DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 719 FL 022 586

AUTHOR	Del Vecchio, Ann; And Others
TITLE	Whole-School Bilingual Education Programs: Approaches for Sound Assessment. NCBE Program Information Guide Series 18.
INSTITUTION	National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	94
CONTRACT	T292008001
NOTE	37p.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education Programs; Check Lists; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; *Institutional Characteristics; *Outcomes of Education; Program Administration; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Rating Scales; Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS	Goals 2000

ABSTRACT

Based on research on the features that are found in effective school-wide bilingual education programs, assessment strategies for such programs are offered. The features are in three groups: indicators relating to school context (ethos, management, and resources that affect the attitudes of school staff, students, and parents in language minority communities), school implementation indicators (curriculum and instruction, staff development, administrator responsibilities, and parent role), and student outcome indicators (skills and strategies required of limited-English-proficient students to succeed in whole-school bilingual education programs and attain the performance standards outlined in "Goals 2000"). Each indicator is described as it relates to diverse language populations, and ways to measure the feature for purposes of program improvement are discussed. Sample assessment forms, in the form of checklists and rating scales, are included for each feature or feature group. In addition, the characteristics of a comprehensive assessment plan are outlined, and major administrative issues in program evaluation (time, funding, support, sources of expertise, consistency across the institution, choice of evaluators, and comprehensiveness of assessment) are discussed briefly. Contains 38 references. (MSE)

NCBE

Program Information Guide Series

ED 376 719

WHOLE-SCHOOL BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS: APPROACHES FOR SOUND ASSESSMENT

ANN DEL VECCHIO, MICHAEL GUERRERO, CYNDEE GUSTKE, PAUL MARTÍNEZ, CECILIA NAVARRETE, CHRISTOPHER NELSON, JUDITH WILDE

18

Summer 1994

The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE) is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) and is operated under Contract No. T292008001 by The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Education, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government. Readers are free to duplicate and use these materials in keeping with accepted publication standards. NCBE requests that proper credit be given in the event of reproduction.

Director: Joel Gómez
Production Manager: Omar Shabka

Whole-School Bilingual Education Programs: Approaches for Sound Assessment

What are whole-school bilingual education programs?
How do we know when they are functioning effectively for all students?

Although we understand bilingual education to mean dual language instruction (and know that dual language instruction has been available in the US since before colonial times), few, if any, whole schools have operated as academies of bilingual education since World War I (Lessow-Hurley 1990). However, under the 1994 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), specifically under Title VII, schools are able to develop and implement exemplary whole-school bilingual education programs. This funding is tied directly to the systematic improvement and reformation of education programs serving language minority (LM) and limited English proficient (LEP) students.

For educators involved in the instruction of LM and LEP students, the challenge is to identify and determine those features that comprise effective bilingual schools. To meet this challenge, it is necessary to rely on knowledge from the field of bilingual education and the studies on instruction and program effectiveness. Together, these features hold great potential for explaining how a whole-school bilingual education program can function.

The literature is replete with studies that identify key indicators useful for designing sound whole school bilingual education programs (c.f., Lucas, Donato, and Henze 1993; Ramirez, Yuen, and Ramey 1991; and Tikunoff 1985, 1991). We were able categorize these indicators into three areas:

1. ***School context indicators*** describe the ethos, management, and resources that permeate and influence the attitudes of school staff, students, and parents in language minority communities;
2. ***School implementation indicators*** target key features in bilingual education schools including curriculum and instruction, staff development, the responsibilities of administrators, and the role of parents; and
3. ***Student outcome indicators*** identify the skills and strategies required of limited English proficient students to succeed in whole-school bilingual education programs and to attain the performance standards outlined in *Goals 2000.*

Although the features in each category are similar to those in effective mainstream schools (Bossert 1986), we found distinct cultural and language-related characteristics. These indicators are presented in Figure 1 along with brief descriptions of their supporting features.

It is with these effective school features in mind that we suggest assessment strategies that can be incorporated into the design and measurement of effective whole-school bilingual education programs. However, several qualifications must be presented before attempting to apply the identified features to programs for LM students. From an optimistic perspective, these features:

1. offer schools with diverse student populations the possibility of becoming not only equitable and desirable places of learning for all students, but also learning environments for the adults and community members who work or volunteer there;

2. expand upon the characteristics identified in studies of effective schools and instruction. Features such as family involvement, bilingualism for all students, cultural and ethnic sensitivity, and cross-cultural communication are elements not identified until recently as critical to schools with large LM populations;
3. validate practices that have been employed by bilingual educators for several years and are believed to lead to more successful students and programs; and
4. lend themselves to assessment and to meeting the evaluation regulations for programs funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

However, we also must be cautious in recognizing potential limitations with these features. They:

1. should be viewed as necessary, but not sufficient, elements for school improvement. These features are derived directly from the literature on effective instruction and programs for language minority students. Other features may also need to be examined in shaping whole-school bilingual education programs. In addition, further research is needed to understand the relationship between effective school features for LM students and academic achievement;
2. have not been established as having a cause-and-effect relationship with student achievement. However, these features have been found in schools that have above-expected levels of student achievement;
3. may not be transferable to other schools. Nonetheless, these features do provide some sound guidelines for ensuring an equitable and appropriate education for LM students; and
4. are drawn from a small number of studies. Some features may be more important for particular programs or types of programs than others.

PURPOSE

The primary purpose of this document is to suggest (1) how the features of effective bilingual education programs can be applied to whole-school bilingual education programs and (2) methods for assessing whether these features are working. Unfortunately, some of the terms of assessment have technical meanings that can cause confusion. To ensure a common understanding of these terms, Figure 2 provides a glossary of terms used in this document to help the reader understand their precise meanings. Once this common understanding is ensured, we briefly describe what the literature tells us about each indicator and its key features. We then introduce a variety of sample assessment methods that can be used to measure these features as well as information on how to use these assessment approaches within a comprehensive evaluation plan. We conclude this document by listing several implications for conducting a sound evaluation of whole-school bilingual education programs.

One caveat must be stated: we need to recognize that integrating effective features into a whole-school bilingual education program has rarely been attempted in the last 20 years. The system is complex and, therefore, somewhat uncertain. It will take some time to develop a whole-school bilingual education program, and more time to develop a sound assessment system. Immediate positive effects should not be anticipated. It will take administrators, staff, students, and communities time to "buy in" to the concept of a whole-school bilingual education program. However, the benefits for the community-at-large are great and encourage us to proceed.

Figure 1
Summary of Effective School and Program Features for Language Minority (LM) Students

School Context	Program Implementation	Student Outcomes
Ethos • *Climate*: Students' languages and cultures are learned, supported, and valued by all school staff. • *Expectations*: High expectations are maintained and made concrete for staff and students. • *School Morale*: A commitment is made to building and preserving high staff and student morale. Management • *Integration*: Elements of effective schooling for LM students permeate the whole school environment. Staff, parents, and students are included in planning and restructuring efforts. • *Supervision*: Equitable assessment, placement, and instructional practices are monitored consistently. Resources • *Administration*: Reallocation of administrative support and resources are marshalled to assist students and teachers. • *Capacity*: Creative strategies (financial and nonfinancial) are used to sustain and expand service capacity. • *Time*: Time and opportunity are given to conduct comprehensive needs assessments and plan effective programs for LM students and teachers.	Curriculum and Instruction • *Cultural and Ethnic Sensitivity*: School curricula, support services, and extracurricular activities are culturally relevant and of interest to LM students. • *Flexibility*: National, state, and local standards are adapted in the curricula for LM students to demonstrate learning and language development in a variety of ways. • *English Teaching Strategies*: Instruction is designed to promote active and purposeful use of English. Teachers communicate clearly and effectively. Students are provided immediate feedback to obtain successful task completion. • *Native Language Teaching Strategies:* Pedagogical approaches along with native language and culture are promoted across content areas. Native language materials are used to develop native literacy skills. Staff • *Knowledge and Experience*: All staff are knowledgeable of the community and culture of students. A balance of qualifications exists among staff. • *Training*: Staff development is explicitly designed for teachers and other staff to serve LM students. • *Autonomy*: Teaching staff are actively involved in planning and making decisions in the school and in their classrooms. • *Collaboration*: School staff and community members actively work together to promote programs and services for all students. Administrators • *Understanding and Knowledge*: Administrators have an understanding of student and staff needs, the theory and implementation of effective practices for LM students, and cross-cultural communication skills for managing bilingual education programs. • *Collaboration*: Collaboration is fostered with diverse agencies, groups, and organizations. • *Support:* Administrators advocate support of bilingual education programs through recruitment, staff development, community, and central office undertakings. Parents • *Outreach:* Efforts are made to expand family involvement and participation in the school. Attention is paid to "immediate" needs of parents. • *Collaboration:* Collaborative educator–parent–child involvement is central to school–home communication and literacy development. • *Support:* Use of home language and varied forms of home visits are used to nurture school–home relationships.	Learning Strategies • *Practice*: Students are provided opportunities to practice, exhibit high levels of successful task engagement, and apply learning and test-taking skills in a variety of situations. • *Information Processing*: Students actively integrate new information and skills and draw onnections to prior knowledge. • *Higher-Order Thinking*: Higher-order thinking skills, including metacognitive and metalinguistic skills, are enhanced through the use of native language and opportunity to transfer those skills. Self-Enhancement • *Cultural/Ethnic Identity*: Native language instruction is used to give students a greater sense of cultural identity, culturally appropriate interaction, discourse patterns, and metalinguistic awareness. • *Motivation and Confidence*: Effective school experiences are used to develop ability, confidence, ethnic identity, and motivation to succeed academically.

Figure 2

Glossary of Assessments Used to Measure Key Indicators

Observation checklists. Checklists can be used to determine whether particular behavioral, physical, or environmental characteristics are present. Typically, desirable behaviors are described briefly and an observer checks (✔) whether each behavior is observed during a particular period of time (e.g., the first week of school). Scores can be developed by counting the number of checks. When the same checklist is used periodically throughout the program, it can be used to demonstrate progress.

