

ABBOTT IMPLEMENTATION MANUAL

Integrating Students of Limited English Proficiency into Standards-Based Reform in the Abbott Districts

*****DRAFT*****

by

Tamara Lucas & Ana María Villegas

© October, 2002 The Education Law Center

This document was produced by the Education Law Center with generous support from the Schumann Fund for New Jersey and the Victoria Foundation. The views expressed are those of the authors and the Education Law Center and not necessarily those of the Foundations.

About the Authors

Tamara Lucas is an Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Foundations at Montclair State University. She has devoted her career to addressing issues of equity and quality in the education of culturally and linguistically diverse students. She began her career as an ESL teacher in San Francisco and later received a Ph.D. in Education, with a concentration in Language, Literacy, and Culture, from Stanford University. Her work has included research on factors facilitating the success of English language learners in secondary schools and on the preparation of culturally responsive teachers. She has also engaged in various efforts with K-12 educators to improve the education of all students. For example, she coordinated a network of eight school districts north of New York City that were collaborating to increase educational equity for their increasingly diverse student populations. Her publications include “Promoting the Success of Latino Language Minority Students: An Exploratory Study of Six High Schools,” “Reframing the Debate: The Roles of Native Languages in ‘English-Only’ Programs for Language Minority Students,” and two books: Into, Through, and Beyond Secondary School: Critical Transitions for Immigrant Youths, and, with Ana María Villegas, Educating Culturally Responsive Teachers: A Coherent Approach.

Ana María Villegas is Professor of Education at Montclair State University, where she teaches courses in urban education and culturally responsive teaching. She has a Ph.D. in curriculum and instruction from New York University. Prior to joining Montclair State University in September 1996, Dr. Villegas was a Senior Research Scientist with the Division of Education Policy Research of Educational Testing Service, a position she held for seven years. Before that, she was on the Education faculty at the University of Colorado-Denver. She has also been a bilingual teacher with the New York City Public Schools.

Dr. Villegas specializes in the education of racial/ethnic and language minority students, particularly in inner city schools. She has conducted studies of policies and practices in the education of immigrant students, effective instructional practices in bilingual classrooms, and strategies for preparing culturally responsive teachers. Her publications include “Immigrant Education in New Jersey: Policies and Practices,” “Helping Immigrant Students,” and “Democracy’s Challenge: Creating Culturally Responsive Schools.” She recently co-authored a book, with Tamara Lucas, entitled Educating Culturally Responsive Teachers: A Coherent Approach, published by SUNY Press.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Barriers to LEP Students’ Access to Learning	3
Effective Instructional Practices for LEP Students.....	6
Creating an appropriate classroom climate	8
Making content comprehensible to students	9
Offering an academically challenging and culturally inclusive curriculum	10
Promoting English language development.....	11
Sample Survey for Content Area Teachers	13
Assessing Student Learning	14
Implementation Issues and Strategies for Meeting those Challenges	15
Tapping existing expertise in the education of LEP students	16
Identify and involve knowledgeable people	16
Collaborate with community groups and agencies	18
Involve the parents of LEP students.....	20
Building expertise in the education of LEP students.....	22
Consider language expertise as a criterion in hiring new staff.....	22
Involve everyone in ongoing learning about the education of LEP students	22
Enhancing the conditions for LEP student learning	27
Hold high expectations for LEP students	28
Seek funding for supplemental programs	29
Sample Survey.....	31
Moving beyond the special-education mentality.....	32
Learn from the experiences of other schools	33
Promote the integration of educators of LEP students and other educators.....	34
Promote the integration of LEP students and other students.....	34
Monitoring the adequacy of the education LEP students are receiving	35
Examples of Schools Working to Integrate LEP Students into School Reform.....	41
Resources.....	44
References.....	52
Appendix A: Abbott District Enrollments.....	57
Appendix B: Definitions.....	58
Appendix C: Laws and Regulations.....	60
Appendix D: School Descriptions.....	62

Introduction

In 1999-2000, over one-third of all students in the 30 Abbott districts spoke a native language other than English, and more than one-tenth were considered limited English proficient (LEP). The proportions of LEP students varied considerably across the districts, but they comprised between 5% and 29% of total enrollments in 18 of the districts. (To see the numbers and proportions of LEP students in the Abbott districts, see Table 1 in Appendix A. For definitions of terms used throughout this chapter, see Appendix B.)

While the Abbott Decisions do not explicitly mention LEP students, their marked presence in the Abbott districts means that their needs must be taken into account in reform efforts. In fact, the decisions and the funds to which they entitle Abbott schools provide a powerful opportunity to reform schooling for all students in Abbott districts, including LEP students. By requiring the state to articulate core curriculum content standards—that is, to make explicit what all students should know and what schools should teach in the different content areas—the New Jersey legislature laid the foundation for enhancing educational equity. Well-crafted standards establish high expectations for all students, including LEP students, and make those expectations clear to everyone.¹

Until recently, state regulations and other DOE instructions said little about *how* the standards should be implemented and district offices were effectively ignored by the state’s language and guidelines. All of this is in the process of changing. In February 2002, Governor McGreevey signed an executive order establishing the Abbott

¹ For a more detailed discussion of standards based school improvement in the Abbott districts, see the Standards chapter of this manual series.

Implementation and Compliance Coordinating Council. This Council is responsible for identifying reform priorities, evaluating state regulations, ensuring full and effective implementation of all Abbott programs, assessing progress, and resolving disputes along the way. One of the Council's first recommendations was to call for workgroups. Five work groups are currently in the process of outlining policy and implementation revisions for the Abbott regulations to reflect greater support at the school level, a more central role for districts, recognition that central offices themselves require assessment and planning for improvement, and clearer criteria for establishing need and securing funds.

It would appear that parties to the Abbott implementation process are in agreement that schools cannot do the work of standards-based instructional improvement alone. The wheels are in motion to establish better lines of communication and support between the state, districts and individual schools to ensure that educators receive the assistance and resources needed to get the job done. The state will require that schools take a hard look at what they need, and will finally look to and support districts as active participants in schools' improvement efforts. Hopefully, changes in the state's approach to Abbott implementation, and the new cooperative relationship between the parties involved will bring about meaningful change for Abbott students. After all, simply having written standards does not guarantee that all students have the opportunity to achieve them.

For LEP students to meet rigorous academic standards, their schooling must incorporate what is known about best practices for their education—including supplemental academic and social support services—and they must have access to teachers who are prepared to teach them. When the State distributed new guidelines for

school and central office assessment, planning and budgeting for 2003-04 and beyond, it was announced that a new working group will be formed to more explicitly review and propose improvements to state, district, and school policies and programs for LEP students.

