ED 319 245   FL 018 537

AUTHOR   Yap, Kim O.; And Others
TITLE   Making a Difference for the Bilingual Child: How One
              District Achieved its Goals.
PUB DATE   Apr 90
NOTE   28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
              American Educational Research Association (Boston,
              MA, April 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE   Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference
              Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Acculturation; Admission Criteria; Behavioral
              Objectives; *Bilingual Education Programs;
              Communication Skills; Daily Living Skills;
              Educational Objectives; Educational Strategies;
              Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second
              Language); *Immigrants; *Limited English Speaking;
              Program Descriptions; Program Design; Program
              Implementation; Skill Development; Staff Development;
              Student Characteristics; Teacher Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS   *Honolulu School District HI

ABSTRACT
              The Students of Limited English Proficiency (SLEP)
program of the Honolulu School District (Hawaii) is designed to help
the large number of limited-English-speaking immigrants adjust to the
American culture in the Hawaiian setting by acquiring basic
communication skills for regular classroom participation and school
activities. The program is implemented in 54 schools with over 60
permanent teachers, 10 educational assistants, and over 80 part-time
teachers. Students are selected for participation and exit based on
language dominance and proficiency ratings. Program components
include: (1) a whole language approach emphasizing communication
skills; (2) a comprehensive database containing achievement status
and diagnostic data, norm-referenced, criterion-referenced, and
non-test; (3) a program implementation checklist and quality control
system; (4) an extensive staff development program; and (5) a
survival skills segment for newly-arrived immigrants. Specific
learner objectives include: making significant gains in oral
language, reading, language arts, and mathematics; adjusting to
school and community, and exiting the program at the 25th percentile
or higher on a standardized achievement test. Evaluation of the
program began only in 1985, with an extensive effort to develop a
longitudinal database for student tracking, to initiate a quality
monitoring process, and to implement systematic program evaluation.
(MSE)

MAKING A DIFFERENCE FOR THE BILINGUAL CHILD: HOW ONE DISTRICT ACHIEVED ITS GOALS

Kim O. Yap
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

Donald Enoki and Patricia Ishitani
Honolulu School District

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Making a Difference for the Bilingual Child: How One District Achieved its Goals

The SLEP Program

Located In the "melting pot of the Pacific," the Hawaii school system serves a population of varied ethnic, cultural and linguistic backgrounds. A large percentage of its 200,000 students are either recent immigrants or second-generation children of non-English speaking parents. The Honolulu School District is the largest of seven school districts In Hawaii. It has 55 public schools with an enrollment of over 35,000, including a sizeable number of students whose dominant language Is not English. Their limitation In the use of English prevents these students from functioning effectively In the regular classroom. The Students of Limited English Proficiency (SLEP) Program is designed to overcome this language barrier. The overall objective of the program Is to help these students to adjust to the American culture In the Hawaiian setting. The program enables them to acquire basic communication skills so that they can participate In the regular classroom Instruction and school activities appropriate for their age and grade level.

The program Is implemented In 54 schools in the district with an annual enrollment of approximately 4,000 In grades K - 12. Program staff Include over 60 permanent teachers, 10 educational assistants, and over 80 part-time temporary teachers. Administrative and Instructional leadership Is provided by a district educational specialist and two resource teachers at the district level. Program funding Is approximately $2.2 million a year.

Students are selected for program participation on the basis of language dominance ratings and performance on standardized norm-referenced tests. Generally, low language dominance ratings and low performance (I.e., below the 25th percentile) on norm-referenced tests qualify a student for program participation. Students exit the program when they achieve a high language dominance rating and score at the 25th percentile or above on norm-referenced tests In reading, language and mathematics.

The program consists of a well-Integrated set of essential components:

o   The whole language approach Is adopted to emphasize language development and a communication skills rather than the mechanics of reading.

o   A comprehensive database system Is established to provide information on achievement status and diagnostic data to the teaching staff. The system contains both norm-referenced and criterion-referenced test and non-test data.

o   A high fidelity program Implementation Is assured through the use of a program Implementation checklist (which Is administered to program staff at least twice a year) and quality monitoring system for Identifying potential problems and developing solutions.

1

o   An extensive staff development program component provides inservice training to program staff in the relevant content areas (e.g., bilingual and bicultural education) and pedagogical issues (e.g., teaching English as a second language). Parents of program students also attend the inservice training when appropriate.

o   A survival skills component provides training in cultural and community survival skills to enable program students who are newly-arrived immigrants to effectively adjust to their new environment.