Surveys. Surveys usually list a series of questions to be answered orally or in writing by the respondent. The responses can be ***forced choice***, where the answers are provided (e.g., Are you pleased with the language abilities of the staff? Yes/No), or Likert-scale continuum (4 to 7 response options such as "almost always" to "almost never"). The responses can also be ***open-ended***, where the individual provides an answer (e.g., What pleases you most about the language abilities of the staff?) Scores can be developed by assigning point values to the responses (e.g., Yes=1, No=2) and summing these values.

Interviews or focus groups. Both interviews and focus groups can provide in-depth information. In a structured interview, responses to a set of prepared questions can be recorded by the interviewer who can ask clarifying questions. Focus groups can include small groups of individuals and a facilitator to discuss a specific topic. Generally, scores are not developed.

Standardized tests. Standardized tests are used to measure student skills. They are so named because their administration, format, content, language, and scoring procedures are the same for all students—they have been "standardized." Locally developed and commercial standardized tests are available for most achievement areas and for some aspects of language proficiency.

When referring to standardized tests, most people think of ***norm-referenced tests (NRTs)***; within this document, we refer to commercially available language proficiency and achievement tests as NRTs. NRTs are typically used to sort people into groups based on their assumed skills in a particular area; they are useful when selecting students for participation in a particular program because they are designed to differentiate among students. In addition, NRTs can provide general information that will help to match classrooms for overall achievement levels before assigning them to a particular program.

Alternative assessments. Alternative assessments are types of measures that fit a contextualized measurement approach—they "can easily be incorporated into classroom routines and learning activities...Their results are indicative of the student's performance on the skill or subject of interest" (Navarrete, Wilde, Nelson, Martínez, and Hargett 1990, p. 2). As used within this document, "alternative assessment" subsumes authentic assessment, performance-based assessment, informal assessment, ecological assessment, curriculum-based measurement, and other similar forms that actively involve the learner.

For many types of alternative assessments, different types of scoring methods can be used. Three typically used methods are ***holistic scoring***, which provides a general, overall score, ***primary trait scoring***, which defines particular features (or traits) of student performance and then provides separate scores for each trait, and ***analytic scoring***, which assigns a weight based on the importance of each trait (e.g., spelling might be weighted less than grammar). Identifying where and how errors occur allows teachers to determine where students' understanding of a topic begins to deteriorate.

SCHOOL CONTEXT

The context in which a whole-school program operates (whether or not it is a bilingual program) is essential to the universal well-being of students, teachers, families, and, ultimately, the program. According to recent research, the most important school context factors for students, especially LM students, are the overall culture of the school, its assets, and the administration's views toward the school and the program (see Figure 1). This section briefly describes these program context factors as they relate to diverse language populations and suggests ways to measure the factors to inform program improvement efforts.

Ethos

Ethos in a whole-school environment refers to the expectations, social norms, and contributions of staff, students, and administrators that enable all those in a school to function successfully in the learning environment. Think about a visit to an effective school. The attitudes and behaviors of students and teaching staff give an observer the feeling of pride and accomplishment. This "feeling" is the culture of the school, the ethos.

Based on studies of effective schools for LM students, ethos can be broken into three general attributes: (1) the climate of the bilingual program and the whole school, (2) the expectations that staff have for all students (including LEP and English proficient students), and (3) staff and student morale. Each of these attributes are described in the following section.

Climate. The degree to which languages and cultures are respected and affirmed is a key element in the climate of the whole-school program. It is important that the school climate be equitable toward the various ethnic and racial groups, the languages spoken other than English, and both sexes. Climate affects not only attitudes toward teaching and learning, but also more general attitudes and behaviors toward other cultures, education, and even employment possibilities. Characteristics to look for within a positive whole school program include:

the use of inclusive, positive language (language that is free of racial, ethnic, linguistic, or sexual slurs);
expressed knowledge about the demographic groups in the school (correctly naming ethnic groups and their home countries, identifying events and people relevant to the groups, and so on);
the embracing of all languages as valuable vehicles for instruction and assessment;
the inclusion of students' families in school events; and
the encouragement of communication among staff and students regardless of status or language.

Within such a climate, all students, regardless of background or experiences, can feel acceptance, have enhanced self-images, and develop a desire to learn.

Expectations. All students need to know that high, yet realistic academic and behavior standards are expected of them. Though it is not unusual to find high expectations for fluent English proficient students, limited English speakers often receive the message that less is expected from them than from their peers. To ensure that high expectations are developed and maintained for all students, whole-school programs should:

provide high level and challenging classes in languages other than English;
ensure that academic and behavioral expectations are concrete, developed with student input, and equitably enforced;

encourage active student participation and provide quick feedback on assignments;
hire qualified language minority teachers and paraprofessionals;
encourage assessment methods that can be summarized to show student growth and accomplishments and can be shared with students, parents, and teachers;
include language minority students in English-only classrooms when feasible; and
celebrate all students' achievements in a public manner.

When building a positive climate for a diverse community of students, it is not only important that high expectations be set, but that the staff clearly believe that all students can meet these expectations.

School morale. School morale is a good indicator of a whole school bilingual program's success—all students see themselves as successful learners, teachers see themselves as successful educators, and administrators see themselves as successful creators of a learning environment; all want to be in school and to work together. Key features of a high-morale, whole-school bilingual education program include:

culturally and linguistically diverse student government and teaching staff;
long-range and short-range plans developed by diverse students, staff, and parents;
attendance at school events reflecting the diversity of students and staff;
positive attitudes about the school expressed by students (and staff) indicating a *desire* to be in school (as opposed to indicating that they are *required* to be in school); and
a clean campus that reflects the positive attitudes of staff and students.

Although it is difficult to develop a plan specifically to improve school morale, it is quite possible to determine that morale is in need of a "fix." If morale is a problem, it is best to look toward other elements within the whole-school program's life that might affect it.

Assessment of ethos. The relevant features of program context should be assessed on a periodic basis. Some appropriate means include observation checklists, attitude surveys, interviews, and focus groups. These assessment approaches can be used together, in combinations, or separately depending on the needs of the program to demonstrate an effective school context. Figure 3 shows samples of these approaches for assessing the school context indicators.

Management

Within the context of a whole-school bilingual education program, "management" refers to the incorporation of a system of supervision into the school that ensures the integration of effective practices for all students across key elements of the school environment. Effective management depends on the development of successful strategies for integrating these practices into existing school structures and supervising or monitoring the implementation of desired practices.

Integration. Instruction that is effective and relevant for all students should be integrated in the whole school curriculum, not just added as a unit here or there, or treated as a special program decoupled from the regular curriculum (e.g., a "pull out" or ESL program). Some dimensions that should be considered when integrating effective practices into a whole-school context are to:

emphasize effective practices for both English learners and second language learners across all parts of the curriculum;
select curriculum materials in all content areas that reflect multicultural perspectives;

emphasize the integration of effective practices for all students in content area instruction;
focus staff training on increasing multicultural awareness and awareness of community needs;
involve parents, students, and school staff in planning and restructuring efforts;
provide equal access for all students to programs serving exceptional students by modifying referral processes to accommodate language minority students (e.g., use of alternative assessments in place of commercially available norm-referenced tests); and
assess student progress, to the degree possible, by matching the content, format, and language of instruction.

Monitoring/Supervision. Administrators of whole-school bilingual education programs must consistently supervise and monitor assessment, placement, and instructional practices to ensure equitable and effective services for all students. Features of sound supervision include informing, delegating, and working with staff in planning and carrying out school practices. Areas that might be monitored include the incorporation of language and culture, instructional practices, testing and assessment, materials selection and development, staff qualifications and professional development, parent and community involvement, and referral procedures.

Assessment of management. Assessing how well a whole school is actually being managed can be facilitated through the use of questionnaires and surveys completed by staff, families, and/or students. Self reflections, surveys, and observation checklists focusing on specific management issues can also be used. These approaches should be designed both to provide constructive criticism and to document practices. Feedback based on monitoring should point out strengths and needs. Where needs (i.e., activities inconsistent with effective practice for language minority students) are identified, administrators must be able to provide suggestions and support for making improvements. Inservice staff training, observations, materials acquisition, and staff collaboration are some support activities that can be managed to facilitate the implementation of effective whole school programs. It is important that schools tailor their assessment of management to meet their particular needs and purposes. Figure 3 presents sample items and formats that might be used. In addition, Lucas (1993) has developed a detailed checklist with management indicators for effective secondary schooling for language minority students.

Resources

Resources are the tangible and not-so-tangible commodities that make a service like education possible. We usually think of resources in their most tangible forms such as the school budget or building facilities. Some of the not-so-tangible resources include a dedicated and inspired teaching staff, flexibility to brainstorm and implement new and creative solutions, and community support. Within the context of the program, resources can be divided into three areas: administration, capacity, and time.

Administration. Resources should be equitably administered and distributed throughout the school to ensure that the physical environment is clean, well-lit, and positive for all students and staff. Administrative resources can include specialized personnel such as a program coordinator and support personnel who can schedule meetings, find substitutes, recruit native language volunteers from the community, explore training options, screen applicants for staff positions, acquire materials such as native foods and spices, find print materials in native languages, procure arts and crafts supplies, arrange field trips, and disseminate information.

Figure 3

Sample Assessments for School Context

Sample Ethos Behavior Checklist

Directions: Check (✓) each behavior that is usually seen.

Performance Statements	September	January	May
1. The staff uses inclusive, positive language.	❑	❑	❑
2. Classroom expectations are clear and concrete.	❑	❑	❑
3. The staff is ethnically and linguistically diverse.	❑	❑	❑
4. Attendance at school events is high.	❑	❑	❑

Sample Resources Self-Assessment Survey with Dichotomous Responses

Directions: Circle the response that most closely fits what you do or see on campus.

1. Meetings were scheduled regularly for planning.	Yes	No
2. Money was budgeted for substitute teachers for inservice training.	Yes	No
3. Time was used to evaluate the use of new instructional materials.	Yes	No
4. Time was available for meeting with colleagues.	Yes	No

Sample Management Survey with Likert-Scale Responses

Directions: Circle the response that you feel describes your program. The response scale is (1) most of the time, (2) frequently, (3) sometimes, and (4) rarely.