The purpose of this chapter is to help educators in the Abbott districts — especially those involved in school management and improvement teams (SMITs)—to make informed decisions that will maximize the benefits of the Abbott Decisions for LEP students. The chapter is organized into five sections. In section one, we discuss barriers to LEP students’ access to learning. Section two summarizes effective instructional practices for LEP students. The third section discusses key challenges educators in Abbott districts face in addressing the needs of LEP students as they implement standards-based reform. Section three also suggests several strategies for addressing each challenge. In section four, we present examples of other schools working to integrate LEP students into their school reform efforts. The last section provides a list of resources, which might be useful to educators in Abbott schools regarding standards-based reform and the education of LEP students.

I. Barriers to LEP Students’ Access to Learning

To succeed in school, LEP students must overcome several barriers. They must learn a new language and adjust to a new culture. Many LEP students, particularly those in the Abbott districts, must also overcome the negative impact of poverty on learning. If LEP students are immigrants (and a large number of them are), they may face two additional barriers to educational success: limited or no previous academic preparation, and emotional and psychological stress tied to the experience of immigration.

Language. By definition, LEP students are not proficient enough in English “to learn successfully in classrooms where the language of instruction is English” (New Jersey Administrative Code, Title 6A:15-1.2 Definitions). Since English is the language of instruction in U.S. schools, lack of proficiency in English is a serious barrier to learning for LEP students. Students who do not understand English are at risk of delayed academic development because they have limited access to the core curriculum.

Culture. The cultural values, customs, and assumptions of many LEP students differ from, and sometimes clash with, the culture reflected in U.S. schools. LEP students may have emigrated from another country, or they may be part of a minority group within the United States. Students who come from other countries—especially those who have had little previous schooling—or from families within the U.S. who do not have a history of success in the educational system may not “know the rules” for participating successfully in school activities. They may not understand how they are expected to participate in class or how to show teachers what they know. Their parents may not understand the roles they are expected to play in their children’s education. Such cultural incompatibilities can create learning barriers for LEP students.

For example, the emphasis on individualism and competition that is at the heart of the school experience in the United States is problematic for many immigrant students. Because some immigrant communities socialize their members to value the family above the individual, school activities based on individual competition can prove difficult. Some students may also be uncomfortable expressing their own opinions or arguing their points of view. These practices may clash with their previous schooling experiences in which they were expected to memorize and repeat the opinions of authorities.

When teachers do not recognize or know how to address cultural differences in the classroom, they can easily misinterpret the behavior of students from minority cultures and develop negative impressions of their academic and social skills. Teachers who treat cultural differences as deficiencies to be corrected, instead of as strengths to be built upon, force students to choose between the ways of home and the ways of school. These cultural conflicts lead to the alienation and marginalization of minority students and can result in serious academic delays.

Poverty. Poverty, which is highly correlated with low academic achievement, is another barrier to learning for LEP students. Like other students in the Abbott districts, many LEP students are poor. They are likely to experience hunger and inadequate nourishment, poor health care, substandard housing, and high rates of mobility. They probably have parents who are poorly educated and who work long hours and therefore have little time at home. They are also likely to lack access to enriching experiences and resources such as preschool, libraries, and concerts. These factors interfere with academic success, regardless of a student's desire or ability to learn.

Limited prior schooling. While most immigrants have attended schools in their native countries, many LEP students from immigrant families come to U.S. schools with little or no previous schooling. They are not literate in their native language, are unfamiliar with the schooling process, and have serious academic gaps. Many of these students come from war-torn and impoverished areas where they had limited opportunities for schooling. The problems of these preliterate or academically delayed students are most notable among middle school and high school age students, who have more challenging academic tasks and less time to catch up to their peers.

Psychological stress. Another barrier to learning for many immigrant LEP students is the stress that accompanies the move to a new country with an unfamiliar language and culture. The immigrant experience uproots people from the safety of a familiar environment and transplants them into a new setting with unfamiliar customs, assumptions, laws, and institutions. Such dramatic change has a profound impact on the family and demands significant adaptation by all family members. Young immigrants, particularly adolescents, must deal with profound loss in the separation from friends and family. The fact that they typically have no choice in the decision to move may intensify their difficulty in adjusting to the changes. In addition, because they are often the first in their families to learn English, young immigrants frequently assume family responsibilities beyond those of their native-born peers. Thus, school-age immigrants experience the stress of this transition no less than the adults in the family.

II. Effective Instructional Practices for LEP Students

According to New Jersey law, students of limited English proficiency must have access to academic courses, non-academic courses, and support services that will prepare them “to meet the Core Curriculum Content Standards for high school graduation” (New Jersey Administrative Code, Title 6A:15-1.4 Bilingual programs for limited English proficient students). (See Appendix C for a summary of federal and state laws and regulations regarding the education of LEP students.) State laws and regulations, however, leave most decisions about the details of the schooling process to local districts and schools. In planning and implementing instructional programs for LEP students as part of their reform efforts, Abbott district offices and members of SMITs will need to draw on what is known about best practices for the education of this student population. To assist in this process, we present a brief summary of these practices here. They should not be seen as rigid prescriptions for teaching LEP students. The diversity of experiences

of LEP students precludes the use of fixed scripts by teachers. Teachers must be flexible in adapting instruction to local circumstances and to individual students. Figure 1 outlines the discussion.

Figure 1
Effective Instructional Practices for LEP Students

➤ **Creating a classroom climate that fosters a feeling of belonging and encourages students to express themselves**

Providing orientation to the school.
Making classrooms non-threatening.
Establishing relationships with students.

➤ **Making content comprehensible to students**

Using students' native languages for instruction.
Aiding students' comprehension.
Involving students actively in learning.

➤ **Offering an academically challenging and culturally inclusive curriculum**

Making the curriculum challenging.
Making the curriculum inclusive.

➤ **Providing for English language development**

Using English for meaningful, communicative purposes.
Creating language-rich classroom environments.
Helping students take control of their own learning.
Using an integrated approach to teaching language.
Coordinating English language and subject matter instruction.

➤ **Assessing Student Learning**

A. Creating a classroom climate that fosters a feeling of belonging and encourages students to express themselves

LEP students often feel isolated when they first enter school. Teachers can ease their sense of isolation by creating supportive classroom communities that involve students as active participants.

Providing orientation to the school. Teachers can foster LEP students' feelings of belonging by helping them become oriented to how schools and classrooms typically operate. They might use a buddy system for LEP students by assigning a peer mentor, or buddy, who speaks both English and the student's native language. The role of the buddy is to help the LEP student adjust to school and classroom routines.

