

ED2/77.10/1982-83
c. 4

COLORADO STATE PUBLICATIONS LIBRARY



3 1799 00107 3964

EVALUATION OF 1982-83 PROGRAMS CONDUCTED UNDER THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ACT



COLORADO
DEPARTMENT
OF EDUCATION
CALVIN M. FRAZIER
COMMISSIONER

JANUARY, 1984

EVALUATION OF 1982-83 PROGRAMS
CONDUCTED UNDER THE
ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ACT

Prepared for the
COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

by
Ronald D. Anderson, Ph.D.

January, 1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	REPORT OVERVIEW	2
II.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
III.	PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	5
IV.	SOURCE OF THE DATA	8
V.	DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROGRAMS	9
VI.	STUDENT GAINS ON ACHIEVEMENT TESTS	13
VII.	DISTRICT JUDGMENTS OF PROGRAMS' STRENGTHS AND PROBLEMS	20
VIII.	DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM CHANGE	22
	APPENDIX A--DISTRICT REPORTING FORM	23
	APPENDIX B--PROGRAM OVERVIEW	26

I. REPORT OVERVIEW

An evaluation of the second year of programs operated in Colorado school districts under the English Language Proficiency Act showed student gains on achievement tests comparable to the first year and comparable to those of students in similar programs in other states. Districts rate the effectiveness of the second year of their programs as very good, a slightly higher rating than in year one. The program strengths most often cited by districts are the provision of individualized assistance, the competence and cooperation of their staff, and the availability of good materials. Other than funding none of the problems cited were common to many districts. One recommendation for change was cited by the majority of districts, namely that a given student's eligibility for funding under the Act be extended to three or more years.

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In response to the mandate in the English Language Proficiency Act, an evaluation was conducted "on the effectiveness of the English language proficiency program and the functioning of this article."

Source of the Data

The data employed in preparing this report were obtained from the final evaluation report each participating school district was required to submit to the Colorado Department of Education by August 1, 1983. The information received in these reports was of three general types: (1) descriptive information indicating the nature of the instructional program, (2) numerical data on student academic achievement, and (3) evaluative information pertaining to program strengths and problems as well as recommendations for changes in the program.

Descriptive Information About Programs

Districts employ a variety of English language proficiency programs including: (1) bilingual, English as a Second Language (ESL) or general tutorial programs, (2) bilingual, ESL or general individualized instruction approaches, (3) bilingual or ESL classes, and (4) combinations of the above approaches.

Student Gains on Achievement Tests

Students were given pre- and post-tests for evaluation purposes, about half of the tests being standardized achievement tests and half English language proficiency tests. The average NCE gain score* for those students given standardized achievement

tests was 4.1. While the gains of A/B students were somewhat larger than C students,** the differences are not dramatic. The greatest student gains, as compared to other students at the same grade level, are made in the lower grades. These results are similar to programs under the first year of the English Language Proficiency Act. The gains achieved by Colorado students are similar to those of students in two other states where similar evaluations have been conducted.

Program Strengths and Problems

On the average, districts rated the effectiveness of this second year of their program as very good. The major strengths of the programs are said to be the availability of individualized or small group instruction, competent and cooperative staff members and quality materials.

In contrast to the first year of the program, no problems, other than funding, stood out as common to many districts.

Recommendations for Program Change

The majority of districts recommended that student eligibility be extended to three or more years.

*NCE scores are defined on page 14 of this report.

**Definitions of A, B, and C student classification are given on page 15 of this report.

III. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

A. The Evaluation Mandate

This report was prepared under a contract with the Colorado Department of Education in response to a mandate from the Colorado General Assembly that an evaluation be conducted of programs operated in Colorado schools under the English Language Proficiency Act. The programs covered by this evaluation were conducted during the 1982-93 school year with support under the second year of the English Language Proficiency Act. An evaluation of these programs was required by section 22-24-106(2) of the Act as follows.

The Department shall report to the General Assembly in January of 1982 and each January thereafter through 1986 on the effectiveness of the English language proficiency program and the functioning of this article. Such reports shall indicate the numbers of students identified and served under each of the categories described in section 22-24-103(4). Beginning in January of 1983, the report shall include: the English language proficiency test results and achievement test results of students certified by the districts; identification techniques and problems, with special attention to students certified to be within the category described in section 22-24-103(4)(c); any recommendation for fulfilling the intent of this article; and such other data and observations as the Department deems to be significant in judging the effect of this article.