1. Curriculum materials in science reflect multicultural perspectives.	1	2	3	4
2. Inservice training focuses on multicultural awareness.	1	2	3	4
3. Training is available that focuses on effective practices.	1	2	3	4
4. Support services and extracurricular activities are available.	1	2	3	4

Sample Open-Ended Interview

Directions: Ask the first question. If the person does not respond, or if further clarification is needed, consider the prompts that are italicized. If you ask further questions, be sure to write them down with the person's response.

1. How well do teachers' curriculum materials reflect multicultural perspectives? *Are these materials available in all content areas? If not, in which areas are they lacking?*
2. Have staff development/inservice sessions focused on multicultural awareness? *What are some examples?*
3. Are effective practices (e.g., total physical response, natural language approach) integrated into content area instruction? *If not, in which areas are they not integrated?*
4. Are classroom expectations clear and concrete? *Do students know: how papers will be graded; what behaviors are acceptable in class; or what the consequences will be for misbehavior? Can you suggest ways to improve students' understanding of the expectations? Do parents understand these expectations?*

Capacity. Capacity can be defined as the expertise of a staff to create and use effective new ideas as well as to improve existing strategies to maintain and improve the education of language minority students. Key features of capacity in an effective whole-school bilingual education program include:

a guiding mission statement or philosophy that embraces diversity;
the inclusion of parents, community members, students, support staff, and others involved in the program in planning and decision-making;
the establishment of regular meetings for training, planning, brainstorming, and creating; and
a practical application of the ideas generated in planning sessions.

Time. Without a sufficient amount of this most precious and basic of resources it is very difficult to establish and maintain an excellent schoolwide program. Time is necessary for adequate planning, training, communication, networking and sharing strategies and ideas, assessment and evaluation, pilot-testing new ideas or methods, and evaluating the results of a new method or program, among others. When considering the cost of in-service training, for example, administrators must consider the budgetary and time constraints of hiring substitute teachers or paying teachers to attend training during their time-off. Time provides countless opportunities for systematic growth and improvement and is a critical feature of effective language minority programs.

Assessment of resources. In whole-school program settings with substantial management input from parents, community members, teaching staff, and other key stakeholders, formal budget and records reviews can also be used to assess program context. Prior to a record or budget review, the evaluation committee (composed of key stakeholders and internal and external evaluators) should identify priorities and reach consensus on questions they wish to answer during the review process. Some examples of assessment instruments for identifying available resources are presented in Figure 3.

School Context Summary

Program context is the first essential component for a whole-school bilingual education program. No education program can flourish if the context in which it operates is not conducive to success. The key elements for a whole-school bilingual education program are the overall climate of the school, its management, and the equitable use of its resources. In identifying these three issues as the focus for a whole-school program, we must know whether they are "working." Also indicated here have been methods for assessing whether these three elements of the school are truly inclusive, flexible, and democratic, and whether they meet the needs of all students and their families. In other words, does the program context benefit the school experience of all staff, students, and family members? Once the context is in place, a new program can be considered for implementation.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Though the school context is critical to the success of an effective whole-school bilingual education program, the actual implementation of its activities and programs has a direct impact on student success. Implementation includes specific school operations within the areas of curriculum and instruction, staff development, the role of the administrator and family/community involvement. This section describes those key elements of program implementation and ways in which these elements might be assessed to measure the operation of a program with diverse student populations.

Curriculum and Instruction

Traditionally, curriculum and instruction have been organized around subject areas or disciplines and presented as separate entities using facts and skills that are disconnected, fragmented, and disjointed. The teacher has been viewed as knowledge disseminator and gatekeeper; paper-and-pencil tests have been the "true" measures of knowledge. With the increased awareness of the needs of students from diverse backgrounds, trends in school reform have emerged with a new vision. This new vision looks at authentic learning and assessment as involving interaction with the environment in such a way that these experiences become integrated in the students' system of meaning (Beane 1991). Thus, active learning based on challenging content is viewed as an effective way to motivate students to reach high levels of achievement. The role of the teacher as facilitator and meaning-maker and the ongoing evaluation of student progress through performance-based assessments are emphasized in effective programs serving LM students.

Pivotal to the implementation of effective curricula and instruction are cultural and ethnic sensitivity; flexibility within the curriculum, instruction, and assessment; and successful English and native language teaching strategies. In the area of curricula, these features can be observed through:

a curriculum grounded in the languages, knowledge, and background of the students;
themes and activities that emerge from actual questions and needs of the students rather than solely through prescribed curricula or presumed needs and characteristics;
a variety of courses offered to students in their native languages and in English;
an inclusion of all students in bilingual programs;
the establishment of national, state, and local standards for all students;
the use a variety of new assessment mechanisms for holding schools accountable for reaching high standards;
the availability of extracurricular activities such as newspapers, enhancement programs, and sports activities for all students, including language minority students;
the involvement of educators, students, communities, businesses, and special interest groups in planning, decision-making, setting goals, and instructional support; and
appropriate identification procedures for students with exceptionalities; programs are developed to support their exceptional needs.

Similarly, there are key characteristics of instruction that relate to sensitivity, flexibility, and appropriate teaching strategies. These include:

opportunities for students to develop their native language while developing English;
instructional practices that integrate content areas, promote higher order thinking skills, and provide opportunities for active student responsibility and purposeful use of language and other skills;
effective teaching strategies such as cooperative learning, language experience, readers' and writers' workshops, and ongoing performance-based assessments;
materials that are varied, developmentally appropriate, free of bias, up-to-date, accurate, and reflective of the language(s) and culture(s) of the students;
expectations maintained by teachers, students, and families that all students can succeed at high levels; and
teachers empowered to make instructional choices that honor their professionalism.

Although these key features may be conducive to effective curriculum and instruction, alone they cannot improve the quality of teaching and learning in schools serving LM students. A clear framework for change based on high standards, comprehensive planning, continuous professional development, flexibility to draw upon all resources, and clear accountability are also key factors in improving teaching and learning.

Assessing curriculum and instruction. A sound assessment plan can be used to stimulate discussion and reflection. Any combination of the following may be assessed: effectiveness of implementation, appropriateness of course content, degree of student involvement, appropriateness of teacher performance, adequacy of classroom environment, extent of learning standards, or student outcomes. Assessments may also focus on identifying the needs and characteristics of the students and families being served. Educators, students, and families can use multiple resources (e.g., observation checklists, surveys, and self-assessments) to establish the format and select the criteria for the assessment tools. Figure 4 presents some sample curriculum and instruction assessment instruments.

Collecting assessment data to plan instruction and build curricula can be facilitated through the use of additional evaluation tools such as descriptive guides and forms for judging student learning, anecdotal records, teacher–parent–student conference interviews, learning logs, observation forms for viewing audio/videotapes, and photographs. Such multiple indicators allow educators to develop a clear picture of the effectiveness of any curriculum or instructional practice.

Staff

The school staff play a critical role in implementing a whole-school bilingual education program. Development of an effective curriculum coupled with appropriate instructional practices requires a great deal of coordinated staff effort. The review of effective school staff practices identified the following four general characteristics of staff qualities: broad knowledge and experience base, an awareness of inservice training needs, a sense of autonomy, and the ability to collaborate. Careful thought must be given to the assessment of these and other related staff qualities. Ultimately, the assessment of staff development must be linked to student learning.

Knowledge and experience. Lucas (1993) indicates that staff need to be knowledgeable about issues related to language minority education. But what constitutes "knowledgeable" and what are the issues? In order to address these questions, the school staff first must reflect on and identify their key issues; they then can make a valid determination concerning the match between their expertise vis à vis the needs of the students. Reflection on student needs must be ongoing since student populations are changing and their needs rarely remain static. Consequently, the staff knowledge base and experience must continually evolve.

Another area of concern is the varied depth of staff experience and knowledge (e.g., awareness of the issues, ability to apply knowledge, and ability to train other staff). Although it is unrealistic to expect all staff members to be trainers on all issues, all staff should at least have a threshold level of knowledge (i.e., an awareness) of key language minority issues and move toward developing expertise in one or more related areas of educational priority (e.g., language development, instruction, or assessment).

The key features for examining the effectiveness of staff knowledge and experience include: the degree of awareness the staff have of students' needs; the degree to which the staff have moved towards acquiring the desired level of expertise in targeted knowledge areas; and the degree to which staff knowledge and experience continue to evolve.

Training. A critical link to continuous growth of staff knowledge is staff training. An active, productive staff training component characterizes effective schools serving LM students (e.g., Garcia 1993; Lucas 1993; Lucas, Henze, and Donato 1990; McCollum, and Russo 1992; Tikunoff 1991). Staff inservice training must be based on meeting the needs of all students. Clearly, if the staff have examined the needs of their students and their own knowledge bases carefully, the selection and prioritization of inservice training should be evident. Moreover, inservice training should be ongoing and coupled with practice and coaching.

Autonomy. The third staff feature associated with effective schooling concerns the issue of staff autonomy or feelings of empowerment to make decisions (c.f. González et al. 1993). At a minimum, informed decision-making might include making explicit the nature of the problem and possible solutions, consultations with other teachers and experts, and developing a plan of action and a mechanism to assess the impact of the action taken in the first place.

Evidence of staff autonomy can occur at different levels—from individual student, small group, and classroom levels to grade and whole-school levels. Traditionally, teachers have had the most autonomy at the individual student, student group, and classroom levels. If the decisions made at these smaller levels are well informed, staff autonomy at higher levels of organization (i.e., the grade and whole-school levels) should be encouraged. Teams of experts could make decisions at most school levels.

García (1993) maintains that, within effective schools, staff also should have a sense of self-efficacy and see themselves as innovators. This offers staff opportunities to expand their knowledge and the autonomy to apply it.

Collaboration. The final effective whole-school feature concerning staff development is collaboration (McPartland and Braddock 1993; Garcia 1993). This feature can be defined as coordinated sharing of resources such as knowledge, support, staff, materials, and decision-making autonomy. Effectively identifying student needs, working within and across teams of staff experts, and negotiating needed inservice training, all require active collaboration among staff.

Assessing staff development. The use of self-assessments, peer reviews, focus groups, objective outsiders, and the students themselves will generate different and valued perspectives on staff development. A variety of assessment strategies (e.g., interviews, surveys, questionnaires) will aid in generating a range of evidence essential for making a valid judgment on the quality of staff development. Figure 5 provides some sample assessment formats and questions related to staff development.

