DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 602 UD 024 150

AUTHOR Reisner, Elizabeth R.
TITLE Building Capacity and Commitment in Bilingual Education: A Practical Guide for Educators.
INSTITUTION NTS Research Corp., Durham, N.C. Educational Policy Development Center.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 72p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Support; Government School Relationship; Parent School Relationship; Program Administration; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; Program Proposals; School Community Relationship; School Districts; Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS *Capacity Building; Commitment; *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII; Instructional Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this guide is to assist local school districts in designing and implementing bilingual education programs that meet Title VII requirements related to the development of local "capacity and commitment" for the delivery of bilingual education services. The guide is organized in seven sections. The first section summarizes steps identified as most relevant to success in building bilingual capacity and commitment. Section 2 explains the rationale for the Title VII interest in capacity and commitment as a key element in the operation of successful bilingual education projects. The next four sections address substantive areas in which bilingual capacity and commitment can be fostered in most school systems; these areas include the bilingual instructional approach, staff development, parent and community involvement, and administration and funding. Section 7 suggests ways to describe capacity and commitment building efforts in a Title VII grant application, and also explains how applications are reviewed when they reach Washington. An appendix contains a list of Title VII funded providers of special assistance to bilingual projects that were operating in 1981-82. (KH)

Building Capacity and Commitment In Bilingual Education: A Practical Guide for Educators

April 1983

Submitted to:

U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C.

Funded through Part C, ESEA Title VII

Final Report as submitted by the Educational Policy Development Center,

Elizabeth R. Reisner.

This study was conducted as part of the Educational Policy Development Center on Educational Quality and Improvement. Conclusions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center's sponsor, the U.S. Department of Education.

Published jointly by the Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Centers (EDACs) for Bilingual Education:

EDAC, Lesley College
49 Washington Avenue
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02140

EDAC, Dallas Independent School District
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204

EDAC, California State University
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, California 90032

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this guide is to assist local school districts in designing and implementing programs in bilingual education. In particular, the guide focuses on one aspect of bilingual education that has been highlighted in changes in the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) and in regulations implementing the Act. That aspect is the development of local capacity and commitment for the delivery of bilingual education services.

The Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) requested that a guidebook on this topic be developed to assist school districts that have experienced problems in understanding the intent of requirements in the Title VII regulations related to capacity and commitment. These districts have asked for assistance in designing and implementing steps that would develop their capacity and commitment in bilingual education. The guide is intended to assist school districts both in understanding the requirements and in taking steps to implement them.

Although school districts preparing applications for new Title VII Basic Grant projects have been seen as the primary users of this guide, it should also be helpful to school districts that are implementing continuation projects under Title VII. We also believe that the guide can assist districts that are designing or implementing bilingual education projects without Title VII funding.

The information and suggestions presented here were collected through a two step process. The first step was to review the research that has been conducted on the development of educational capacity and commitment by school districts. Special attention was given to research on commitment and capacity building in bilingual education. The findings of these research studies were analyzed in order to identify the factors that seemed to be the most important in the successful development of local capacity and commitment.

The second step of the process was to examine these success factors in visits to several school districts, chosen because they had demonstrated capacity and commitment in bilingual education. These six districts were widely diverse in geographical location, urban/rural character, and mix of language groups. They had in common the fact that they were considered by Federal and State bilingual education officials to have demonstrated capacity and commitment in bilingual education. Also, they had all received and implemented grants under the Bilingual Education Act.

Because of limitations in the scope of the project, we did not have an opportunity to verify that the educational practices we observed were "exemplary" in the strictest sense. For example, we cannot verify that any of these practices are consistently associated with improvements in academic achievement or language proficiency. What we can say, however, is that many of these practices appeared to be supportive of local efforts to build capacity and commitment in bilingual education.

What we found in the school districts was not identical to our expectations. Some topics that had been highlighted in earlier educational research findings did not seem to be quite so important once we talked to local bilingual project personnel. We also found factors that seemed to be very significant in practice, though virtually ignored in the research literature. Despite these variations from what we had expected, we saw many instances of concrete events and actions that reinforced findings presented in the research literature.

This guide reflects our analysis of both what we learned from our review of earlier research and what we discovered from our visits to school districts. We have presented general suggestions as well as specific approaches to implementing those suggestions. In every instance the specific approaches are based on our actual observations of current practices in school districts implementing bilingual education projects.

The organization of the guide is intended to make it as helpful as possible for you. The guide is organized in seven sections. The first section of the guide summarizes the steps identified as most relevent to success in building bilingual capacity and commitment. Topics in the

remaining sections are grouped a way that parallels the grouping of responsibilities in most school districts. The second section explains the rationale for the Title VII interest in capacity and commitment as a key element in the operation of successful bilingual education projects. The next four sections of the guide address substantive areas in which bilingual capacity and commitment can be fostered in most school systems; these areas include the bilingual instructional approach, staff development, parent and community involvement, and administration and funding. The seventh section suggests ways to describe capacity and commitment building efforts in a Title VII grant application; it also explains how applications are reviewed when they reach Washington.

We wish to thank the teachers, administrators, parents, and students in the following school districts: Boston, Massachusetts; Flagstaff, Arizona; Houston, Texas; Rockland County, New York; South Bay, California; and Washington, D.C. The challenges inherent in efforts to build bilingual capacity and commitment came alive for us in learning about their experiences. I also personally wish to thank Dr. Gilbert N. Garcia of OBEMLA for his guidance and aide in this project. In addition, I extend my appreciation to Dr. Martin E. Orland for his help in conducting many of the interviews and reviewing much of the research literature on which this guide is based.

Elizabeth R. Reisner

NTS Research Corporation
Washington, D.C.

SECTION 1. SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED STEPS IN BUILDING BILINGUAL CAPACITY AND COMMITMENT

In the course of developing this guidebook a number of steps were identified that may be useful to educators in the development of capacity and commitment in bilingual education. These steps are discussed in this guidebook at the end of the sections to which they pertain.

To provide an overview of the guidebook and to assist readers who are concerned with only one or two specific topics, we have summarized the steps here. The numbers shown in parentheses correspond to the pages on which each particular step is discussed.

Instructional Approach

1. Identify ways to highlight the similarities between LEP and non-LEP students (pp. 12-15).

2. Modify the overall curriculum, both the bilingual and all-English components, to achieve as much similarity as possible between the two components (pp. 12-15).

3. Design and implement screening procedures to identify LEP students (pp. 15-16).

4. Design and implement student grouping procedures that, to the extent possible, create instructional groups that are based on shared primary or home languages and similar levels of English proficiency (pp. 16-17).

5. Adopt organizational approaches to bilingual instruction (e.g., team teaching, self-contained classrooms, or pullout instruction) that

exploit the talents and strengths of the instructional staff as much as possible, while also reflecting the numbers and characteristics of LEP students (p. 17).

6. Where adequate instructional materials are not available, consider using project staff members either to adapt existing materials or to develop new materials to meet local needs (p. 18).

7. Design and implement exit and followup procedures for bilingual program "graduates" (pp. 20-21).

Staff Development

8. If bilingual teacher shortages exist, consider the use of incentives in attracting qualified bilingual education teachers (pp. 25-26).

9. Cultivate ties with local teacher training institutions (pp. 26-27).

10. Consider recruiting new bilingual teachers from within the current teaching staff (pp. 26-27).

11. Plan inservice training through systematic surveys of teachers' needs and interests related to bilingual inservice training (pp. 28-29).

12. If participation has been low for bilingual inservice training in the past, consider ways of increasing participation (p. 30).

13. Provide followup activities or services for training participants (p. 30).

Parent and Community Involvement

14. Create opportunities for parents to have pleasant, informal contacts with the bilingual project (pp. 33-36).

15. Inform the community about the benefits of bilingual education (p. 36).

16. Assist parents in providing support at home for the bilingual instructional program (pp. 36-37).

17. Improve parent capabilities to participate in project oversight activities (pp. 37-38).

Administration and Funding

18. Determine what your district's legal responsibilities are in the area of bilingual education and make certain those responsibilities are clearly communicated to the school board and the public (pp. 40-42).

19. Use grant funds (from Title VII or other sources) for activities that can gradually be transferred to local funding sources (pp. 42-43).

20. Design the project's organization to increase the involvement and commitment of the rest of the school district (pp. 43-47).

21. Be prepared for changes in the roles of bilingual education staff (pp. 47-48).

SECTION 2. BILINGUAL CAPACITY AND COMMITMENT IN THE CONTEXT OF ESEA TITLE VII, THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT

The Bilingual Education Act was enacted in 1968 as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). An important factor stimulating passage of the legislation was evidence of the serious educational needs experienced by school aged children with limited proficiency in English. In addition, many educators favored passage of the legislation because of the opportunity it would offer to demonstrate successful techniques for delivering bilingual education.

In 1978, Congress enacted a number of amendments to Title VII. Several of the amendments reflected congressional concern that bilingual programs needed to become permanent instructional components of school systems, rather than remaining solely "soft money" activities and thus susceptible to cancellation. One of the most important such changes was the heightened emphasis in the law on local efforts to improve long term capabilities for the delivery of bilingual education. This emphasis can be seen in several places in the act but most notably in Section 721(b)(3)(E), in which one selection criterion for bilingual education grants is described as follows:

> An application for a grant under this part may be approved only if --
> ...[T]he Secretary of Education determines that the assistance provided under the application will contribute toward building the capacity of the applicant to provide a program of bilingual education on a regular basis which will be of sufficient size, scope, and quality to promise significant improvement in the education of children of limited English proficiency, and that the applicant will have the resources and commitment to continue the

program when assistance under this title is reduced or no longer available....