Specific learner objectives include the following:

1.   Students will make significant gains in oral language as measured by the Basic Inventory of Natural Language (BINL)

2.   Students will make significant gains in reading, language arts and mathematics as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT).

3.   Students will be able to adjust to the school and community as indicated by the Student Record Profile (SRP).

4.   Students will be able to exit the program by scoring at the 25th percentile or higher on the MAT reading, language arts and mathematics subtests.

Although the SLEP Program has been in existence for almost two decades, efforts to assess program impact had been sporadic until more recent years. Specifically, in 1985 the district embarked on an extensive effort to (a) develop a longitudinal database to track program implementation and its impact on student performance, (b) initiate a quality monitoring process to provide data-based technical assistance for program improvement, and (c) implement a systematic program evaluation process to document student performance and provide suggestions for program improvement. These critically important program processes are described below.

4

The Longitudinal Database

The development of a program database was guided by considerations relating to program implementation, student performance, as well as school, family and community factors.

Program Implementation

Program impact is often assessed without first ascertaining whether a program has been put in place (Hall & Loucks, 1977). Such assessments are potentially useless to decisionmakers. Data on program implementation are particularly important in bilingual education projects because these projects face unique difficulties in program implementation (Bissell, 1979). Information on degree of implementation allows us to make a more valid interpretation of project outcomes.

In addition, descriptive data on student characteristics, types of services provided, length of student participation and criteria for determining language proficiency are useful in project management. Program implementation information can also help identify key factors which influence the success of the project.

Student Performance

The ultimate beneficiaries of any bilingual program are the participating students. Student performance is a critical element of an assessment of program impact. An assessment of student performance should include affective and attitudinal changes as well as cognitive skills.

School, Family and Community Factors

Other essential elements of a bilingual program pertain to the influence of school, family and community factors on program outcomes. School staff, parents and community members vary in their attitudes toward particular languages, in their support of bilingual education, and in their willingness to promote the use of languages other than English in the classroom (Bissell, 1979). It is important that an assessment of program impact takes into account the roles of parents, the community at large and the institutional context in which the program operates.

3

Data Sources

Program Implementation

To obtain data on program implementation, a program implementation checklist was created. This instrument assesses the degree to which essential program elements are implemented in each participating school. The checklist is administered by district staff who have an intimate knowledge of program operations. The staff are encouraged to use multiple methods (e.g., interview, review of documents, onsite observations) to gather evidence of high (or low) fidelity program implementation. The instrument consists of 24 items relating to the following aspects of program operations:

- o Instructional approach

- o Diagnosis

- o Student grouping

- o Monitoring

- o Staff development

- o Parent involvement

Each item is rated a on three-point scale: not implemented, partially implemented or fully implemented.

Student Performance

The assessment of student achievement includes both norm- and criterion-referenced measures. In the norm-referenced mode, a pretest-posttest design is used with test norms serving as controls. In the criterion-referenced mode, pretest-posttest gains are measured without reference to a norm group. The primary instruments consist of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (1978 and 1985) and the Basic Inventory of Natural Language (1979).

In the norm-referenced mode, testing occurs close to the norming dates (October 15 and April 25 for pretest and posttest, respectively). Whenever possible, posttesting includes students who have exited the program. In the criterion-referenced mode, the pretest is generally administered when students enter the program. Posttesting generally occurs when students exit the program.

Achievement status of students with low language dominance ratings, as determined by the state's English Proficiency Test, is assessed by the BINL only. Most of these students are immigrants who have just arrived from their native countries and are non-readers of English. Students with high language dominance ratings are tested with the MAT in a fall-spring testing cycle.

4

In addition to these standardized tests, the program uses a Student Record Profile (SRP) system to gather data on specific language objectives completed by each participating student. These objectives include four domains of language skills: syntax, semantic, morphemic and phonic. The SRP system also includes data on social adjustment to the school and the community. Four major components are: culture, basic survival, school survival and community survival.

A third measure of student performance consists of school grades of participating students in four subject areas: mathematics, language arts, reading and speaking/listening. Since grading practices differ from school to school, all grade designations are converted to fit a five-point scale:

    1 = Failing

    2 = Barely Passing

    3 = Satisfactory

    4 = Very Good

    5 = Excellent

School, Family and Community Factors

School or classroom climate has long been identified as a major contributing factor to high student achievement, particularly in compensatory education (Edmonds, 1982; MacKenzie, 1983). To assess class climate, a classroom climate inventory was adapted from existing inventories on school climate. The instrument consists of 28 items relating to both positive and negative school affects, including cohesiveness, goal-direction, clarity, satisfaction, openness, reward, cooperation, communication, warmth, formality, favoritism, apathy and cliqueness. The items are presented on a three-point scale of Yes, Maybe or No. Sample items include:

    o   I have friends in my class.

    o   There are many rules to follow in my class.

    o   In my class all students do the same things.