In summary, if a staff is to implement a whole-school bilingual education program that will serve both monolingual and bilingual students equitably, it will have to engage in a dynamic process of well coordinated development activities.

Administrators

A promising aspect of the nation's efforts to restructure its schools is that an increasing number of people who are interested or involved in the education of LM students appears to be reaching consensus on an array of issues. One point in particular suggests that successful restructuring will depend largely on the ability of people at all levels of the education system to change (Olsen et al. 1994).

One facet of bilingual program implementation where this especially holds true is at the administrator level. A review of the effective schools research conducted over the past several years acknowledges that administrators play a critical role in facilitating program implementation that positively affects language minority students' outcomes (de George 1991). Identifying specific roles as well as assessing their impact

Figure 4

Sample Curriculum and Instruction Assessments

Sample Curriculum Observation Checklist

Check (✓) any of the following features observed in your school's curriculum.

- ❑ Native language development
- ❑ ESL classes use approaches appropriate for the ESL level of the student:
  - ___ Total Physical Response
  - ___ Natural Language Approach
  - ___ Language Experience
- ❑ Content classes in native language and English

Sample Teacher Native Language Use Rating Scale

Rate the use of native language on the following scale: 1 = unsatisfactory; 2 = satisfactory; 3 = outstanding.

1. Students' native language was used in a meaningful context.	1	2	3
2. The teacher's use of students' native language was understandable.	1	2	3
3. The teacher was able to understand students' questions, responses, and problems.	1	2	3
4. The teacher checked students' comprehension during instruction.	1	2	3

Sample Text Review

Circle the response that most closely matches what you see in the text material.

1. Information is accurate.	Yes	No
2. Graphics and illustrations reflect students' culture and background.	Yes	No
3. Reading level is developmentally appropriate for the target students.	Yes	No
4. The overall rating of this text is: (*Circle one*)	Excellent Good	Adequate Poor

---

Sample Student Survey Questionnaire

(Can be developed in native language and English as appropriate)

Rate each item according to the following scale: SA = strongly agree; A = agree; D = disagree; SD = strongly disagree.

1. My classes are interesting to me.	SA	A	D	SD
2. I am involved in the planning of classroom activities.	SA	A	D	SD
3. There is a variety of reading materials available in my first language.	SA	A	D	SD
4. The reading materials available are useful and interesting to me.	SA	A	D	SD

Sample Teacher Peer Observation or Teacher Self-Assessment

Rate each statement according to the following scale: 3 = always; 2 = sometimes; 1 = never.

1. Does the lesson move from the general to the specific?	1	2	3
2. Are details presented within a general conceptual framework?	1	2	3
3. Is there an attempt to draw on student background knowledge and interests?	1	2	3
4. Are students given choices?	1	2	3
5. Is the content meaningful?	1	2	3
6. Is there support for the students' first language and culture (even if the teacher does not speak the students' native language)?	1	2	3

on overall student and program accomplishments are critical factors in determining whether whole-school bilingual education programs are implemented effectively. As Segan and Segan (1991) propose, the institutionalization and acceptance of bilingual education as an integral part of the school depends on both the support that administrators provide and their ability to communicate to all staff. Features of effective bilingual programs that focus more specifically on the roles of administrators and their practices have been identified by García (1987), de George (1991), and Segan, and Segan (1991). These effective features can be categorized into three areas: understanding and knowledge, collaboration, and support.

Understanding and knowledge. It is imperative for all administrators to develop an extensive knowledge base regarding bilingual education. De George (1991) suggests that the knowledge base could be clustered into three areas: student and staff needs, theory and practice of bilingual education, and culture and cross-cultural communication. Key features of the administrator's knowledge base include:

developing an understanding of the history of bilingual education including legal, social, and political implications; instructional theories; implementation models; and current issues and trends;
recognizing the challenge of teaching LEP students, the need for ongoing and consistent support for staff, and the need for many resources;
using multiple assessment techniques; and
confirming the importance and value of cultural diversity and promoting language and culture as resources to be maintained.

Collaboration. Implementing effective bilingual programs involves entire school communities and shared decision making. Implementing bilingual programs that permeate every aspect of the school or district will mean new dynamics and structures of administration and management that focus on teamwork, collaboration, building trust, and working together (Olsen et al. 1994). According to de George (1991), Rosenholtz (in Segan, and Segan 1991), and others, key features in administrators' collaborative efforts include:

communicating high achievement goals for all students and organizing action that links family, student, and teacher efforts;
engineering opportunities for teacher collaboration at many levels as part of a comprehensive team-building plan;
encouraging joint administrator–teacher decision-making in instructional matters and enhancing the articulation of each classroom with an effective bilingual program; and
managing relationships with local, state, and federal external groups, agencies, and organizations.

Support. In districts where effective bilingual programs are implemented, there typically is a high degree of administrative support from the superintendent's level down. Effective bilingual programs benefit from administrators who demonstrate high levels of advocacy for the program, its students, and its staff. The key features of an administrator's supportive efforts include:

recruiting staff at all levels who are not only sensitive but knowledgeable about issues related to bilingual education and language minority students;
creating a vision for the bilingual education program that includes successful outcomes for students, staff, and parents;

promoting a salary differential policy for teachers who are endorsed or licensed in bilingual/ESL education in recognition of the importance of their specialization;
promoting and providing comprehensive staff development which includes pre- and inservice training, credit unit equivalents, and university/college coursework; and
ensuring that the needs of LEP students are addressed.

Assessing administrative efforts. The successful implementation of a whole-school bilingual education program will depend heavily on the quality of leadership provided at all administrative levels. A paradigm shift in the national system of education is creating a need for leadership vitality in bilingual education that stresses flexibility, collaboration, and the development of a comprehensive knowledge base. Figure 5 provides sample assessments that focus on the roles and functions of administrators.

FAMILY INVOLVEMENT

Traditionally, successful family involvement is measured by the increased active participation of parents in schools or programs. The challenge faced in linguistically diverse communities is that the typical expectation of school involvement does not accommodate the needs of those families facing the barriers of poverty, illiteracy, and cultural and linguistic differences (Goodson, Swartz, and Millsap 1991).

Based on numerous studies of exemplary bilingual and multilingual family programs (e.g., Cummins 1986; Faltis and Merino 1992; Lucas 1993; McCollum and Russo 1992), a new framework is proposed for designing and assessing the effectiveness of family involvement in multilingual communities. This framework reflects three common features: outreach, collaboration, and support.

Outreach efforts expand involvement from the parent to all family members; attempts are made to address the long-term needs of children by serving the short-term or immediate needs of the whole family.

Collaborations are established among key stakeholders (community leaders, educators, parents, and students) from the onset. All are involved in decisions ranging from scheduling to setting policy.

Support is provided through activities and services that will impact student learning directly and indirectly. By communicating to families in their home language, providing English-language instruction, and offering a wide variety of activities and services, schools can promote active parental participation. Parent advocates, counselors, or liaisons who are familiar with the community culture and who can speak the language(s) of the community can be employed to train school staff and bridge community school relations.

Assessing family involvement. In determining an assessment system for this innovative concept of family involvement that is practical and useful, we recommend identifying the needs of parents, assessing the impact of the collaborations and partnerships, and monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of family involvement activities. Specific examples of assessment items and formats for each step are provided for each step in Figure 6.

Other assessment devices that can be used to monitor numbers of persons participating in activities as well as the impact activities are having on families include sign-in sheets, self-reflections, diaries, logs, and focus groups. Family literacy skills can be assessed with various types of instruments including standardized literacy tests, interviews, observation devices, self-assessments, and performance samples (Holt 1994).

Figure 5

Sample Assessments for Staff and Administrators

Sample Interview Questions To Establish Staff Knowledge

1. What are the most pressing needs of your students? What evidence supports your opinion?
2. Which of these needs do you feel the staff have the knowledge and expertise to effectively address?
3. In which of these needs areas would you like to develop greater expertise?
4. Would you be interested in providing peer-training in any one of the needs areas you've identified?

Sample Rating Scale After Inservice Training

Rate the following statements on a scale from (1) = lowest level of agreement to (4) = highest level of agreement with the statement.

1. Previous staff discussions prepared me for this training.	1	2	3	4
2. I feel I have a better understanding of the issues.	1	2	3	4
3. I integrate this skill into my repertoire of teaching strategies.	1	2	3	4
4. I feel the administration has facilitated my participation in this training.	1	2	3	4

Sample Questionnaire Items After Practicing Skill

Please respond to the following questions.

1. How effective was the peer-coaching you received?
2. If you have begun to systematically apply the new skill, have you noticed any impact on students?
3. What kind of additional training or activities in this area would be useful to you?
4. Has the administration been supportive of your efforts to develop new skills?

Staff survey with Likert-scale responses

Circle the response that describes your building administrators: most of the time (MT), sometimes (S), or rarely (R).

1. Joint administrator–teacher decision making is encouraged.	MT	S	R
2. Opportunities for comprehensive staff development are consistently provided.	MT	S	R
3. The bilingual program is viewed as an integral part of all school programs.	MT	S	R
4. Parents are welcomed to school and treated with respect.	MT	S	R

Selected Self-Assessment Survey Items for Assessing Administrators

1. Do you encourage shared decision making?	Yes	No
2. Do you consistently communicate high achievement for all students as a goal?	Yes	No
3. Do you promote bilingualism and biliteracy as something valuable for all students?	Yes	No

Open-Ended Interview With Administrators

1. What are the goals and objectives of your school's bilingual program?
2. How could teacher–administrator collaboration in the school be enhanced?
3. Are you familiar with the legal implications and requirements that apply to LEP students?
4. In what specific ways do you model the importance and value of cultural diversity?

Focus Group Questions for Administrators and Staff

1. What is the district's vision of bilingual education?
2. Are goals and objectives clearly articulated?
3. What can administrators do to promote bilingual education in the community?

Figure 6

Sample Formats and Items for Assessing Family Involvement

Selected Survey Items for Assessing Family Needs

Check the areas you would like to receive information about or training in from the school.

