SEA data collection are being modified to include exit information; all SEAs will complete · Westat study on exited students is looking at proficiency and other reasons for exiting · Data from California indicate that from 1991 to 2000, rates of redesignation have moved from 5.7 percent in 1991 to 7.8 percent in 2000 · Pilot study based on 9 SEAs indicated that most students transition in 3-4 years 	<p>Source: To be determined. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually (proposed). <i>Next collection update:</i> 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> Unknown.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: N/A.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: <i>Limitations:</i> Currently reported data are for states rather than for Title VII grantees; current studies may focus on ideal projects and/or problematic projects, thus leading to inaccurate conclusions. Students do not exit dual language projects; need to determine students prepared to exit.</p>
1999:	New indicator	No target set		
2000:		No target set		
2001:		No target set		
2002:		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
<i>Indicator under construction</i>			<p>Status: Unable to judge.</p> <p>Explanation: Program office is developing criteria for model programs based on (1) <i>Expected Gains Study</i>, on-going data collection describes “model” as 3 years of longitudinal, matched-student data showing increased student proficiency and achievement, (2) IDRA study of 10 schools that has developed 25 indicators of “model” schools for LEP students, (3) <i>Academic Excellence</i> program that has established criteria for identifying projects meeting needs of students and then provides dissemination funding to projects. However, the means to merge these into one set of criteria, to implement these criteria, and to evaluate the result is problematic. The program office is considering how to accomplish this.</p>	<p>Source: Biennial Evaluation reports, possibly Annual Performance Reports proposed. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> Late 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> Unknown.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: N/A.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Various definitions of “model” project will need to be combined and may identify different projects - need to determine how to combine definitions, use definitions, and evaluate the results.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999:	New indicator	No target set		
2000:		No target set		
2001:		No target set		
2002:		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
<i>Indicator under construction</i>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: Unable to judge.</p> <p>Explanation: Program office is developing criteria for quality inservice professional development based on contracted synthesis of local project evaluations and other sources; criteria will be available late 2001. Contractors who are synthesizing the biennial evaluation reports will be asked to add this data element to their information.</p> <p>Initial goal is 20% but the target will be revised based on initial results.</p> <p>Source: Biennial Evaluation Reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Biennially. <i>Next collection update:</i> Late 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> Unknown.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: N/A.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Biennial evaluations typically list how many teachers participate in professional development activities only, without considering an evaluation of those activities.</p>
1999:	New indicator	No target set	
2000:	Collected Biennially	No target set	
2001:		No target set	
2002:			

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 NCBE will increase 15 percent per year.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of hits on NCBE Web site</i>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: Target exceeded.</p> <p>Explanation: The actual increase for FY00 was 62 percent, exceeding and tripling the 15 percent target.</p> <p>The large increase may be based on these facts: (1) NCBE has continued to increase outreach efforts; (2) an increased client base as the number of educational agencies that have little or no prior experience of LEP students continues to increase; and (3) ongoing improvement and expansion of the website; and (4) <i>awards and recognition</i> for the website as a high-quality source of information on good pedagogical practices.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: ED attestation process.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: <i>Limitations:</i> Measure does not address customer satisfaction, although anecdotal comments support satisfaction. <i>Planned Improvements:</i> Disaggregation of data to examine who uses NCBE and what types of materials are downloaded.</p>
1997-98:	3,100,000	Baseline	
1998-99:	4,409,811 (up 38%)	15%	
1999-00:	7,125,848 (up 62%)	15%	
2000-01		15%	

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	
<i>Number of state educational agencies (SEAs) reporting more specific demographic and language information when completing annual SEA Title VII survey.</i>		Status: Unable to judge. Explanation: Annual Report from states is due by June 2001.	Source: Redesigned Summary Report of the Survey of the States' LEP Students and Available Educational Programs and Services, 2000. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> Late 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> Unknown. Validation Procedure: N/A. 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:	51 (data not complete)			56
2000-01:				56
2001-02:				

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/ESL programs accreditation 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 baseline is based on first cohort of submitted biennial evaluation reports, projects originally funded in FY1995. Data on projects funded in FY 99 is expected to be available in 5/2001. Validation Procedure: None. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: <i>Limitations:</i> Original data based on a sample of reports; program office has to develop criteria for "high quality". <i>Planned Improvements:</i> 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.
1997:	989 (from sample of grantees)		
1999:	Data not available	4,000	
2000:		6,000	
2001:		6,000	
2002:			

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	<p>Status: Progress toward target.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It is difficult to evaluate since bilingual fellowship projects fund new students each year. Thus any given year's students may be from cohorts who began during various different fiscal years.</p>	<p>Source: Program database updated several times a year. Since participants are required to serve LEP students or repay the amount of the fellowship to the department maintains employment data on fellowship participants.</p> <p><i>Frequency:</i> Ongoing.</p> <p><i>Next collection update:</i> Late 2001.</p> <p><i>Date to be reported:</i> Unknown.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Employer confirmation obtained as necessary.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data from fellows who finish is typically late in arriving and with new database may be entered late. Data will be entered as soon as possible.</p>
1997:	92%			
1998:	92%			
1999:	92% (data not complete)	93%		
2000:		93%		
2001:		93%		
2002:				