This criterion states that two related standards must be used to assess an applicant's proposed implementation of the Title VII grant that it has requested. To re-phrase the language of the statute, the two standards can be described as follows:

- Capacity -- The applicant must show that the Title VII grant will assist in building the school district's ability to deliver bilingual instruction that is sufficiently high in quality and broad in coverage to improve the educational achievement of all students in the district who are limited in English proficiency.
- Commitment -- The applicant must also show that it has made realistic plans (in terms of funding and local intent) to continue the bilingual program after Title VII support is ended or reduced.

In the Title VII regulations (published in final form in the FEDERAL REGISTER on April 4, 1980), this legislative criterion is included as one of several criteria for the selection of grantees under the Basic Projects program. Under the "Commitment and Capacity" criterion, an applicant may earn up to 20 points out of a total of 110 points. This criterion is described in §123a.30(g) as follows:

[In approving an application] the Secretary considers --

(1) Evidence of the applicant's past commitment to bilingual education; and

(2) The likelihood that the applicant will continue or increase that commitment as indicated by --

(i) Its plan for continuing teacher training when Federal funds are reduced or no longer available;

(ii) Its plan for expansion of the project;

(iii) Its plan to provide followup services from State and local resources to children who have achieved proficiency in English;

(iv) Specific plans for the gradual assumption of the costs of the program during the project period; and

(v) Plans for providing non-Federal resources to meet bilingual education needs in future years.

In another important criterion at §123a.30(h) entitled "Prior Grantees," special requirements are described for any applicant who has had a Title VII grant within the past three years and who proposes to implement a new bilingual project in the same school(s), grade(s), and language(s) as were served under its previous grant. Any such applicant may receive points for "Commitment and Capacity" only if a special justification is provided in the application. The justification must contain two components:

(i) Evidence of a continuing need for Federal assistance to carry out a program of bilingual education; and

(ii) Evidence that the applicant has significantly increased the number of qualified bilingual personnel in the project schools or improved the capability of existing staff.

Both the "Commitment and Capacity" criterion and the "Prior Grantees" requirements impose significant demands on applicants. In order to earn points for its "Commitment and Capacity," an applicant must demonstrate two types of achievements -- first, its history of commitment to bilingual education and, second, its specific plans for continuing and increasing that commitment through the development of five aspects of bilingual capability listed above. "Prior Grantees" that are requesting, in effect, the continuation of earlier Title VII projects must also provide additional evidence of a history of bilingual capacity building (through information on past success in increasing the numbers or capabilities of the district's bilingual staff).

Taken altogether, these provisions indicate that Title VII funds are primarily to be used to continue the development of capacity and commitment already underway prior to submission of a Title VII application. Examples of approaches to the development of that capacity and commitment can be seen in the next sections of this guide.

SECTION 3. INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACH

The instructional approach used to provide services to participating students is the heart of any district's bilingual program. Even in districts where Title VII funds are used only to provide ancillary services such as staff training or curriculum development, the primary objective of these activities is almost always the improvement or expansion of the bilingual instructional approach or the integration of bilingual instruction with other local instructional priorities. Because it is so central, the bilingual instructional approach must be a key focus of local efforts to build capacity and commitment in bilingual education.

The discussion here addresses two major questions about the bilingual instructional approach. First, what special instructional features seem to characterize those districts where bilingual education is a permanent component of the overall instructional program? Second, what steps can a district take to improve its bilingual instructional services?

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONAL FEATURES OF DISTRICTS THAT HAVE BUILT BILINGUAL CAPACITY AND COMMITMENT

In examining the research literature on bilingual capacity building and in visiting districts that were previously described as having developed bilingual capacity, we were particularly interested in characteristics of the bilingual instructional approach. What made successful, mature programs different from programs in districts whose bilingual projects were just getting started? What aspects of their instructional approach had proved effective in winning greater local acceptance for bilingual education?

We found two key instructional features that seemed to be particularly important characteristics of districts that had built bilingual capacity and commitment:

- The bilingual project was delivering instruction that was the same in major respects as that delivered to English proficient children in the district's regular, English-only program of instruction.
- The bilingual projects used explicit, distinctive instructional approaches and techniques that were implemented in a fairly consistent manner across all of the project schools in a given district.

At first glance these two descriptions seem contradictory. How can a local bilingual program provide the same instruction as the district's regular program, if it is also emphasizing the use of certain distinctive bilingual instructional approaches? We found that a district's program can contain both of these characteristics if, on the one hand, it holds the same expectations for all students and also teaches the same general skills in both the bilingual and all-English curriculum, while, on the other hand, it uses consistent bilingual instructional techniques in a regular and thorough fashion throughout the bilingual project. The discussion below describes how and why this happens.

Similarities Between Bilingual and All-English Instructional Approaches

After conversations with many people, we discovered four factors influencing the similarities between the bilingual and all-English programs within a given district:

- Teachers, principals, and others held the same expectations for bilingual project participants and for monolingual English students. These expectations were seen

especially in terms of certain student characteristics and habits, which were expected to be the same for all students. They included for each student:

-- a serious commitment to learning;

-- a cooperative attitude and good behavior; and

-- regular attendance.

- Students who were limited in English proficiency (LEP) were seen by their teachers as exhibiting the same diversity of individual interests and talents that characterized the population of monolingual, English-speaking students.
- All students, whether in the bilingual program or not, were expected by their teachers to cover the same general curriculum and approximately the same amount of material in a year's time. For example, although mathematics instruction might be delivered in both the bilingual program and the all-English program, the mathematics skills being taught were the same in both programs, and students were expected to progress at the same rate regardless of their participation in the bilingual program.
- The same encouragement and opportunities to excel were given to all students. This could be seen in extracurricular activities and physical education as well as in academic contexts.

Looking at the last of the four points above, we discovered serious efforts underway in several districts to provide special services to those LEP children who were intellectually gifted or who were talented in particular academic areas. We also saw special college preparatory activities for LEP students at the high school level. In addition to the benefits provided to the individual students who were involved, these special activities were believed to yield additional benefits, including the following:

- They helped to dispel negative stereotypes about the abilities and characteristics of LEP students.

- The availability of special learning opportunities provided encouragement and incentives to all of the LEP students.
- The special activities reminded the outside community of the intellectual assets of the LEP students.

Special opportunities for gifted and talented LEP students were only one way of emphasizing the fact that LEP students shared the same abilities and diversity as non-LEP students. Given the presence of similar abilities, districts found that the bilingual and all-English instructional programs should be as similar as possible to permit bilingual program "graduates" to move into the all-English instructional program as soon as their level of English proficiency permitted (or at the grade level that the bilingual instructional program was no longer available to LEP students, whichever came first). If, for example, the bilingual project participants had been taught a different approach to mathematics problem-solving or if different behavioral standards had been applied to the bilingual participants, the transition to a non-bilingual classroom would be considerably more difficult than it needed to be. With similar expectations as to their performance and the same curriculum, however, LEP students could move more smoothly into the all-English instructional program as soon as their level of English proficiency permitted. Similar expectations for all students also reduced possible resentment that bilingual students were receiving an easier curriculum or that they were a special category of students for whom the normal performance standards did not apply.

In several districts, we observed that the bilingual project had sought to highlight its academic strengths to the larger community by recruiting able students from all-English backgrounds to participate in the bilingual program. Several project directors had actually gone to business and political leaders in the community and persuaded them to request that their children be scheduled into the bilingual classes. From the point of view of the all-English students, they gained valuable exposure to a second language, which inevitably led to their acquisition of the

second language. The bilingual projects meanwhile gained prestige and, often, supporters from among the community's leadership elite. By actively recruiting monolingual English students into the program in its early days, bilingual projects often later reported waiting lists of monolingual English students whose parents believed the program would be academically enriching to their children. (All districts reported the need to handle the participation of monolingual English students with flexibility; for example, monolingual English students usually did not participate in instruction in English as a Second Language provided to LEP students, and they usually received special, locally-funded instruction in the second language.) Although the individual students -- LEP and non-LEP-- were the main beneficiaries of these integrated programs, the bilingual project itself benefited from the impression that was created of the bilingual project as an academically enriching opportunity for all students.

Distinctive Instructional Approaches in the Bilingual Program

In the local bilingual projects we visited, bilingual instructional personnel were expected to implement specific instructional approaches that were used for bilingual instruction throughout the project. They were not left on their own to improvise their own classroom approach to bilingual education. The content of the project approaches varied from one district to the next, but in general they shared several common instructional concerns and objectives, including the following:

Screening procedures for identifying LEP students. Each district had in the past conducted a districtwide survey of the parents of school-aged children (or, in some cases, parents of children enrolled in public schools) to determine the home language of each child. These survey results, along with classroom observation of students' language use and some testing, had been used to identify students who were eligible for bilingual instruction. In the years since the first survey, the survey questions had been asked of the parents of all new students at

the time of their enrollment in the district. Once a student was identified as eligible for bilingual services, the student's parents were asked to indicate their written approval for their children's participation in the bilingual project. Students whose parents did not approve their participation were placed in classes where they received instruction in English as a Second Language (ESL). For those students who were selected and approved for participation in the bilingual program, their placement in a bilingual classroom or group was determined on the basis of additional testing or interviewing of the students to determine their respective levels of skill mastery in English, the home language, and other subject areas.

Student grouping. Each of the districts we visited grouped LEP children according to their level of language proficiency. In elementary schools, for example, we frequently saw LEP students divided into three groups: (1) those who were more proficient in the same non-English home language than in English, (2) those who were equally limited in English and in their home language, and (3) those who were more proficient in English than in their home language. In most cases, these groups reflected three levels of English proficiency, with the first group having the least proficiency in English and the third group having the greatest English proficiency. The first group, not surprisingly, had the greatest needs for native language instruction, while the third group was most likely to receive much of their instruction in English. In districts or schools where there were too few LEP students (or too many different languages being spoken) to permit this type of grouping, LEP students were generally grouped informally into these same three general groups either for special help from a bilingual classroom aide or for pullout instruction provided by a bilingual resource teacher. The main advantage stemming from this type of grouping was that language instruction could be targeted more carefully to students' individual needs. The possible disadvantage, for which teachers and administrators needed to be alert, was the possibility that the grouping could become inflexible, thus preventing students from moving from one group to another as their

language proficiency grew. A second potential disadvantage was that the groups could be used to structure the student's entire day, thus leading to needless (and potentially harmful) segregation.