Schools might also give each new LEP student a list of school and classroom rules translated into the student's native language. Bilingual students can be important liaisons in orientation because they can review the school and classroom expectations with the LEP students and answer questions.

Making classrooms non-threatening. Another way teachers can welcome LEP students is to make their classes non-threatening places for self-expression and for practicing English. Teachers can do this by minimizing competition, maximizing cooperation, and encouraging students to take risks and be supportive of one another.

Establishing relationships with students. Teachers who establish good relationships with students tend to have a positive influence on their academic achievement. When students know that a teacher cares for them, they are more likely to apply themselves to school activities. However, for teachers to connect with their students, they must believe their students are capable of learning. Teachers' understanding of their students' experiences plays a critical role in learning. Teachers

who see linguistic and cultural differences as strengths to be tapped in the learning process, rather than as problems to be overcome, can communicate more effectively with their LEP students. In order to fully understand the experiences and recognize the strengths of students of diverse social and cultural backgrounds, teachers need to learn as much about their students as possible. They can do this by having students share their experiences and perspectives in written and oral in-class activities, communicating directly with parents and community members, and visiting homes and communities.

B. Making content comprehensible to students

Using students' native languages for instruction. Whenever possible, LEP students should have the opportunity to learn academic content in their native languages and develop their native language proficiency while they are developing their academic English proficiency. The national Standards for English Language Arts emphasize the importance of native language development to the learning of English. New Jersey requires districts with twenty or more LEP students who speak the same language to offer all required courses in the students' native language as well as in English. When LEP students have access to such courses, they can develop content knowledge appropriate to their age and grade rather than lagging behind as they develop their English skills. Even when it is not possible to provide full-blown bilingual programs, LEP students can benefit from the use of their native languages—by teachers or by other students—for clarification and elaboration of ideas being conveyed in English.

Aiding students' comprehension. When English is the language of the classroom, teachers can help make content in English comprehensible to LEP students by adjusting their instruction in a variety of ways. They can use graphic organizers, simplified speech,

increased wait time, restatement of central points in the lesson, and frequent comprehension checks. They can also employ mediums other than language, such as visuals, music, physical activities, and hands-on activities.

Involving students actively in learning. Active participation in classroom activities is a stimulus for learning, so teachers must deliberately plan and implement instruction to involve all students, including LEP students. Cooperative learning tasks, hands-on activities, discovery projects, problem-solving activities, and role-playing are effective both in teaching English to students with limited English language proficiency and in teaching new concepts to students in their new language.

C. Offering an academically challenging and culturally inclusive curriculum

Making the curriculum challenging. An effective curriculum for LEP students prepares them to meet the same rigorous standards that other students are expected to meet. Such a curriculum values depth over breadth of material covered and allows for in-depth understanding of fewer topics rather than superficial attention to a larger number of topics. It emphasizes problem solving, communication, critical thinking, and inquiry rather than focusing solely on basic skills and memorization of facts. It also gives equal attention to developing LEP students' English language proficiency (through ESL classes) and to developing their academic knowledge and skills in the core content areas (through rigorous content courses).²

Making the curriculum inclusive. Students learn not simply by acquiring new knowledge and skills, but by re-configuring and reorganizing what they already know. Because students' individual and cultural experiences form the foundation for future learning, teachers must build bridges from students' existing knowledge and prior experience to the new information and skills they need to learn. One way teachers can

² For more on teaching a standards based curriculum, see the Standards chapter of this manual series.

help their LEP students to build bridges to learning is by selecting multicultural topics and materials that are relevant to their students' lives. For example, teachers can select stories for their literature classes that reflect different linguistic and cultural groups represented in class.

D. Promoting English language development

To succeed in school, LEP students need to learn English as quickly as possible. Because English is the language used in mainstream classes, a prolonged lack of English limits students' access to mainstream education. English language development, therefore, must be a key component of instructional programs that serve LEP students, whether they are English-as-a-second-language or bilingual education programs.

Using English for meaningful, communicative purposes. One effective strategy for teaching English to LEP students is to involve them in using the language to communicate in meaningful ways. Rote imitation of language patterns and review of the rules of grammar can be helpful in the early stages of second language learning, but to develop true language skills, students must have consistent and extensive exposure to the types of communication used everyday.

Teachers must create a classroom environment in which students use English to communicate with one another. For example, a teacher might organize students into small groups to conduct a science experiment so that English is the only language most members of each group have in common. Students would have to speak with one another in English in order to carry out their experiments.

Teachers can also help their students develop English writing skills by engaging them in meaningful activities. Teachers in different schools might pair their LEP students as pen-pals so the students could write to their pen-pals regularly and perhaps

visit on occasion. Such a long-term project would create a genuine context for communication through writing.

Creating language-rich classroom environments. To develop their bilingual proficiency, LEP students need lots of contact with language—both oral and written language, and both English and their native languages. Classrooms should be filled with reading materials of all sorts—textbooks, novels, nonfiction books, magazines, journals, and student-written texts. They should also be places where students are constantly engaged in communicating with each other orally and in writing. While workbook exercises and oral drills can help LEP students learn some language structures, they should be used sparingly; instead meaningful communication among students should predominate.

Helping students take control of their own learning. Another strategy for actively engaging students in learning English is to enable them to control their own work. Teachers empower LEP students by allowing them to choose from a selection of carefully designed learning activities. Of course, these activities should require students to use English in meaningful ways.

Using an integrated approach to teaching language. Teachers help LEP students to learn English by treating listening, speaking, reading and writing skills holistically, not individually or sequentially. When different language skills are taught in an integrated manner, even beginning students can easily learn to read and write stories.

Coordinating English language and subject matter instruction. The primary goal of English-as-a-second-language programs is English language development, but a secondary goal is to support learning in other academic areas. English-as-a-second-

language teachers can work cooperatively with content area teachers, for example, by reviewing vocabulary related to concepts introduced in content area classes.

It is generally easier for English-as-a-second-language teachers to take the lead in this curricular coordination. The English-as-a-second-language teacher must have a clear and current understanding of the academic content taught to LEP students in their other classes. This demands ongoing communication with the academic subject teachers. While informal conversations work, it is better to set aside specific times to discuss the curriculum regularly, even if only briefly. Another way to communicate is for the English-as-a-second-language teacher to develop a short survey for content teachers to complete. The following is a sample of such a survey:

Sample Survey For Content Area Teachers

How can the ESL program coordinator and ESL teacher(s) best support the learning of LEP students in your classes during the coming months?

