

FEDERAL POLICY, LEGISLATION, AND EDUCATION REFORM:

The Promise and the Challenge for Language Minority Students

Kris Anstrom

Section on Migrant education by
Anneka Kindler

INTRODUCTION

If systemic reform is to achieve its goal of educating *all* students to high standards, then the educational community must be guided by a comprehensive understanding of the language minority population, the challenges faced in educating these students, and the most effective educational programs for them. Issues related to the education of language minority students need to be understood within the context of educational reform as exemplified in the recent passage of three ground breaking pieces of legislation, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA), and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act. All three pieces of legislation require that new linkages be formed across old programmatic boundaries, between local educational agencies (LEAs), state education agencies (SEAs), institutions of higher education (IHEs), and the federal government, and between community-based organizations and the schools. Resultant partnerships and initiatives have the potential of impacting language minority students either positively or negatively. Knowledge of the issues and legislation on the part of those concerned with the education of language minority students and their involvement in all levels of the reform effort will help determine whether language minority students benefit from the reform movement. The purpose of this document is to provide an overview of the issues and legislation pertinent to the attainment of educational equity and excellence for language minority students.

LANGUAGE MINORITY STUDENT POPULATION

As the nation works toward achieving the goals outlined in the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, it is becoming clear that our ability to achieve these goals is increasingly dependent upon the schools' ability to educate language minority students. Approximately 9.9 million children and youth, or more than one in five, live in homes where a language other than English is spoken. This figure represents an increase of 22.4 percent over the 8.1 million recorded for 1980. While the language minority population is increasing, the population of students from English-only homes has declined (Waggoner, D., 1994). This upward trend highlights the importance of educational programming that accounts for the specialized needs of this population.

The limited-English proficient (LEP) school-aged population is a subset of language minority

From 1985 to 1994, the LEP student population increased at an average 9.6 percent per year; by contrast, the overall student population increased by approximately one percent annually.

students. There is much variance among LEP student population estimates due to the broad range of definitions of LEP; however, it is clear that the number of LEP students is growing. Enrollment figures for limited English proficient students have reflected an upward trend over the last nine years. The most recent figures available for the 1993-94 school year indicate a 16 percent increase over the previous year. LEP students enrolled in public or nonpublic elementary or secondary schools numbered 3,038,000 during the 93-94 school year, representing an increase of approximately 400,000 LEP students. These figures are taken from the SEA reports made annually to the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) and most likely fall far short of the actual enrollment figures (Donly, et.al., 1995).

The three states with the largest LEP student populations--California (1,215,000), Texas (422,700), and New York (216,400)--reported substantial increases in their LEP populations over the 92-93 school year (Donly, et.al., 1995). A study completed for the school year 1991-92 revealed that LEP students were concentrated in the west. Fifty-nine percent lived in the west; 20 percent, in the South; 13 percent in the Northeast, and 8 percent were concentrated in the North Central region. According to a recent study, most LEP students were young. More than two out of three were in grades K-6, 18 percent in grades 7-9, and only 14 percent were in grades 10-12. The study also revealed that Spanish was the native language of approximately three out of four LEP students. Four percent spoke Vietnamese, followed by Hmong, Cantonese, Cambodian, and Korean (2 percent each). One of twenty-nine different Native American languages was spoken by 2.5 percent of LEP students (Fleischman, H.L. and Hopstock, P. J., 1993).

For the 1992-93 school year, more than 2.4 million LEP students were served by special programs. Of this number, almost 50 percent were enrolled in state-funded bilingual programs. Of the federal programs, Chapter 1 served the largest percentage of LEP students (approximately 31 percent), special education enrolled about 6 percent, and the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program enrolled approximately 10 percent. Title VII Bilingual Education Programs served 11 percent of all LEP students. Under the new IASA 1994, an even larger number of LEP students will be served under Title I programming (IASA 1994, sec. 1112). Approximately 21 percent of LEP students were not enrolled in any special assistance program (Donly, et.al., 1995).

CHALLENGES FACING DISTRICTS

Although LEP students are spread across the country, they are concentrated in a relatively limited number of school districts. According to a recent survey completed by NCBE, Los Angeles (291,527), New York (154,526) and Chicago (57,964) had the highest enrollment levels of LEP students in the country, representing a substantial portion of the nationwide enrollment figure. A recent study by the U.S. GAO reported that the nation's 25 largest metropolitan areas accounted for approximately 20 percent of all students but about 42 percent of all LEP students (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1994).

These large urban districts face significant challenges including large numbers of students living in poverty, lack of resources and funding, high dropout rates, and increasing violence and drug activity in their schools.

More than 40 percent of all LEP students live in large urban districts where resources to educate these students are often scarce.

In addition, urban districts, as well as other districts that enroll large numbers of language minority students, face particular challenges associated with their education. The GAO study examined five districts which enrolled large numbers of language minority students and summarized the particular challenges faced in educating them. Some of these challenges include:

> **Linguistic and cultural diversity.** Language minority students in large districts represent a variety of cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The variety of languages these students speak often makes it impossible for districts to provide the bilingual instruction and services these students need. In one district included in the GAO study, only 3 percent of about 21,000 limited English proficient students received bilingual instruction. Although ESL instruction is often provided, support to assist students in comprehending academic subject matter is often lacking when bilingual education is not available. Furthermore, cultural differences often result in misunderstandings that impede effective teacher-student communication (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1994).

> **Implementation of promising non-bilingual approaches.** Content-area instruction and other similar approaches conducted in English have been effective (Tikunoff, W., et.al., 1991); however, these approaches require substantial investments of time and resources.

> **Limited federal support.** Title VII provides funds to districts to help them meet the educational needs of LEP students; however, this funding has not kept pace with the growing LEP population. For example, the \$192 million appropriated for Title VII funding in 1990 is 40 percent less, when inflation is considered, than the amount appropriated in 1980. Over this same period of time, the U.S. Census data indicate that the LEP population grew by more than 25 percent (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1994). Though Title VII funds do provide assistance to a number of urban districts, it is not the intention of Title VII to provide for the education of all language minority students; thus, urban districts must rely on state and local sources to educate the majority of these students.

> **The number of language minority students living in poverty.** Based on 1990 U.S. Census data, approximately 37 percent of language minority students are poor, compared with about 17 percent of all students (General Accounting Office, 1994). In addition, a large percentage of language minority students were classified as educationally disadvantaged, particularly in the upper grade levels. More than two years of schooling were missed by 20 percent of language minority students in the average high school and 12 percent in the average middle school. (Fleischman, H.L., et.al, 1993).

> **Health and emotional needs.** Many language minority students experience significant health and emotional needs, particularly immigrant students who have lived through the trauma of war and conditions in refugee camps.

> **Parent involvement.** It is well known that involving parents in their children's education is critical. However, considerable barriers to involving the parents of LEP students in school life do exist. Not only do many of these parents not speak English, many are also illiterate in their native languages. Thus, efforts to translate written materials designed for parent use into other languages often meet with little success.

EFFECTIVE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

To meet the challenges outlined above, schools need to implement effective programs for language minority students. However, as the authors of *School Reform and Student Diversity: Case Studies of Exemplary Practices for LEP Students* state, creating effective programming for these students is a multi-faceted task requiring "a re-examination of what it means to be educated...and careful attention to how a highly heterogeneous student population actually learns" (Berman, P., et.al., 1995).

Studies conducted in recent years, particularly the Ramirez study, indicate that programs in which the native language is strongly supported, in combination with balanced second language development, are more successful in supporting language minority students' *academic achievement in the second language* than are programs that give little or no academic support to the native language. Of the three programs addressed in the Ramirez study, English Immersion, Early-Exit Bilingual Education, and Late-Exit Bilingual Education, the Late-Exit programs were found to be most effective in terms of promoting academic achievement in the second language. However, these results were not initially evident; they appeared only after more than several years of bilingual education programming (Ramirez, J., et.al. 1991).

In addition to native language support, effective bilingual programs have been found to incorporate the following pedagogical premises:

- >The active involvement of learners in meaningful and developmentally appropriate activities best promotes learning;
- >The primary language is used as a means for promoting thinking and learning rather than as a crutch for the acquisition of English;
- >Language is learned within various contexts, both academic and social. Time and opportunity are allowed for students to develop the language they will need in a variety of contexts;
- >Critical decisions regarding exiting and transitioning students from programming are not made arbitrarily;
- >Beginning English literacy and content development are supported through oral language and comprehension development;
- >A student's first and second language abilities determine the type of instructional assessment rather than grade level or other predetermined criteria;
- >Involvement of the parents and the community is critical for the academic achievement of language minority students;
- >Inclusion of the students' cultures in the curriculum and instruction is conducted in a manner that will foster self understanding as well as cross-cultural understanding;
- >Program decision-making accounts for larger sociocultural and political factors, such as socioeconomic disparities between language minority and language majority groups;

Recent research demonstrates that language minority youth can achieve academically at levels at or above the national norm if instructional strategies that acknowledge, respect, and build upon the language and culture of the home are employed (Garcia, E., 1991).

>Teachers as members of a learning community are involved in all aspects of programming for language minority students (Nadeau, A., 1995).