The Colorado Board of Education adopted on August 17, 1981, and subsequently amended on May 12, 1983, Rules for the Administration of the English Language Proficiency Act which contain the following regulations with respect to evaluation.

- 3.00 (6) Evaluation: Each district funded under the Act shall submit an evaluation report to the Department not later than August 1, 1982, and annually thereafter. The information provided shall be on report forms provided by the department. The district evaluation report shall refer to the preceding school year ending June 30, 1982, and thereafter, and shall include but not be limited to the following:
- 3.00 (6) (a) Assessment instruments and procedures used.
 - 3.00 (6) (b) In the report due on or before August 1, for the previous year, districts shall provide compiled

pre- and post-test results on English language development and comprehension section of nationally standardized tests, and pre- and post-composite achievement test results for students certified and served under the Act. For a student in kindergarten or first grade or for a student whose English proficiency is so limited as to make pre-testing impractical, districts may utilize observation checklists or similar non-test evaluations as indication of proficiency levels of the student before being served. Districts may also provide other evidence demonstrating levels of progress made by students in the program. 3.00 (6) (c) Specific descriptions of the programs provided by the district to certified students and the district's best judgment as to the effectiveness, special successes and problems encountered in the implementation of these programs.

3.00 (6) (d) Recommendations, if any, the district may give for the improved implementation of the Act or amendments to the Act that might be considered by the Department and General Assembly.

3.00 (6) (e) Signature of the superintendent or designee of the reporting district.

B. Source and Scope of Charge to Evaluator

As in the first year evaluation, the Colorado Department of Education contracted with the author of this report to analyze, interpret, summarize, and report information obtained from school district evaluation reporting forms. This year, however, the work was preceded by a survey of Colorado school executives* to identify ways in which the first year evaluation procedures could be modified to better meet the evaluation needs of local school districts. This survey led to preparation of materials for local school districts to aid them in meeting local evaluation needs** and resulted in modifications to the district evaluation report form which reduced reporting requirements.

Some of the work of obtaining evaluation data was done cooperatively with the Department as indicated in the following list of activities.

1. The reporting forms were developed cooperatively by the contractor and the Department, followed by review and revision through a process involving local school districts.

2. The forms were distributed by the Department and, except for some evaluation orientation sessions in which the contractor participated, all communication with school districts concerning compliance with the evaluation requirement was handled by the Department of Education.

3. Upon receiving the reports and checking them for completeness, the Department forwarded them to the contractor for analysis and reporting.

4. Although the information contained in these district reports is summarized here by the contractor, other information as to the certified count of students in the school districts and the results of audits of districts was compiled by the Department

* Anderson, Ronald D., Beverly L. Anderson, Richard J. Kroc II, and William Madura, Survey of Local School District Evaluation Needs Related to Instruction Provided Under the English Language Proficiency Act. Prepared for the Colorado Department of Education, 69 pages, February, 1983

**Anderson, Ronald D. and Beverly L. Anderson, Suggestions for English Language Proficiency Act Evaluation at the Local Level, Prepared for the Colorado Department of Education, 23 pages, March, 1983

and is available as an addendum to this report. Thus, this report pertains only to subsections b-e of the rules quoted above.

C. Audience for This Report

The audience for this report is assumed to be the Colorado General Assembly although the contents are expected to be of interest to the Colorado State Board of Education, Colorado Department of Education, and local school districts as well.

IV. SOURCE OF THE DATA

The data employed in preparing this report were obtained from the final evaluation report each participating school district was required to submit to the Colorado Department of Education by August 1, 1983. A copy of the report form is contained in the appendix. The three major sections of this report form were as follows.

A. Program Description and Judged Effectiveness

This section provided space for the district to designate the type of English language proficiency programs conducted and rate their effectiveness.

B. General Assessment of Programs

It provided districts with an opportunity to describe (a) areas of strength, (b) special problems encountered and (c) any recommendations they wished to make for improved implementation of the Act or amendments to the Act which might be considered by the Department of Education or the General Assembly.

C. Student Profile

This section of the report required information on each individual student as to pre-test and post-test scores on a nationally standardized achievement test or an English language proficiency test. This information, together with such related student information as grade level, was used in preparing this report.

The information received in the reports was of three general types: (1) descriptive information on the nature of the instructional program, (2) numerical data indicating the extent of student academic achievement, and (3) evaluative information pertaining to program strengths and problems as well as recommendations for changes in the program. The information provided in this document will be organized within these same three categories and presented in the indicated order.

V. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROGRAMS

As indicated above, the evaluation reports submitted by the school districts provided a variety of descriptive information about the assessment procedures used for student certification and the various instructional programs provided to students.

A. The Type of Programs Provided

The specific English language proficiency programs provided across the state vary substantially. The approaches are many and varied and identified by a variety of labels. Based upon program descriptions provided by districts in their first year reports for 1981-82, a classification system was developed as described below for categorizing these programs and providing an overall descrip-

tion of the general characteristics of these programs across Colorado. This classification system was presented in this year's report (1982-1983) and district personnel could indicate which type(s) of program was operating at each grade level and rate its effectiveness. These general program categories are as follows.

1. Tutorial Pull-out

Under this arrangement, students are pulled out of their regular classes (language and/or content area classes) and given assistance by a tutor. Operating at either the elementary or secondary level, this type of program has several variations as follows.

- a. Bilingual Tutorial--assistance in English and/or content areas is provided by a bilingual tutor or aide.
- b. ESL Tutorial--tutorial assistance in English, and sometimes in content areas, is provided using an English as a Second Language (ESL) approach.
- c. General Tutorial--other types of tutorials such as general assistance in both content areas and English provided in the English language only or oral language development assistance provided by a tutor in English.

2. Individual Instruction Within the Regular Classroom

The type of assistance provided to students is similar in character to that described within the categories of #1 above except it is provided by the regular teacher or a paraprofessional within the regular classroom situation:

- a. Bilingual Individualized Instruction--assistance in English and/or content areas is provided by a bilingual teacher or aide.
- b. ESL Individualized Instruction--assistance is provided in English and sometimes in content areas, using an ESL approach.
- c. General Individual Instruction--other forms of individualized instruction such as general assistance in both content areas and English provided in the English language only and not employing an ESL approach or oral language development assistance provided by a teacher in English.

3. Classes

- a. Bilingual Classes--the entire or major part of the curric-

ulum (content areas and English) is taught bilingually for the full day by a bilingual teacher or the curriculum is initially presented in English by a non-bilingual teacher and reinforced by a bilingual aide under the supervision of a bilingual resource teacher.

- b. ESL Classes--instruction is provided in ESL classes, usually at the secondary level, emphasizing language development. In some cases, they include content area instruction using ESL techniques.

4. Combinations

Combinations of the above approaches are sometimes used for given students with the most common being the following.

- a. Bilingual Tutorial-ESL Classes--bilingual tutorial assistance is provided for a portion of the day and ESL classes are provided for another part of the day.
- b. ESL Tutorial-ESL Classes--ESL tutorial assistance is provided for a portion of the day and ESL classes are provided for another part of the day.

5. Other

Several other forms of instruction are sometimes employed such as computer-assisted instruction, supplementary oral language development, peer tutoring or a combination other than specified above.

[Note: So-called "Magnet Schools" are not included as a category in the above list because the instruction may take any one of several forms described above.]

Table 1 summarizes the number of districts involved in each type of program and the district ratings of the effectiveness of their programs.

Table 1. Number of Districts Utilizing Various Types of English Language Proficiency Programs and District Ratings of their Effectiveness.

Type of Program	Number of Districts*	Rating of Effectiveness				Average Rating**
		Excel- lent	Very Good	Fair	Poor	
A. Tutorial Pullout						
1. Bilingual Tutorial	24	5	9	10	1	3.8
2. ESL Tutorial	32	11	15	5		4.1
3. General Tutorial	18	3	8	7		3.8
B. Individualized Inst. in Regular Classroom						
1. Bilingual Ind.	11	2	6	3		3.9
2. ESL Ind.	10	2	5	3		3.9
3. General Ind.	28	4	9	11	4	3.5
C. Classes						
1. Bilingual Classes	10	5	3	2		4.3
2. ESL Classes	13	3	7	3		4.0
D. Combinations						
1. Bilingual Tutorial- ESL Classes	4		3		1	3.5
2. ESL Tutorial- ESL Classes	6	1	5			4.2
E. Other						
	12	3	6	3		4.0
TOTAL	168	39	76	47	6	3.9

* This column totals to more than the number of districts having ELPA funded activities because many districts operate more than one type of program.