Children	Myself
❑ Helping children with homework	❑ Improving English speaking/reading/writing skills
❑ How to discipline children	❑ Studying for a GED
❑ Provide counseling for children	❑ Improving talking with my children

Selected Interview Questions for Assessing Family Needs

1. What kinds of help do your children need? In school? At home?
2. What would you like to learn to help your child? At school? At home?
3. What time is the best for you to attend classes or meetings that may be developed?

Selected Survey Items for Assessing Family Participation and Satisfaction in Partnership Activities

Circle the number that best describes your participation and satisfaction with our partnership activities.
Key: 1 = Low; 2 = Mediocre; 3 = High.

	Participation			Satisfaction		
1. Planning goals	1	2	3	1	2	3
2. Designing program activities	1	2	3	1	2	3
3. Assessing family needs	1	2	3	1	2	3

Selected Approaches for Assessing Family Activities

1. Sign-in sheet information: Include the following information: date of activity; name of activity; name of participants; names of children, if attending; and sponsor(s) of the activity (e.g., Title I, VII, Indian Education, Migrant Education).
2. Interview/Questionnaire Responses: Questions to ask: *In which activities are you participating? What part of the activity sessions do you like best? What have you learned in these sessions? What else would you like to learn in the activity sessions?*
3. Self-assessments/reflection of skill development: Using video- or audiotapes, self-rating forms, self-reports, and comparisons of their own techniques/skills with modeled performances, parents can ask themselves the following questions: *What skills or techniques am I learning? In what areas am I strong? How do I know I am strong in those areas? In what areas do I need improvement? What do I need to do to improve in those areas?*
4. Focus groups questions: *What family literacy activities are most useful? Why? What activities could we enhance or delete? What other activities do you feel would be most useful to the community? Who would benefit from these activities?*
5. Family literacy assessments: *Pre/post-assessments* using a combination of multiple-choice short essay questions to measure reading comprehension and writing skills. Topics can range from cooking and nutrition to the U.S. school system, as long as they are tied to the adult literacy framework of the program.

   Observations of adult listening, reading, speaking, and writing skills can be rated according to the following scale: 4 = with ease; 3 = with some support; 2 = with great difficulty; 1 = not at all. Skills can also be assessed holistically or analytically based on predetermined criteria (e.g., writing criteria can be developed for the following rubrics: voice, organization, word choice, and mechanics). Other rubrics can consist of beginning literacy; developing literacy, and full literacy.

   Portfolios: Can be used to gather a complete picture of individual family members' participation and performance.

In short, an assessment plan for family involvement programs should be viewed as a dynamic process. It is linked closely to the diverse needs of families within the community, to the collaborative efforts of all key stakeholders, and to the activities and services required for successful family participation.

Program Implementation Summary

The essential component for a whole-school bilingual education program is the effective implementation of an appropriate and sensitive curriculum. The curriculum must be sensitive to cultural, ethnic, and linguistic differences and must support learning in the native language as well as in English. For this to be effective, staff must have the appropriate knowledge and experience, and must be empowered to utilize them. Administrators must understand the purpose of and support all academic programs within the school and must ensure collaboration both within and outside of the school. Finally, the entire family should be involved in the student's education. Once program context is in place and program implementation has begun, student outcomes can be considered. Without notable student outcomes, the program cannot be said to be truly successful.

STUDENT OUTCOMES

If the school's program context and program implementation are in place, then equitable and positive student learning are possible. Traditionally, student outcomes focus on achievement in the standard content areas of math, science, social studies, and language arts. In effective bilingual education programs, other essential results have been identified as well. The acquisition of learning strategies and improved self-concepts are as necessary to student growth and progress as academic achievement. This section describes learning strategies that can be used to promote positive academic achievement; self-concept strategies, including motivation, confidence, and ethnic self-pride; and assessment approaches that can be used to measure student progress and accomplishments.

Learning Strategies

Learning strategies are conscious mental processes that students develop and use in new learning situations, and to assess goals and outcomes. Students will learn more when they are able to reflect on what they are learning, and internalize and understand how they learn best. In other words, positive student outcomes (achievement) can result from the development of reflective cognitive monitoring and the development of metacognitive skills. Research on effective whole-school programs for LM learners identifies the particular advantage that bilingual students have in the area of metalinguistic awareness. For example, bilingual students often possess the ability to analyze the form as well as the content of language, the knowledge of how to talk about language, and control over non-literal uses of language such as puns, irony, and figures of speech (Snow 1990). Teachers are in an ideal position to model strategies that can enhance these abilities; they can demonstrate to students the thought processes and behaviors involved in applying metalinguistic and metacognitive skills.

The goal for any whole-school program is to prepare independent and cognitively aware students. In order to do this, students must participate actively in practice tasks and in processing new information into prior information, and must apply higher-order thinking skills in the target languages. Each of these areas is discussed in the following section along with methods for assessing whether these are occurring within the whole-school bilingual education program classroom.

Practice. Students require opportunities to practice applying learning strategies through active involvement in meaningful learning. Students who develop an awareness of learning strategies that can be applied to various tasks are better equipped to exhibit high levels of productive and successful task engagement. It is especially important for LM students to practice the application of learning strategies in activities that are relevant to them and that stem from their own strengths and diverse backgrounds. Language minority students also require ample opportunities to practice and apply learning strategies in their native language so that they then can transfer or apply their knowledge of these specific learning strategies to English task demands.

Information processing. All learners benefit greatly when new information is built upon prior knowledge and abilities. Positive outcomes can result from students' participation in schema building activities and the application of knowledge across content areas. Schema building activities such as webbing, quickwrites, and discussions, allow teachers to identify what students know about a topic. Subsequent opportunities to process information can build on existing strengths and include hands-on, process-oriented, meaningful activities. It is important that students have these opportunities to use new language skills to draw connections between the second language and concepts in their native language.

Higher order thinking. To develop students' attitudes, achievement levels, and abilities in two languages, offer meaningful active involvement across content areas in higher order thinking skills such as inquiry and problem solving. The ability to transfer skills to new learning situations and real life situations is enhanced through the development of higher order thinking skills. Conscious use of effective learning strategies in the native language allows students to transfer those skills to a second language. Students and teachers both benefit from opportunities to reflect on and evaluate the quality of their own thinking skills and strategies (Gardner 1993).

Assessment of learning strategies. Effective assessment of learning strategies involves determining what strategies are being used then looking for positive achievement and self-image outcomes. The easiest way to ascertain the learning strategies being used is through observational checklists; in addition, students can be asked questions about their perceptions of what they are learning. Assessment in this area is not graded, but is utilized to determine how rather than what students learn. Samples of assessment tools directly related to learning strategies and self-enhancement are included in Figure 7.

Self-Enhancement

The objectives of many education systems sometimes involve little more than learning specific content and procedural skills. However, research on excellent language minority programs identifies other outcomes such as the development of positive cultural and ethnic self-concepts, motivation to learn, and self-confidence as objectives of the education process. Self-concept is defined as skills and attitudes, including aspects of temperament and personality, that play a significant role in the individual's identity and engagement in the learning process. Self-esteem reflects a value judgement about oneself and one's morals, principles, and spirituality. Self-enhancement occurs when language and culture are validated through inclusion in all aspects of the whole-school bilingual education program and when students see themselves as an integral and constructive part of the learning environment.

Cultural/ethnic identity. Many language minority programs include development of a strong, positive ethnic identity as an objective necessary for the advancement of traditional academic achievement objectives. Academic achievement often is less-than-optimum for students who identify themselves as "differ-

Figure 6

Sample Assessments for Learning Strategies for Self Enhancement

Procedures for Conducting a Focus Group to Find New Strategies to Motivate Students

- ❑ Participants (between 5 to 10) include seventh grade teachers and education assistants.
- ❑ The purpose of the group is to identify strategies that actively involve students in the learning process and motivate them to enjoy learning.
- ❑ The group meets monthly to brainstorm new ideas and report on the effectiveness of strategies.
- ❑ A notebook of ideas and comments on the effectiveness of ideas is kept and made available in the staff lounge.

Sample Student Learning Strategies Self Evaluation

Today in Social Studies...

1. I learned more about...
2. I still have the following questions:
3. I have developed the following plans to answer these questions...

A Sample Rating of a Student's Writing Strategies

Does the student...

1.	use constructive strategies for getting drafts started?	___always	___sometimes	___rarely
2.	take the conference period seriously?	___always	___sometimes	___rarely
3.	help peers by listening to their drafts?	___always	___sometimes	___rarely
4.	use revision and editing processes?	___always	___sometimes	___rarely
5.	use support systems in the classroom (manuals, guidelines, spelling aides, resource materials)?	___always	___sometimes	___rarely
6.	actively participate during sharing?	___always	___sometimes	___rarely

---

Sample Ethnic Pride Self-Assessment

Students complete statements about ethnic pride at the beginning of the year and again at the end of the year.

1. Understanding my own traditional customs helps me appreciate others by...
2. Speaking my family's language is important because...
3. Here's what I do to show pride in who I am...

Sample Motivation and Confidence Self-Assessment

Circle the response that you feel most closely matches your feelings about your work in this class. The responses are (1) rarely, (2) sometimes, and (3) often.

1.	I work hard in this class.	1	2	3
2.	I understand the material for the class.	1	2	3
3.	This class is difficult, but worth the hard work.	1	2	3
4.	I speak up in class and have good ideas to share.	1	2	3
5.	Other students in class look up to me.	1	2	3

ent" and who feel this difference is equated with inadequacy. In our school systems, children who feel "different" are often children who do not speak English as their native language, or others who can be identified easily based on appearance (handicap, racial/ethnic, and so on). Cultural/ethnic identity is defined as a positive sense of self that radiates from an awareness of the beliefs, values, customs, and language of the culture to which an individual is born and raised.

Motivation. Motivation can be defined as the incentive to learn when the context for that learning is inclusive. Motivation to learn has long been acknowledged as a critical factor in an individual's ability and willingness to engage in the learning process. The effective schools research indicates that children are motivated to learn when the materials, methods, and content have personal meaning for them. For LM children, meaningfulness can be translated into the inclusion of their values, beliefs, customs, and language in all aspects of the instructional delivery system.