All data collection activities are conducted by the district school level staff. For example, school level program staff administer both MAT and BINL to the participating students first in September/October and then in April/May. The MAT is administered in small groups, the BINL (a language production test) is given individually. The class climate inventory is administered by school level staff towards the end of the school year. District level staff (resource teachers) make onsite visits twice during the school year to a sample of SLEP schools to gather data on program implementation. Other evaluation information such as grade point averages and performance on specific instructional objectives is gathered from school and program files.

Building the Database

The evaluation information is first transcribed onto a set of data summary forms at the student, classroom and school levels. The data are then entered into the computer for easy storage, retrieval and analysis. All data transcription and data entry activities are accomplished at the district office.

The computerized database consists of data files at three different levels: schools, classrooms and individual students. School level data files cover the following variables:

- o   School name

- o   Type of school (e.g., elementary, secondary)

- o   School enrollment

- o   SLEP enrollment

- o   Language groups

- o   School locale (e.g., urban, suburban, rural)

- o   Program setting (e.g., in-class, pull-out)

- o   Program funding

- o   Teacher-student ratio

- o   Staffing patterns (e.g., ESL and bilingual teachers)

- o   Program implementation status

- o   School climate

Classroom level data include the following variables:

- o   Grade level

- o   Class size

- o   Instructional setting (e.g., pull-out, in-class)

- o   Teacher-student ratio

- o   Length of instruction (minutes per day or week)

- o   Language groups in class

- o   Instructional staff

8

o Instructional service

o Use of English in class

o Time-on-task

o Program implementation status

o Class climate

Student level data cover the following variables:

o Grade level

o Primary home language

o Ethnicity

o Language dominance rating

o Gender

o Date of birth

o Participation in other special programs

o Date of program exit

o Achievement on

   - MAT reading

   - MAT language arts

   - MAT mathematics

   - BINL

o School grades in

   - Mathematics

   - Language arts

   - Reading

   - Speaking/listening

o Student Record Profile

7

9

- Syntax

- Semantic

- Morphemic

- Phonic

- Culture survival

- Basic survival

- School survival

- Community survival

These data files provide data elements needed in annual program evaluation and in an on-going program quality monitoring process.

Systematic Evaluation

Over the past several years, the program has been the focus of a systematic, comprehensive evaluation. The evaluation is to provide evidence of program impact as well as information useful for program improvement. While the longitudinal data base provides a wide range of cognitive and affective measures, district and school level administrators are particularly concerned about the performance of program participants on norm-referenced standardized tests. It is particularly important that there be evidence that the program is helping to narrow the achievement gap between students of limited English proficiency and their monolingual English speaking peers. An implicit assumption is that once these students overcome the language barrier, their performance in the regular school program will pose no specific problems.

The evaluation is conducted with the assistance of an external consultant and follows a set of guidelines developed on the basis of relevant research findings (e.g., Bissell, 1979; Berke, 1980; Berke, 1983) and experiences in similar compensatory education programs (e.g., Chapter 1). The guidelines help ensure the technical adequacy of the evaluation and its potential usefulness to decisionmakers.

In assessing student achievement on norm-referenced tests, a pretest-posttest design is used with test norms serving as controls (Tallmadge, 1982). The Metropolitan Achievement Test is adopted for use in the evaluation because it meets the criteria of validity and reliability and has a reasonably good match with the program's instructional objectives. The test is administered close to the empirical norm dates (October 15 and April 25 for pretest and posttest, respectively). Students at different grades take the respective test levels recommended by the test publisher. Testing includes both current students and those who have exited the program for a year. The latter group is included to provide data on the longer-term impact of the program.

Achievement gains are measured in the normal curve equivalent (NCE) metric. The NCE metric, a transformed measure of percentile ranks, assumes that with "regular" schooling, students will maintain their relative status, making zero NCE gain. NCE gains can be put in three categories (positive, zero and negative) to find out the proportion of program students who make positive gains (i.e., making greater progress than their regular peers and narrowing the achievement gap).

The evaluation is conducted as a team effort between the external consultant and the district staff to promote evaluation use (Dickey, 1980; Eash, 1985). The external consultant provides technical guidance and assistance to ensure the integrity and objectivity of the evaluation. The district staff perform most of the data collection and preliminary data aggregation. The external consultant is responsible for formal data analysis and the preparation of the evaluation report.