A program model that has attracted increased attention is the two-way bilingual education model. Students enrolled in these programs develop dual language proficiency in English and another language in classrooms that are normally comprised of half native speakers of English and half native speakers of another language. Various studies have found that the dual-language approach is not only effective in developing bilingualism in students from two language groups, but also in supporting academic excellence. Students in schools with dual language programs have demonstrated academic progress on standardized tests along with fluency in two languages (Lindholm, K.J. and Gavlek, K., 1994).

To examine effective programming for schools where bilingual models are impractical due to enrollment of students from a variety of linguistic backgrounds, the U.S. Department of Education conducted a study of the significant features of exemplary programs that used English as the primary medium of instruction. An understanding of these alternative programs is becoming increasingly important as the LEP student population grows and mainstream educators are assuming a greater role in educating them. Mainstream educators usually are not proficient in the native languages of LEP students; however, by adopting the policies and practices of successful alternative programs, a more effective education can be provided for the limited-English proficient population.

The U.S. Department of Education study found that successful alternative programs included administrative-level features such as instructional leadership in planning, coordinating, and administering the programs; the involvement of teachers experienced in content-area instruction and bilingual/ESL methodology; and a history of intensive professional development. In the area of professional development, the establishment of mentoring programs for novice bilingual/bicultural teachers was found to be a promising approach. Such programs build on the support a beginning teacher receives from his/her more experienced colleagues. Also, such programs are integrally connected to the school's culture, a factor that the literature on educational reform has highlighted as critical to the success of school reform (Torres-Guzman, M.E. and Goodwin, L. A., 1995). Programs described in the study were noted for the extent to which they were integrated with the whole-school program. A detailed description of an integrated bilingual/mainstream program is discussed in the publication *Teamworks: Mainstream and Bilingual/ESL Teacher Collaboration* (Sakash, K. and Rodriguez-Brown, F., 1995). In addition, these programs provided intensive staff development in the knowledge and skills necessary for instructing LEP students (Tikunoff, W., et.al, 1991).

Instructional-level features of exemplary alternative programs included the integration of effective instructional principles with English-language development in the content areas and learning environments that supported LEP students' active engagement in learning tasks (Tikunoff, W., et.al., 1991). Research has shown that students who are actively engaged in seeking knowledge and acquiring new skills are more likely to experience authentic learning. Active learning has been found to be particularly effective with language minority students given its contribution to the development of a community of learners involved in authentic discourse activities. This emphasis on communication provides many opportunities where students can

produce and manipulate language to support a variety of goals. Active learning, rather than rote language drills, supports opportunities for authentic communication, which is essential for the acquisition of language (Lathrop, L., et.al., 1993). Encouraging students to use their native languages to achieve comprehension of the subject matter was also found to be important.

Though it is important to identify what is and what is not effective programming for language minority students, it is also imperative to have an understanding of the effective implementation of such programming, particularly within the context of whole-school educational reform.

A recent study funded through the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the Department of Education identified eight schools that have created exemplary learning environments for LEP students. Significant whole-school restructuring that included innovative methods of organizing teaching, governance, and usage of time is a major feature of each exemplary school. These schools also exhibited high-quality language arts, mathematics, science, and English language acquisition programming for LEP students. A detailed description of each school is provided in the document *School Reform and Student Diversity: Case Studies of Exemplary Practices for LEP Students* (Berman, P., et.al., 1995).

In *Implementing Bilingual Programs is Everybody's Business*, Toni Griego-Jones (1995) outlines the necessary factors for successful implementation of bilingual programs within the context of a **whole-school approach** to reform. Critical factors include:

- >Statements of support from the superintendent and other district wide personnel;
- >Identification and clarification of specific duties in implementation;
- >Intensive and continuing staff development on issues important in the education of language minority students;
- >Changing of many accepted organizational practices which create barriers to successful implementation of bilingual programming;
- >Involvement of both bilingual and mainstream classroom teachers as trainers in areas of expertise;
- >The use of teachers in supervisory positions.

These factors are not intended to be definitive for successful implementation of bilingual programs; however, they do point toward the need for more integration, cooperation, and collaboration across boundaries, particularly boundaries that separate bilingual programming from the mainstream (Griego-Jones, T., 1995).

EDUCATION REFORM AND GOALS 2000

Educators and policy makers acknowledge that in order to improve student learning, the education system as a whole must be revamped.

"Systemic reform holds promise for improving instruction and

learning for all students, including LEP students. But such an outcome is not a foregone conclusion. Thus far the reform movement has generally sidestepped the particular conditions, needs, and strengths of LEP children. Difficult issues remain to be addressed in many areas including, curriculum, instruction, assessment, and leadership" (August, D., et.al., 1994).

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act, signed into law in 1994, provides direction and funding for this systemic reform. Key components of this reform include: (1) high standards for all students; (2) curricula and instruction tied to these standards; (3) student assessments tied to the curricula (4) professional development; and (5) parent and community involvement (U.S. Department of Education, 1994. Goals 2000 Fact Sheet). Each of these key components has ramifications for language minority students.

>**High standards.** The recent release of content standards in the areas of history and the arts have stirred new questions about what should be taught and learned in our schools. While some standards have been criticized as overly demanding, others have received blame for attempting to politicize the curriculum (Brandt, R., 1995). At issue for language minority students is whether they will have access to the kind of curriculum and instruction necessary for them to achieve to these high standards. Researchers and policy makers have made various recommendations for ensuring that language minority students are included in the development of these new standards. First, it is imperative that experts in the field of language minority education be included in national, state and local panels relating to standards development. Second, content standards must incorporate what research and practice has told us about how language minority students learn and about how content is most effectively taught to them. In addition, supplementary English as a second language standards also need to be developed. The first language abilities of language minority students should also be acknowledged in the content and performance standards. Finally, along with content and performance standards, opportunity to learn standards will also need to be drafted to ensure that language minority students have access to the resources necessary for them to work toward these challenging new content and performance standards (August, D., et.al., 1994).

>**Assessment.** As noted in a recent article in *Education Leadership* (Brandt, October 1994), perceptions concerning the challenges of assessment have shifted from designing good performance-based assessments to understanding the interface between assessment and curriculum and instruction. This shift is in keeping with the Goals 2000 legislation that requires that standards, curricula, and assessment be linked. In order to ensure that language minority students participate in the new measurements being developed, states need to create performance assessments that are appropriate for language minority students and that are as rigorous as those used to measure achievement of native English speakers. Equitable assessment for language minority students requires that appropriate measures be developed in the native languages of these students and/or modifications in English-language assessments need to be made so that they are more comprehensible (August, D., et.al., 1994).

>**Professional Development.** A pivotal issue for the reform efforts that schools are undertaking is how to promote the high quality, long-term professional development needed to institute the changes demanded by the reform agenda. New roles and practices will need to be adopted which will demand a new type of professional development. This type of professional development involves creating new roles for teachers, such as teacher leader, peer coach, teacher-as-researcher, and cooperative learning groups. Teachers will need to become problem-solvers and collaborators, and administrators will need to support them by offering new structures and institutional arrangements that provide high-quality,

ongoing learning opportunities (Darling-Hammond, L. and McLaughlin, M., 1995). Additionally, professional development programs that contribute to the goal of educating all students to high standards must prepare teachers to teach an increasingly diverse student population. Such programs should not only equip teachers and administrators with the skills and knowledge necessary for working with diverse populations but should also identify and implement strategies for attracting more minorities to the field of education.

>Parent/Community Involvement. Involving the family and community in school is key to reaching today's students. Methods for including the families of language minority students in school activities is crucial for meeting the learning needs of these students. A strong home-school connection is often cited as a positive factor in the achievement of minority students. In addition, educators need to understand and incorporate the knowledge and strengths that language minority students bring to school into the curriculum and instruction.

In the U.S. Department of Education's Summary of Major Activities (January, 1995), Secretary Riley identified eight issues requiring the nation's attention. Of these eight, six relate directly to improving the educational opportunities of language minority students. They include: improving safety and discipline; strengthening basic and advanced skills for all students; better teaching, greater parental involvement; greater connection between school and work, and better access to technology. A discussion of these issues, the legislation that addresses them, and its impact on the education of language minority students follows.

EDUCATION REFORM AND THE IMPROVING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS ACT

The IASA of 1994, which reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for five years, funds important programs for disadvantaged and limited English proficient youth in K 12 education programs. It also promotes professional development initiatives, more widespread use of educational technology, and the increased participation of parents and community members in the educational system. An important change in the new legislation is its relationship to Goals 2000. The IASA is designed to tie existing federal programs to the objectives of Goals 2000 and in so doing act as a catalyst for school reform. Both pieces of legislation support school reform through establishing high performance standards and through emphasizing the professional development of teachers, administrators, and other staff.

Title I: Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards

In 1965, Title I was enacted "to provide financial assistance to local education agencies servicing areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their education programs by various means" (Public Law 89-10). From the beginning, Title I, replaced by Chapter 1 in 1981, was viewed as the vehicle for addressing the educational inequities of poor and educationally disadvantaged children.

IASA authorizes full participation of eligible LEP students in Title I programs for economically disadvantaged youth.