Confidence. Confidence is defined as assurance and conviction or self-possession; it is enhanced for LM students in an inclusive learning environment. Confidence is strongly tied to self-evaluation, which is dependent on two primary sources of information: the individual's experience, and what the individual thinks other people think of him/her. When LM students find themselves in education systems that reflect their learning styles and strategies and that validate their culture and way of life, confidence in ability to succeed is often a positive outcome that facilitates academic achievement.

Assessment of self-enhancement. The assessment of learning strategies and self-enhancement rarely occurs through the use of standardized or norm-referenced tests. Instead, surveys of attitudes, observations of behavior as recorded through checklists and interviews, and self-assessment of attitudes and skills can be useful tools for measuring change/progress. Assessment is usually not graded, so the importance and relevance of self-enhancement to academic learning must be underscored in some other fashion. Figure 6 provides some examples of assessment instruments used to measure self enhancement.

Student Performance Assessment

Assessment of student performance is important for at least two reasons: it ensures that students are improving their content and linguistic knowledge; and it "proves" to funding agencies that the special programs they funded are working. In the past, standardized tests have been the primary means for measuring what students know, not only for mainstream projects but also for federally funded programs such as Title I. Since the *Nation at Risk* report (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983), there has been talk of reforming assessments and assessment practices. Key to the current reform movement in the Clinton administration's *Goals 2000* legislation are the three types of standards identified: ***content standards*** define what should be taught and what students should learn; ***performance standards*** are concrete examples and definitions of what students should know and be able to do; and ***opportunity to learn standards*** define the criteria for assessing the adequacy of the learning opportunities provided for students.

The objective now must be to determine appropriate performance standards for students within whole-school bilingual education programs. To do so, both standardized tests and alternative assessments must be considered, including the purposes for which they function best and for which they are appropriate within a whole-school context.

Alternative assessments. The current reform movement in education and education testing is forcing many psychometricians to rethink their position on assessing students. Stakeholders are beginning to

suggest new frameworks that move away from testing students with the traditional standardized tests (e.g., Berlak 1992; Figueroa 1990; Gardner 1993). Although the manner in which we should assess students is not yet described fully, there is some basic agreement that the goal is contextualized measurement of student achievement. Gardner (1993) describes such assessment as ecologically valid, intelligence-fair, sensitive, intrinsically interesting and motivating, and part of the natural learning environment. Not only do alternative assessments measure students' knowledge, but they also can measure specific skills.

Alternative measures can take many forms, depending on the content and purpose of the assessment. The use of alternative assessments can be linked easily to classroom routines and learning activities. Some of the forms of alternative assessment that are more specifically appropriate for assessing students' learning include anecdotal records, teacher and student checklists, peer reviews, questionnaires, holistic rating scales, quizzes, criterion-referenced tests, cloze tests, and miscue analyses. Some forms more closely linked to activities include:

- ❑ essays, reports
- ❑ journal entries, logs
- ❑ collaborative work
- ❑ homework
- ❑ poetry, creative writing
- ❑ posters, artistic media
- ❑ reading lists
- ❑ games
- ❑ story retelling
- ❑ brainstorming
- ❑ writing samples
- ❑ debates, presentations

(from De Fina 1992, and Navarrete et al. 1990)

Although many of these alternative assessments appear to focus on student achievement, it should also be pointed out that they can be used to assess language proficiency (both native language and English). With alternative assessment, a single instructional activity can generate measures of language proficiency across all four modalities (reading, writing, speaking, and listening). Essays, reports, letters, and journal entries can be used as measures of the student's ability across different genres of writing. Similarly, reading lists, book reports, and story retelling can generate measures of the student's comprehension and reading ability. Observations of games, debates, and conferences can give indications of the student's oral and aural proficiencies.

Because alternative assessment can and should take many forms, teachers are frequently left with a major question: What do I do with all of this? How can it be organized to make sense of it all? One approach to organizing the information is through a ***portfolio***. Portfolios can serve as a repository for a student's "best" work and to demonstrate achievement and readiness to progress through the curriculum or program. By looking at "best" products across the school year, growth is demonstrated. Another way to demonstrate growth is to use the portfolio as a process or a place to keep *all* student work on a particular project, from first notes to final draft. In this way, growth can also be seen as the child, teacher, parents, and, possibly, peers evaluate the project's progress and the child modifies and edits the work. Portfolios can be empowering, can provide important information for school staff, and can show achievements in a practical manner. However, certain key elements must be in place when attempting to utilize portfolios.

1. Portfolios must be systematic, purposeful, and meaningful; they must have a clear purpose. The portfolio is not just a collection of work; each piece must be selected carefully to demonstrate growth and achievement—it must have a reason for being in the portfolio. Also, the portfolio can be used to collect materials within or across content areas.

2. Portfolios must exhibit self-reflection and judgement. In choosing the works to be included, teachers and learners should set guidelines and criteria.
3. Portfolios must interact with the curriculum. Portfolios must contain work that demonstrates a variety of tasks measuring the same skill and must demonstrate a close link between those tasks and curriculum objectives.
4. Portfolios must be assessed reliably. It is important that criteria be set so that administrators, teachers, parents, and/or students can all agree on what is a good portfolio.

This last element—portfolio assessment—is a controversial issue. Some argue that portfolios should not be graded, although individual contents should be graded. Others argue the opposite. First, it is important to recognize that the grading issue is based, in part, on the purpose of the portfolio. If the purpose is to meet the mandates of a funding agency to show "success," then grading of at least parts of the portfolio will be necessary.

When looking at individual pieces of work, it should be remembered that not every one need be graded. For some assignments, it may be enough to note that the work was completed or that the child participated, rather than having to assign a specific grade or score. At other times, a specific score may be needed. In such cases, scoring procedures such as holistic, primary trait, and/or analytic, should be considered.

For any type of scoring procedure, a method, or "rubric," should be developed to delineate the criterion for each score. For instance, if a holistic score of one to four is utilized, what constitutes a "one" and what does a student need to do to demonstrate "four" skills? Both time and practice are necessary to develop a sound, reliable scoring method. Other scoring methods are also appropriate for different types of alternative assessments. It is important to remember, however, that the criteria developed must reflect sound and reliable practices.

Standardized tests. When referring to standardized tests, most people think of norm-referenced tests (NRTs). NRTs are typically used to sort people into groups based on their assumed skills in a particular area. Although NRTs are designed to allow for comparison of students across grades, cities, states, and countries, such comparisons may not be appropriate for whole-school programs that are truly sensitive to all their students' needs.

NRTs can be useful to the teacher when either (1) the objectives of the curriculum being used match the objectives of the NRT, (2) the classroom teacher can access item scores for each student, or (3) the same NRT is used for needs and outcome assessments. The former, the match of curriculum and NRT, is important because the extent of the match will give more or less credence to the students' scores on the test. For instance, if the match between NRT and curriculum, referred to as "coverage," is good and students do poorly on the test, then teaching strategies, program objectives, and other factors should be reviewed; if coverage is poor, it should be expected that the students will score poorly. If item scores are available, the teacher can review error patterns to determine which items and portions of the test were problematic for students (e.g., the visual recognition portion of the reading subtest). However, this is time consuming and only possible if the school requests the necessary scoring information from the test scoring company. Finally, using the same NRT on an annual basis will allow comparison of students to baseline information and to national, regional, or local norm groups.

There also are some cautions to be aware of when using NRTs. Those most applicable to a whole-school bilingual education program include:

1. NRTs were designed to determine how well a student does in comparison to a particular norm group; they are not designed to show how well the student knows a particular subject area; and
2. they have been used to assess progress in specially-funded programs on the basis that these students should become "more like" their mainstream peers. For example, a LM student should learn to write with the same skill as an English-only peer. If this is an appropriate comparison, at what point in time does this expectation become realistic?

Commercially available language proficiency tests are considered standardized tests since they are administered in a uniform manner and generate results that compare the individual's test score to a norm group's. These types of language proficiency tests can be useful for making a number of language-related decisions (e.g., placement, monitoring language development). Similarly, test data generated from these types of tests are often useful for reviewing the impact a whole-school bilingual education program has had on language proficiency development over time.

However, as with any psychometric instrument, there are a number of precautions one should take when using standardized test scores to make a judgement regarding a student's language proficiency. Currently, many of the commercially available language proficiency tests are discrete-point measures of grammatical competence. Language proficiency entails much more (e.g., discourse organization, language functions, non-verbal communication) than just grammatical competence (Bachman 1990; Oller 1991).

In addition, while recent attempts have been made on the part of standardized language test developers to capture the linguistic processes as they present themselves in a school setting, they are not fully successful either. The four skills (aural, oral, reading, and writing) on these commercial language proficiency tests generally are not integrated in a lifelike manner. Thus, while language proficiency tests can be useful, they must be supplemented with additional evidence that is critical before a valid judgement or decision can be made regarding a student's language proficiency.

Student Outcome Summary

Frequently the only measure of program success is student achievement. Though student performance is important, the methods for measuring it must be cautiously considered. Careful attention must be paid to how assessments measure both achievement and language proficiency and how the skills are actually called upon in a real-life school setting across the curriculum. Standardized measures, especially commercially available tests, must be supplemented with additional evidence before valid and reliable judgements about a student's content area achievement or language skills can be made.

In addition to academic achievement outcomes, the effects on self-image must also be considered. The whole-school bilingual education program should seek to ensure that students' ethnic pride, confidence, and motivation levels are enhanced and that various learning strategies that are appropriate for ethnically and linguistically diverse students are employed. This section has described student assessment, in general, and, more specifically, the assessment of learning strategies and self-enhancement.

A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION PLAN

A fully developed assessment system is an essential component of any whole-school program. However, a recent study on school restructuring in California found that "schools are failing to consider information that will help them plan appropriate programs or assess the effectiveness of their reforms for students of different linguistic, cultural, or racial groups" (Olsen et al. 1994, p. 20). A concomitant problem is the lack of resources and support available to schools for the design and utilization of new assessment procedures (Olsen et al. 1994). In this section we suggest components of an assessment program that will assure that the community's needs are addressed by the school, that key components of program context and implementation can be measured, and that the effectiveness of the curriculum (i.e., learning) can be evaluated; in addition, methods for assuring the meaningfulness of the assessment practices are introduced.