1. Teach the following vocabulary words:

2. Teach the following expressions:

3. Review the following concepts:

4. Other:

E. Assessing Student Learning

The overall purpose of assessment should be to help teachers identify the particular strengths and needs of their students so they can determine the most effective ways of building on what the students already know while helping them grow academically. It is particularly challenging to assess the learning of LEP students. They may understand academic concepts but not be able to show their understanding because they are not proficient in English. Teachers must be able to distinguish difficulties in learning concepts from difficulties in understanding and using English.

While standardized and classroom tests can provide some information about student learning, they should not constitute the sole source of such information. To effectively assess LEP student learning, teachers need to use a variety of strategies to examine and evaluate students' work on meaningful tasks. For example, teachers can use observation checklists to assess how students apply what they have learned, individually and in small groups. They can examine students' work products and give close attention to students' oral responses in class. They can engage students in oral interviews, story retelling tasks, and completion of story prompts. If students are literate and have formal education in their native languages, assessing their academic content knowledge in their native language can supplement assessments in English. Professional development on alternative, authentic, and performance assessments for LEP students can help teachers develop the skills to more accurately assess their learning.

Standardized norm-referenced tests pose special problems for LEP students. Garcia and Pearson (1994) have argued that standardized tests are biased in three ways, as applied to LEP students. First, the content of such tests reflects the shared knowledge

and expectations of the dominant linguistic and cultural groups in the larger society. Second, the linguistic demands of the tests make it impossible to distinguish language proficiency from other types of knowledge and skills the tests are supposed to assess—especially given the short time allowed for test completion. Third, the students who are used to “norm” the tests are typically not representative of LEP students. The result of these biases is that the tests do not accurately reflect the knowledge and skills of LEP students. Acknowledgement of these problems has led some states to exclude LEP students from taking certain standardized tests. On the other hand, the desire to hold school districts accountable for educating LEP students to high standards has led other states to require that they take standardized tests. Regardless of the requirements, until standardized tests can be developed that validly measure LEP students’ knowledge and skills, educators should not rely on the results of such tests to assess LEP students.

II. Implementation Issues and Strategies for Meeting Those Challenges

The overriding goal of the Abbott Decisions is to ensure that students in New Jersey’s poorest school districts receive a thorough and efficient education, as required by the state constitution and defined by the Abbott remedies. More specifically, the districts must prepare all students to meet the state’s Core Curriculum Content Standards. While having such standards in place is an important step toward providing an equitable education, their existence alone does not ensure that all students have the opportunity to succeed. Schools in the Abbott districts must implement education programs in a way that helps LEP students meet the standards. Given the barriers to learning for LEP students, this raises a number of issues that school districts must address. We will discuss five of those issues below and suggest strategies for addressing them.

A. Tapping existing expertise in the education of LEP students.

The ability of LEP students to achieve high standards depends on their access to educators and other adults who are knowledgeable and skilled in working with LEP students. One challenge for school leaders is to find ways to tap this expertise among the adults already working in or associated with the school. We discuss three strategies for tapping existing expertise that can help LEP students meet high standards.

1. Identify and involve people knowledgeable of the education of LEP students in planning and decision-making.

To ensure that the needs and concerns of LEP students are addressed in reforms, people with knowledge, skills, resources, and commitment to the education of LEP students need to be included in all planning and decision-making activities—not just decisions about the ESL or bilingual program. In most school communities, there are some people with relevant linguistic, cultural, and professional knowledge and experience. These may be teachers, aides, administrators, or counselors employed by the school, or people associated with the school, such as parents, social workers, community members, and volunteers. Teachers may have knowledge of first- and second-language learning. Teachers and aides may speak the languages of the LEP students and their families. People from the students' own native cultures—especially aides and community members—have cultural knowledge that can help in designing strategies for bridging students' native cultures and mainstream U.S. school culture. School counselors and social workers may have good ideas for how the school can help LEP students work through the emotional difficulties often associated with immigration.

While it will be obvious who some of these people are, school leaders need to take concrete steps to seek out those that may not be so readily identified. This may be

one of the ways in which the district office can become more involved in supporting schools in the Abbott implementation process. While individuals at the school site may be the most likely to identify those with the skills and interest to work with LEP students, Districts might facilitate that process by ensuring that the time, space and resources are available for those individuals to do this work that may be outside their formal job description. By coordinating administrative efforts in whatever way is helpful and feasible, the district office can minimize the extraneous responsibilities that pull educators at the school site away from one on one contact with students.

Another source of information regarding people with knowledge and experience in working with LEP students are parents and community members on the SMIT. Perhaps these individuals could develop a list of resource people in the community who have knowledge, resources, and interest in the education of LEP students and who could be called upon to participate in school activities. Administrators and teachers on the SMIT can develop a short survey such as the following to identify those in the school with relevant knowledge and experience.

**Sample Survey to Identify People in Schools
With Knowledge and Experience for Working With LEP Students**

1. What is your role in the school (for example, teacher, aide, counselor)?

2. Can you speak any languages other than English? If so, which ones? How would you rate your fluency? (fully fluent, moderately fluent, minimally fluent)

3. Please describe the nature and extent of your professional experience with young people who speak native languages other than English and their families.

4. What contributions, if any, do you think you could make to the academic and social experiences of LEP students at our school? (e.g., sponsor an international club, help with translations, organize a pen-pal program, mentor students)

2. Collaborate with community groups and agencies.

Another way schools can tap existing expertise regarding the education of LEP students is to reach out to community groups and agencies that provide services to the families of LEP students or are part of their lives in other ways. Such groups include government and non-profit agencies providing social services, community centers where members of particular ethnic or national groups socialize, and religious institutions, which play central roles in the lives of many communities. Not only can people associated with these groups make important contributions to school activities and planning; students and their families can also be referred to them for services such as

health care, housing, immigration assistance, and language and literacy development— aspects of students’ lives that can make or break their academic success but that cannot be easily addressed by schools alone. By helping LEP students address multiple barriers to learning, schools can increase the likelihood that they will succeed academically. Parents and community members on the SMIT can identify non-governmental community groups and institutions by including them in the resource list mentioned above, along with a list of resource people in the community.

Having a parent liaison or a community services coordinator can increase the likelihood that students’ needs will be identified and met. Probably the most effective way for schools to build relationships with community groups is to have a community liaison at the school. Given the complex demands on teachers and administrators, it is difficult for them to find time to initiate and maintain relationships with community groups and agencies. It is best for someone to have this as his or her primary responsibility. The liaison can keep the SMIT informed of his or her work in the community and recommend community members who might become involved in school activities—including those who are good candidates to serve on the SMIT.