Currently, Chapter 1 participants represent a significant portion of the public and non public school enrollment. Of the 48,110,000 elementary and secondary students enrolled in public and private schools during the 1992-93 school year (National Center for Education Statistics, 1994), 6,403,054 of these students participated in Chapter 1 programs. This figure represents an increase of approximately 8 percent over the 1991-92 level of 5,903,619 students. Twenty-seven percent of Chapter 1 students were African-American and 29 percent were Hispanic. Thirty-nine percent, still the largest proportion of Chapter 1 students, were white. Fifty states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs reported that 17 percent of their Chapter 1 participants were limited English proficient (Sinclair, B. & Gutmann, B., 1994).

Recently, educators, researchers and others involved with Chapter 1 (now Title I) programs have raised concerns about the effectiveness of these programs in addressing the educational needs of disadvantaged students (Office of Policy and Planning, Planning and Evaluation Service, 1993). The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Schools Act, which was enacted into law as the IASA of 1994, became the vehicle for addressing these concerns and has led to the reform of Title I legislation. The new Title I legislation aims to provide the means for children in high-poverty schools to meet the new academic, content, and performance standards that are required for all children and that states will be developing as part of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act.

Limited-English Proficient Students: One concern that has been addressed by the new legislation is the degree to which limited English proficient students can be included in Title I programs. The previous Chapter 1 law required that programs distinguish between educational deprivation and limited English proficiency when determining eligibility for programming (Section 1014 [d] [1]). The new legislation has eliminated this requirement thus paving the way for greater inclusion of LEP students in Chapter 1 services.

The former Chapter 1 frequently fragmented programs and separated people from one another; the new Title I strives to bring people and programs together.

In addition, Title I requires that local education agency plans describe how they will coordinate and integrate services with other educational services, including those offered to limited English proficient students (IASA 1994, sec. 1112). The new Title I also specifies that assessments that determine the yearly performance of each school must "provide for the inclusion of limited English proficient students who shall be assessed, to the extent practicable in the language and form most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what students know and can do, to determine such students' mastery of skills in subjects other than English" (IASA 1994, sec. 1111). These new provisions raise additional challenges for Title I programming including determining appropriate native language assessments and/or designing alternative assessments that evaluate LEP students' academic knowledge and skills; and educating Title I staff in new methods and strategies for working with the LEP population. In order to provide guidance to Title I coordinators on issues concerning the education of LEP students through Title I, a panel of educators, researchers, and policy makers met to determine those areas of the legislation that have implications for LEP students. Their analysis and recommendations were compiled in a recently published document entitled *LEP Students and Title I: A Guidebook for Educators* (August, D., et.al. (1995).

Achieving High Standards: The new Title I legislation requires states receiving Title I funds to demonstrate that they have challenging content and performance standards in at least the areas of math and reading or language arts and that these standards are used to uphold Title I programs and students to the same high standards expected of all students (IASA 1994, sec. 1111, 1994). The new Title I makes clear that a basics-driven curriculum is no longer sufficient. Components of a targeted assistance school program (schools that are ineligible or have not opted for a school-wide approach), should "use effective instructional strategies... that help provide an accelerated, high quality curriculum, including applied learning; and... coordinate with and support the regular education program (IASA 1994, sec. 1115, 1994). Therefore, if disadvantaged children are to meet the high performance standards demanded of all students, Title I programs will need to redirect their attention to developing students' cognitive strategies, emphasizing meaning and understanding rather than the oftentimes decontextualized drill-and-practice in basic facts and skills, contextualizing instruction in "real texts" and real-life problems, integrating reading, writing and language arts, seeking connections between content areas, and establishing links between school life and home life (Knapp, M.S., et.al., 1993).

Reform: The new legislation reforms targeted assistance programs by requiring that these programs "give primary consideration to extended time strategies, be based on what research shows is most effective in teaching and learning, and involve accelerated curricula, effective instructional strategies, strong coordination with the regular program, and highly qualified and trained staff" (U.S. Department of Education, IASA Summary Sheets, 1994).

>Extended Time Programs. Programs that rely on extended learning time, also known as add-on programs, have not been widely used.

Schoolwide programs allow Title I funds to be combined with other federal, state, and local funds to support programs for all students in the school, not just students eligible for Title I.

Before- and after-school instruction was used by 9 percent of elementary schools, and only 15 percent offered summer school instruction during the 1991-92 school year (Office of Policy and Planning, Planning and Evaluation Service, 1993). With emphasis in the new legislation given to extended-time strategies for targeted assistance schools, the challenge will be to develop curricula that emphasize higher order skills within a context that is meaningful to the students and that relates to the general education program and to develop and train staff in effective instructional strategies.

>School-wide Projects. Though intended to encourage fundamental instructional reforms such as integration of curricula and services, case studies of school-wide projects have indicated that reduction in class size, a decrease or elimination in the number of pull-out programs, more staff development time and widespread use of Chapter 1 materials by all students have commonly been the results of adopting a school-wide project. School-wide projects were first authorized in 1978 amendments to Title I. Since 1988, the number of schools implementing this model has increased from approximately 200 in the 1988-89 school year to more than 2000 for the 91-92 school year. Prior to the recent reauthorization of the ESEA (now the IASA of 1994), only schools with poverty rates of at least 75 percent were eligible for school-wide projects (Office of Policy and Planning, Planning and Evaluation Service, 1993). The new legislation recognizes that Title I can become the catalyst for reforming the entire instructional program by lowering the minimum poverty level for eligibility to 60 percent for the 1995-96 school year and then to 50 percent in subsequent years (IASA 1994, sec. 1114).

With the increased attention and funding given to school-wide projects, it is important to understand the challenges and obstacles confronting schools that implement these projects. Transitioning to a school-wide project implies that new approaches, new roles, and new administrative structures will need to be learned. Adequate time and preparation for the transition are crucial as are appropriate and on-going staff development in new technologies, new standards-based content and methods, and more effective teaching styles. Equally important are the alliances that will need to be formed with parents, community-based organizations, and businesses. Such alliances are essential in giving the assistance schools need to encourage academic achievement in their students. An additional issue for school-wide projects is to find ways to stabilize change once the project has been successfully implemented given the propensity for administrative turn over in high poverty schools (Pechman, E. and Fiester, L., 1994).

>Secondary Students. Currently, only 4 percent of students receiving Chapter 1 services are in grades 10-12 (Office of Policy and Planning, Planning and Evaluation Service, 1993). However, Title I now specifies that local education agencies must serve high poverty middle and high schools before serving other elementary schools that fall below 75 percent poverty (IASA 1994, sec. 1113). This reallocation of services will ensure that more secondary students will be served by Title I. In addition to instructional services, Title I resources can also be used for career and college guidance, counseling and mentoring, as well as other services that help transition students to higher education or work. Challenges for secondary Title I programs include integrating academics with practical training and coordinating Title I services with other programs for at-risk youth such as the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, Tech-Prep, and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 (IASA 1994, sec. 1114).

>Professional Development. The new legislation focuses attention on professional development by making available funds for all personnel to receive the high quality professional development needed to assist students to meet the new academic standards.

"...limited English proficient students...shall be assessed, to the extent practicable, in the language and form most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what students know and can do, to determine such students' mastery of skills in subjects other than English...." (IASA 1994, sec. 1111).

Additionally, the legislation provides direction for the type of professional development that should be given by requiring professional development activities that "support instructional practices that are geared to challenging State content standards and create a school environment conducive to high achievement in the academic subjects", that allow schools to combine resources from other sources such as Title II of IASA and Title III of the Goals 2000 Educate America Act, and that "where appropriate...include strategies for developing curricula and teaching methods that integrate academic and vocational instruction (including applied learning and team teaching strategies)." In order for this integration and collaboration to occur, LEAs are encouraged to design professional development programs that include all staff, not just Title I staff (IASA 1994, sec. 1119).

>Assessment. The new legislation requires that Title I assessment be aligned with State testing systems

that are keyed to curriculum frameworks which, in turn, are based on performance standards for all students (IASA 1994, sec. 1111). The challenge for Title I programs, then, will be to design assessments that maintain a strong emphasis on accountability but that are aligned closely with what is actually being taught and learned by the students. Title I assessment will need to move towards emphasizing advanced skills rather than the basic skills it has in the past, and will need to link testing to course content. To meet the challenge of retaining accountability and ensuring accurate information from which informed decision making can be made, multiple testing measures will need to be implemented that may include alternative methods of assessment (Advisory Committee on Testing in Chapter 1, 1993). Indeed, the Title I legislation specifically states that assessments must "involve multiple up-to-date measures of student performance, including measures that assess higher order thinking skills and understanding" (IASA 1994, sec. 1111)

>School/Parent Partnerships: The new Title I legislation speaks to the need for increased parent participation in their children's education by requiring LEAs receiving parental involvement funds to "jointly develop with parents ... a school-parent compact that outlines how parents, the entire school staff, and students will share the responsibility for improved student achievement and the means by which the school and parents will build and develop a partnership to help children achieve the State's high standards." Furthermore, the legislation specifies that the compact describe "the ways in which each parent will be responsible for supporting their children's learning, such as monitoring attendance, homework completion, and television watching...." It also stipulates that parental involvement is to be ensured by various means, including providing assistance in understanding assessments, and in how to monitor a child's progress. Community-based organizations and businesses are also to be included in parent involvement activities (IASA 1994, sec. 1118).