** Average rating is based on: Excellent=5, Very Good=4, Good=3, Fair=2, and Poor=1.

VI. STUDENT GAINS ON ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

While many student gain scores were limited to those on English language proficiency tests, a substantial amount of student data was reported in terms of gains on standardized achievement tests. These latter tests are the only ones for which it is technically feasible to aggregate the results and provide meaningful information about average gains achieved by students in the programs. It is mainly this standardized achievement test information that is reported in this section, although some general information about the language achievement tests also is presented.

Of the 10,683 students listed in the evaluation reports, complete pre-test and post-test information on standardized achievement tests was provided for 3,191 students. Complete pre-test and post-test data on an English language proficiency test were provided for 4,012 students. Data from the other 3,480 students were not usable for pre-test and post-test comparison because a different test had been used for the pre-test and post-test or one of the scores was missing or uninterpretable. In the majority of these cases, the data were unusable because one of the two scores was missing, most often due to student mobility. Initial district reporting and Department followup generally were quite complete; most gaps in the data are due to uncontrollable factors such as students leaving a district before the time post-tests were given.

A. Overall gains

Of the 10,683 students listed in the district evaluation

reports, both pre-test and post-test data on the same standardized test were provided for 3,191 students. For these students, the average NCE gain score was 4.1. This quantitative information requires some explanation. First, an NCE score may be most easily thought of as a modified form of a percentile score.* A percentile score for a given student simply represents the percentage of students in the comparison group who have a score below the given student. For example, a student with a percentile score of 34 had a score higher than 34 percent of the total comparison group. Thus, the score does not indicate absolute performance but performance compared to some group, in this case a national group on which the test was standardized. The main difference between a percentile score and an NCE score is that the NCE score has been adjusted to make the intervals between the scores of equal size, thus allowing ready calculation of average scores.

Second, the scores being discussed are gain scores. For each student, the NCE score on the pre-test is subtracted from the post-test score; the difference is the gain score. For example, a student with a pre-test score of 30 and a post-test score of 34 would have a gain score of 4. Thus, a gain score describes how the

*The reader interested in a more technical definition of NCE may want to know that NCE scores are a form of standardized score with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 21.07. The mean and standard deviation were established to give a score which resembles a percentile score in terms of the range of likely scores (about 1-99). Because it is a standardized score, certain mathematical manipulations can be done on NCE's (e.g., calculating an average score) which cannot be done with percentile scores.

given student's performance has changed with respect to the comparison group. Between the pre-test and post-test (for example, between October and April of a school year), the comparison group will have progressed academically. If a given student has lost ground with respect to the comparison group (for example, dropped from an NCE score of 30 to 28, yielding a gain score of -2), this student will have a negative gain score even though this same student has made academic progress. Gain scores can be positive or negative. The average gain score of 4.1 reported earlier indicates that the students enrolled in programs supported under the Act gained more than the national average for students beginning at the same level.

The magnitude of this gain must be modified somewhat due to a technical matter known as the regression effect. Before addressing this matter, however, the performance of A/B students and C students must be addressed separately.* Of the 3,191 students with pre- and post-achievement data reported above, 1,042 were A/B students and had an average NCE gain score of 6.7, while 2,149 were C students with an average gain score of 2.8.

*A, B, C, and A/B refer to the following categories of student language dominance based upon definitions provided in the Act.

A= "A student who speaks a language other than english and does not comprehend or speak english."

B= "A student who comprehends or speaks some English, but whose predominant comprehension or speech is in a language other than English."

C= "A student who comprehends and speaks English and one or more other languages and whose dominant language is difficult to determine."

A/B= Either A or B as described above.

The average gain of A/B students was noticeably greater than that of C students.

The previously mentioned regression effect must now be addressed. A rather elusive concept, an explanation of it is out of place in this report. In capsule form, it can be said that it is the tendency of extreme scores (either higher or lower than the mean, but in the case of this evaluation, below the mean) to be less extreme on the post-test than on the pre-test when students were selected for participation on the basis of their pre-test scores. Since C students were selected for participation on the basis of their pre-test scores, a correction must be made for it. This correction* is estimated to be 1.7 which, when subtracted from the previously indicated gain of 2.8 gives an NCE gain score of 1.1 for C students when adjusted for the regression effect.