In fact, the type of community collaboration that is needed is built into the Abbott Decisions. Abbott requires that each elementary school have a family support team made up of social workers, nurses, counselors, parent liaisons, administrators, parents, and teachers. This support team is supposed to provide health, counseling, nutritional, tutorial, and other needed services. Every middle and high school in Abbott districts must have a community services coordinator to identify student needs and arrange for community-based providers to furnish essential health and social services.

3. Involve the parents of LEP students.

The third strategy for tapping existing expertise for educating LEP students is to involve the parents of LEP students in various capacities in school activities as well as in planning and decision-making. Family members can make an important contribution by communicating their concerns and priorities for their children's education, and by helping educators understand the different expectations and assumptions students bring to school from their homes.

Unfortunately, there are many barriers to the involvement of the parents of LEP students in schools. The most obvious barrier is that most parents of LEP students are also not fluent in English. If the school does not provide translators for meetings and activities, they are not able to fully participate. If documents are not translated into the parents' native languages, they cannot understand school communications. If parents have little formal schooling, they may not even have access to translated documents. Because many parents of LEP students are immigrants, their perceptions of the role that families play in their children's formal education may differ from those of U.S. schools. They may not know that parents are expected to actively advocate for their children in U.S. schools. They may not be aware of the different opportunities for becoming involved. Because parents of LEP students in Abbott districts are likely to be poor, they may work long hours and therefore not have time to participate in school activities.

Given these barriers, school leaders have to be creative in developing approaches to reach the parents of LEP students. For example, people with ties to LEP students' communities can serve as family liaisons. Parents can be invited into the school to serve as volunteers or to share their experiences or special knowledge in classes. ESL or

family literacy classes can be offered for family members. Other strategies for building connections between the school and families of LEP students include:

- (1) Translating school documents and communications into students' home languages.
- (2) Having translators at all meetings that parents might attend—including SMIT meetings if necessary.
- (3) Holding meetings at times and in places where the parents of LEP students are most likely and able to attend—for example, at community centers or churches.
- (4) Ensuring that oral communication with parents is conducted in their native languages, even if this means hiring consultants.
- (5) Co-sponsoring meetings with local community organizations that serve the families of LEP students.
- (6) Holding events where LEP students participate and receive recognition—for example, student-of-the-month breakfasts, student recognition assemblies.

(See Lucas, 1997, for a more detailed discussion of strategies for involving the parents of immigrant students in schools.)

Schools face a very real challenge in finding the time and resources (both human and financial) to implement these strategies. It may be helpful to think of working toward greater parent involvement in small increments, rather than expecting to implement all these strategies at once. Once again, the parents and community members on the SMIT can be a resource. They can develop strategies to involve parents of LEP students in various school activities and efforts. People from LEP students' communities who are employed by the school—such as classroom aides—can be asked for their suggestions as well, especially if no parents of LEP students are currently on the SMIT.

B. Building expertise in the education of LEP students.

In addition to identifying and tapping the knowledge and experience of those already associated with the school, school leaders must also find ways to build the capacity of the school to help LEP students meet core curriculum content standards. One way to do that is to hire new staff with expertise in the education of LEP students. Another way is to involve everyone in the school in ongoing learning that will better prepare them to educate LEP students. We discuss these strategies below.

1. Consider expertise in the education of LEP students as a criterion in hiring new staff.

Schools can build their capacity to educate LEP students and help them meet high standards by hiring new staff with relevant formal education and experience. School leaders must make sure that any specialists hired to work with LEP students have the appropriate credentials. In addition, they can show their commitment to incorporating LEP students into the larger school reform effort by considering experience with LEP students in the hiring of staff for mainstream positions. The larger the number of mainstream staff who can teach LEP students effectively, the better LEP students will perform in mainstream classes.

2. Involve everyone in ongoing learning about the education of LEP students.

The Abbott mandate regarding whole school reform models is changing and Court approval is being sought for such changes. Schools will no longer be required to adopt a whole school reform model, but may do so if they wish. District offices are expected to provide assistance in selection of, implementation of or separation from models. Perhaps most importantly, the state now emphasizes that models, if adopted,

should be a *tool* to assist in the foremost goal of standards based educational improvement; they are *not* to be viewed as an end in themselves. In addition, instead of model developers, schools may choose to work with universities, consultants, or other agencies, based on assessment of school needs and the match between those needs and the particular technical assistance and/or professional development available from such providers.

One aspect of the guidelines regarding improvement efforts that has not changed is the expectation that professional development be central to any improvement plan, whether as part of a whole school reform model or not. To assist schools in incorporating LEP students into school improvement efforts, such professional development should give attention to ways to incorporate best practices in the education of LEP students as part of the reform process.³ Because of the specialization of faculty and the lack of communication across traditional institutional boundaries (for example, grade levels, departments, subject matter and other specializations), most mainstream educators are not knowledgeable enough about ways to work effectively with LEP students. At the same time, most LEP educators are not knowledgeable enough about the expectations of mainstream teachers and the content of the mainstream curriculum to prepare LEP students for a successful transition to mainstream classes.

To implement standards-based reform that integrates LEP students, school leaders need to ensure that everyone—not just ESL and bilingual teachers and aides—develops the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions for successfully educating LEP students. Professional development should be designed to prepare the school staff, collectively, to

³ For more on professional development in support of standards based improvement, see the Standards chapter of this manual series.

address the multiple barriers to learning faced by LEP students. That means, those with different roles—school leaders, parents, teachers, paraprofessionals, counselors, social workers—should have access to ongoing learning opportunities geared to their particular roles.

There are a number of potential sources of professional development. In some districts, central office or school-based staff have expertise in the education of LEP students and understand how to design effective professional development. Faculty at colleges or universities, especially those with programs to prepare ESL and bilingual teachers, may work with schools to plan and carry out professional development efforts. Many national organizations (in particular, the National Association for Bilingual Education, and Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) and their regional affiliates maintain lists of people who are available to provide professional development on particular issues. Federally funded assistance centers can also provide professional development related to LEP students or can refer schools to people and organizations that can. These organizations and others that provide various types of information and assistance are listed in section five below.

Regardless of who provides the professional development, it should be thoughtfully planned to have the most impact. Below, we discuss three guidelines for designing and implementing professional development that is likely to make a real difference in the education of LEP students.