In summary, Title I of the IASA of 1994 contributes to systemic reform by:

- >Coordinating the State, LEA, and schools' programs to ensure high standards for all children;
- >Providing students with an accelerated curriculum and instruction that will allow them to meet the high standards;
- >Emphasizing extended learning time and/or school-wide programs that will allow Title I students to receive instruction at least equivalent to that received by other children;
- >Promoting school-wide reform, effective instructional methods, and challenging academic content;
- >Enhancing the quality of instruction by expanding professional development opportunities;
- >Aligning services under all sections of Title I with each other, with other educational programs, and with health and social services, when feasible;
- >Strengthening parent involvement in their children's education;
- >Allocating resources to areas where the needs are greatest;
- >Using State assessment systems to improve accountability and to demonstrate how well children are achieving the State's performance standards;
- >Allowing schools and teachers more authority in making decisions in return for greater responsibility for student performance (IASA 1994, sec. 1001).

The new IASA legislation targets those migratory students who are most in need of services by limiting the population counted for funding purposes to those who have moved within the last three years.

Migrant Education

The Federally funded Migrant Education Program (MEP), was established in 1966 to support state programs designed to meet the complex educational needs of migrant students and to facilitate interstate coordination of services. Federally supported regular school year and summer term programs have played an important role in improving educational opportunities for migrant students; however, migrant children continue to experience high dropout rates, low achievement levels, and slow progress through school (Salerno, A., 1991). The reauthorization of the MEP under the IASA of 1994 is anticipated to bring about needed improvements in the delivery of services to migrant students (USED, IASA Summary Sheets, 1994).

Demographic Information: In order to provide services to migrant children, states must first identify them. Unfortunately, since migrant farm workers and their families often move across state and even national boundaries, it is difficult to know the exact number of migrant children in a state at a given point in time. Counting migrant children is made more complicated by differing identification and record-keeping practices within different states (Strang, et.al., 1993). Estimates can vary widely.

U.S. Department of Education estimates of migrant children for 1990 utilized MEP program eligibility as a criterion for counting migrant students. In 1990, children who had undergone a migratory relocation within the previous six years were regarded as eligible for services. The study reported that states had identified 597,000 children eligible for MEP services (Cox, J.L., et.al., 1992). In contrast, the National Agricultural Workers Survey conducted in the same year estimated that 587,000 children of migrant workers had undergone a migratory move within only the previous year (Strang, E.W., et.al., 1993). In 1994, 657,373 students were identified by the Department of Education as eligible for MEP services, of which approximately 70 percent received some type of service. The states with the highest concentrations of MEP migrant students during the 1992-93 school year were California (166,793), Texas (95,703), and Florida (33,068) (Henderson, A., et.al., 1994).

Characteristics of Migrant Students:

Migrant students have unique educational needs stemming from mobility, work and family responsibilities, poverty, and often language.

The transience, poverty, and language barriers that children of migratory farm workers and fishers experience make them among the most in need of additional help.

Public schools that are geared towards meeting the needs of a relatively stable population of students residing in a geographic area may be unaware of or have difficulty meeting the special needs of migrant students.

Since the family's migration is not patterned around the traditional school year, migrant students experience considerable disruptions in the continuity of their education. Although migrant summer programs enable many students to make up missed instructional time, it is often difficult for migrant students to accrue enough

academic credit to stay at grade level with their non-migrant peers (Salerno, A., 1991). In migrant families, children can be expected to work in the fields or to care for younger siblings when their parents are working (Chavkin, N.F., 1991). Often, children as young as ten years old can make a significant contribution to their family's income by working rather than attending school (Prewitt Diaz, J.O., et.al., 1989). This results in an increased level of absenteeism and contributes to the low graduation rate of older MEP students. Frequent moves, adjusting to differing school systems, curricula, and social conditions, late starts or early exit during the school year, problems with records and credit transfers are migration-related problems that contribute to lower academic achievement and high dropout rates among migrant students (Cox, J.L., et.al., 1992).

According to a 1992 study, about two-thirds of migrant students come from families where earnings are below the poverty level (Strang, E.W., et.al., 1993). The cost of migrating can be high. It is not uncommon for migrants to arrive at a new destination with little or no money or food (Prewitt Diaz, J.O., et.al., 1989). Many migrant students suffer educational disadvantages stemming from poverty and poverty-related health problems such as malnutrition, parasitic infections and chronic illness, which can directly affect educational performance (Huang, G., 1993).

The Department of Education data from 1992-93 show that 24.9 percent of all MEP program participants were identified as LEP; 80 percent of migrant students were identified as Hispanic (Henderson, A., et.al., 1994). Another study, which examined the language characteristics of adult migrants, showed that 84 percent of migrant workers speak little or no English, and that 90 percent speak a language other than English in the home (Strang, E.W., et.al., 1993). These figures seem to point to a potentially greater need for bilingual or ESL services than is reflected in the LEP estimate.

Federal Legislation: In 1994, MEP was reauthorized as part of the IASA, which was enacted to enable all K-12 students to meet challenging content and performance standards.

IASA makes substantive changes to enhance the quality of programming provided to migratory youth and to broaden their access to Title I and other federal programs.

Given that the needs of migrant students can vary greatly among the states, the federal government has adopted programs that allow maximum flexibility to states for addressing the needs of the students they serve. The Federal government allocates funds to state education agencies based on the estimated number of migrant students residing both permanently and temporarily within the state. Educational services to migrant students are provided in programs that are designed and administered at the state and local levels. SEAs can also use federal funds to improve coordination of educational services to migrant students between states. Eligible migrant students may also benefit from federal funds that support state programs for other target groups, such as Chapter 1, bilingual education, or special education. In addition to providing funding for services and leadership, the federal government is also charged with facilitating the transfer of migrant students' health and school records.

The IASA legislation of 1994 incorporates several important changes with regard to migrant students, aimed at focusing limited federal funds on the neediest students:

>Specifies that priority be given to resources for the most recently migrated students with the highest risk of academic failure. Prior legislation had given priority to these students but without regard to individual need.

- >Facilitates the targeting of funds by redefining the eligibility for MEP to include only students who had undergone a migratory move within the previous three years, as opposed to the previous threshold of six years.
- >Extends eligibility to youth who are also independent migrant workers.
- >Terminates the contract for the centralized Migrant Student Record Transfer System.
- >Requires the Department of Education to seek recommendations for improving the ability of schools and districts to identify students and transfer records.

Permissible state activities under the IASA of 1994 that specifically relate to the education of migrant students include: identification and recruitment, needs assessment, transfer of records and credits, compensatory services for interruptions in schooling, counseling and other services to help overcome social isolation, and coordination with other programs (IASA 1994, sec. 1301).

When the educational needs of migrant students are comparable to those of non-migrant Title I students, the law states that migrant students should be served using general Title I allocations. Depending on the programs adopted by a state, these services may include: increased amount and quality of learning time through extended school day or school year programs, preschool and early childhood education, Head Start/Even Start programs, vocational and academic programs, counseling, mentoring, parental involvement, supplementary assistance for students not meeting standards. For secondary students, Title I funds can be used to sponsor college and career awareness, preparation, and training; school-to-work transition, and partnerships with business. Migrant students also benefit from funding for the professional development of teachers, aides, and counselors.

Similarly, migrants who are also LEP may be eligible for services funded through Title VII of IASA 1994 that are provided by the state to non-migrant LEP students. These benefits may include: preschool, elementary, or secondary level bilingual or Special Alternative education, family language education, and funding for training of bilingual instructors.

Title II: Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program

Research on school reform has reported the pivotal nature of professional development in state and local efforts to improve the effectiveness of the teaching-learning process.

The new IASA 1994 legislation stresses professional development approaches that relate strongly to the daily lives of teachers as opposed to one-shot, pull out inservice programs.

The increasing numbers of language minority students in our nation's schools, combine, point to the need for professional development that equips all teachers with the skills and knowledge needed to work with these students. The Eisenhower Professional Development Program, Title II of the IASA, 1994, builds upon state and local initiatives to provide the ongoing, intensive and high-quality professional development that will enable teachers to provide challenging learning experiences in the core academic subjects for all students, including language minority students (U.S. Department of Education, IASA Summary Sheets, 1994). Language minority students will benefit from teachers who have been involved in professional learning opportunities that develop the following skills, knowledge and attitudes:

- >Awareness of the types of specialized instructional services LEP students need;
- >Ability to work collaboratively with other staff;
- >Understanding of second language acquisition principles and ability to apply them in varied settings;
- >Ability to include bilingual parents in school life and to draw from parents' culture and background to make instruction more meaningful for linguistically and culturally diverse students;
- >Capacity to provide an instructional program rich in opportunities for speaking, listening, reading and writing;
- >Ability to evaluate a student's level of proficiency and design instructional activities slightly above his/her ability;
- >Understanding of language minority students' cultures and skill in incorporating their cultures into instruction (Milk, R. and Sapiens, A., 1992).