The use of team teaching, self-contained classrooms, and pullout instruction. Each of these approaches for organizing bilingual instruction was seen in districts identified as having successfully built bilingual capacity and commitment. In general, it appeared that districts where the greatest effort had gone into development of the bilingual program had adopted the most complex instructional arrangements, requiring the most planning and coordination (e.g., team teaching as one such instructional arrangement).* What these rather complex configurations seemed able to do, however, was to permit the personal teaching strengths of individual teachers to be exploited most fully. For example, a teacher who was particularly effective in bilingual instruction in mathematics was able to assist more children in that skill area than if he or she had been working in a self-contained classroom.

Whatever the instructional design chosen, however, the key factor in ensuring the success of the approach appeared simply to be the fact that a careful analysis had been conducted to match student needs and circumstances to the curricular approach. In schools where a pullout design was being used, for example, it was the result of a considered judgment and not an accident of scheduling. In general, districts that were implementing projects that appeared to be permanent components of the overall instructional program chose their instructional designs and adapted them using a careful process of review, discussion, and revision.

---

*It seems possible that districts with large, stable LEP student populations would be more likely to have developed complex instructional arrangements for two reasons. First, they would have had more experience in providing instruction to LEP students and thus would have refined their instructional techniques over a longer period of time. Second, they would have more student grouping possibilities open to them as a result of their large numbers of LEP students.

Curriculum materials. The districts we saw had each made use of curriculum materials from a variety of sources, including materials prepared by teachers within the district, materials prepared by other school districts (or by other educational institutions such as colleges and universities), and materials prepared by commercial curriculum developers. We were not surprised to see that some curriculum materials had been developed locally, and, indeed, other evidence on successful educational programs suggests that the development of local educational capacity is encouraged through the local development of curriculum materials. The reason for that linkage between curriculum development and educational capacity is that participation in curriculum development often encourages instructional staff to feel that they have invested a part of themselves in the instructional program, and therefore it encourages greater personal commitment to the instructional endeavor -- in this case, bilingual education. According to our interviews, use of materials developed outside the district reflected, in part, the effectiveness of the Bilingual Education Service Centers (BESCs) and the Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Centers (EDACs) in identifying and disseminating bilingual instructional materials materials for local school districts.*

The use of English and the students' home language. All of the districts we visited reported that the development of English proficiency was the primary objective of their respective bilingual programs. Many reported also that in recent years they had shifted their approach to achieving English proficiency by changing their classroom mix of English and the students' native language. Most of the districts that we visited reported that their projects placed greater emphasis on instruction in the English language now than had existed in the initial years of the bilingual project. Our interviews suggest that this shift reflects many factors, including enactment of the 1978 amendments to Title VII emphasizing the goal of English proficiency for all students receiving Title VII

*A list of current BESCs and EDACs is included in the appendix at the end of this guidebook. Although established and funded under authority of the Bilingual Education Act, both types of centers assist school districts without regard to whether the district is a Title VII grantee. A list of current grantees under the Title VII materials development program is also presented in the appendix.

services. In addition, the shift seemed also to reflect other locally based factors, including the following:

- Decisions by the local bilingual program staff that program participants would benefit from increased instruction in and classroom use of English.
- Pressure from outside the program staff (e.g., the district administration, parents, or students) to increase the emphasis on achievement of English proficiency.
- A reduction in program resources (due to increased numbers of students requiring bilingual instructional services or decreased bilingual instructional resources for the same number of LEP students) causing smaller amounts of bilingual resources to be available to each LEP student.

Whatever the cause, it is important to note that the number of districts we visited was very small and so our observation may not be accurate for all districts that have developed stable, effective bilingual programs. Also, the change in emphasis reflected modifications from their first bilingual project schools in the sense that most of the early bilingual projects in the districts we visited had operated very intensive bilingual programs in one or a very few schools, while the other schools of the district provided only rather makeshift services to their LEP students. The initial projects thus tended to be characterized by one or a few model schools whose techniques and successes had been passed on to the other schools of the district. It would not be surprising if the native language focus of the model schools had gradually lessened as the program was expanded to more schools.*

---

* It is possible that this pattern of model bilingual schools is atypical of bilingual projects in general. The existence of model schools may have been the factor leading to the initial Title VII grant, which in turn prompted the rapid development of bilingual capacity in the district. If so, the experiences of the school districts we visited would not necessarily be generalizable to other districts operating bilingual education projects.

Efforts to identify and assist bilingual project participants who are able to move into regular, English-only classrooms. More variation was seen in this aspect of the instructional program than in any other feature. This variation was sometimes attributable, however, to factors other than local instructional approaches. For example, in two districts with otherwise impressive bilingual programs, "exit" procedures for English-proficient bilingual participants were virtually ignored.

- In one district with a fairly rapid decline in total student enrollment, bilingual project staff were reluctant to "graduate" English proficient students. Because the district was laying off teachers in areas (both geographic areas and subject matter areas) where the demand for instructional services had decreased, bilingual teachers wanted to keep their classes full, even if it meant retaining some students who were ready to enter the regular, English-only program.
- In another district, funding was available for bilingual education only through the third grade. Therefore, LEP students enrolled in the bilingual program generally stayed in it as long as services were provided, with teachers giving relatively little consideration to "graduating" bilingual participants into the regular instructional program.

Despite the lack of formal exit procedures in these districts, the bilingual participants who had achieved English proficiency were in fact receiving instruction that was remarkably similar to that received by students in the all-English program but with some extra attention to their lingering English language needs. Thus, although the circumstances were not optimal for mainstreaming formerly LEP students into English-only classrooms, students were nevertheless receiving services consistent with rapid integration into an English language environment.

In other instances, variations in exit procedures among districts were based on differing instructional approaches. This was seen particularly in connection with followup services to former bilingual participants. In general, districts that had large, stable bilingual projects tended to place major emphasis on the provision of special services to students who had left the bilingual program. These services tended to take one of two forms:

- Use of a bilingual instructional specialist (sometimes called a bilingual curriculum consultant) to advise language arts and reading teachers on how to provide supplementary assistance to former participants in the bilingual program, usually through the use of special curriculum materials designed to reinforce English language skills.
- Use of bilingual resource teachers (often funded under the district's compensatory education program) to provide supplementary pullout instruction to students formerly participating in the bilingual program.

Where possible, these followup services were individualized to focus on the particular skill areas in which each former bilingual participant continued to need help.

Special Instructional Features of Bilingual Projects That Have Built Capacity and Commitment

As described here, we found that bilingual projects that had successfully built capacity and commitment in bilingual education tended to demonstrate two consistent features. First, the same expectations and standards were held for all students regardless of whether they were LEP or non-LEP and whether they were enrolled in the bilingual program or not. This uniformity of expectation carried over to the skills that were taught in the bilingual and all-English instructional programs. Second, a consistent bilingual approach was used in the

instruction provided throughout the project. Although the instructional approaches varied in a number of respects, the approach used in each project was implemented in a consistent fashion within the project. Described another way, distinctive instructional strategies for LEP students are a necessary means to attaining the goal of consistent educational performance for all students.

STEPS FOR IMPROVING LOCAL BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES

Based on what we learned from the districts we visited and the research we reviewed, we were able to identify seven steps for improving the design of the bilingual approach in a local project:

1. Identify ways to highlight the similarities between LEP and non-LEP students. By finding and highlighting commonalities between LEP and non-LEP students, it becomes easier to integrate the two groups within the daily life of the school. Common characteristics that should be explored include similar ranges of diversity within each group as well as similar experiences and desires.

2. Modify the overall curriculum, both the bilingual and all-English components, to achieve as much similarity as possible between the two components. Similarities in skills being taught, subject areas, and student work load are particularly important. A review of the district's policies in these areas may suggest that both the bilingual and all-English components need to be modified in order for each to become slightly more like the other.

3. Design and implement screening procedures to identify LEP students. Such procedures should be thorough enough to ensure the identification of all LEP students, while minimizing the testing burden and any stigmatization of students or parents.

4. Design and implement student grouping procedures that, to the extent possible, create instructional groups that are based on shared primary or home languages and similar levels of English proficiency.

The benefit of such groups is that they permit instruction to be targeted more closely to the specific needs of participating students. To be more effective, the grouping should also be sufficiently flexible to permit the reassignment of students to different groups as their language proficiency increases (or decreases) relative to other members of their groups. To permit maximum growth for all students, however, the groups should only be used for limited purposes, such as reading and composition.

5. Adopt organizational approaches to bilingual instruction (e.g., team teaching, self-contained classrooms, or pullout instruction) that exploit the talents and strengths of the instructional staff as much as possible, while also reflecting the numbers and characteristics of LEP students. Small numbers of LEP students often constrict the organizational possibilities available in a project. In instances of larger LEP enrollments, however, it is possible to make better use of bilingual (and non-bilingual) teachers. Our observations suggested the possibility that pooling of teaching resources through team teaching may be an effective way to improve a project's bilingual instructional approach.

6. Where adequate instructional materials are not available, consider using project staff members either to adapt existing materials or to develop new materials to meet local needs. This approach has the benefit of including project staff more directly in the project's design and administration, therefore increasing their sense of "ownership" of the project.

7. Design and implement exit and followup procedures for bilingual program "graduates." The purpose of these procedures is to reinforce skills learned in the bilingual project and to address possible new problems experienced when "graduates" enter the regular curriculum.

The effectiveness of these activities will depend to a large extent on the capabilities of the instructional staff of the bilingual project.