B. Gains Within Various Types of Programs

It is impossible to make valid judgments about the comparative value of various kinds of English language proficiency programs based upon the results of an evaluation of this type. As a result, districts were not required to report student gains by program type. It is impossible to use this data to judge the comparative value of the various program types because there are so many variables that influence these results. For example, particular types of programs tend to be used in particular school

*Based on a table provided in a draft report by Roy M. Gabriel entitled "Correcting for the Regression to the Mean Bias in Title I Evaluation Results: Theoretical Correction Tables" (Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, undated). The table value was obtained using an estimated test reliability of .90 and pre-test selection of students below the mean.

districts, so the results may be influenced by differences between districts. In fact, in last year's evaluation the variability among districts was about three times as large as the variability among program types (standard deviation of 3.2 compared to 1.1). Because of the influence on the variable program type of other variables such as district, this type of data would provide no basis for judging the relative worth of various program types.

C. Gains by Grade Level

When analyzed by grade level, the data show the greatest gains being made in the earlier grades, particularly kindergarten and first grade. These data are displayed in Table 2.

While the grade level data are influenced somewhat by other variables, similarly to the situation with programs as noted above, these factors are more randomly distributed across grade level than across other variables such as program type. Thus, there is more basis for taking the data in Table 2 as an indicator of relative progress in the various grades. One caution about the kindergarten and first grade data, however, is that a smaller percentage of such students were given achievement tests and a question must be raised as to what selection factors may have been introduced in selecting such students for testing. Inspection of district data shows that the higher scores at these grade levels are not due to particular districts choosing to use achievement test.

D. Gains by Language

The number of languages, other than English, spoken by students totaled to 73, with the number of students in most language categories being so small that examining the achievement data

by language category is rather pointless. Thus, data was neither collected nor analyzed on this basis.

E. Gains on English Language Proficiency Tests

While scores on various English language proficiency tests have not yet been sufficiently refined in a technical sense to allow meaningful aggregate reporting of student progress as done with standardized tests, these tests were allowable under the Act

Table 2. Mean NCE Student Gain on Achievement Tests by Grade Level and Student Classification

Grade Level	A/B		C		A/B and C Combined	
	number of students	mean NCE gain	number of students	mean NCE gain	number of students	mean NCE gain
K	104	19.3	61	15.4	165	14.3
1	76	13.1	134	8.5	210	10.2
2	116	5.2	224	3.7	340	4.2
3	66	6.1	218	3.7	284	4.2
4	84	7.2	253	3.14	337	4.3
5	108	3.2	267	1.6	375	2.1
6	90	6.8	231	1.3	321	2.9
7	76	3.9	162	2.1	238	2.6
8	75	4.0	145	4.2	220	4.1
9	62	5.6	136	0.3	198	2.0
10	50	1.7	140	2.1	190	2.0
11	65	1.6	110	-1.6	175	-0.4
12	70	4.7	68	1.5	138	3.2
TOTAL	1042	6.8	2149	2.8	3191	4.1

for evaluation purposes. The progress of approximately one-half of the students was assessed with such instruments rather than standardized tests. The typical test of this type yields a so-called level score which describes the student's proficiency. Table 3 reports the average gain made by students on the most commonly used tests of this type. Note that the levels of the several tests cannot be compared directly and the gain in level of proficiency is a comparison of the student's own level between pre- and post-test, not a comparison to a national norming group as in the case of standardized achievement tests.

Table 3. Average Student Gain in Levels Between Pre-test and Post-test on English Language Proficiency Tests.

Test	Number of Students	Average Gain
IDEA Proficiency Test	1832	1.5
Language Assessment Scale	1102	1.7
Structure Tests - English Language	475	5.7
Language Assessment Scale/Basic Inventory of Natural Language	287	1.7
Bilingual Syntax Measure	182	1.3

F. Comparison of Colorado Results to Other States

Evaluations somewhat similar to the one conducted in Colorado have been done in a few other states. By and large they have faced the same technical difficulties cited above in this report, but it is reasonable to compare the results of this evaluation with the gains reported in other states and thus gain some indications as to

whether or not programs supported under the Colorado English Language Proficiency Act have a significant impact.

As part of last year's evaluation, data were obtained from two other states, selected simply because they were known to have data available. In an evaluation of their bilingual education programs, the State of Michigan found average fall to spring NCE gain scores of 3.10 in grades 3 through 6 and 2.95 in grades 7 through 12.* The students involved in this evaluation were not selected on the basis of pre-test scores so no correction for the regression effect was used. California reported fall to spring NCE gain scores of 3.9 in 1979-80 and 4.1 in 1980-81 for students in grades 2 through 12 of their bilingual education programs (potential regression effects unknown).** In general, it can be said again this year that the gains achieved by Colorado students are comparable to those in the other two states for which data were acquired.