Funds from the Eisenhower Professional Development Program can be used to improve the ability of teachers to work with language minority students in the core academic subjects, if such training is tied to the school's reform efforts. Guiding principles of the legislation include state and localized decision making as to the type of professional activities needed to improve teaching and learning and adherence to recent research findings on the types of activities that constitute high-quality professional development. Under Title II, the following have been identified as high-quality professional development activities:

- >opportunities to learn subject-based knowledge and effective methods for teaching in specific disciplines;
- >whole-school involvement of teams of teachers, administrators, other staff (when appropriate), and parents;
- >engaging participants in interactive and collaborative learning experiences that support the experience and knowledge staff already have and that derive from the day-to-day life of the school;
- > use of active, hands-on learning based in reality.
- >allowance for the time it will take to acquire new and innovative strategies necessary for teaching to challenging content and performance standards.

Other areas that Title II emphasizes are professional development activities that support teaching to diverse populations, such as language minority students, and inclusion of strategies to ensure the effective involvement of parents in their children's schooling (IASA 1994, sec.2001).

Funding from the Eisenhower Professional Development Program is allocated in the following manner:

- >Five percent of appropriated funds are used to support national activities such as seed money for organizations to develop high quality professional development programs, establishing a national clearinghouse for science and mathematics, and supporting evaluation of professional development programs and activities.
- >Ninety-four percent of funds are reserved for grants to the States. Of this amount 84 percent must be used for grants to local educational agencies, 5 percent of which may be used for State-level

administration and activities. The remaining 16 percent must go to the State agency for professional development by institutions of higher education.

>Of the 84 percent allocated to local educational agencies, 20 percent may be used for district-level activities. The remaining amount must be used for professional development activities for school-based staff. Local educational agencies must match half of the Eisenhower funds they receive from a variety of other Federal funds, such as Title I or Title VII.

>One percent of appropriated funds are reserved for a special professional development demonstration program (U.S. Department of Education, IASA Summary Sheets, 1994).

Education Technology

As America's schools approach the twenty-first century, the use of technology in the classroom becomes imperative in equipping students with the skills needed to meet the challenges of the future.

New technology provides many opportunities for LEP students to enhance their language and cognitive development.

In the past, technology in the classroom often meant the use of the computer to provide supplemental or additive exercises. New technologies such as the Internet, online subscriber services, distance learning, interactive instruction, and multimedia, are transforming the way teachers teach and students learn. These new technologies are being used to accelerate learning for all students and provide them with opportunities to use different modalities in learning. Educators of language minority students are particularly interested in exploring the ways in which technology can enhance learning for these students who often do not respond to more traditional approaches. The multimedia instructional technology of today provides a much broader range of opportunities that can impact the quality of education for language minority students. The benefits of educational technology for these students include:

>Giving students the opportunity to learn through different modalities, such as audio, visual, or kinesthetic (Barbe and Swassing, 1979);

>Contributing to an active learning environment that is particularly suited for language minority students (Apple Computer, 1991);

>Providing occasions for cooperative learning, an effective methodology for language minority students (Johnson, R., et.al., 1986);

>Encouraging development of communication skills when technology is used with small groups or when telecommunication is used (Steinberg, E.R., 1992).

>Motivating students by making learning exciting and relevant (Johnson, R., et.al. 1986).

A variety of funding opportunities are available for implementing or expanding education technology programs for LEP students.

The Department of Education and the National Science Foundation have initiated several programs to support systemic reform of technology education in the schools. Educators of language minority students need to be aware of these opportunities in order to ensure that their needs and those of their students are included in the design and implementation of education technology programs. Funding sources for educational technology include the following:

Under the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994:

- >Title I provides monies for developing effective educational technology and for integrating it into the curriculum.

- >Title II provides funds to LEAs to establish and maintain local professional networks that create an avenue for teacher interaction and information exchange on promising practices.

- >Title III, the Technology for Education Act, supports the integration of educational technology into school reform efforts and assists schools in adopting technology to enhance curricula, instruction and administrative support. Under Part A, the following programs and activities are funded:

- * National Programs for Technology in Education: Directs the Secretary of Education to develop a long-term plan that describes how the Department and other agencies will encourage technology use to promote systemic reform and gives wide authority for federal leadership in educational technology through research, development, demonstration, consultation, evaluation, and dissemination activities.

- * State and Local Programs for School Technology Resources: Authorizes grants to States for competitive awards to school districts for technology resources, professional development, connection to networks to access information and programming, and for educational services for adults and families. If the total amount available under the State and Local Programs is \$62 million or greater, the funds would be distributed to States by formula. If the total amount is less than \$62 million, discretionary National Challenge Grants for Technology in Education are authorized.

- * National Challenge Grants for Technology in Education: These grants are awarded to consortia including at least one school district with high numbers of disadvantaged children. The purpose of the consortia requirement is to link the developers of technologies with school districts, so that the practical and effective use of technology in classrooms, including those with many poor students, can be explored and understood.

- * Regional Technical Support and Professional Development: Authorizes funds for a set of regional entities to be created through competitive grants in late 1995 that will provide advice and training in the use of educational technology to school districts and states.

- >Part B of Title III authorizes the Star Schools program that supports collaborations of various entities to provide distance learning services, equipment, and facilities to underserved students including those living in rural and urban areas (IASA 1994 Summary Sheets, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Public Affairs).

- >Title IV provides funds for LEAs to buy computer hardware and software (U.S. Department of Education Gopher, 1995).

The Goals 2000 Educate America Act has provided planning grants to States to integrate technology into

overall state education improvement plans. Technical assistance for States, LEAs, teachers and other school personnel can be obtained through the Regional Technology Consortia (RTC) Program. The RTC is funded by the Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement to assist with the successful integration of advanced technologies into K-12 classrooms and other educational settings, such as library media centers. Six Regional Technology Consortia were established to conduct regional activities that address professional development, technical assistance, and information resource sharing to promote the effective use of technology in education, with special emphasis on meeting the needs of educators in the region they serve.

The National Science Foundation offers a number of funding opportunities in the area of educational technology including the following:

>The National Science Foundation's Statewide Systemic Initiative, Urban Systemic Initiative and Rural System Initiative provide funds over five-year periods for grant-winning states, large cities, and rural areas to plan and implement large-scale, coordinated efforts in math, science, and technology. Challenge grants under Title III of IASA should be coordinated with NSF Systemic initiatives source Guide for National Challenge Grants Applicants (U.S. Department of Education Gopher, 1995).

>National Science Foundation's Applications of Advanced Technology Program provides grants to examine the strengths and weaknesses of new, innovative applications of advanced technologies, and to lay the foundation and knowledge necessary for the use of new, revolutionary computer and telecommunications systems and related technologies for teaching and learning science and mathematics.

>National Science Foundation's Networking Infrastructure for Education Program provides grants to alliances of academic institutions, school districts, professional societies, state agencies, and others concerned with education reform to complete policy studies and research, development and demonstration projects related to the role of electronic networks in support of education reform.

>National Science Foundation's Teacher Enhancement Program seeks to improve, broaden, and deepen the interdisciplinary and pedagogical knowledge of teachers, administrators, and others who play significant roles in providing quality mathematics, science, and technology education for students from pre-K through grade 12.

Other education technology grant opportunities through various departments include the following:

>U.S. Department of Commerce's Telecommunications and Information Infrastructure Application Program awards matching grants to state and local governments and nonprofit organizations for the planning and construction of telecommunications networks for the provision of educational, cultural, health care, public safety, and other social services.

>U.S. Department of Commerce's Public Telecommunications Facilities Program awards matching grants to governmental and other non commercial entities to purchase telecommunications equipment if the equipment is to be used for educational purposes.

>U.S. Department of Education's Technology, Educational Media, and Materials for Individuals with Disabilities funds projects and centers for advancing the use of new technology, media and materials in

the education of youth who are disabled.

>National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA) Educational Training and Life Long Learning in Aeronautics seeks to support aeronautical related educational technology in K-14 schools.

>NASA's Information Infrastructure Technology and Applications Program sponsors pilot programs to demonstrate technologies and techniques to facilitate educator-to-educator collaboration to enable students to become electronic information explorers and to provide teachers and students access to real science data.

>NASA's 1995 Education Related Solicitation promotes educational technology related to utilizing earth and space science data in the classroom.

>U.S. Department of Agriculture's Rural Electrification Administration's Distance Learning and Medical Link Grant Program provides grants to rural schools, hospitals, and other organizations to provide educational and medical benefits through distance learning and medical link projects in rural areas (Department of Education Gopher, 1995).

Title IV: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

Violence and drug use in the schools have increased in recent years, especially in urban schools that enroll high numbers of disadvantaged and language minority students. This trend in increased violence and drug-use has made it more difficult for teachers to focus on teaching and provide students with real learning opportunities.

Large urban districts which have higher incidences of violence and drug use also enroll a large percentage of the language minority student population. Forty-two percent of all LEP students are enrolled in the nation's 25 largest metropolitan areas.