The evaluation maintains a client orientation and shifts the emphasis from summative evaluation to a systems approach to program improvement. It constitutes a continuous activity of data collection and analysis for program monitoring and tailoring (Cooley, 1983).

9

Using the longitudinal database, the annual evaluation addresses a wide range of questions, including:

o What staffing configuration produce the highest students achievement in the SLEP program?

o Are the instructional strategies being implemented as intended?

o What instructional strategies and materials are most effective in developing cognitive skills?

o What kinds of inservice training seem most appropriate for the SLEP program staff?

o What kinds of inservice training seem most satisfactory to SLEP parents?

o Are students exited or mainstreamed from the program performing satisfactorily in the regular classroom?

o What is the performance pattern of program students over time?

o Is the prevailing school climate positive as perceived by program students?

o How are program students adjusting to the school and community?

o What does a typical project school look like in terms of such characteristics as:

   - Subject areas covered

   - Length of instruction

   - Language use in class

   - Instructional approach

   - Staff training

   - Staff characteristics

   - Teacher-student ratio

   - Achievement profile

   - Length of student participation

An annual evaluation has been conducted on the program since 1985 to address these questions.

Quality Monitoring

Most program improvement approaches establish new cooperative diagnostic and problem-solving groups to make things happen. These groups are variously called quality circles, quality of (school) life committees, problem-solving task forces or leadership teams (Pratzner, 1984). They provide the opportunity for people to identify barriers to the effectiveness of their organization and, through problem-solving, break down those barriers. The approach is based on the conviction that within the organization there exists a largely untapped pool of creative expertise and insight which the existing organizational structure has hidden or suppressed. This latent talent can be channeled and put to work to increase school and program effectiveness. In the Honolulu district, such a process is called quality monitoring. A participatory and collaborative effort, quality monitoring seeks to bring about positive changes in the SLEP program. It is a systematic process of examining program implementation variables and evaluation results and translating them into action plans to improve student achievement. A dynamic process, quality monitoring promotes school level use of evaluation data for program improvement, leads to an on-going identification and analysis of variables affecting student achievement and ensures fidelity of program implementation. An important part of quality monitoring is the continuous exploration for better ways of providing instruction to program participants. The identification and analysis of important variables provide a sound basis for examining program implementation and impact.

As change facilitators (Hall & Hord, 1984), the district level staff initiate the quality monitoring process by assuming the following responsibilities:

o   Examination of achievement gains for each program school in comparison to previous years, to district averages, and to grade level averages. Significant patterns are noted.

o   Examination and analysis of program implementation variables.

o   Preparation of school level staff and administrators for the initial quality monitoring meeting by providing a list of topics to be discussed.

o   Coordination of meetings with school level staff and administrators to identify variables and practices in the areas of administration, program implementation, monitoring, testing and evaluation, curriculum and inservice, and parent involvement.

As program implementation and outcome variables are reviewed, questions such as the following are raised:

o   Does the staffing configuration produce a classroom environment conducive to maximal language learning?

o   Is the instructional delivery system meeting the needs of program participants?

o   Is the per pupil cost noticeably higher or lower than others? Why?

o   Are the evaluation procedures appropriate for the target population?

o   Are the evaluation results significantly better or worse than those of previous years?

o   Do the evaluation results indicate significant patterns his year, from year to year, and/or over the years?

o   What are the strong and weak areas in the test performance of program participants?

11

13

o   Are program staff using appropriate instructional strategies and materials?

o   What are the inservice needs of program staff?

o   Are parent involvement activities helping parents to help their children at home?

Then, in a collaborative, problem solving mode, district and school level staff and administrators develop a plan of action and identify persons responsible for carrying the plan. Decision making and responsibility are shared by all individuals involved in the program.

Since the quality monitoring process was first implemented, program schools selected to participate in the process have met with much success in using evaluation results for program improvement. Achievement gains have invariably resulted from the strong commitment of the program personnel to this objective. In addition, several other positive outcomes have occurred when participating schools are in their second or third year of quality monitoring:

1.   The district's role in examining evaluation results has diminished as school level staff begin to analyze evaluation results themselves.

2.   Program staff have begun to participate in program improvement plans with a positive attitude focusing on solutions rather than problems.

3.   Most importantly, a self-monitoring attitude has begun to prevail. School level staff are now better able to identify problem areas. This is evident in quality monitoring sessions where school level staff determine the priorities for the year and problem areas to be discussed.