SECTION 4. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Staff development is a key element in any effort to build bilingual capacity and commitment. The reason for its importance is that the district's ability to deliver high quality bilingual services to LEP students on a permanent basis is largely dependent on the numbers and competencies of bilingual education teachers available in the district to provide bilingual services.

The Title VII funding criteria include staff development as a specific element. In the regulations, one measure of "Commitment and Capacity" is the applicant's "plan for continuing teacher training when Federal funds are reduced or no longer available," as stated in §123a.30(g)(2)(i). The justification for continued funding of "Prior Grantees" includes "evidence that the applicant has significantly increased the number of qualified bilingual personnel in the project schools or improved the capability of existing staff," as stated in §123a.30(h)(2)(ii).

Most school districts implementing bilingual programs face two major problems related to staff development -- recruiting qualified bilingual education teachers and improving the bilingual education skills of teachers already providing bilingual instructional services. These problems are made particularly difficult in States that have no special certification (or endorsement) requirements for bilingual education teachers or that have only minimal State requirements.* This section of the guidebook

*At present only 17 States plus the District of Columbia have bilingual certification (or endorsement) requirements. Although this number includes most of the States with large populations of LEP students, it does not include all of them.

discusses the recruitment and inservice training issues separately. Suggested steps for local staff development are presented at the end of the section.

RECRUITMENT OF QUALIFIED BILINGUAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

Previous research studies have indicated that different parts of the country tend to experience very different problems in bilingual teacher recruitment. Surprisingly, however, these variations do not fall into local patterns about which we can generalize easily. Undoubtedly, some of the differences are related locally to salary scales and to specific teaching opportunities. Whatever the context, bilingual teacher recruitment is a serious concern in most areas that are either--

- Experiencing an increase in enrollment of LEP students; or
- Are making a major effort to upgrade the instructional services offered to LEP students.

Districts where both of these events are happening are, not surprisingly, likely to feel the greatest pressure to recruit new bilingual teachers.

Earlier research by the author, supplemented by interviews in districts visited for this study, indicates that many districts are making major efforts to recruit qualified bilingual education teachers. These measures include:

- Placement of advertisements in schools of education and in school districts nationwide, combined with recruiting trips to distant sites believed to have bilingual teachers available;*
- Payment of salary supplements to qualified bilingual education teachers who teach in bilingual education programs;

*We found this to be true for small and medium-sized districts as well as large districts.

- Payment of monetary bonuses to staff members who bring in new, qualified bilingual teachers;
- Assurance of lighter teaching loads and/or increased instructional resources for bilingual teachers; and
- Assurance of protection against involuntary lay-offs.

In some districts, adoption of these incentives may be precluded by local union contracts. Nevertheless, if bilingual education needs are great enough, one or more of these features can sometimes be negotiated into the contract.

Besides recruiting teachers from outside the district, another popular approach to increasing the numbers of qualified bilingual education teachers is the provision of degree oriented training to bilingual teaching aides. In several districts we visited that were in particular need of bilingual teachers, bilingual aides with several years experience in the district could apply for approval to enroll in a local teacher training program to become bilingual education teachers. If approved by the district and accepted by the teacher training institution, participants received a salary stipend from the school district and had all of their tuition and other educational expenses fully paid by the district. Following successful completion of the teaching degree and attainment of certification, these newly qualified bilingual teachers were virtually assured of a teaching position in the bilingual program. In one other district we visited, bilingual education aides could participate in a similar teacher training program, except that they continued to work in bilingual classrooms part-time while participating in the teacher training program.

We were told of other comparable programs in which bilingual training opportunities were available to certified teachers from within the district who needed special training in order to qualify as bilingual teachers. Because most of these teachers already have language abilities in the second language, the special training generally consists of courses in bilingual instructional techniques.

Although decisions to undertake expensive efforts to recruit and train bilingual teachers were generally viewed as major administrative

policy actions, bilingual project directors in the districts we visited in every instance had the authority to recommend to the district administration that such actions be taken. Local bilingual project directors were also able to take other steps that were important for teacher hiring purposes. Often these included the development of friendly relationships with nearby colleges or schools of education. We observed several instances in which school districts actively encouraged postsecondary institutions to increase their capabilities in bilingual teacher training. Then, to make that encouragement more concrete, the school district offered to place student teachers from the college or university in the districts' bilingual education program. Districts said they frequently recruited permanent bilingual teachers from among those bilingual student teachers who had shown impressive classroom teaching abilities during their student teaching assignments. In addition to the student teaching placements, we observed that bilingual project directors often alerted teacher training institutions to bilingual teacher openings in the district and encouraged the institutions to recommend the positions to their best students.

None of the bilingual projects we visited were permitted to make the final, official selection of new bilingual teachers. In every case that we learned about, final decisions on teacher hiring were made at the district level by the director of personnel. Bilingual project directors were, however, given the opportunity to screen or interview teaching candidates (often testing candidates in their proficiency in the second language that they would be using in the bilingual project). This role for the bilingual project director was valuable not only for the screening function itself but also for the opportunity it gave the bilingual director in shaping personnel decisions that affected the program.

Our informal assessment of teacher hiring procedures was that final hiring decisions by the district's central office was overall a fairly desirable local feature. When all the teachers in the system had been hired through the same process, they had more experiences in common than they might have had otherwise. Also, it is probably safe to say

that the newer bilingual teachers in the system shared other characteristics as a result of having been selected for employment through the same personnel office as had hired the district's other teachers. For example, the same priorities were used in hiring bilingual teachers as in hiring other teachers. These included the tendency in some districts to favor teachers with strong academic records, or teachers from the local area, or teachers with certain personality traits. Application of these priorities helped bilingual education teachers to be well integrated into the overall staff. (The issue of staff integration is discussed more fully in the sixth section of the guide.)

INSERVICE TRAINING IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Inservice training in bilingual education represented a major activity in all the bilingual projects we saw but one.* In each instance, local bilingual project directors offered evidence to suggest that inservice training was important in building local bilingual capacity. Training participants varied in their reactions to the training, although most expressed the belief that it had improved their effectiveness as bilingual education teachers. The following discussion summarizes our main observations as to the key aspects of the inservice training activities we saw.

Planning for Inservice Training

In the districts we visited that had the largest and oldest bilingual education programs, plans for inservice training were made on the basis of annual teacher surveys. The surveys, usually conducted in the spring, asked bilingual teachers and aides what topics they would like to see as the focus of inservice training opportunities in the coming year.

---

*The single exception was a district operating under a teacher contract that mandated the provision of degree credits for any participation in inservice training. Because the receipt of credits raised the salaries of training participants, the district administration tended to discourage the provision of inservice training for any purpose, including bilingual education.

The surveys also asked what formats for training were preferred by teachers and aides. On the basis of survey responses, specific plans were developed over the summer and initiated with the opening of school. Survey responses varied across districts, although two districts reported that their surveys had indicated major interest in fundamental learning processes, such as the following:

- In one district, survey respondents said they wanted to know more about how children learn to read. They felt they had learned a number of techniques to assist children in learning to read in a bilingual framework, but they wanted a better understanding of the fundamental steps in acquiring reading skills. With this knowledge, teachers felt that they would be able to fit their bilingual teaching and reinforcement techniques more effectively to the actual learning process that students were experiencing.
- In another district, survey respondents said they wanted to know more about the stages that characterize children's acquisition of a second language. For reasons similar to those in the example above, bilingual teachers (and other teachers) believed they could match instruction to students' needs more effectively if they had a better understanding of second language learning.

In the cases we saw, bilingual project directors believed that bilingual inservice training had been more effective as a result of this early planning step. They attributed the increased success, in part, to the fact that the training activities were now addressing real needs experienced by the teaching staff. A second reason for the success was that the staff felt that they had greater "ownership" of the training process because they had helped determine the focus of the training activities. A third reason mentioned to us was that the use of teacher preferences to guide decisions on training content areas had been accompanied by the consideration of teacher preferences in determining training formats and schedules.

Participation in Inservice Training

We were surprised to see that participation in bilingual inservice training was virtually never limited to bilingual education teachers only. Teachers outside the bilingual project were encouraged to participate in training in order to increase their sensitivity to the learning needs of LEP students and to ways of addressing those needs. In addition, bilingual education teacher aides were also encouraged to participate because of their key role in reinforcing the instructional objectives of the bilingual classroom teacher and their frequent, ongoing contact with many of the LEP students.

Two varying features in the delivery of inservice training for bilingual education teachers were whether teachers were required to participate and whether they were paid for their participation. No patterns were evident in terms of the prevalence of either voluntary or mandatory participation and paid or non-paid participation. In general, districts reported that participation rates were higher when participation was mandatory and when participants were paid for their time. Except for improved attendance, however, no evidence was available to indicate how pay or mandatory participation affected the success of the training activities.

Followup Activities

An important characteristic of training activities was the arrangements that were made to provide later reinforcement of the skills acquired through bilingual inservice training. These followup activities took many forms, including attendance by trainees at followup meetings, classroom observations of participants to determine if they had used their new skills to change activities in their classrooms, and participation by trainees in interviews to determine their response to the training activities. In every case, local bilingual personnel believed the followup activities to be important in reinforcing new skills and also in assessing the effectiveness of the training activity itself.

STEPS FOR IMPROVING THE NUMBER AND SKILLS OF BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

From our observations in school districts and from our knowledge of previous research data, we were able to derive six recommendations for improvement in the number and skills of bilingual instructional staff.

1. If bilingual teacher shortages exist, consider the use of incentives in attracting qualified bilingual education teachers. Possible incentives include salary supplements for bilingual teachers, bonuses for district staff members who bring new bilingual teachers to the district, and extra teaching resources for bilingual teachers.