Draw on what is known about effective professional development. Effective professional development goes beyond workshops. Teachers don't just learn the latest techniques or tricks; they engage in ongoing learning activities that reflect current

thinking in the theory and practice of teaching and learning. Such professional development requires new roles for teachers. It might include peer coaching, teacher-research, and team teaching. Josué González and Linda Darling-Hammond (1997, p. 37) argue that teacher learning occurs when professional development is:

- (a) *Experiential*—that is, engages teachers in concrete tasks, not just in learning about what others have said or done.
- (b) *Grounded in inquiry, reflection, and experimentation* driven by those participating in the professional development.
- (c) *Collaborative and interactive*.
- (d) *Derived from teachers' work with students* rather than providing generalizations about teaching and learning.
- (e) *Sustained, ongoing, and intensive*.
- (f) *Connected to other aspects of school change and improvement*.

Designing such professional development clearly requires a rethinking of the traditional one-time workshop approach that prevails in schools. It calls for a commitment of time and energy beyond that needed for planning one-time workshops. Those designing professional development need to learn about the characteristics of effective professional development. They also need to be creative and willing to take risks. School leaders must cultivate these qualities as they consider possible approaches to professional development.

Build in communication and collaboration between mainstream educators and LEP educators. Typically, ESL, bilingual, and mainstream educators live in different worlds and rarely communicate with each other. This lack of communication is exacerbated by the fact that classes for LEP students are often physically separated from “regular” classes. Professional development should bridge this gap across institutional

boundaries. It should provide opportunities for ESL, bilingual, and mainstream educators to communicate and collaborate regularly. It should promote the sharing of information and expertise among adults involved in the education of LEP students—bilingual and ESL teachers, mainstream teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, counselors, social service providers, parents, and community members. Such communication and collaboration can help to ensure that LEP students' needs and interests are incorporated into the standards based improvement plan and that bilingual and ESL educators are knowledgeable of the expectations and curriculum in mainstream classes.

Restructure the uses of time in the school day. It is very difficult to provide high-quality professional development of the sort described above within the constraints of the typical daily school schedule. Schools need to restructure the ways time is used so that high-quality professional development will be possible. As Erichson and Goertz (2001, p. 57) point out in their description of the process of the second-year of Abbott implementation, such restructuring is needed to build schools' capacity to provide any sort of professional development—whether it is aimed primarily at helping educators implement a standards based curriculum, work with a whole school reform model, enhance their knowledge, skills, and dispositions for integrating LEP students in such reforms, or all of the above.

Like many of the changes required to truly reform schools, changing the uses of time in schools is exceedingly difficult (see Gándara, 2000). While it will take a great deal of effort and ingenuity, school leaders need to find ways to provide time during the school day for teachers and others who work with LEP students to engage in both collaborative and individual learning activities. Team teaching, for example, allows time

for one teacher to be engaged in teacher research in the classroom or to be away from the classroom periodically. Shared planning time for particular groups of educators can facilitate collaborative learning. Block scheduling and interdisciplinary instruction in secondary schools can also free blocks of time during the day. Use of resource teachers, part-time teachers, and substitutes can free regular teachers at elementary and secondary levels for a period of time when they can work and learn together. One way for SMIT members to get ideas for ways to restructure uses of time in schools is to visit schools that have innovative schedules and structures. Many of the resources listed at the end of this chapter include descriptions of such schools.

C. Enhancing the conditions for LEP student learning.

Some educators have argued that if students do not have equitable opportunities to learn, they should not be held accountable for meeting the same standards as students who have more and better opportunities. They have advocated for the development of criteria regarding the conditions that must be in place to ensure students an equal opportunity to meet school, district, state, and federal expectations of performance and achievement. (For a discussion of opportunity to learn criteria, see Elmore and Fuhrman, 1995.) The Abbott Decisions are the most far-reaching effort made by a state to address this inequity by mandating programs, reforms and funding to improve the conditions for learning in New Jersey's poorest districts. To ensure that LEP students in Abbott districts benefit maximally from this groundbreaking court decision, school leaders need to give focused attention to enhancing their conditions for learning. This is a third issue for educators attempting to integrate LEP students into school improvement efforts in Abbott districts. Below, we discuss two strategies for addressing this issue.

1. Hold high expectations for LEP students.

One of the most important conditions for the academic success of all students is educators' belief that their students are capable of meeting high expectations. This is particularly true for LEP students because these students are not proficient in English and may not understand the culture of U.S. schools --they are too often perceived as deficient, in need of remediation, and incapable of learning complex content. The barriers to learning faced by LEP students in U.S. schools should not keep them from learning at high levels. Schools can help LEP students meet the Core Curriculum Content Standards by emphasizing high standards and high expectations and by taking concrete actions to demonstrate those expectations. Some of the actions that have been identified in effective schools for LEP students include hiring minority staff in leadership positions to act as role models, providing special programs to prepare LEP students for college, making it possible for LEP students to enter mainstream classes as soon as they are ready, challenging students in classes rather than relegating them to watered-down curriculum, and formally recognizing students for doing well (Lucas, Henze, & Donato, 1990). In addition, instruction in all classes should emphasize problem solving, communication, critical thinking, and inquiry for LEP students rather than basic skills development and memorization of facts and procedures. Professional development can provide support for teachers and others in schools to examine their current expectations and take steps to raise their expectations.

2. Develop and seek funding for supplemental programs to provide support so that LEP students can meet high expectations.

Schools can make it more likely that LEP students will succeed by addressing their emotional and psychological needs and by providing the extra academic support many will need to meet rigorous standards and high expectations. As we discussed in section one, many LEP students experience high degrees of psychological stress that can interfere with their success in school. Professional counselors, therapists, and social workers from the students' own cultures are in the best position to help them overcome such stress. If no one affiliated with the school fits this description, school professionals should identify counseling professionals in the community, consult with them, and refer students to them as needed. Community-based organizations are often the best source of information about the most appropriate types of counselors for particular cultural groups.

Many LEP students also need extra help in developing their English language and literacy skills, study skills, test-taking skills, and knowledge of academic content areas. Students with little prior schooling definitely need extra assistance in learning how to be students—specifically, in developing literacy and study skills. Supplemental programs might include tutoring, mentoring, writing labs, computer labs, a resource center, before-school and after-school programs, Saturday programs, and summer school. The provision of such programs is an essential condition for the learning of many LEP students, and Abbott explicitly entitles schools to funds for this type of assistance and supplemental programming.

Abbott has a built-in mechanism to support schools in carrying out this strategy. The New Jersey Supreme Court mandates that the Commissioner of Education authorize and provide or secure funding for requested school-based social service programs for

which there is a demonstrated need. The responsibility of schools, and now district offices, is to demonstrate the need. That means school leaders must facilitate the documentation of the special needs of LEP students. The criteria for establishing need as the basis for receiving supplemental funding through Abbott are under review and revision by the Compliance Council workgroups. When these criteria are clearer, and when sample needs assessment instruments and funds requests become available, they will be posted on the ELC website.