Thus, the quality monitoring process has encouraged problem solving in an objective and systematic manner. With this new perspective, positive changes have continued to occur in the program schools.

As new concerns arise during the school year, new action plans are developed. Some of the changes occur immediately; others are made later in the school year. Outcomes reported by school level staff are reviewed by district staff at the beginning of the following school year as a new quality monitoring cycle begins.

The quality monitoring process requires the involvement of all program staff. On an on-going basis, program staff share information, insights and evaluations with the district resource teachers and other colleagues. The involvement of the district resource teachers as team members provides the opportunity to determine what is really occurring in the classrooms.

The interactions among the longitudinal database, the annual program evaluations and the quality monitoring process have created a set a powerful program processes and highly positive student outcomes during the 1985-88 school years. We discuss these in the following sections, using the 1987-88 school year as an example.

Program Characteristics

Enrollment

For the 1987-88 school year, the program served 3,750 students in grades K through 12. As in the two preceding years, there was a fairly even distribution of participants across grades, although heavier concentrations were found in kindergarten through grade 10. Also, there were slightly more students in grades K-6 (52 %) than in grade 7-12 (48 %).

Ethnicity

Among program participants, the single largest ethnic group was Filipino. These youngsters represented 31.0 percent of the elementary and 35.1 percent of the secondary SLEP students. At the elementary level, the other major ethnic groups were Indo-Chinese (19.2%), Chinese (14.3 %), Samoan (13.7%) and Korean (10.0%). At the secondary level, the other major ethnic groups were Chinese (24.2%), Indo-Chinese (12.5%), Korean (10.3%) and Samoan (10.0%).

Language Groups

Ilokano speaking students represented 20.2 percent of th total SLEP enrollment in 1987-88. Other major language groups, in order of size, were Cantonese (13.7%), Samoan (11.2%), Korean (9.4%) and Vietnamese (8.7%). There were 18 other language groups.

Program Participants

A majority (61.3%) of the SLEP students were in low language dominance categories. There were slightly more male students at both the elementary (54.9%) and secondary (53.5%) levels. A significant portion (15.7%) of the students were also in the Chapter 1 program. More than one-half of the elementary (63.9%) and secondary (50.8%) students received no other special services. About one-third (32.3%) of the elementary and one-half (55.2%) of the secondary students had been in the program for two or more years. Approximately 38 percent of the elementary students and 17 percent of the secondary students were first year participants.

Program Setting

About one-half (51.9%) of the SLEP schools were located in urban Honolulu. The others were in suburban areas. A significant number (49.0%) of these schools used the pull-out setting. The remainder mostly used a combination (e.g., pull-out and in-class) of instructional settings. In 1987-88, there was a decrease in the use of the pull-out setting compared with the preceding years.

Program Staff

In 1987-88, a high percentage (25.8%) of the instructional staff consisted of part-time ESL teachers. Other categories of staff included:

o   Full-time ESL teachers (17.4%)

o   Part-time bilingual teachers (20.6%)

o   Full-time bilingual teachers (10.3%)

o   Half-time ESL teachers (6.5%)

o   Half-time bilingual teachers (9.0%)

o   ESL/bilingual educational assistants (6.4%)

Most of the program staff (74.4%) had been with the program for two or more years. The longevity of service was even more pronounced among teachers at the secondary grades where 66.1 percent of the staff had been with the program for three or more years. A predominant majority (87.3%) of the program staff had baccalaureate or higher degrees. A significant number of these staff (58.1% at the elementary grades and 23.5% at the secondary grades) majored in elementary education. A relatively low percentage (9.3% and 13.7 % for elementary and secondary grades, respectively) listed ESL/TESOL as their academic area in college. Over one-half (65.7%) of the instructional staff were fluent in one or more languages other than English. Multi-lingualism was particularly evident at the secondary level where most (77.2%) of the staff spoke one or more languages besides English.

Type of Instruction

ESL was the most common type of service provided to SLEP students. This was particularly true at the elementary grades where 31.5 percent of the classes offered ESL instruction. At the secondary level, ESL instruction was offered in 17.9 percent of the classes. At the elementary level, 10.9 percent of the classes received bilingual instruction. At the secondary level, bilingual instruction was offered in 7.1 percent of the classes. In the rest of the SLEP classes, a combination of these services was offered to the students.

Use of English

In a majority (61.7%) of the SLEP classes, English was used almost all the time. In 17.4 percent of the classes, English was used about three-fourths of the time. Another 7.4 percent used English about half the time. The small remainder reported using English less than half the time.