2. Cultivate ties with local teacher training institutions. Useful relationships with such institutions can be either formal or informal or both. Through informal relationships, capable teacher trainees at schools of education can be encouraged to apply for bilingual teacher openings. Through more formal relationships, teacher trainees can be brought into the district's schools as student teachers. Their capabilities can then be observed and developed to permit the student teachers to be recruited after they complete the program.

3. Consider recruiting new bilingual teachers from within the current teaching staff. This suggestion encompasses both bilingual education aides and teachers in the all-English instructional program. In no instance would this approach be particularly easy, since it would often require a significant amount of special training. But this recruiting approach has the advantage of providing the district with new bilingual teachers whose general abilities are already known to the school district and who already know the local bilingual project.

4. Plan inservice training through systematic surveys of teachers' needs and interests related to bilingual inservice training. To be useful to teachers, bilingual inservice training must be based on actual teacher needs. Examples were given here of the use of periodic staff surveys to assess training needs. Other needs assessment methods

are possible, almost any of which are preferable to basing training decisions on external factors, such as the availability of training materials or of consultants from outside the district. Similarly, the format and schedule for the training must be compatible with the preferences of participants in order to assure their enthusiasm and cooperation.

5. If participation has been low for bilingual inservice training in the past, consider ways of increasing participation. Possible techniques for this include requiring teachers to participate in training, paying them to participate, and opening the training activities to teacher aides and teachers outside the bilingual program.

6. Provide followup activities or services for training participants. Training followup can take many forms, depending on the nature of the training activity and individual needs associated with the training topic. What is important is that the skills and concepts learned in the training be clarified and reinforced after participants have had an opportunity to use what they have learned in the initial training activity.

Bilingual instructional staff are only part of the team that must assist the LEP child to achieve English proficiency and improve his or her academic achievement. The other part of the team is the child's family and community. Their role in building local capacity and commitment is discussed in the next section of the guide.

SECTION 5. PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

The support of parents and community members plays an important role in local efforts to build capacity and commitment for bilingual education. There are two primary reasons why local support from outside the school system is so important. First, parents of bilingual project participants can provide valuable aid to the bilingual instructional program by working with their children at home and reinforcing the skills and concepts which their children are being taught in school. (The value of parent support for bilingual instruction is little different from parent support for other types of instruction in this regard.) Second, because bilingual education is often a new instructional program in school districts, local community support is vital to the long term acceptance of bilingual education as a permanent, ongoing feature of the instructional program. In particular, acceptance of this kind is generally essential for the commitment of local funds to support bilingual education.

This section of the guidebook discusses parent and community involvement in bilingual education from three perspectives: (1) approaches to bringing the parents of bilingual project participants and other community members into closer contact with the schools, (2) approaches to assisting parents in providing home support for bilingual instruction, and (3) approaches to improving parent and community capabilities in project oversight. The section concludes with a set of suggested steps for improving parent and community involvement in bilingual projects.

BRINGING PARENTS AND THE COMMUNITY INTO CLOSER CONTACT WITH THE SCHOOLS

In each of the school districts we visited, we asked principals, project directors, and others how much parent and community participation occurred in the bilingual program. In many instances we were told that

there was relatively little parent participation. It was difficult to stimulate the parents of bilingual participants to participate in their children's instructional program, according to the persons with whom we spoke. They stressed, however, that the parents of bilingual participants were no different from other parents in this respect.

Substantial levels of parent involvement had been achieved only where special efforts had been made to bring parents into closer contact with the schools. One approach for doing this was to employ a person proficient in English and the home language of the LEP students as a home-school liaison. The liaison's duties were to maintain an informal communications link to parents in order to keep them informed on school activities and to suggest ways that they might work with their children to improve their academic performance. In addition, the liaison worked intensively with the parents of students who were having special difficulties in the school, including problems in achievement, behavior, and attendance.

The persons who held the liaison position had varying backgrounds. In one instance the bilingual project's curriculum consultant served as home-school liaison in addition to her curriculum duties. In other instances paraprofessional teacher aides performed liaison functions in addition to their classroom duties. We also saw projects where the liaison person had no other responsibilities except for the home-school linkage activities.

Whatever their other duties, the liaison persons we met all shared certain characteristics. As individuals, they were outgoing, friendly people who could communicate easily with school personnel and with LEP students and their families. In addition, they were closely involved with the bilingual project and understood the project's objectives and activities at each grade level. They were also familiar with other community organizations and agencies outside the public schools and could refer students and families to sources of assistance and support, as needed. In every instance the home-school liaison was a key figure in improving contact and communication between the bilingual project and the community.

In addition to the appointment of bilingual liaison persons, the other approach we saw for improving parent contact was the sponsorship of special activities for parents and other community members in which students themselves were involved. Parents would consistently come into the school, we were told, to watch their children in a performance or to participate in a student-centered activity. (By contrast, parent meetings generally drew few attendees.) Once initial contact was established through the student-centered activity, it was easier to encourage other types of parent involvement and parent-teacher communication as well.

One district reported that it had initiated a theater arts program as part of its bilingual education activities, in order to develop enthusiasm for and family participation in bilingual education. Designed as an extracurricular activity for bilingual project participants, students selected and in some instances wrote plays to be performed by their bilingual project classmates. The plays sometimes used one of the home (non-English) languages of the bilingual students, sometimes used English, and sometimes used a combination of English and other languages. Each play was learned and rehearsed under the guidance of a drama expert who was also fluent in the languages being used. While the students learned the play, parent committees worked with students in preparing costumes and sets. The play was then performed in an evening show for families and the general public, followed by a daytime performance for students.

Although no formal instruction was provided through the theater arts program, the activities benefited bilingual project participants in many ways. In addition to the language skills used in reading and speaking the parts and directions, students in the bilingual project also had the experience of a special school activity in which they were the center of attention. Just as importantly, the plays and the preparation for them brought parents and other community members into the school and provided an opportunity for enjoyable informal contact between parents and staff of the bilingual project and between parents and their children and their children's friends.

In the school district where we observed the bilingual theater arts activities, the project had been initiated in a single junior high school.

Over several years' time, however, bilingual project personnel in other junior highs and several high schools in the district had also started similar programs. To facilitate the transfer of the activity to additional schools, bilingual education staff at the originating school had prepared a manual describing their techniques for making the theater arts activities successful, with special attention to approaches for involving parents.

Although that district's focus was on theater arts, other types of student activities can serve similar purposes. We heard of several instances of special day-long excursions for students, parents, and teachers in bilingual projects, usually preceded by careful planning by the participants and necessary fund-raising. Other similar activities included arts and crafts exhibits and musical performances.

A complementary set of strategies was described in several districts that had made efforts to promote the bilingual program within the larger community. Generally, the purpose of this type of community outreach was to stimulate support for continuation (and sometimes expansion) of the bilingual program. Outreach often took the form of publicizing the success of the program through information on improving test scores, stories about individual teachers and students in the bilingual program, and open houses or fairs in which the success of the program was described. Information was conveyed through press releases and through publicizing the availability of speakers who worked with the bilingual program. Project directors reported to us that these techniques had improved the public's understanding of the program and had dispelled many fears, including suspicions that bilingual education was promoting "separatist" tendencies among LEP students or that there were undesirable political overtones in the bilingual program.

ASSISTING PARENTS IN PROVIDING HOME SUPPORT FOR BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION

In all the districts we visited, parent involvement in bilingual instruction started with the school's communications with parents to seek their permission for their children's participation in the bilingual

project. In several districts, parent approval was followed by a letter in the family's home language explaining the placement that had been determined to be most appropriate for the student. This step was seen as particularly important in districts that individualized the bilingual instructional program according to the precise English and home language abilities of each child.

Two districts we visited had established formal programs for training parents to assist their children. In one district a series of workshops was held every year to teach parents how to assist their children with language development at home. The annual planning for these workshops included extensive outreach activities, using the home-school liaison personnel to inform parents about the workshops and to encourage their attendance. For parents of kindergarten students, a special series of workshops was conducted to provide suggestions to parents on how to improve their children's readiness for reading instruction.

In the second of the two districts, a handbook on student language development had been prepared especially for use by parents. Written in Spanish, which was the only non-English language used in this district, the handbook explained the curriculum approach used in the bilingual education project and related the curriculum to the learning steps required for a child to become proficient in a second language.

IMPROVING PARENT CAPABILITIES IN BILINGUAL PROJECT OVERSIGHT

None of the districts we visited reported significant parent involvement in the governance of the bilingual project, even though all had Title VII parent advisory committees, as required by law. In discussions with members of these parent advisory committees it appeared that they saw their major duties as, first, promoting communication between the schools and other parents and, second, publicizing the successes of the bilingual project within the community. None of the committees seemed to be playing a role in making program decisions on instructional approaches or project administration.

We found, however, that parent and community groups in each district had played major roles in the initial stages of the bilingual education

project. Their actions at these stages had mainly been to persuade the school board that bilingual education was legally required under Federal and, often, State law and that it was educationally beneficial. (See Section 6 for approaches to developing the legal rationale for the local provision of bilingual education.) Through varying combinations of persuasiveness and political muscle, these groups had been successful in getting their districts' first bilingual education activities underway. As bilingual education staff were hired in each district, they had taken over some of the informal lobbying functions formerly implemented by local parent groups. Thus, although we didn't see major efforts by parent groups to influence the current governance of bilingual projects, this absence may simply have been a result of the types of districts we visited -- districts with well-established, stable programs of bilingual education.

Even though the parent groups with whom we met did not play large roles in project governance, they did work seriously at their other functions of communication and public relations. Interestingly, all noted how important it had been for them to learn about the operations of bilingual parent groups in other districts. Some had learned about other groups through attendance at State or regional parent conferences. Others had learned about counterpart groups through friends or other informal contacts. But they all indicated interest in learning the particular strategies used in bilingual parent activities in other districts. They also expressed satisfaction in learning that bilingual parent groups elsewhere often experienced the same types of problems that they themselves experienced.