Unsafe and drug-infested schools impact language minority students to a greater degree since they are more likely to be enrolled in urban or disadvantaged schools with higher incidences of violence and drug use than are language majority students. According to a recent study on the demographics of inner-city schools, approximately one-quarter of inner-city students were classified as language minority whose home language was not English (Peng, S., et.al., 1992).

Two pieces of legislation provide direction and funding for programs that work toward safe and disciplined learning environments: the Goals 2000 Educate America Act and the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act. Goal 6 of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act states that "every school in the United States will be free of drugs, violence, and the unauthorized presence of firearms and alcohol and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning." In order for students to achieve to the high standards called for in the Goals 2000 legislation, States and communities need to address ways to make schools safe, drug-free, and more disciplined as part of their reform efforts. Title VII of Goals 2000, the Safe Schools Act, authorizes the Department of Education to award competitive grants to school districts to help them reduce violence. Grants of up to \$3 million each may be made for periods up to two years. Monies will promote a variety of activities including the installation of metal detectors and comprehensive violence prevention efforts such as mentoring programs and the training of school personnel in conflict resolution (U.S. Department of Education, Goals 2000 Fact Sheet, 1994).

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, Title IV of the IASA 1994, promotes drug education and prevention programming in schools and communities and expands the program to include programs for the prevention of youth violence. Funds will be given to governors, State and local education agencies, institutions of higher education, and non-profit organizations. Guiding principles of this legislation include:

- >The addition of violence prevention as an integral component of the program. Localized-decision making as to the design of a violence prevention program is key. Program possibilities include systematic school safety strategies, collaboration with community agencies, implementation of violence prevention activities, such as conflict resolution and peer mediation, and the procurement of metal detectors and employment of security guards.
- >Flow of resources to where they are most needed. States will receive 50 percent of their funds based on the Title I formula; the other 50 percent will be based on the school-aged population. Criteria for selecting the neediest LEAs will be determined by the States, and 30 percent of the LEA funding will be given to those LEAs that have the greatest need. The remaining 70 percent will be distributed to LEAs based on enrollment.
- >Greater accountability. States and LEAs must determine needs and assess program outcomes. This information will be used to develop policies and programs. In addition, they must report their progress toward meeting their goals and objectives to the public. A national evaluation system will also be established.
- >Promotion of community-wide strategies. To encourage linkages between schools and communities, LEAs must collaborate with local government, businesses, parents, medical and law enforcement professionals and community-based entities in the development of their drug and violence prevention initiatives.
- >Authorization of more activities. Newly authorized activities include mentoring, health education, community service, conflict resolution, peer mediation, character education, procurement of metal detectors, and employment of security guards.

Title VII: Bilingual Education, Language Enhancement and Language Acquisition Programs

The purpose of Title VII is "to educate limited English proficient children and youth to meet the same rigorous standards for academic performance expected of all children and youth, including meeting challenging state content standards and challenging state performance standards in academic areas" (IASA 1994, sec. 7102). The new Title VII makes important contributions to systemic reform by seeking to end the isolation and fragmentation of bilingual education programs.

Title VII, as reauthorized, is an integral component of both IASA and Goals 2000 and seeks to apply the concept of systemic reform toward improving the education of language minority students.

Prior to the new legislation, Title VII programs were often implemented and operated parallel to, rather than in conjunction with, the regular education program. Cooperation and collaboration, when and if it occurred, was not a central focus of either program. This notion of "separate but equal" has led to concerns about

whether bilingual students are receiving the same opportunities for a quality education as mainstream students. Additionally, transitioning students from the bilingual program to the mainstream was made more difficult by this lack of coordination across programs. Title VII addresses these concerns by providing grants to states and local education agencies for programs that are aligned with comprehensive reform efforts. Title VII programs must be designed and implemented under the premise of providing the opportunity to achieve the same challenging standards advocated for all students. The content standards developed by the state or under Goals 2000 will be the same standards used for LEP students (U.S Department of Education, IASA Summary Sheets, 1994).

Grants to School Districts and States: The four new grant categories are three year development and implementation grants to initiate new programs; two-year enhancement grants to improve existing programs; five-year comprehensive school grants to develop projects integrated with the overall school program; and five-year systemwide improvement grants for district-wide projects that serve all or most LEP students.

Title VII works toward ending the fragmentation of bilingual education programs by implementing new discretionary grants that ensure that these programs are not isolated from the overall school program.

Though implementation of these grant categories may occur in a variety of ways and considerable flexibility is allowed in designing and implementing these programs, greater accountability will also be demanded. Greater emphasis will be placed on LEP students' achievement of the state's content and performance standards. The following is a brief discussion of the intent of each grant category.

Program Development and Implementation Grants are to be awarded for the purpose of developing and implementing new comprehensive, coherent and successful preschool, elementary, or secondary bilingual or special alternative instructional programs that are coordinated with other relevant services to meet the full range of educational needs of LEP students and their families.

Program Enhancement Grants are awarded to carry out highly focused, innovative, locally designed projects to expand or enhance existing bilingual or special alternative instructional programs.

Comprehensive School Grants will be awarded to implement schoolwide bilingual or special alternative instructional programs to reform, restructure and upgrade all relevant programs and operations that serve all LEP children and youth in schools having significant concentrations of these students.

Systemwide Improvement Grants provide funding to implement districtwide bilingual or special alternative instructional programs to improve, reform, and upgrade relevant programs and operations within an entire LEA with a significant concentration of LEP students. (IASA 1994, secs.7112--7115).

Parent outreach and education is an integral part of the new Title VII. Funds received from any of the above programs can be used to promote outreach and parent education. Under Title I with which Title VII is to be aligned, LEAs must give parents of LEP students the opportunity to participate in school programs, including, to the extent practicable, providing information in the home languages of the LEP student population.

In addition, Title VII requires that priority be given to applications that promote bilingual proficiency in both English and another language for all students that participate in the program. As discussed previously, one promising approach used to promote bilingual proficiency, especially in schoolwide programs, is the two-way

bilingual model. Two-way bilingual education supports bilingual proficiency among all students by providing instruction in two languages to both non English speaking students and their English-speaking counterparts. A two-way approach conforms naturally to the goals of schoolwide programs in that all students are participants and curricula, instruction, and assessment are highly integrated.

Strengthened State Role: Under the new Title VII the demands placed upon the state education agency (SEA) personnel will be greater than in the past. SEAs must play a pivotal role in planning and coordinating services for LEP students.

The newly authorized Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers, funded through Title XIII, will incorporate the valuable professional development services and expertise currently provided by the MRCs and EACs to ensure that the educational needs of LEP students are met.

This enhanced role includes reviewing LEA applications to assess whether they conform to the state's school reform plan, its Goals 2000 plan or the state Title I plan. States will also disseminate information pertaining to the effective education of language minority youth to a greater extent than in the past. They will ensure that new and more accurate assessments are developed for LEP students and that these assessments are aligned with state standards (U.S. Department of Education, IASA Summary Sheets, 1994).

Professional Development: Funds from Title VII can be combined with funds from other federal sources, such as Titles I and II, to provide ongoing, high-quality professional development for educators of language minority students. Local education agencies applying for grants under subpart 1 are encouraged to include professional development plans that are linked to state certification requirements for bilingual education. In addition, professional development should be linked to school reform efforts and include all teachers, not just those directly responsible for the bilingual education program. Recommendations for staff development programs that incorporate goals for systemic reform include the following:

- >Collaboration among school districts, state and county education agencies, IHEs, professional organizations and state credentialing boards must occur;
- >Implementation of creative programs that provide an alternate route to certification or career ladder programs for paraprofessional staff should be implemented;
- >Envisioning of staff development as an ongoing process that provides teachers the opportunity to reflect upon practice, to view themselves as learners engaged in discovering how students learn, and to discuss and collaborate on the creation of optimal learning environments;
- >Formation of "learning communities" that produce change and that allow teachers to reach out across grade levels, disciplines, and individual schools;
- >Involvement of mainstream teachers in a variety of professional development activities that reduce the isolation of bilingual programs and that develop whole-school approaches to the education of language minority students;
- >Implementation of coordination and monitoring activities on the part of the district to ensure quality programming for LEP students (Milk, R., et.al., 1992).

The new Title VII professional development grants address many of the aforementioned recommendations. A brief discussion of each grant category follows:

The Training for All Teachers Program funds grants for up to five years to states, LEAs, and IHEs. The grants are intended to support the inclusion of curricula related to the needs of LEP students into professional development programs.

Bilingual Education and Teachers and Personnel grants provide funds up to five years to IHEs that collaborate with states and LEAs to provide preservice and inservice programs that train bilingual education teachers and other staff to teach language minority students.

National Professional Development Institutes offer funds up to five years to IHEs to offer assistance to schools or IHEs to upgrade the quality of their teacher education programs for educators who teach or are preparing to teach language minority students.

The Graduate Fellowships in Bilingual Education Program offers fellowships for master's, doctoral, and post-doctoral studies in programs related to the education of LEP students in areas such as teacher training, program administration, research and evaluation, and curriculum and instruction (IASA, 1994 secs. 7142-7145).