One way to do this is to document students' progress toward meeting the standards and to use the data collected to identify areas of special need. We present elements of such a monitoring system below in discussing the fifth implementation issue (*Developing a system for monitoring the adequacy of the education LEP students are receiving*). A more immediate way to document LEP students' needs is to ask teachers, aides, counselors, parent liaisons, and others who interact with LEP students what those needs are. A member of the SMIT might contact by phone or meet briefly with those who have the most contact with LEP students—ESL and bilingual teachers and aides, for example—to identify what they perceive as the areas of greatest need for supplemental services. A short survey could be developed to guide these conversations and to solicit information about those needs from others. Below is a sample of such a survey.

Supplemental Services for LEP Students -- Sample Survey

The purpose of this survey is to document the special needs of LEP students in order to determine what supplemental programs they may need.

1. Your role:
(regular classroom teacher, ESL or bilingual teacher, special education teacher, classroom aide, counselor, social service provider, parent liaison)
2. What do you see as the two or three areas of greatest need for LEP students in the school that could be addressed in supplemental programs? Using the five-point scale below, please rate the need of LEP students for supplemental services in each of the following areas. Please briefly explain each need.

(1) _____ Health services

No Need				Very serious need
1	2	3	4	5

Explanation:

(2) _____ Social services (e.g., housing, clothing, transportation)

No Need				Very serious need
1	2	3	4	5

Explanation:

(3) _____ Psychological counseling

No Need				Very serious need
1	2	3	4	5

Explanation:

(4) _____ Career planning

No Need				Very serious need
1	2	3	4	5

Explanation:

(5) _____ Knowledge of and skill in the use of technology

No Need				Very serious need
1	2	3	4	5

Explanation:

(6) _____ Study skills

No Need				Very serious need
1	2	3	4	5

Explanation:

(7) _____ Test-taking skills

No Need				Very serious need
1	2	3	4	5

Explanation:

(8) _____ Other

No Need				Very serious need
1	2	3	4	5

Explanation:

D. Moving beyond the special-program mentality without diluting the quality of LEP students' education.

The education of LEP students in New Jersey, as in the rest of the country, has traditionally been addressed through special programs, not whole-school efforts. A tension exists between the need to incorporate LEP students into school improvement efforts and the need to provide special programs and services for LEP students. A fourth

issue confronted by schools implementing Abbott is that of envisioning the education of LEP students in a new way—a way that addresses their special needs but does so as an integral part of reforms for the entire school. The danger is that LEP students' interests will be subsumed under those of other students. Since LEP students constitute a relatively small proportion of the total number of students in most districts, and since in some places their presence is relatively recent, they may be marginalized or ignored (as the literature suggests, they have been in many contexts of WSR, for example; see Stringfield et al., 1998). Below, we discuss three strategies school leaders can use to achieve the balance of meeting the special needs of LEP students and, at the same time, integrating them into a school improvement plan.

1. Learn from the experiences of other schools.

While there have not been many attempts to incorporate LEP students into WSR models or other improvement efforts, some schools have managed to do so. Educators in Abbott schools can learn a great deal from the experiences of other schools—even those that have not been fully successful. This learning should be part of the school's ongoing professional development effort. It might include reading articles and reports (see Anstrom, 1997; Berman et al., 1995; Jones, 2000; Lara, 1995; McLeod, 1996; Stringfield et al., 1998) as well as visiting schools and districts when possible. In section four, we present examples of three schools that have made specific efforts to include LEP students in their improvement initiatives and in section five, a list of resources you might use in your own efforts.

2. Promote the integration of educators of LEP students and other educators.

To move toward greater integration of LEP students, the school should be organized to minimize the isolation of ESL and bilingual educators. As we mentioned before, educators of LEP students and mainstream educators rarely cross paths in the typical school. As long as that separation exists, it is unlikely that LEP students will be fully integrated into the school's reform efforts. To facilitate this integration at the secondary level, ESL/bilingual and mainstream teachers might have common planning times. At both elementary and secondary levels, teachers can be encouraged (and allowed) to team-teach and develop collaborative projects and activities. Teams of teachers and other school staff can be responsible for planning and coordinating certain school activities. School leaders will need to provide time and rewards for those who participate in such activities. Teachers cannot be expected to add new responsibilities such as these on top of what they are already expected to do.

3. Promote the integration of LEP students and other students.

Like educators of LEP students, the students themselves are also typically isolated from students in mainstream classes. They may rarely have the opportunity to interact with native English speakers. If LEP students are to be included in improvement efforts, schools need to minimize their isolation and separation. At the same time, LEP students must continue to have access to the special classes and services they need. Efforts to facilitate the interactions of LEP and mainstream students might include shared projects, extra-curricular activities, gradual transitioning of LEP students into some mainstream classes (such as art and physical education), peer mentoring, and international clubs and events.

E. Developing a system for monitoring the adequacy of the education LEP students are receiving.

Another issue schools face in implementing improvement plans that incorporate LEP students is determining whether their efforts are having the desired effect. To determine their success, school leaders need to develop a system to monitor the quality of the education provided to LEP students as well as students' progress toward meeting program goals and state standards. Such monitoring might be part of the accountability system each district is required to develop by Abbott to determine whether the school is helping students attain the Core Curriculum Content Standards (Subchapter 1: General Provisions, 6.19A-1.5(h)). A task force consisting of a cross-section of those with expertise in the education of LEP students could be given responsibility for carrying out the monitoring activities and for reporting findings and recommendations to the SMIT. This system should include three components, which we discuss below.

Ongoing review of the extent to which effective instructional practices for LEP students are being used in the school. School leaders typically rely on teachers to make decisions about instructional practices for students. It is important, however, that someone, preferably the school principal, fulfill the role of instructional leader, ensuring that teaching is high quality, and informed by the best thinking and experience regarding teaching LEP students a rigorous standards based curriculum (See Standards chapter of this manual for more on instructional leadership and the principal's role). A central aspect of leadership and oversight is to determine the extent to which the improvement plan and WSR model, if applicable, incorporates (or allows for the incorporation of) the best practices in the education of LEP students. If the WSR model applies to only a portion of the school experiences of LEP students, then the practices in their other school

experiences—including ESL and bilingual classes—also need to be considered. If your school operates within a whole school reform model, questions guiding this review might include the following:

Whole School Reform Model

- Are LEP students explicitly discussed in materials describing the WSR model?
- If so, to what extent are effective practices reflected in the discussion?
- If not, to what extent does the model allow for the application of effective practices for educating LEP students (summarized in Figure 1)?
- Are staff developers and others associated with the reform model knowledgeable of the education of LEP students? Do they provide staff development in ways to incorporate LEP students into the model?