Teacher-student Ratio

Although one-on-one instruction was used in some cases (2.0%), the typical instructional group size was between 5 to 10 students. Approximately 22 percent of the classes reported teacher-student ratios ranging from 1:2 to 1:5. Another 46 percent had ratios falling between 1:6 and 1:10. Ratios ranging from 1:11 to 1:15 were found in 18 percent of the classes. The small remainder reported ratios higher than 1:16. As a general trend, the elementary grades enjoyed more favorable ratios (smaller groups) than the secondary grades.

Length of Instruction

Program students received SLEP instruction five days a week. At the elementary grades, an average of 75 minutes of instruction was provided per day. The secondary students received slightly less instruction, averaging about 68 minutes each day.

Time-on-Task

For over 80 percent of the class time the SLEP students were reported to be engaged in active learning (e.g., written assignment, silent reading, listening to teacher lecture, reading aloud and class discussion). Close to 36 percent of the time was spent on activities requiring interaction between the teacher and students. Time spent on non-engaged activities (e.g., getting ready for learning tasks, socializing, watching others, being disciplined, playing a game or being out of the room) was relatively brief. The elementary and secondary classes showed a highly similar pattern of time use.

Class Climate

The class climate Inventory measures such factors as cohesiveness, goal-direction, clarity, satisfaction, openness, reward, cooperation, communication, warmth, formality, favoritism, apathy and cliqueness. The data suggest a generally positive class climate in the SLEP program. There is also some evidence that the elementary grades enjoyed a more positive climate than the secondary grades. For example, a higher degree of uniformity in instruction was evident at the secondary level than the elementary level, suggesting a lower degree of individualized instruction at the secondary level.

15

Program Implementation

Data obtained from the program implementation checklist suggest that in most instances a high fidelity implementation of the SLEP program has occurred in the participating schools. The checklist was administered by district level staff who had an intimate knowledge of the program. These staff used multiple sources of information to assess the status of program implementation in a sample of 91 SLEP classrooms. These sources included document reviews, interviews with school level staff, and onsite observations. Based on a convergence of evidence, each critical aspect of program operations received one of hree status ratings: not implemented (1), partially implemented (2), or fully implemented (3). The 24 critical program elements covered six domains of program operations. For the 1987-88 school year, the average ratings were as follows:

Domain	Average Rating
Instructional approach	2.74
Diagnosis	2.83
Student grouping	2.79
Monitoring	2.87
Staff development	2.77
Parent involvement	2.24

Among the consistently favorable patterns of high ratings, monitoring was the strongest domain of program operations. A relatively weak area was parent involvement. A more indepth look at the specific elements of instruction revealed that the use of the student's own language in an educationally supportive manner was a relatively weak area with a rating of 2.61. In parent involvement, the lower ratings pointed to two relatively we. areas: (a) parents assisting students in class related activities by serving as resource persons, volunteer tutors, or translators; (b) parents being provided with materials and/or techniques to develop skills in helping their children.

16

18

Program 'mpact

Norm-referenced Test Performance

Achievement data showed a very favorable student performance pattern during the 1985-88 school years. Positive performance occurred in oral language proficiency as measured by the BINL, in reading, language arts and mathematics as measured by the MAT, and in school grades for reading, language arts, mathematics and speaking/listening.

Specifically, program students made substantial NCE gains on the BINL over the three-year period. Moreover, the achievement gains increased from year to year. A similarly favorable performance pattern was also evident with respect to reading, language arts and mathematics as measured by the MAT. Table 1 presents a summary of the achievement data.

17

19

Table 1

NCE Scores of Program Students on the BINL and the MAT

Area	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88
BINL			
Pretest	74	71	65
Posttest	82	84	87
Gain	8	13	22
MAT Reading			
Pretest	26	26	22
Posttest	29	31	29
Gain	3	5	7
MAT Language Arts			
Pretest	28	27	23
Posttest	32	33	29
Gain	4	6	6
MAT Mathematics			
Pretest	37	38	33
Posttest	40	42	38
Gain	3	4	5

Note. For each school year, data were based on approximately 1,700 program students for whom there were matched pretest and posttest scores.

It should be noted that the BINL was normed on regional (mainly California) samples of students having similar backgrounds as SLEP students. In addition, there is a close match between the test contents and the SLEP curriculum. The relatively high NCE scores and NCE gains are undoubtedly a result of these factors. The MAT, on the other hand, was normed on a nationally representative sample of the U.S. student population. Also, a new (1985) version of the MAT was used in 1987-88. The lower NCE scores for that school year were primarily due to the use of the new MAT norms.