Additional Programs Authorized: During the decade between 1980-90, 9 million immigrants came to the U.S. This is the highest number since 1910, when 8.9 million immigrants came to American shores. However, in 1919 that number represented 9.7 percent of the total U.S. population. In contrast, the 9 million who arrived in the last decade comprise only 3.6 percent of the total U.S. population, as estimated by the 1990 census (National Center for Education Statistics, 1993). Though the immigrant population has remained minimal relative to the total population, immigrants tend to cluster in areas where previous immigrants have established communities. For this reason, immigrant populations are clustered around major metropolitan areas, especially those that serve as major ports of entry (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1990).

Transitioning immigrant youth into American society is a costly proposition. Furthermore, immigrant students will be required to meet the same challenging standards demanded of all students, as outlined in the Goals 2000 legislation. In order to assist states and LEAs that experience unexpectedly large increases in their student population due to immigration, the Emergency Immigrant Education Program (EIEA) has been reauthorized. In order to qualify for funding, a school district must have at least 500 immigrant students or these students must represent at least 3 percent of the school's total enrollment. Only immigrant students who have been enrolled in U.S. schools for less than 3 academic years can be considered when determining whether a district is eligible for EIEA funds. EIEA funds may be used to enhance instructional programs for immigrant youth, to provide the salaries of trained personnel, and to purchase curricular materials and educational software (IASA 1994, secs. 7301-7305).

Research has demonstrated that the study of a foreign language contributes to the development of creativity and higher-order thinking skills. Furthermore, as has been widely acknowledged in the press and from other sources, America's future in a global economy is dependent upon our ability to communicate with people from other cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Title VII addresses the need for foreign language learning in our nation's schools, particularly at the elementary level, with the addition of two programs, the Foreign Language Assistance Program and the Elementary School Foreign Language Program. These programs assist in the design and implementation of foreign language programs. Moreover, the Foreign Language Assistance Program promotes the inclusion of linguistic assets already existing in most communities by giving special consideration to programs that link non-native English speakers in the communities with schools in order to encourage two-way language learning. Special consideration will also be given to programs that include intensive summer language training, support professional development, or provide for the sequential study of

a foreign language for elementary students. The Elementary School Foreign Language Incentive Program provides incentive payments to public elementary schools that provide a program designed to lead to students' communicative competency in a foreign language (IASA 1994, secs.7202-7205).

**EDUCATION REFORM AND
THE SCHOOL-TO-WORK
OPPORTUNITIES ACT**

Various indicators confirm that limited English proficient students are more likely to drop out of school and are less likely to enroll in a postsecondary institution than are other language minority students. In the National Center for Education Statistics report, *Language Characteristics and Schooling in the United States, A Changing Picture: 1979 and 1989*, the following analysis is found:

English language proficiency appears to be related to the enrollment status of persons 16 to 24 years old who spoke languages other than English at home. Persons who reported difficulty speaking English were less likely than those who reported speaking English very well to be currently attending college (9 percent compared to 24 percent respectively). They were also more likely to not be currently enrolled and not have completed high school (42 percent compared to 14 percent respectively). Regardless of whether the language spoken is Spanish or all other languages, the relationship between difficulty speaking English and enrollment status holds (p. 31).

Clearly, educational alternatives are necessary if LEP students are to develop the academic, analytical and technical skills necessary for the technological workplace of today.

One such alternative is a school-to-work program that links academic school-based learning to the types of skills and knowledge needed in the workplace. Jointly administered by the Departments of Education and Labor, the School-to-Work Opportunities Act provides federal monies to establish a national system for enhancing the educational, career, and economic opportunities for all youth (including language minority students) through partnerships among businesses, schools, community-based organizations, and state and local governments.

School-to-work programs assist students in making the transition from school to a good first job on a high skill, high wage career track (U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Labor, *Why School-to-Work?* 1994).

The legislation requires core components and goals, but it does not mandate one method for implementing these components and goals. This flexibility allows states and communities to build upon already existing,

successful school-to-work programs, such as youth apprenticeship programs, tech prep, career academies, and cooperative education. In addition, new programs and new ways of teaching and learning will grow out of this effort to tie learning in school with learning in the workplace (U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Labor, 1994).

The guiding principles of the school-to-work legislation include the following:

- >School-based learning: Classroom instruction that integrates work and school-based learning and is based on high academic and occupational skill standards.
- >Work-based learning: Work experience, structured training and mentoring at job sites.
- >Connecting Activities: A variety of activities that build and maintain bridges between school and work. Examples include matching students with participating employers, and training job-site mentors and teachers.
- >A course of training and work experiences coordinated with school based learning.
- >A program designed to meet the same academic content standards the state has established for all students, including, where applicable, standards established under GOALS 2000, and to meet the requirements necessary to prepare a student for postsecondary education and achievement of a skills certificate.
- >A program of instruction and curriculum that integrates academic and vocational learning.
- >Broad instruction in the classroom and workplace that, to the extent practicable, exposes students to all aspects of an industry.
- >Effective secondary-postsecondary linkages.
- >Career awareness, exploration and counseling.
- >Initial selection of a career major not later than the beginning of eleventh grade.

Seventy-five percent of young people in the U.S., including many language minority students, do not receive a college degree. Many of these young people do not have the basic academic and vocational skills necessary to find career track positions (U.S. Departments of Education and Labor, *School-to-Work Opportunities Fact Sheet*, 1994).

- >Workplace mentoring and instruction in general workplace competencies.
- >Assistance for students in finding jobs and continuing their education and training. (U.S. Departments of Education and U.S. Department of Labor, 1994).

School-to-Work programs would give the limited English proficient student the opportunity to develop the occupational, academic, and English skills necessary to either enter the workforce in a career-track position

or to continue his/her education at a post-secondary institution (U.S. Departments of Education and U.S. Department of Labor, 1994). Limited-English-proficient students would benefit from school-to-work programs for several reasons: (1) LEP students are often less aware than their English-speaking peers of career opportunities available to them in the U.S. economy. Thus, career counseling, which is one component of school-to-work programs, would benefit LEP students by providing them with choices at a point in their educational lives when they have the most resources available to them. (2) The type of instruction that occurs in a school-to-work program conforms with what we know is sound educational practice for LEP students. These programs emphasize active, hands-on learning that involves students in real-life situations and builds upon their prior experiences and knowledge. (3) School-to-work programs give the extra assistance LEP students need to either find jobs or continue their education.

Ninety percent of School-to-Work Opportunities funds will be used for grants to states and communities. The two types of state grants are State Development Grants and State Implementation Grants. State Development Grants allow states to develop statewide School-to Work Opportunities plans. State Implementation Grants are competitively awarded to states that can demonstrate the ability to begin implementation of the statewide plan. Grantees must award at least 65 percent of the funds provided to local partnerships within the first year of the grant. That percentage will increase in subsequent years (U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Labor, 1994).

Direct federal grants to local partnerships fall under the following categories: Local Partnership Grants, Grants to Local Partnerships Serving High Poverty Areas, and Grants for Native American Youth. These competitive grants will be awarded to partnerships that involve employers, public secondary and postsecondary education institutions, and labor organizations or non-managerial employee representatives as well as other appropriate organizations, such as apprenticeship agencies. Grants to Local Partnerships Serving High Poverty Areas will be awarded to programs in high poverty urban and rural areas. Special grants to programs that serve Native American students will also be available.

CONCLUSION

The issues discussed in this document represent only some of the major challenges and opportunities facing those concerned with the education of language minority students. Goals 2000, IASA of 1994, and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act provide a framework for educational reform; however, ensuring that language minority students benefit from the outcomes of these legislative initiatives is not only dependent upon the degree to which educators, parents, and community members understand the challenges and opportunities but also on the degree to which they act effectively in the best interests of the language minority student population. Institutional change that benefits all students can come about only if individuals at all levels of the reform movement, from the classroom to the boardroom, are aware of their roles in initiating change and use the skills and resources at their disposal to work for educational excellence and equity for all students.

SOURCES

Advisory Committee on Testing in Chapter 1 (1993). *Reinforcing the Promise, Reforming the Paradigm*. U.S. Department of Education: Washington, DC.

Apple Computer, Inc. (1991). *Apple Classrooms of Tomorrow: Philosophy and Structure and What's Happening Where*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service (DRS) No. ED340349.

August, D., et.al. (1994). *For All Students: Limited English Proficient Students and Goals 2000*. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education: Washington, DC.