VIII. DISTRICT JUDGMENTS OF PROGRAM STRENGTHS AND PROBLEMS

The district evaluation reports contained an optional page for indicating program strengths, special problems and recommendations to the Department of Education or General Assembly. The first two of these three items are summarized here.

*Data from Research, Evaluation and Associated Services, Michigan Department of Education (unpublished)

**California State Department of Education, Evaluation Report of Consolidated Programs, 1980-1981.

A. Areas of Strength

When asked to identify areas of strength for their program four items were mentioned most frequently. Mentioned most often was the individual assistance provided to students; daily tutorial help and other forms of individualized help were considered a key feature of the assistance provided to students. The competence of the staff also was cited frequently. The importance attributed to staff also was evidenced by numerous references to cooperation among staff--teachers, administrators and others--as an important program strength. A fourth area of strength cited essentially as frequently as those above was the availability of good, numerous and varied instructional materials.

Many other strengths were cited as well, the more common ones including, for example, a good program, CDE workshops and support, community support, state funding, district commitment, good inservice education, and simply the fact that children got help. There were many program strengths and many of them apparently were common to numerous districts.

B. Special Problems

Of the districts responding to the optional section of the evaluation report dealing with strengths, problems and recommendations, the vast majority mentioned at least one problem. There was very little commonality, however, among the problems. The most frequently mentioned was cited by only six districts and was essentially an anticipated problem - the two year limit on the eligibility of students for ELPA support. The next most frequently mentioned problems related to testing; four districts mentioned the

difficulty of obtaining parent checklists, three referred to the inappropriateness of standardized tests for many students, and a few other districts cited some other problem related to testing and assessment. The remaining problems apparently were largely idiosyncratic to particular districts since none of these remaining problems was mentioned by more than two or three districts.

IX. DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM CHANGE

Of the many recommendations offered, only one was mentioned frequently; in fact it was cited by the majority of districts responding to the optional section of the evaluation report dealing with strengths, problems and recommendations. This recommendation was that student eligibility be extended to three, four or more years. There is a strong persuasion that the job can not be done for all students in the two years. Mention also was made by two or three districts of the need for more funds, the desirability of making more use of an advisory committee to provide advice on the operation of the ELPA program and the value of periodic state-wide or regional meetings for communication.

APPENDIX A
DISTRICT REPORTING FORM

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ACT

School District _____

Superintendent's Signature

Date

1. Program Description and Judged Effectiveness: (For the one or more types of programs in your district indicate the grade level(s) at which they are used and your rating of their effectiveness).

	<u>Grade Level(s)</u>	<u>Rating of Effectiveness*</u>
A. <u>Tutorial Pull-out</u>		
1) Bilingual Tutorial	_____	_____
2) ESL Tutorial	_____	_____
3) General Tutorial	_____	_____
B. <u>Individual Instruction Within the Regular Classroom</u>		
1) Bilingual Individualized Instruction	_____	_____
2) ESL Individualized Instruction	_____	_____
3) General Individualized Instruction	_____	_____
C. <u>Classes</u>		
1) Bilingual Classes	_____	_____
2) ESL Classes	_____	_____
D. <u>Combinations</u>		
1) Bilingual Tutorial-ESL Classes	_____	_____
2) ESL Tutorial-ESL Classes	_____	_____
E. Other: (Please describe)		
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

*Program Effectiveness (Select one for each program operational in your district) Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, or Poor.

COE - DARI FORM CLEARANCE FORM NO. <u>CDE-399</u> UNIT <u>ELPA</u> APPROVAL THROUGH AUGUST 1984	REQUIRED <small>TO OBTAIN BENEFIT</small> 866-2407
--	---

11.

STUDENT PROFILE

District _____ School _____				TEST DATA					
				Pre-Test			Post-Test		
				Student Identification Name or Code	Grade Level	Student Category (A/B or C)	Test* No.	Date Given	Percentile Score
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									
23									
24									
25									

*Test number used for Evaluation

TEST INFORMATION

Test* No.	Test Name	Portion Used	Test Edition
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ACT

OPTIONAL

III. General Assessment of Programs Operated Under the English Language Proficiency Act

A. Areas of strength:

B. Special problems encountered in implementing the Act:

C. Recommendations for improved implementation of the Act or amendments to the Act that might be considered by the Department or the General Assembly:

CDE - DARU FORM CLEARANCE		RECOMMENDED
FORM NO. CDE-389		
UNIT FI PA		866-2407
APPROVAL		THROUGH AUGUST 1984

APPENDIX B

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ACT
PROGRAM OVERVIEW

January 12, 1984

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
English Language Proficiency Act
Program Overview

The purpose of the English Language Proficiency Act is to provide state support for English language proficiency programs in the public schools for children whose dominant language is not English.