A closer look at the proportion of program students making positive NCE gains revealed that a predominant majority of the students made gains on the BINL. The MAT data showed that a large majority of the participants made positive NCE gains. Again, increasingly higher percentages of program students made positive gains on both the BINL and the MAT over the three-year period. Table 2 presents a summary of the data.

Table 2

Percent of Program Students Making Positive NCE Gains

| | | MAT | | |
School Year	BINL	Reading	Lang. Arts	Math
1985-86	81.3	57.8	59.1	53.3
1986-87	81.0	59.8	61.9	59.4
1987-88	86.7	69.9	66.6	64.3

Note. For each school year, data were based on approximately 1,700 students for whom there were matched pretest and posttest scores.

Criterion-Referenced Performance

In addition to norm-referenced test data, the program uses a Student Record Profile (SRP) system to gather data on specific language objectives completed by each program student. These objectives cover four domains of language skills: syntax, semantic, morphemic and phonic. There are 22 specific objectives in syntax, 20 in semantic, 7 in morphemic and 4 in phonic. For each of the three school years, the data showed that the average program participant completed a majority of the objectives. The completion rates were higher in morphemic and phonic where the average student mastered about two-thirds of the objectives during each school year. Also, as one would expect, the secondary students demonstrated substantially higher rates of completion than their elementary counterparts.

The SRP system also includes data on social adjustment: culture, basic survival, school survival and community survival. There are 5 specific objectives in culture survival, 7 in basic survival, 16 in school survival and 11 in community survival. During each school year, the average SLEP student completed a majority of the objectives. As one would expect, secondary students did considerably better than their elementary counterparts in mastering these objectives.

School Grades

The longitudinal database includes data on grade point averages of program students in four subject areas: mathematics, language arts, reading and speaking/listening. Since grading practices differ from school to school, all grade designations are converted to a five-point scale:

    1 = Failing

    2 = Barely passing

    3 = Satisfactory

    4 = Very good

    5 = Excellent

The data suggest that as a group, the SLEP students were performing satisfactory school work in the four subject areas. In all instances, the failure rates hovered around 5 percent or less. About 20 percent of the students showed "very good" performance. Approximately 6 to 8 percent were doing "excellent" work in language arts, reading and speaking/listening. Close to 13 percent had "excellent" grades in mathematics.

Performance of Exited Students

Approximately 150 students exited the program each school year. There is strong evidence that +these students were performing well in the regular classroom as well as on norm-referenced tests. Specifically, in all instances, a predominant majority of the students were doing satisfactory or better work in reading, language arts, mathematics and speaking/listening. Generally, less than 3 percent of the exited students failed in any of these subject areas. Close to one-third of the exited students received "very good" grades in language arts, reading and speaking/listening. More than a quarter of the exited students were doing "excellent" work in mathematics.

Moreover, the exited students were able to continue to make positive NCE gains in reading, language arts and mathematics as measured by the MAT. Although these gains were relatively small, they were consistent over the three-year period. Table 3 presents a summary of the data.

Table 3

NCE Scores of Exited Students

Area	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88
MAT Reading			
Pretest	44	46	37
Posttest	46	49	44
Gain	2	3	7
MAT Lang. Arts			
Pretest	47	49	41
Posttest	49	52	49
Gain	2	3	8
MAT Mathematics			
Pretest	54	57	54
Posttest	56	59	57
Gain	2	2	3

Note. For each school year, data were based on approximately 150 exited students for whom there were matched pretest and posttest scores. The data reflect achievement status a year after the students exited the program.

The 1985 version of the MAT was used in 1987-88. The lower NCE scores were primarily due to the use of the new MAT norms. It is also noteworthy that the exited students scored very close to the national norms (50 NCE) in reading and language arts. Their scores were slightly above the national average in mathematics.

Perhaps more significantly, a high percentage of the exited students continued to make positive NCE gains on all three MAT subtests. As shown in Table 4, from one-half to two-thirds of the exited students showed positive NCE gains one year after they exited the program.

Table 4

Percent of Exited Students Making Positive NCE Gains

Area	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88
MAT Reading	55.1	62.3	69.3
MAT Lang. Arts	56.0	61.8	67.3
MAT Mathematics	53.5	49.3	58.2

Note. For each school year, data were based on approximately 150 exited students for whom there were matched pretest and posttest scores one year after they exited the program.