Creating an Effective Assessment and Evaluation System

The overall purpose of a whole-school program's assessment system is to initiate and maintain discussion about how the school addresses the educational needs of all students, including LM students. In so doing, the school must be prepared to assess each of the components of school context and program implementation, as well as student outcomes. The objectives of each element of the assessment system must be understood clearly by school staff and by students and their families. In general, the elements of an assessment system include:

a needs assessment to determine the current status of the indicators of school context, program implementation, and student outcomes. "Initial assessment is important in the development of a successful [whole-school] program because it provides program planners with the opportunity to examine the needs, desire, and goals of the potential participants" (i.e., the entire school) (Graham, in Holt 1994, p. 36). The basic questions are, "Where are we now? What is the school doing?";

measures of progress to determine the successful features of the program, the shortcomings of the program, and whether program implementation and the students are progressing in the expected manner. Assessing the progress "can help staff determine the extent to which their instructional efforts lead to beneficial results and...give participants a sense of accomplishment by showing them that they are making headway" (Wrigley, in Holt 1994, p. 61). The basic question is "How much change has there been from the beginning of the program until now?";

outcome measures to determine whether the objectives of the academic year or educational unit have been met. These measures make it possible to summarize the progress made by the whole-school bilingual education program during the entire academic year. The basic question is, "How much change did we effect this year?"; and

evaluation an aggregation of progress and outcomes measures to determine whether the needs originally identified have been met by the program. In other words, "What changes have been made in school context, program implementation, and student outcomes?"

Designing the Evaluation

Just having data collected from various measures of progress and outcome is not enough. Data must be organized in a meaningful way to ensure that the conclusions about the success of the program are explicit and useful. To do this, evaluation design must be carefully considered prior to program implementation.

Two general types of information have been described as useful within a school program. The first, ***formative evaluation***, is conducted at various points during the planning and early stages of the program. A good formative evaluation can identify problems and suggest ways to modify the program in order to improve it. Thus, the needs assessment should be repeated during the early stages of the actual program to ensure that the population being served has not changed and that the identified needs still are germane. The use of ***dynamic evaluation*** has increased in recent years. While similar to formative evaluation, dynamic evaluation is more ongoing in nature and can provide suggestions for improving the project throughout its life (c.f., Figueroa 1990). Although some education agencies may require written formative or dynamic evaluation reports, frequently oral reports to key stakeholders in decision-making roles may be more appropriate.

The second type of evaluation, ***summative evaluation***, tends to be more formal. This might be the year-end report or the end-of-project report. The summative evaluation generally takes all the assessment results from across the life of the program (or the year), summarizes them, provides information about the strengths and weaknesses of the program, and suggests methods for further improvement in upcoming years. The summative report generally is written for, and frequently must follow, the particular requirements of a funding agency.

It is often best to consult with a professional evaluator when planning an evaluation design. There can be many pitfalls in designing and utilizing assessment instruments, especially for a bilingual population. In addition, many funding agencies have specific requirements and regulations that must be followed. A professional evaluator may have ideas on how these requirements can be followed while also serving the needs of the community.

Ensuring Meaningful Measurement

To ensure that an assessment is meaningful for the whole-school bilingual education program, two factors must be considered: reliability and validity. While psychometricians still argue about the relative importance of each of these concepts and what constitutes "good" reliability and validity, some general explanatory statements can help to clarify these test qualities.

Reliability can be seen as the stability or consistency of the assessment. For instance, two assessments of the same student, done at the same time, should show similar results; two reviews of a teacher's qualifications should result in similar conclusions. An instrument must be reliable if it is to be used to make decisions about whole-school program implementation or about students participating in the whole-school bilingual education program. Moreover, a measure that is not reliable cannot be valid.

Validity is more difficult to describe, in part because psychometricians are changing their own views of validity (Angoff 1988). As described by Messick (1988), validity asks whether the interpretation, uses, and actions based on assessment results are appropriate. The Joint Committee of the American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement adds that "validity...refers to the appropriateness, meaningfulness, and usefulness of the specific inferences made from test scores" or assessment results (1985, p. 9).

An instrument is reliable and valid only when it is used in the manner for which it was developed and for the purpose for which it was designed (including, of course, the students for whom it was designed). For example, a standardized, norm-referenced language arts test should not be used to determine students'

English proficiency. And, just as assessments must be reliable and valid, so must evaluations if they are to be useful in the decision-making process.

Assessment and Evaluation Plan Summary

When considering the purpose of an assessment, whether it is to be used as part of a needs assessment, to measure progress or outcomes, or as part of an evaluation, there is one key element—if there is no real purpose for a particular assessment, *do not do it!* If the aim is to show change over time (e.g., change in teacher attitudes, improvement in the curriculum for LM students, or student growth in reading), then the assessment should be something that can be used several times throughout the year. If the purpose is to show that objectives for a program have been met, then the assessment should match those objectives.

It also should be remembered that evaluation and assessment are tied together closely. Individual assessments for the various key indicators for school context, program implementation, and student outcomes are collected to show progress. These assessments then are aggregated for the purpose of evaluation to show that a program is meeting its stated purposes. Program evaluation and assessment include accountability and ongoing modification to ensure a program's continued success. Regardless of their purpose, assessment and evaluation must take into account reliability and validity and must focus on making a determination as to whether or not the linguistic, cultural, and education needs of individual students and the community (i.e., employers, families, and groups of students) are met.

IMPLICATIONS OF ASSESSMENT

What implications do these assessment and evaluation approaches have for whole-school bilingual education programs? Five major issues, at this juncture, appear to be of most importance.

1. ***Time***. As mentioned earlier, sufficient time will be needed to conduct the necessary needs assessment for each component of the evaluation as well as to field-test the validity and practicality of their assessment strategies. Equally important is the time needed to carry out the collaborative efforts with other funding agencies that have not been required before (e.g, coordination among Title I, Title VII, and Migrant Education Programs).
2. ***Funding***. In order to carry out a process-oriented evaluation like the one proposed, more funding will be required than has been allocated in the past for evaluations. Support for initial and ongoing planning, continuous monitoring, new assessment strategies, summarizing, and report writing will be required if a meaningful and useful evaluation is to be conducted.
3. ***Support***. This is a key issue for success. Most schools have not had to assess the implementation of their programs. Support in the form of technical assistance, for example, must be available to help school personnel collect the relevant information, report the necessary data, and account for their use of federal dollars appropriately.
4. ***School expertise***. In the spirit of collaboration and team-effort, staff, parents, students, and other key stakeholders must be trained and become experts on general assessment issues in order to participate in many aspects of the evaluation. School staff have the advantages of knowing the system that is in place, and being aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the day-to-day operations of the school. However, caution must be taken to allow evaluation teams the time to carry-out their responsibilities and develop the expertise required for reliable and valid assessments.

5. ***Assessment.*** Rather than testing different groups of students with different assessments or with the same, possibly inappropriate assessment, the whole-school bilingual program should look at ways to assess all students comparably. Portfolio assessments are one way to accomplish this and should be considered by whole-school programs. The specific contents and scoring procedures might change depending upon the student's grade level, language proficiency, and achievement, but the general portfolio contents would include the same types of materials. In this way, achievement levels can be shown to be comparable across classrooms within the whole-school program.
6. ***Evaluators.*** Who will design and implement the evaluation? Who will conduct the observations and interviews, or lead the focus group(s)? The answers to questions such as these are based on (1) the expertise of the school administrators and staff, (2) the purpose of the evaluation, (3) the monies available, and (4) the time available. School staff must be allowed the opportunity to consider utilizing internal evaluators, external evaluators, or a combination of both. A determination of the best alternative will be based on the expertise, isolation, and complexity of the program.
7. ***Evaluation.*** Most current evaluations deal almost solely with student outcomes. Within a whole-school bilingual education program, evaluation will also need to include the key indicators for program context and implementation. To ensure appropriate planning and evaluation, school data must be disaggregated by specific home language groups, language proficiency, and gender.

CONCLUSIONS

A whole-school bilingual education program is most likely to succeed when all its components—context, implementation, and outcomes—are working in concert. In other words, when the context is positive for all those involved in the education of students (including parents, administrators, teaching staff, and students), then the implementation will be positive. The curriculum will be innovative and sensitive to the needs of all students in the school; staff will be empowered by training and decision-making opportunities; administrators will understand the needs of their students and staff and encourage collaborations between them and with the community-at-large; families will be comfortable within the school environment; and learning strategies will be appropriate for the needs of LM and LEP students for whom teaching staff have high expectations. In being successful and seeing themselves as contributing and valuable members of the education community, all students, including language minority students, will develop improved self-concepts and will be motivated to work toward even higher standards.

REFERENCES

Angoff, W. H. (1988). Validity: An evolving concept. In H. Wainer, and H. I. Braun (Eds.), *Test validity* (pp. 19-32). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Beane, J. (1991, October). "The middle school: The natural home of integrated curriculum." *Educational Leadership*, 49, 9-13.

Berlak, H. (1992). Toward the development of a new science of educational testing and assessment. In H. Berlak, F. M. Newmann, E. Adams, D. A. Archbalds, T. Burgess, J. Raven, and T. A. Romberg (Eds.), *Toward a new science of educational testing and assessment* (pp. 181-206). New York: State University of New York.

Bossert, S. (1986). Effective elementary schools. In R. M. J. Kyle (Ed.), *Reaching for excellence: An effective schools sourcebook* (pp 39-40). (Contract No. 400-81-00040). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Congressional Record (1994, March 21). Conference report on HR 1804, Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Congress.

Cummins, J. (1986). "Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention." *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 18-36.

De Fina, A. A. (1992). *Portfolio assessment: Getting started.* New York: Scholastic.

de George, G. (1991). *Essential elements of bilingual program administration working paper.* (Contract No. T289005003). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Faltis, C. J., and Merino, B. J. (1992). Toward a definition of exemplary teachers in bilingual multicultural school settings. In R. V. Padilla, and A. H. Benavides (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on bilingual education research* (pp. 277-299). Tempe, AZ: Bilingual Press.