STEPS FOR IMPROVING PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Based on what we learned in the districts we visited and in the research we reviewed, four steps seem particularly pertinent to local efforts to increase and improve parent and community involvement in bilingual education.

1. Create opportunities for parents to have pleasant, informal contacts with the bilingual project. Their own lack of English proficiency

understandably deters many parents of bilingual participants from learning about their children's school activities. By creating opportunities for easy contact between parents and the school, preferably in the home language of the parents, the bilingual project is likely to improve overall communication between the school and the home. The most promising practices of this type that we saw were the use of home-school liaison personnel and the sponsorship of student-centered performances and activities.

2. Inform the community about the benefits of bilingual education. In many communities, the objectives and methods of bilingual education are seriously misunderstood. These misunderstandings can sometimes threaten the growth or even the survival of the program unless they are corrected.

3. Assist parents in providing support at home for the bilingual instructional program. By learning about the bilingual project's instructional approach to language development, parents can often provide reinforcement for project objectives. Because of the limited school experience of some parents of LEP students, it is frequently useful to provide specific information on activities that parents can undertake with their children to improve their children's intellectual growth.

4. Improve parent capabilities to participate in project oversight activities. The types of assistance parents need in this area depend largely on the role that the Title VII parent advisory committee sees itself playing. Whatever their specific role, however, key assistance almost always will include learning more about the local bilingual education project and learning about the activities of Title VII parent groups in other districts.

The instructional program, staffing, and parent and community involvement all depend on the effectiveness of local administration and funding. Those topics are discussed in the next section of the guide.

SECTION 6. ADMINISTRATION AND FUNDING

Decisions about administration and funding of a local bilingual project must be made with an understanding of the end product envisioned through the Title VII capacity and commitment building requirements. If bilingual capacity and commitment have been built in a district, the bilingual program will be a permanent part of the district's curriculum, administered within its normal administrative framework and funded on an ongoing basis from State and local resources. With that arrangement as the goal, Title VII assistance can be seen as one of several tools for attaining the goal.*

The three preceding sections of this guidebook have discussed issues in the educational design and content of a local bilingual project. This section describes approaches to project administration and funding that can facilitate growth in bilingual capacity and commitment. These approaches are discussed in the contexts of (1) legal rationales for creating permanent bilingual capacity, (2) funding strategies to encourage the commitment of regular State and local financial resources for bilingual education, and (3) organizational techniques for improving bilingual capacity.

THE LEGAL RATIONALE FOR CREATING PERMANENT BILINGUAL CAPACITY

School districts undertake bilingual education for one of two principal reasons. First, they believe bilingual instruction is the educationally

---

*The goal may not be fully attainable in some districts due to local circumstances. The provisions of Title VII implicitly acknowledge that possibility. Nevertheless, even in those districts that are unlikely to build permanent bilingual capacity in the short term, movement towards the goal is possible and desirable.

sound approach to improving the achievement of LEP students, and, second, they believe the law requires them to provide bilingual education to LEP students. While the weight given to educational versus legal rationales will vary from district to district, persuading economy-minded school boards to commit the funds under their control to bilingual education almost always requires a reminder of the requirements of the law.

In the districts we visited, different laws served as the impetus for the commitment of locally controlled resources. Several States, including some we visited, have State laws requiring bilingual education for certain LEP students.* Districts in other States used as a legal mandate the provisions of Federal law, as expressed in Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and interpreted by the Supreme Court in 1974 in Lau v. Nichols. Although bilingual education is not explicitly required by either Title VI or the Lau decision, Federal civil rights enforcement activities have been premised on the notion that bilingual education is generally the most desirable method for implementing the requirements of Title VI and Lau.

This guidebook is not intended to interpret or summarize the requirements imposed on school districts by Federal or State law regarding bilingual education. It is accurate to say, however, that school districts consistently and effectively use the requirements of Federal and State law as a prime rationale for the introduction and expansion of programs of bilingual education. For example, a budget-minded school board that finds itself vetoing educational improvement plans for other components of the district's instructional program may find it difficult to justify approval for improvements involving bilingual education. Legal considerations may,

---

*According to a State survey taken in 1980 by the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 12 States currently have laws requiring the provision of bilingual education to LEP students in districts where at least a minimum number of LEP students are enrolled (Guide to State Education Agencies, National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education: Rosslyn, Va., 1980). The 12 States include many of the States with high enrollments of LEP students.

however, make it possible for the board to authorize funding of bilingual improvement plans in the face of cutbacks elsewhere.

BILINGUAL FUNDING STRATEGIES THAT ENCOURAGE THE COMMITMENT OF STATE AND LOCAL RESOURCES

Encouraging the commitment of regular State and local funds for bilingual education is probably the most important and the most difficult challenge in establishing local bilingual capacity. As indicated in the second section of this guide, Title VII funds are intended primarily to continue the development of a bilingual education project that has already been initiated with local resources. The availability of State and local dollars for bilingual education is complicated by the quite varied circumstances affecting many districts. Three particularly important circumstances are as follows:

- The availability of special State funds for bilingual services to LEP children.
  The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education reported that in 1980 there were 21 States that provided special State funds for bilingual education. (Some but not all of the States with laws mandating bilingual education also provided State funds for implementing programs of bilingual education.) Although requirements for local funding eligibility vary among States, it is obvious that the availability of State bilingual funds is an important asset for a district initiating or expanding its bilingual program.
- Enrollment trends within the school district.
  In a district where total enrollment is declining, it is often difficult to justify the hiring of new, specially trained teachers, such as bilingual education teachers. Even when the LEP student enrollment is growing within such a district, the understandable tendency is to assign regular teachers (who might otherwise be subject to lay-offs) to classrooms for LEP students. This

circumstance can hurt the development of a bilingual project.

- Overall fiscal health of the district.
  If the tax base or taxing ability of a municipality or school district is shrinking, it becomes harder to initiate or expand any special program within the district. Often, only the highest priority activities will be allowed to continue in these circumstances.

Within the framework created by local circumstances, there are nevertheless several strategies available for building fiscal capacity for bilingual education. The first and most popular strategy is a simple one -- hire bilingual personnel on whatever "soft" money is available; then as regular personnel vacancies open up in the district, convert each of the outside-funded positions to a regular, locally-funded bilingual position. The "soft" funds may come from Federal or State sources or from a one-time-only appropriation by the school board or comparable authority. Obviously, it will not be an easy task to convert new positions into permanent bilingual positions, due to competition from other local educational projects. But this strategy has been successful in many districts where the school board and district administration were convinced that bilingual education was a necessary and potentially successful undertaking.

In many instances, this funding strategy works because the district hierarchy sees the bilingual project as an important, well-integrated component of the overall instructional program. Techniques for achieving this kind of organizational integration are described below.

ORGANIZATIONAL TECHNIQUES FOR INCREASING BILINGUAL CAPACITY AND COMMITMENT

In every district we visited, the bilingual education project was organizationally well-integrated into the overall school program. This level of integration was apparent in all aspects of the bilingual project from the physical layout of bilingual classrooms to the location of bilingual education within the district's administrative hierarchy.

The Geography of Bilingual Education

The most visible feature of integration was the placement of bilingual classrooms within schools. In every instance we saw, bilingual classrooms were distributed throughout school buildings. They were never off in a wing to themselves or otherwise grouped together. (Almost every project reported that they had started out as a bilingual-only enclave before changing to a more dispersed physical arrangement.) This layout appeared to have important benefits in terms of encouraging greater interaction among bilingual participants and other students. It also encouraged informal communication between bilingual program teachers and other teachers.

District Organizational Relationships

An important organizational feature we observed was the relationship of the bilingual project to the district hierarchy. In the districts we visited, the bilingual project was organizationally under the direction of the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction (or, in one instance, the Assistant Superintendent for Basic Skills). Because this assistant superintendent had as his or her goal the smooth integration of all special and regular instructional programs, the bilingual project was often asked to adjust to accommodate districtwide instructional priorities. This demand for a certain amount of flexibility by the bilingual project could possibly be detrimental in situations where the assistant superintendent was not sympathetic to bilingual education. In the cases we saw where the district was fundamentally supportive of bilingual education, however, the ability of the project to accommodate districtwide priorities appeared to have strengthened the bilingual project overall. An example of such a priority would be an increased emphasis on the development of reading comprehension skills or increased attention to instruction in composition. The bilingual project was expected to to implement these priorities according to the same schedules and ground rules as the other components of the instructional program. By achieving those districtwide goals, the bilingual project increased its stature and prestige within the school system.

Although bilingual education appeared strengthened by the ability to work cooperatively under an Assistant Superintendent for Instruction or Basic Skills, we did not see bilingual education subsumed under any other instructional area, such as language arts or foreign languages. In districts where bilingual education is a recent initiative, that arrangement may sometimes be tried temporarily. Such an approach is unlikely to be successful, however, due to the low priority on bilingual education that usually results. In projects where bilingual education has created its own status and acceptance, the program benefits significantly from standing as an organizational equal to other subject areas.

In districts we visited that had large bilingual projects that have been in place for several years, project personnel made particular efforts to work closely with principals and, where applicable, regional superintendents.* The focus of this cooperation was essentially to make the principal or regional superintendent feel comfortable with the bilingual project -- to feel that the project and its goals and methods were consistent with the overall educational program of their respective schools and regions. One major way that the bilingual project worked at achieving this cooperative relationship was by arranging for the bilingual project to assist in or take over many of the bilingual-related responsibilities that would otherwise fall on the principal or regional superintendent. For example, bilingual project personnel provided extensive information and assistance to the principal and/or regional superintendent on the following topics:

- Staff development, including both recruitment and inservice training;
- Curriculum selection and the development of new curricular materials; and
- Assessment of student achievement and project effectiveness.