- August, D., et.al. (1995). *LEP Students and Title I: A Guidebook for Educators*. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education: Washington, DC.
- Barbe, W. B. and Swassing, R. H. (1979). *Teaching Through Modality Strengths: Concepts and Practices*. Zaner-Bloser: Columbus, OH.
- Berman, P., et.al., (1995). *School Reform and Student Diversity: Case Studies of Exemplary Practices for LEP Students*. National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning: Santa Cruz, CA.
- Burnett, G., et.al., (1994). *The Unfulfilled Mission of Title I/Chapter 1 Programs*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education: New York, NY.
- Brandt, R. (March 1995). "What to Do With Those New Standards" *Education Leadership*, Vol. 52, No. 6.
- Cahape, P. (March 1993). "The Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS): An Update" *ERIC Digest*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools: Charleston, WV.
- Chavkin, N.F. (May 1991). "Family Lives and Parental Involvement in Migrant Students' Education" *ERIC Digest*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools: Charleston, WV.
- Cox, J. L., et. al. (1992). *Final Report: Descriptive Study of the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program, Volume I: Study Findings and Conclusions*. Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education by Research Triangle Institute: Research Triangle, NC.
- Darling-Hammond, L. And McLaughlin, M. (April 1995). "Policies that Support Professional Development in an Era of Reform" *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 76, No. 8.
- Donly, B., et.al. (1995). *Summary of Bilingual Education State Educational Agency Program Survey of States' LEP Persons and Available Educational Services 1993-94*. Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education by Development Associates, Inc.: Arlington, VA.
- Dyson, D. S. (February 1983). "Utilizing Available Resources at the Local Level" *Migrant Education Fact Sheet*, ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools: Las Cruces, NM.
- ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education (June 1991). "Highly Mobile Students: Educational Problems and Possible Solutions" *ERIC/CUE Digest*, No. 73. ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education: New York, NY.
- Fleischman, H. L. and Hopstock, P. J. (1993). *Descriptive Study of Services to Limited English Proficient Students*. Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education by Development Associates, Inc.: Arlington, VA.
- Garcia, E. (1991). *The Education of Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students: Effective Instructional Practices*. National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning: Santa Cruz, CA.
- Griego-Jones, T. (1995). *Implementing Bilingual Programs is Everybody's Business*. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education: Washington, DC.
- Henderson, A., et. al. (1994). *State Chapter 1 Migrant Participation and Achievement Information -- 1992-93*. Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education by Westat, Inc.: Rockville, MD.
- Henderson, A., et. al. (1994). *A Summary of Bilingual Education SEA Program Survey of States' LEP*

Persons and Available Educational Resources, 1992-93. Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education by Development Associates, Inc.: Arlington, VA.

Henderson, A., et al. (1992). *A Summary of State Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program Participation and Achievement Information 1989-90*. Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education by Westat, Inc.: Rockville, MD.

Huang, G. (Jan 1993). Health Problems Among Migrant Farm Workers' Children in the U.S. *ERIC Digest*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools: Charleston, WV.

Interstate Migrant Education Council (1987). *Migrant Education: A Consolidated View*. Education Commission of the States: Denver, CO.

Johnson, R., et.al. (1986). "Comparison of Computer-assisted, Competitive, and Individualistic Learning" *American Educational Research Journal*. Vol. 23, No. 3.

Knapp, M.S., et.al. (1993). *Academic Challenge for the Children of Poverty, Volume 1: Findings and Conclusions*. Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education by SRI International: Menlo Park, CA and Policy Studies Associates, Inc.: Washington, DC.

Lathrop, L., et.al. (1993). *Special Issues Analysis Center Focus Group Report: Active Learning Instructional Models for LEP Students*. Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education by Development Associates, Inc.: Arlington, VA.

Lindholm, K. J. And Gavlek, K. (1994) *California DBE Projects: Project-wide Evaluation Report, 1992-93*. Author: San Jose, CA.

Milk, R., et.al. (1992). *Re-Thinking the Education of Teachers of Language Minority Children: Developing Reflective Teachers for Changing Schools*. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education: Washington, DC.

Nadeau, A. (1995). *Linguistic Diversity and Reform: Can the Practices be Identified?* National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education: Washington, DC.

National Center for Education Statistics (1993). *Language Characteristics and Schooling in the U.S., A Changing Picture: 1979 and 1989*. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education: Washington, DC.

National Center for Education Statistics (1994). *Mini-Digest of Education Statistics 1994*. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education: Washington, DC.

Office of Migrant Education (1992). *Directory of Services for Migrant and Seasonal Farm workers and their Families*. U.S. Department of Education: Washington, DC.

Office of Migrant Education (1994). "Preliminary Questions and Answers About the New MEP." Unpublished Memorandum from the U.S. Department of Education: Washington, DC.

Office of Policy and Planning, Planning and Evaluation Service (1993). *Reinventing Chapter 1: The Current Chapter 1 Program and New Directions*. U.S. Department of Education: Washington, DC.

Ortiz, V. and Volkoff, W. J. (1987). *Evaluation Report of the Rural and Migrant Gifted Project*. Fresno Office County of Education: Fresno, CA.

- Passow, A.H. (1988). *Curriculum and Instruction in Chapter 1: A Look Back and a Look Ahead*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education: New York, NY.
- Pechman, E. and Fiester, L. (1994). *An Idea Book: Implementing Schoolwide Projects*. Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education by Policy Studies Associates, Inc.: Washington, DC.
- Peng, S., et.al. (January, 1992). "Demographic Disparities of Inner-City Eighth Graders" *Urban Education*, Vol. 26, No. 4.
- Perry, L. J. (Summer, 1984). "W.C.U. MicroNet: A State Network for Linking Secondary Science and Math Classrooms" *Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching*. Vol. 16, No. 18.
- Prewitt Diaz, J. O. (1991). "The Factors that Affect the Educational Performance of Migrant Children" *Education*, Vol. 111, No. 4. p. 483-486. Project Innovation: Chula Vista, CA.
- Prewitt Diaz, J. O., et al. (1989). *The Effects of Migration on Children: an Ethnographic Study*. Centro de Estudios Sobre la Migracion: State College, PA.
- Puma, M.J., et.al. (1993). *Prospects: The Congressionally Mandated Study of Educational Growth and Opportunity--The Interim Report*. Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education by Abt Associates, Inc.: Bethesda, MD.
- Rasmussen, L. (1988) "Migrant Students at the Secondary Level" *ERIC Digest*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools: Las Cruces, NM.
- Ramirez, J., et.al. (1991). *Final Report: Longitudinal Study of Structured English Immersion Strategy, Early-Exit and Late-Exit Transitional Bilingual Education Programs for Language Minority Students*. Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education by Aguirre International: San Mateo, CA.
- Reynolds, C. and Salens, S. (1990). "Issues and Programs in the Delivery of Special Education Services to Migrant Students with Disabilities" *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, Volume 7 Special Issue, Summer 1990. Boise State University: Boise, ID.
- Salerno, A. (1989). *Characteristics of Secondary Migrant Youth*. BOCES Geneseo Migrant Center: Geneseo, NY.
- Salerno, A. (May 1991). "Migrant Students Who Leave School Early: Strategies for Retrieval" *ERIC Digest*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools: Charleston, WV.
- Sakash, K. and Rodriguez-Brown, F.V. (1995). *Teamworks: Mainstream and Bilingual/ESL Teacher Collaboration*. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education: Washington, DC.
- Sinclair, B. and Gutmann, B. (1994). *State Chapter I Participation and Achievement Information- 1992-93*. Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education by Westat, Inc.: Rockville, MD.
- Steinberg, E. R. (1992). "The Potential of Computer-based Telecommunications for Instruction" *Journal of Computer-Based Instruction*, Vol. 19, No. 2.
- Strang, W., et al. (1992). *Final Report: Descriptive Study of the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program, Volume II: Summary Reports of Intensive Case Studies*. Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education by Research Triangle Institute: Research Triangle, NC.
- Strang, E. W., et. al. (1993). *Services to Migrant Children: Synthesis and Program Options for the Chapter*

I Migrant Education Program. Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education by Westat, Inc.: Rockville, MD.

Stringfield, S., et.al. (1994). *Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Children: First Year Report*. Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education by The Johns Hopkins University: Baltimore, MD and Abt Associates, Inc.: Cambridge, MA.

Tikunoff, W.J., et.al. (1991). *Final Report: A Descriptive Study of Significant Features of Exemplary Special Alternative Instructional Programs*. Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education by the Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory: Los Alamitos, CA.

Torres-Guzman, M.E. and Goodwin, L.A. (1995). *Mentoring Bilingual Teachers*. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education: Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census (1990). *The Foreign Born Population in the United States*. U.S. Department of Commerce: Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Education (1994). *Goals 2000 Fact Sheet*. U.S. Department of Education: Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Education (1994). *The IASA of 1994: Summary Sheets*. U.S. Department of Education: Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Education Gopher (1995). *Resource Guide for National Challenge Grants Applicants*. U.S. Department of Education: Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Labor (1994). *School-to-Work Opportunities Fact Sheet*. U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Labor: Washington, DC.

U.S. General Accounting Office (1994). *Limited English proficiency: A Growing and Costly Educational Challenge Facing Many School Districts*. U.S. General Accounting Office: Washington, DC.

U.S. House of Representatives (1994). *Improving America's Schools Act, P.L. 103-382*. U.S. Government Printing Office: Washington, DC.

Waggoner, D. (1994). *Numbers and Needs*, Vol. 4, No. 4.

The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE) is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) and is operated under Contract No. T295005001 by The George Washington University, Graduate School for Education and Human Development, Center for the Study of Language and Education. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Education nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. government. Readers are free to duplicate and use these materials in keeping with accepted publication standards. NCBE requests that proper credit be given in the event of reproduction.

The HTML version of this document was prepared by [NCBE](#).

[go to HOME PAGE](#)
<http://www.ncela.gwu.edu>