Figueroa, R. A. (1990). Best practices in the assessment of bilingual children. In A. Thomas, and Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology-II.* Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Garcia, E. (1987). *Effective schooling for language minority students.* (Focus Occasional Papers, No. 1). Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE).

Garcia, E. (1993). Project THEME: Collaboration for school improvement at the middle school for language minority students. In *Proceedings of the third national research symposium on LEP student issues: Focus on middle and high school issues.* 2, 323-354.

Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice.* New York: Basic Books.

Gonzales, M. L., Risner-Schiller, C., and Stell, E. M. (1993). Principal's role in promoting bilingual literacy. In J. V. Tinajero, and A. F. Ada (Eds.), *The power of two languages: Literacy and biliteracy for Spanish-speaking students* (pp. 199-208). New York: Macmillian/McGraw-Hill.

Goodson, B., Swartz, C., and Millsap, M. (1991). *Working with families: Promising programs to help parents support young children's learning.* Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.

Holm, A., and Holm, W. (1990). Rock Point, a Navajo way to go to school: A valediction. *Annals of American Academy of PSS* (pp. 170-184).

Holt, D. (Ed.) (1994). *Assessing success in family literacy projects: Alternative approaches to assessment and evaluation.* McHenry, IL: Delta Systems.

Joint Committee of the American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and American Council on Measurement. (1985). *Standards for educational and psychological testing.* Washington, DC: APA.

Lessow-Hurley, J. (1990). *The foundations of dual language instruction.* New York: Longman.

Lucas, T. (1992). *Successful capacity building: An analysis of twenty case studies (Phase III report): Descriptive analysis of bilingual instructional service capacity building among Title VII grantees).* Oakland: ARC Associates.

Lucas, T. (1993). *Applying elements of effective secondary schooling for language minority students: A tool for reflection and stimulus to change* (Program Information Guide, No. 14). Washington, D.C.: NCBE.

Lucas, T., Henze, R., and Donato, R. (1990). "Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools." *Harvard Educational Review*, 60, 315-340.

Lyons, J. (1993). The view from Washington. *NABE News*, 16(5), pp. 1, 25-27.

McCollum, H., and Russo, A. W. W. (1993). A conceptual framework on learning environments and student motivation for language minority and other underserved populations. In *Proceedings of the third national research symposium on LEP students' issues: Focus on middle and high school issues.* 1, 1-40. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Mehrens, W. A., and Lehmann, I. J. (1978). *Measurement and evaluation in education and psychology* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Messick, S. (1988). The once and future issues of validity: Assessing the meaning and consequences of measurement. In H. Wainer, and H. I. Braun (Eds.), *Test validity* (pp. 33-46). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Navarrete, C. (1994, February). Reaction to NABE education assessment position statements. In J. Lyons (Chair), *Recommendations for educational assessment concerning language-minority students.* Presentation at the annual meeting of the National Association for Bilingual Education, Los Angeles, CA.

Navarrete, C., Wilde, J., Nelson, C., Martínez, R., and Hargett, G. (1990). *Informal assessment in educational evaluation: Implications for bilingual education programs* (Program Information Guide, No. 3). Washington, D.C.: NCBE.

Oller, Jr., J. W. (1991). *Language and bilingualism: More tests of tests.* Bucknell University Press. Associated University Press.

Olsen, L., Chang, H., Salazar, D. D. L. R., Leong, C., Perez, Z. M., McLain, G., and Raffel, L. (1994). *The unfinished journey: Restructuring schools in a diverse society.* Sacramento: California Tomorrow.

Ramirez, J. D., Yuen, S. A., and Ramey, D. R. (1991). *Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children.* (Contract No. 300-87-0156). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Segan, E., and Segan, P. (1991). Supporting success within and beyond the bilingual classroom: The principal's role. In A. L. Carrasquillo (Ed.), *Bilingual education: Using languages for success* (pp. 97-114). New York, NY: New York State Association for Bilingual Education.

Snow, C. (1990). Rationales for native language instruction: Evidence from research. In A. Padilla, H. Fairchild, and C. Valadez (Eds.), *Bilingual education.* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Stanford Working Group. (1993). *Federal education programs for limited-English proficient students: A blue print for the second generation.* Stanford, CA: author.

Tikunoff, W. J. (1991). *Working with diverse student populations* (Working Paper). Larkspur, CA: The Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Tikunoff, W. J. (1985). *Applying significant bilingual instruction features in the classroom.* Washington, D.C.: NCBE.

Viewpoint [an interview with Dr. Eugene Garcia] (in press). *EAC-West News.* (Available from EAC-West/NMHU, 121 Tijeras NE, Suite 2100, Albuquerque, NM 87102).

OTHER TITLES AVAILABLE FROM NCBE

Titles in NCBE's Focus Occasional Paper and Program Information Guide series are available for $3.50 per copy. To order any of the titles listed below, circle their number(s) and provide the information requested below. Detach this page and mail it, along with your check or purchase order, to: NCBE Orders, 1118 22nd Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.

Focus Occasional Paper Series

9. **Bilingual Education: A Look to the Year 2000.** Gilbert Narro Garcia, 1994.
8. **Distance Learning: The Challenge for a Multicultural Society.** Aida Barrera, 1993.
7. **School Readiness and Language Minority Students: Implications of the First National Education Goal.** Cynthia D. Prince & Leslie A. Lawrence, 1993.
6. **Re-Thinking the Education of Teachers of Language Minority Children: Developing Reflective Teachers for Changing Schools.** Robert Milk, Carmen Mercado & Alexander Sapiens, 1992.
5. **Programs for Secondary LEP Students: A California Study.** Catherine Minicucci & Laurie Olsen, 1992.
4. **Teaching and Testing Achievement: The Role of Language Development.** Muriel Saville-Troike, 1991.
3. **Bilingual Education: A Focus on Current Research.** Stephen D. Krashen, 1991.
2. **Early Childhood Programs for Language Minority Children.** Helen Nissani, 1990.
1. **Bilingualism and Bilingual Education: A Research Perspective.** Kenji Hakuta, 1990.

Program Information Guide Series

17. **Family Literacy for Language Minority Families: Issues for Program Implementation.** Margaret Mulhern, Flora V. Rodriguez-Brown & Timothy Shanahan, 1994.
16. **Multicultural Education: Strategies for Linguistically Diverse Schools and Classrooms.** Deborah Menkart, 1993.
15. **Reforming Mathematics Instruction for ESL Literacy Students.** Keith Buchanan & Mary Helman, 1993.
14. **Applying Elements of Effective Secondary Schooling for Language Minority Students: A Tool for Reflection and Stimulus to Change.** Tamara Lucas, 1993.
13. **The Literacy Club: A Cross-age Tutoring/Paired Reading Project.** Barbara Cook & Carole Urzua, 1993.
12. **Cooperative Learning in the Secondary School: Maximizing Language Acquisition, Academic Achievement, and Social Development.** Dan D. Holt, Barbara Chips & Diane Wallace, 1992.
11. **Teaching Science to English Learners, Grades 4-8.** Ann K. Fathman, Mary Ellen Quinn & Carolyn Kessler, 1992.
10. **Writer's Workshop and Children Acquiring English as a Non-Native Language.** Katharine Davies Samway, 1992.
9. **Performance and Portfolio Assessment for Language Minority Students.** Lorraine Valdez Pierce & J. Michael O'Malley, 1992.
8. **The Newcomer Program: Helping Immigrant Students Succeed in U.S. Schools.** Monica Friedlander, 1991.
7. **Integrating Language and Content Instruction: Strategies and Techniques.** Deborah J. Short, 1991.
6. **Fostering Home-School Cooperation: Involving Language Minority Families as Partners in Education.** Emma Violand-Sánchez, Christine P. Sutton & Herbert W. Ware, 1991.
5. **School Based Management: What Bilingual and ESL Program Directors Should Know.** Denise McKeon & Lynn Malarz, 1991.
4. **Using Interpreters and Translators to Meet the Needs of Handicapped Language Minority Students and Their Families.** Sandra H. Fradd & Diane K. Wilen, 1990.
3. **Informal Assessment in Evaluation of Educational Programs: Implications for Bilingual Education Programs.** Cecilia Navarrete et al., 1990.
2. **Integrating Learning Styles and Skills in the ESL Classrooms: An Approach to Lesson Planning.** Emma Violand Hainer et al., 1990.
1. **Helping Language Minority Students After They Exit from Bilingual/ESL Programs: A Handbook for Teachers.** Else V. Hamayan & Ron Perlman, 1990.

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

_____

Phone: _____ *ORDER TOTAL* _____

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1994 O - 161-397

detach here

About the Authors

The authors are on the staff of the Title VII Evaluation Assistance Center (EAC-West) at New Mexico Highlands University, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Ann Del Vecchio is a senior research associate with the EAC-West. She completed her doctorate in education psychology at the University of New Mexico.

Cyndee Gustke is a research associate with the EAC-West. She completed her master's degree in elementary education at the University of New Mexico.

Michael Guerrero is a research associate with the EAC-West. He completed his doctorate in educational linguistics at the University of New Mexico.

Paul Martínez is director of the EAC-West. He received his doctorate in curriculum and instruction and bilingual education from New Mexico State University..

Cecilia Navarrete is the assistant director of the EAC-West. She received her Ph.D. in curriculum and teacher education from Stanford University.

Christopher Nelson is a senior research associate. He received his doctorate in educational psychology and research from the University of Kansas.

Judith Wilde is a senior research associate with the EAC-West. She completed her doctorate in psychological foundations of education at the University of New Mexico.

ED OBEMLA 94-1

Whole-School Bilingual Education Programs: Approaches for Sound Assessment

Whole-School Bilingual Education Programs: Approaches for Sound Assessment examines the research base on effective schools and its implications for whole-school bilingual education programs. Specifically, the authors focus on the identified features of effective schools in light of the distinct cultural and language-related characteristics they may take on when placed in the context of large language minority student populations and, by extension, whole-school bilingual education programs.

The authors suggest assessment strategies based on the effective schools features that can be incorporated into the design and measurement of effective whole-school bilingual education programs. Sample assessments are included in the publication.

NCBE

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education
1118 22nd Street, NW ▲ Washington, D.C. 20037