*The two large, urban districts we visited had regional superintendents who administered the educational affairs of geographic sectors of the school districts. In other urban districts, comparable positions are sometimes known as assistant or deputy superintendencies. These positions generally only exist in school districts with very large enrollments.

Information provided on these topics was often designed to meet several different objectives:

- In instances, where the principal or regional superintendent knew little about bilingual education, information was designed to provide background on bilingual goals and methods, often using analogies from the district's all-English program.
- Emphasis was often given to the linkages and exchanges between the bilingual and all-English programs.
- Where possible, information was given in the form of a decision to be made by the principal or regional superintendent. By making a choice between two or more carefully explained alternatives, the principal or regional superintendent was given an opportunity to take an important hand in administering the project, while needing to commit relatively little of his or her time.

Several principals in schools with stable, institutionalized bilingual projects told us that they appreciated the fact that the project seemed to "run all by itself," with little routine attention required. In fact, we found that these projects operated successfully because of skillful managerial and instructional guidance from the bilingual project staff, an arrangement that made the principal's life considerably easier than it would otherwise have been. Because the bilingual project is generally a special project involving some but not all of the students in a school, there is often the possibility that tension will exist between the school principal and the bilingual project director. The bilingual director in most districts exerts considerable instructional leadership over the school's bilingual education activities. In the end, however, the principal bears the final responsibility for the educational activities of the school. In the districts we visited, the bilingual project directors seemed comfortable with yielding clear leadership to the building principals, while trying forcefully to educate the principals about bilingual education objectives and techniques.

One interesting anecdote on this topic is worth repeating: In a large urban district we visited, the local bilingual project director had wanted to establish a cooperative relationship with a particular regional superintendent. That individual had not had much exposure to bilingual education previously, but when he learned about it he asked for an Italian bilingual program to be established in several of the schools of his region. Though there were other competing bilingual priorities in the district, the bilingual staff decided to work with the regional superintendent to initiate the Italian program, hoping that that cooperation would help secure his support for other bilingual activities. In fact, after the Italian program was underway, this regional superintendent became a good advocate for bilingual education within the district hierarchy. Later, the investment proved particularly valuable when the regional superintendent was appointed deputy superintendent of the entire school system and continued his support for the program from a more senior level in the district's organizational structure.

The Role of the Bilingual Project Director

One person who may find his role diminished in a district that has developed bilingual capacity and commitment is the bilingual project director. Although bilingual leadership will continue to be needed in large, stable bilingual projects, it may well require a different kind of leader than the one who shepherded the early growth of the project. In many of the districts we visited, it appeared that the initial bilingual director had been successful because of his or her abilities to persuade the school board and community that bilingual education was a good way of helping LEP children to participate fully in the district's educational program. The project director had also been able to assemble teachers, aides, and materials to get the program off the ground. To the extent that the project director was successful, however, the skills needed to accomplish those early tasks became gradually less important to the bilingual project.

What became valuable instead as the project developed were insights into various curricular approaches to bilingual education. In

well-established bilingual projects, bilingual directors need to be able to analyze curricular alternatives and to train teachers and aides in particular instructional approaches. In some instances the initial bilingual director can successfully acquire the skills needed to play the later role, but in other cases the first bilingual director may simply be edged out of a leadership position as his or her skills become less and less relevant to the changing needs of the bilingual project.

STEPS FOR IMPROVING CAPACITY TO PROVIDE EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION AND FUNDING FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Based on observations in six school districts and on a review of research in this area, several guidelines can be suggested for local school districts interested in improving their capacity and commitment for effective administration and funding of bilingual education.

1. Determine what your district's legal responsibilities are in the area of bilingual education and make certain those responsibilities are clearly communicated to the school board and the public. Varying Federal and State laws are relevant to bilingual education depending on the district's particular circumstances. In many instances these requirements can provide a useful impetus to districts considering initiation or expansion of a bilingual education program.

2. Use grant funds (from Title VII or other sources) for activities that can gradually be transferred to local funding sources. Given the generally temporary nature of Title VII funds and other Federal and State categorical grant funds, it is important that careful long term planning precede the allocation of grant funds. Before using the grant funds, answers must be found to questions such as: How will this money be used to increase permanent bilingual capacity? What permanent funding sources will replace these temporary funds after the project grant period?

3. Design the project's organization to increase the involvement and commitment of the rest of the school district. This requirement means that the school district's management structure (including building

principals) must be sufficiently involved in the bilingual project to feel a sense of "ownership" and integration with the project. This objective must be balanced, however, against the need for project integrity, in order to retain the unique elements and targeting of the bilingual project.

4. Be prepared for changes in the roles of bilingual education staff. Well-established bilingual programs that have achieved capacity and commitment often require different types of leaders than do bilingual projects that are just getting started. Refinements in curriculum often replace basic program development as project priorities. Bilingual education leaders must be prepared to adapt to those changes as their programs grow and win acceptance within the school system and community.

SECTION 7. DEMONSTRATING BILINGUAL CAPACITY AND COMMITMENT IN A TITLE VII APPLICATION

This section of the guidebook suggests ways to present the district's capacity building accomplishments in an application for a Title VII grant. It also explains how Title VII grant applications are reviewed by the office that administers this Federal program.

DESCRIBING BILINGUAL CAPACITY AND COMMITMENT IN A TITLE VII APPLICATION

In addition to designing and implementing steps to develop capacity and commitment, it is also important to describe those steps clearly and succinctly in a Title VII grant application, if Title VII funding is being sought. Because of the variety of possible approaches and circumstances relevant to any particular school district, the Title VII application format permits the applicant to describe its efforts in capacity and commitment building in virtually any way that is appropriate for the applicant within the constraints set by the funding criteria.

The instructions for the Title VII Basic Grants application for new projects, as issued by OBEMLA, state specifically:

> A brief narrative description of the proposed project is required. The applicant should address the appropriate funding criteria in the order that they are listed in the program regulations. Each selection criterion must be addressed in the program narrative. The Secretary uses only the selection criteria in the regulations for review of applications. (Emphasis present in the original.)

Thus, the application narrative should be organized according to the funding criteria stated in the regulations.

Because of the number of applications that must be reviewed in a short space of time, OBEMLA reviewers consistently recognize and appreciate project descriptions that are concise and clearly written. As a practical matter, this means that a project description that demonstrates the following characteristics is most likely to communicate effectively to an OBEMLA reviewer:

1. Careful and logical organization

Because the reviewer must determine the extent to which the project description fulfills each of the funding criteria, it is in the applicant's interest to organize the project description so that the parts which correspond to each criterion can be easily identified, as indicated in the quotation cited above. It also makes the description easier to read if each topic under each criterion is separately and explicitly addressed.

2. Specificity

Readers are not looking for broad philosophical statements about bilingual education in project applications nor are they looking for descriptions of the general needs of LEP students. What they do want to see is an explicit description of the students to be served by the project, their particular instructional needs, and the needs that will be addressed by the proposed project; readers also need to see the precise steps that will be taken to address those needs. For districts requesting multi-year grants, detailed information should be provided to indicate how the participants, staff, and activities are expected to change over the multi-year period. Where appropriate, numerical indications of needs and instructional plans are useful. However, statistics that do not relate directly to the proposed project will not strengthen the application. Similarly, specific descriptions of instructional materials and approaches are often useful in understanding more about the proposed project. Also, research works which support the approach proposed in the application may be useful in understanding the premises underlying the project's design. In general, however, research citations on general educational topics are not helpful to the panelists.

3. Minimum of jargon

Project descriptions should be written in direct, clear language. Because various definitions can be applied to many words and phrases in educational jargon, applicants are encouraged to avoid such terms. The example below illustrates this suggestion:

- Clear -- "Improvements in the English-language reading skills of participating students will be sought through..."

- Not so clear -- "Gains on measures of student L2 decoding and comprehension will be maximized by..."

In some instances, educational terminology cannot be avoided. For example, any explanation of student testing procedures is likely to require a discussion of test characteristics, analysis of achievement scores, and the like. Technical terminology may also be needed to underscore the rationale for a particular instructional approach or a particular testing instrument or measure. Such terminology should not be used, however, as a substitute for a thorough description of what is being proposed in the application.

PROCEDURES FOR FEDERAL REVIEW OF CAPACITY AND COMMITMENT AS DESCRIBED IN A TITLE VII APPLICATION

It is often easier to prepare a written description of activities if the writer knows the context in which the description will be read and the specific audience for the written work. In the case of Title VII applications, Federal reviews are conducted in accordance with the procedures described in the Title VII regulations and the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR). Based on the requirements established by those two sets of regulations, staff in OBEMLA have developed a series of administrative procedures which that office uses to review Title VII grant applications.

The procedures for Basic Grant applications can be summarized as follows:

- In March or April of each year a Notice of Closing Date is published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. It describes where to request an application form, when the application is due to ED, where to mail the application, and other matters. In addition, the Notice of Closing Date has also often indicated the total amount of funds available for new and continuation grants in each Title VII grant category (e.g., Basic Grants, Demonstration Projects, etc.), along with the total number of grants expected to be made in each category and the estimated average amount of each grant.
- After applications are submitted to ED, they are logged in on the day they are received by the ED Application Control Center.
- The Application Control Center then turns applications over to OBEMLA, where they are immediately logged in again.
- Next, each application is screened by a Title VII program officer to determine if all of the necessary elements of the application are in place (e.g., required budget components, signatures, etc.). Any applicant that has omitted an important part of the application is then given the opportunity to supply that missing element.
- Each complete application and appropriate rating forms are then put into a folder. In this process, any appendixes or unrequired attachments to the application are removed from the application. Also, any fancy covers to the application are removed.
- Each application is then ready for quality review by members of a review panel.