In accordance with the Act, the local school districts are charged with the identification of eligible students. Children are eligible for assistance under the "A/B" category if their dominant language is not English. These students either speak or comprehend little or no English. Children are eligible for assistance under the "C" category if their dominant language is difficult to determine. These students speak both English and another language. To be eligible, these "C" category students must have achievement scores below the district or national mean on a nationally standardized test or below the acceptable proficiency level on an English language proficiency test. (Full definitions of the A, B, C, D, and E categories are found in Attachment 1.)

Children Being Served Through the English Language Proficiency Act

Approximately 8,500 students in Colorado have been certified by the local school districts as being eligible for ELPA assistance for the 1983-84 school year. This figure represents a decrease of 30.8% compared to FY 1983 total of 12,315 children. While the total number of students has decreased during the past year, the number of local school districts with eligible children has remained the same at 91 districts.

Students in the A/B category decreased by 25% from 6,793 in 1982-83 to 5,105 in the 1983-84 school year. This decrease was somewhat less than the one noted in the "C" category of 38% below the 1982-83 certified count.

The number of new students being certified as eligible for the 1983-84 school year is 5,131, which represents a decrease of 11.7% as compared to the total number of new certified students (5,809) from 1982-83. New "A/B" students decreased by 3% while new "C" category students decreased by 24% from the previous year.

The total allocation of funds of approximately \$2.8 million is the same as the previous year. However, funds allocated for each eligible child have increased due to the decrease in the certified count of eligible children as noted previously. Specifically, the allocation for "A/B" students has increased from \$305 per student in 1982-83 to \$398 per student in 1983-84. The allocation for "C" students has also been increased from \$123 per student to \$198 per student.

Detailed statistical information is provided in Attachment 2, and a listing of languages spoken by eligible children is provided in Attachment 3.

Audit Results - FY 1982-83

In accordance with the English Language Proficiency Act (C.R.S. 22-24-106 (c)) and the rules of its administration (2224-R-3.00(7)), "Each year the Department shall audit a minimum of one-third of the districts funded under the Act." The audits focused upon the district records for each student certified as follows:

- . Parent and teacher checklists or equivalent school district procedures;
- . Student assessment information, if applicable, including test scores and related district eligibility cut-off scores;

- . Observation methods/results used, if applicable, to determine student eligibility;

Audit exceptions were noted in 26 of the 39 local districts' records.

The audit exceptions were the result of one or more of the following:

- . No Parent and Teacher checklists to substantiate the certification of the child's eligibility;
- . Misinterpretation of the Parent and Teacher checklist information in the certification of the child's eligibility;
- . Incorrect count of the number of eligible children;
- . No student assessment results utilized to substantiate the certification of a child's eligibility when required in accordance with the Act;
- . Inappropriate use of cut-off scores in the certification of a child's eligibility when required in accordance with the Act;
- . No substantiation of other observation data that was used by the districts to certify eligibility in accordance with the Act.

In consideration of the above identified problems, the Department has implemented several activities to aid the districts in their administrative procedures. The following activities have been undertaken:

- . A series of regional workshops for the clarification of the administrative duties and responsibilities of local districts;
- . The preparation and distribution of a revised consolidated packet regarding the English Language Proficiency Act: Legislation, Reporting Forms, and Operational Guidance;
- . The reduction of required ELPA paperwork (by 50%);
- . Followup audits of all districts which had audit exceptions, to ensure compliance with the Act and Rules.

While audit exceptions were noted, the districts are doing well in complying with the intent of the Act. The exceptions identified were primarily administrative oversights rather than a specific intent of non-compliance.

General Observations

After two years of operation under the English Language Proficiency Act, positive results of the program have been noted as follows:

- . Many school districts have shown increased commitment to the ELPA program as indicated by:
 - . The hiring of more ELPA staff at district's expense;
 - . An increased number of requests for ELPA technical assistance from the Colorado Department of Education;
 - . A significant increased participation among both teachers and administrators at state-sponsored workshops or conferences.
- . During the past year the data reporting requirements of the local districts has been reduced by approximately 75%. This reduction, initiated by the Department, was the result of a detailed analysis of the use of data gathered, as well as, the identification of data that was already available through alternative sources.
- . Department staff are currently in the process of further reducing the data collection and reporting requirements of the districts through the design of a micro-computer-based data collection system. The system, which will be compatible to most local school districts micro-computer technology, is currently being pilot tested with the Denver Public Schools.