Parent Activities

Program records showed that a wide range of activities was provided to SLEP parents each school year. Examples included:

o Open house/orientation meeting

o Cultural activities (e.g., Mothers' Day, Christma. cultural presentation, choral performance, cooking demonstration)

o Parent inservice/workshop/class (e.g., computers, self-esteem, home reading, bookmaking, conversational English)

o Parent/teacher/school conference

o Book fair

o Excursion (e.g., library tour, field trip)

o Student achievement awards program

In addition, adult education classes were offered at four school sites to help parents to:

o learn to speak, read and write English;

o prepare for citizenship and driving tests;

o enroll in higher education or employment training;

o improve self-image and set goals for better living, and

o learn another language.

Parent learning centers were established at nine program sites to:

o assist parents in understanding Hawaii's educational system;

o provide educational activities for parents so that they are able to help their children at home with school work;

o help parents learn survival skills which enable them to function better in the community;

o help parents learn basic communication skills in English so they can understand and participate in school activities;

o assist parents in understanding other cultures in Hawaii through multicultural activities; and

o help parents learn how to use computers so that they can assist their children.

24

26

Summary and Conclusions

Recently, bilingual education has received much attention from researchers as well as the federal government (e.g., Baker & de Kanter, 1983; Berke, 1983; Willig, 1985). The attention has focused on both program implementation and outcomes of educational services provided to increasingly large numbers of youngsters with limited English proficiency. One such effort is implemented in the Honolulu district which has a high concentration of low-income and immigrant families. The SLEP program seeks to provide a smooth transition for recent immigrant students to adjust to the dominant culture and regular school life in the United States. Its primary objective is to improve the students' English language skills so that they may function effectively in the regular classroom. The program offers special educational services in 54 schools, serving some 4,000 students in kindergarten through high school grades.

Drawing on the effective schools research base, the district has implemented a well-integrated set of essential program components. It has demonstrated a successful effort in helping children of limited English proficiency to adjust to the mainstream American culture.

Evidence of positive program impact with respect to norm-referenced achievement is strong and consistent. A predominant majority of the program students made positive NCE gains in oral language as measured by the BINL. A large majority also made positive NCE gains in reading, mathematics, and language arts as measured by the MAT, narrowing the achievement gap between SLEP students and their non-SLEP counterparts. Other data show that the program students were performing well in the regular school program. Most received satisfactory or better grades in mathematics, reading, language arts and speaking/listening. On the average, less than 5 percent of the program students received failing grades in these subject areas. Perhaps more remarkably, in most instances, a large majority of exited students continued to make achievement gains on norm-referenced tests and were performing well in the regular program. Over a three-year period, both current and exited students showed an increasingly positive performance pattern.

The essential program elements responsible for the positive impact are clearly documented by district staff and seem easily transportable to other locations. It is likely that the implementation of these program activities in other school systems will bring about similarly favorable results.

25

References

Baker, K., & de Kanter, A. (1983). Federal policy and the effectiveness of bilingual education. In K. Baker & A. de Kanter (Eds.), Bilingual education: A reappraisal of federal policy (pp. 33-86). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Berke, I. P. (1980). Evaluation into policy: Bilingual education. Unpublished dissertation, Stanford University.

Berke, I. P. (1983). Evaluation and incrementalism: The AIR report and ESEA Title VII. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 5 (2), 249-256.

Bissell, J. S. (1979). Program impact evaluation: An introduction for managers of Title VII projects. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Cooley, W. W. (1983). Improving the performance of an educational system. Educational Researcher, 12 (6), 4-12.

Dickey, B. (1980). Utilization of evaluations of small-scale innovative educational projects. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 2 (6), 65-77.

Eash, M. J. (1985). A reformation of the role of the evaluator. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7 (3), 249-252.

Edmonds, R. R. (1982). Programs of school improvement: An Overview. Educational Leadership, 40 (3), 4-11.

Hall, G. E., & Loucks, S. F. (1977). A developmental model for determining whether the treatment is actually implemented. American Educational Research Journal, 14, 263-276.

Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (1984). Analyzing what change facilitators do. Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 5 (3), 275-307.

MacKenzie, D. E. (1983). Research for school improvement: An appraisal of some recent trends. Educational Researcher, 12 (4), 5-17.

Pratzner, F. C. (1984). Quality of school life: Foundation for improvement. Educational Researcher, 13 (3), 20-25.

Tallmadge, G. K. (1982). An empirical assessment of norm-referenced evaluation methodology. Journal of Educational Measurement, 19 (2), 97-112.

Willig, A. C. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. Review of Educational Research, 55 (3), 269-317.