Three panelists read the narrative portions of each Basic Project application. The panelists are individuals who are chosen to serve on the review panels because of their expertise in bilingual education. In selecting panelists, efforts are made to recruit experts with a variety

of skills relevant to bilingual education. Effort is also made to attain variety among the panelists in terms of geographical background and other personal characteristics. To the extent possible, applications are assigned to panelists who have special expertise in the area proposed as the main focus of the particular bilingual project (e.g., curriculum development, teacher training, etc.). However, panelists are not assigned any applications from school districts with which they have had any personal involvement.

After receiving an application, each panelist is given one to two hours to read and evaluate it. Panelists use the selection criteria and scoring methods described in the Title VII regulations. The panel ratings of the three panelists are added to determine the raw score for each application.*

The raw score of the application is then used to rank order all applications within each grant category. Applications are selected to receive grants in rank order, except that applications are selected for funding out of rank order as necessary to achieve two statutory requirements, described in Section 721(b)(4) of the Act and quoted here:

> In the consideration of initial applications from local educational agencies to carry out programs of bilingual education under [the Basic Grant provisions], the Secretary shall give priority to applications from local educational agencies which are located in various geographical regions of the Nation and which propose to assist children of limited English proficiency who have historically been underserved by programs of bilingual education...

OBEMLA program officers recommend to the OBEMLA Director any applications that should be moved up in ranking, in compliance with this provision.

---

*One component of the raw score is the application's score under the "Need" criterion, which is determined on the basis of numbers of students to be served who have never received Title VII services and numbers of students to be served who come from low income families. (See §123a.30(a) of the Title VII regulations.) Panelists do not compute the "need" score themselves.

On the basis of this process, applicants are selected to receive Basic Grant awards. Following the selection process, budget negotiations are conducted to determine the final amount of the grant.

DECIDING ON THE CAPACITY AND COMMITMENT BUILDING ACTIVITIES TO BE INCLUDED IN THE APPLICATION

In preparing the narrative description of the proposed Title VII project, it is important to describe both the bilingual capacity and commitment that the district has already built and also the new capacity and commitment building efforts that will be made possible through the Title VII grant. To the extent possible, the description of these efforts should highlight the continuity of purpose and actions that connect the proposed Title VII project with actions that have already been taken in the district. For example, if bilingual staff development has always been the primary need in the district and if Title VII funds are required to continue work in that area, the application should be explicit and forthright in stating that fact. OBEMLA reviewers will not necessarily fault the application for proposing to continue work on a problem of long standing. What is important, however, is that proposed activities build on previous experiences and accomplishments. It would be much less desirable to repeat the same activities year after year than to expand and extend activities over a multi-year period (e.g., inservice training expanded to address additional topics in bilingual education and extended into new schools and grades).

* * *

Not all of the ideas and recommendations in this guide will be relevant in every school system. At least one or two suggestions may work in your district, however. Experiences described here may prompt you to think of similar approaches that would help your district to build capacity and commitment in bilingual education. If so, our efforts in preparing this guidebook will have been fruitful.

The guidebook has been intended primarily to help school districts get started in their development of bilingual capacity and commitment. For further information on any of the topics discussed here, contact the Bilingual Education Service Center serving your region.

APPENDIX

TITLE VII - FUNDED PROVIDERS OF SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO BILINGUAL PROJECTS

Title VII Bilingual Education Service Centers

1981-82

1. Providence School Department
   600 Mt. Pleasant
   Providence, RI 02908

   Adeline Becker

   (401) 456-8280

   Serving Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine.

2. Georgetown University School of Languages and Linguistics
   37th & D Streets, N.W.
   Washington, D.C. 20057

   Ramon Santiago

   (202) 625-3540

   Serving New York State, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Washington, D.C., Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia.

3. Hunter College
   695 Park Avenue
   New York, NY 10021

   Aristedes Cruz

   (212) 481-5070

   Serving New York City and Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

4. Florida International School of Education
   Bay Vista AC
   I 383A
   North Miami, FL 33183

   Luis Martinaz

   (305) 552-2494

   Serving Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina.

5. University of Southwestern Louisiana
East University Avenue
Lafayette, LA 70504

Robert Fontenot

(318) 264-0991

Serving Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas and Tennessee.

6. Community Consolidated School District #15
Northwest Educational Cooperative
500 South Dwyer Avenue
Arlington Heights, IL 60005

Anne M. Keifer

(312) 870-4100

Serving Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, Illinois, Iowa, and Missouri

7. University of Colorado
Campus Box B-191
Boulder, CO 50309

Steve de Castillo

(303) 492-5416

Serving Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana.

8. Region XIII Education Service Center
7703 North Lamar Blvd.
Austin, TX 78752

Jesus Garcia

(512) 458-9131

Serving Oklahoma and Texas ESC Regions V-XIV, XVI, and XVII.

9. Intercultural Development Resource Association
5835 Callaglian Road
Suite 350
San Antonio, TX 73228

Abe Lardo Villareal

(512) 684-8180

Serving Texas (San Antonio and The Valley)

10. Education Service Center Region I
1900 West Schunoir
Edinburg, TX 78539

Tomas Thomas

(512) 383-5611

Serving ESC Region I and II (Edinburg and University of Kingsville).

11. National Institute of Multicultural Education
3010 Monte Vista
Northeast Suite 203
Albuquerque, NM 87106

Tomas Villareal

(505) 262-1721

Serving New Mexico and ESC Region XIX.

12. San Diego State College of Education
5300 Campanile Drive
San Diego, CA 92634

Raphael Fernandez

(714) 265-5193

Serving Arizona, Nevada, and California (San Diego, Imperial, Riverside, Bernadino, Kern, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara Counties).

13. California State - Fullerton
P. O. Box 307
Fullerton, CA 92634

Anthony Vega

(714) 773-3994

Serving California (Los Angeles, Ventura, and Orange Counties).

14. California State - Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, CA

Steven Arvizu

(916) 454-6236

Serving California, Nevada, Oregon, Northern Mariana Islands, Trust Territories of the Pacific, Guam, American Samoa, and Hawaii.

15. Bay Area Bilingual Educational League
2168 Shattuck Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94704

Robert Cruz

(415) 549-1820

Serving California.

16. University of Washington College of Education
122 Miller Hall
DQ - 12
Seattle, WA 98195

Juan Juarez

(206) 543-4203

Serving Washington, Idaho, Alaska, and Oregon.

17. Instituto Internacional de la Americas World University
Barbosa Avenue
Esquina Guayama Street
Hato Rev, PR 00917

(809) 782-2990

Serving Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

18. University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, MN 87131

Ignacio Cordova

(505) 277-5961

Serving Navajo (Colorado and Utah) and other Native American (New Mexico, and Oklahoma).

19. Arizona State University
Center for Indian Education
302 Farmer
Tempe, AZ 85281

Milo Kalectica

(602) 965-5688

Serving Arizona, Utah, Nevada (all Native American projects, except Navajo, in these areas).

Title VII Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Centers

1981-82

1. Lesley College
   49 Washington Avenue
   Cambridge, MA 02140

   Paul Liberty

   (617) 492-0505

   Serving ED Regions I, II, III, and IV (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, District of Columbia, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee).

2. Dallas Independent School District
   3700 Ross Avenue
   Dallas, TX 75204

   Juan Solis

   (214) 742-5991

   Serving ED Regions V, VI, VII, and VIII (Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming).

3. California State University - Los Angeles Foundation
   5151 State University Drive
   Los Angeles, CA 90032

   Charles Leyba

   (213) 244-3676

   Serving ED Regions IX and X (Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Guam, Trust Territory of the Pacific, American Samoa, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington).

Title VII Materials Development Projects

1981-82

1. Asian American Bilingual Center
   Berkeley Unified School District
   1414 Walnut Street, Room 9
   Berkeley, CA 94709

   Linda Wing

   (415) 848-3199

   Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Pilipino

2. National Asian Center for Bilingual Education
   11729 Gateway Boulevard
   Los Angeles, CA 90064

   Mieko S. Han

   (213) 474-7173

   Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Laotian

3. Southeast Curricula Development Center
   1410 N.E. Second Avenue
   Miami, FL 33132

   Maria Gonzalez

   (305) 350-3241

   Haitian Creole

4. Social Studies Materials Development Center for Greek-Speaking Children
   Florida State University
   302 Education Building
   Department of Curriculum & Instruction
   Tallahasee, FL 32306

   Byron G. Massialas

   (904) 644-5038

   Greek (Extension Expires 3/31/82)

5. Pacific Area Language Materials Development Center
University of Hawaii
2424 Maile Way
Honolulu, HI 96822

Robert Gibson

(808) 948-6842

Carolinian, Chamorro, Illokano, Korean, Marshallese, Palauan, Samoan, Trukese, Ulithian, Woleian, Yapese

6. Arabic Materials Development Center
611 Church Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Frederick W. Bertolaet

(313) 763-9946

Arabic

7. Asian Bilingual Curriculum Development Center
Seton Hall University
Parrish House, 162 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, NJ 07079

Byounghye Chang

(201) 761-9447, 9456

Chinese, Japanese, Korean

8. Native American Materials Development Center
407 Rio Grnade Boulevard, N.W.
Albuquerque, MN 87104

Jay Degroat

(505) 242-5222

Navajo (Extension Expires 3/31/82)

9. National Center for Materials and Curriculum Development
University of Iowa
N. 310 Oakdale Campus
Oakdale, IA 52319

Lawrence M. Stolurow/Alan B. Henkin

(319) 353-5400

Cambodian, Laotian, Vietnamese

10. National Materials Development Center for French and Creole
168 South River Road
Bedford, NH 03102

Norman Dube'

(603) 668-7198

French

11. Portuguese Materials Development Project
Center for Portuguese and Bilingual Studies
Brown University, Box O
Providence, RI 02912

Joao P. Botelho

(401) 863-2507

Portuguese

12. National Center for the Development of Bilingual Curriculum
Dallas Independent School District
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75204

Juan D. Solis

(214) 742-5991

Spanish