Concern

The major concern among ELPA school districts' administrators and teachers focuses on the two-year limitation. Many contend that ELPA students need more time than two years to become proficient in the English language and to compete successfully in a school system.

Summary

In general, the implementation of the Act appears to be progressing well and the intent of the legislation is being fulfilled.

RN/ds

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ACT (ELPA)

State Summary

I.	<u>Eligible School Districts</u>				Percent of change from last year
	<u>1981-82</u>	<u>1982-83</u>	<u>1983-84</u>		
	107	92	91		1%
II.	<u>Eligible ELPA Children:</u>				Percent of change from last year
		<u>1981-82</u>	<u>1982-83</u>	<u>1983-84</u>	
A.	"A/B" Category	5840	6793	5105	- 25%
B.	"C" Category	5026	5522	3427	- 38%
		<u>10866</u>	<u>12315</u>	<u>8532</u>	
	(See attached definition)				
III.	<u>New Students Certified:</u>				Percent of change from last year
		<u>1982-83</u>	<u>1983-84</u>		
A.	"A/B" Category	3320	3236		- 3%
B.	"C" Category	<u>2489</u>	<u>1895</u>		- 24%
		5809	5131		
IV.	<u>Language Spoken by Eligible Children:</u>				
A.	Language Spoken (See Attached List)				
		<u>1981-82</u>	<u>1982-83</u>	<u>1983-84</u>	
		66	74	73	
V.	<u>Allocation of Funds:</u>				
		<u>1981-82</u>	<u>1982-83</u>	<u>1983-84</u>	
A.	Total Available	\$2.8 Million	\$2.8 Million	\$2.7 Million	
B.	Allocation: "A/B" Student	361	305	398	
C.	Allocation: "C" Student	136	123	198	

DEFINITIONS OF A, B, AND C STUDENTS

A _____ STUDENT

A student who speaks a language other than English and does not comprehend or speak English.

B _____ STUDENT

A student who comprehends or speaks some English, but whose predominant comprehension or speech is in a language other than English.

C _____ STUDENT

A student who comprehends and speaks English and one or more other languages and whose dominant language is difficult to determine, if the student's English language development and comprehension is:

- (i) At or below the district mean or below the national mean or equivalent on a nationally standardized test; or
 - (ii) Below the acceptable proficiency level on an English language proficiency test developed by the Department.
-

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY PROGRAM

Languages Spoken - 1983-84

<u>Language</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Language</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Spanish	5474	32. Turkish	10
2. Vietnamese	830	33. Urdu (Pakistan)	10
3. Korean	375	34. Danish	9
4. Hmong	296	35. Dutch	9
5. Khmer	202	36. Punjabi (Pakistan)	9
6. Arabic	199	37. Taiwanese	9
7. Lao	197	38. Kickapoo	8
8. Chinese	182	39. Afrikaans	6
9. German	87	40. Flemish	6
10. Japanese	70	41. Tigrinya (Ethiopia)	6
11. Persian	59	42. Gujarati (India)	5
12. Tagalog	50	43. Icelandic	5
13. Thai	46	44. Champa (Africa)	4
14. Polish	39	45. Ibo (Nigeria)	4
15. French	34	46. Marshallese	4
16. Greek	34	47. Nepali	4
17. Navajo	25	48. Tamil (India)	4
18. Italian	19	49. Bulgarian	3
19. Russian	17	50. Serbo-Croatian	3
20. Pashto (Afghanistan)	16	51. Sioux	3
21. Hindi	15	52. Efik (Nigeria)	2
22. Hebrew	14	53. Somali (Africa)	2
23. Amharic (Ethiopia)	13	54. Swahili (E. Africa)	2
24. Czech	13	55. Armenian	1
25. Samoan	13	56. Assyrian (Syria)	1
26. Finnish	12	57. Bengali	1
27. Hungarian	12	58. Berber (Africa)	1
28. Swedish	12	59. Catalan (Spain)	1
29. Norwegian	11	60. Chamorro (Guam)	1
30. Indonesian	10	61. Dari (Iran)	1
31. Portuguese	10		