If your school is developing, or is already operating within an improvement plan, the following questions might guide a review of whether LEP students' needs are adequately addressed by the plan:⁴

Instructional Practices

1. How do teachers create classroom climates that foster a feeling of belonging and encourage students to express themselves?
 - Orienting LEP students to schools in the United States.
 - Making classrooms non-threatening environments.
 - Establishing meaningful relationships with students.
 - Other approaches.
2. How do teachers make content comprehensible to students?
 - Using students' native languages for instruction.
 - Aiding students' comprehension.
 - Involving students actively in learning.
 - Other approaches.

⁴ For more on developing a standards based improvement plan, please see the Standards chapter of this manual.

3. How do teachers make the curriculum challenging?
 - Emphasizing problem solving.
 - Emphasizing communication.
 - Emphasizing critical thinking.
 - Emphasizing inquiry.
 - Helping students develop their academic knowledge and skills in core content areas as well as English language proficiency.
 - Other approaches.
4. How do teachers make the curriculum inclusive?
 - Drawing on students' prior knowledge and skills.
 - Selecting multicultural topics that are relevant to students' lives.
 - Selecting multicultural materials that are relevant to students' lives.
 - Other approaches.
5. How does the school promote LEP students' English language development?
 - Using English for meaningful, communicative purposes (not just for drill and practice).
 - Creating language-rich classroom environments.
 - Helping students take control of their own learning.
 - Using an integrated approach to teaching language.
 - Other approaches.
6. How is LEP students' learning assessed?
 - Using a variety of strategies to assess student learning.
 - Evaluating students' work on meaningful tasks.
 - Other approaches.

Analysis of the implications of the Core Curriculum Content Standards for LEP students. School leaders can also enhance the capacity of the school to help LEP students achieve the standards by examining and discussing ways in which their implementation poses challenges for LEP students. When educators are aware of those challenges, they are better able to help students overcome them. The best way to become aware of them is to set aside time to read the standards carefully, considering their implications for LEP

students. For example, some of the content standards may require command of English vocabulary and language structures that LEP students have not yet mastered. Schools might need to offer after-school programs focused on the language of certain academic subjects to give LEP students a more equitable opportunity to meet those standards.

Monitoring students' progress toward meeting the goals and standards. The third component of this monitoring system is the development of a process for keeping track of student progress. Knowing that effective instructional practices are being used is not enough; schools need to closely monitor LEP students' progress toward state standards and program goals—including the goal of making a smooth transition into mainstream classes. Below we detail several strategies that have been found effective in this monitoring process.

An effective monitoring system attends to students' developing language and literacy skills as well as their progress in academic subjects. Broad-based assessment techniques are used to evaluate the progress of the LEP student. As we discussed in section two of this chapter, these techniques include informal observations of the student in various settings, examination of the student's work products, close attention to the student's performance in class, and analysis of the results of written classroom tests. Standardized tests can provide useful information about student progress, but should never be the sole basis for making critical decisions about the student's future.

Educators must exercise caution when evaluating bilingual students who appear competent in English. While children can usually gain a fair degree of oral proficiency in a second language within one or two years of schooling, it generally takes five or more years for these students to master the more demanding, context-reduced language of

classroom instruction and written text. Educators need to be aware of this natural process of language development and understand that what may appear to be an academic problem can actually be a stage of normal language development.

In a study of immigrant education in New Jersey, Villegas and Young (1997) found that school districts that were considered effective in educating LEP students used the following criteria in making decisions regarding the students' readiness to enter mainstream classes: English language proficiency measured by the Language Assessment Battery or the Maculaitis Test; academic achievement measured by tests given both in English and the students' native language in some cases; satisfactory progress in reading, language and academic subjects determined by report card grades; overall performance in the special bilingual/ESL instructional program; and assessment of the student's readiness to perform well in mainstream classes by bilingual and ESL teachers.

Educators in the Elgin, Illinois school district consider the following criteria in making decisions about transitioning LEP students into mainstream classes: number of years of education and type of education before coming to the U.S.; reading and writing skills in English and in the student's native language; success in mainstream classes while enrolled in bilingual/ESL classes; standardized achievement test scores; English proficiency test scores; academic achievement; self concept and personal inclinations toward mainstreaming; counselor and/or teacher judgment; and family support (Lucas & Wagner, 1999).

To ensure the ongoing success of LEP students, schools need to follow the progress of their LEP students for at least a year after they enter the instructional mainstream. This will show how well the students adapt to such classes and whether they continue to need extra support. Schools might learn about students' progress by

surveying mainstream teachers on a regular basis. Students who are struggling in mainstream classes should be reassessed and provided with additional support when needed.

Figure 2 summarizes the implementation issues and strategies we have discussed in section III.

Figure 2: Implementation Issues and Strategies

-
- 1. Tapping existing expertise in the education of LEP students.**
 - (a) Identify and involve people knowledgeable of the education of LEP students in planning and decision-making.
 - (b) Collaborate with community groups and agencies.
 - (c) Involve the parents of LEP students.

 - 2. Building expertise in the education of LEP students.**
 - (a) Consider expertise in the education of LEP students as a criterion in hiring new staff.
 - (b) Involve everyone in ongoing learning about the education of LEP students.

 - 3. Enhancing the conditions for LEP student learning.**
 - (a) Hold high expectations for LEP students.
 - (b) Develop and seek funding for supplemental programs to provide support so that LEP students can meet high expectations.

 - 4. Moving beyond the special-program mentality without diluting the quality of LEP students' education.**
 - (a) Learn from the experiences of other schools.
 - (b) Promote the integration of educators of LEP students and other educators.
 - (c) Promote the integration of LEP students and other students.

 - 5. Developing a system for monitoring the adequacy of the education LEP students are receiving.**
-

IV. Examples of Schools Working to Integrate LEP Students Into School Reform

While there is as yet no data on promising practices for integrating LEP students in standards-based reform in the Abbott districts themselves, some schools in similar contexts have had some success in doing so. The three schools described in Appendix D were part of a study of eight schools identified as having instituted “exemplary school reform efforts for LEP students in grades 4 through 8” in language arts, science, and mathematics. (See Berman et al., 1995 and McLeod, 1996 for full reports of this study.) We opted to feature these schools because they use many of the effective instructional practices discussed in section two of this chapter and many of the implementation strategies discussed in section three. While the particular opportunities and challenges of Abbott do not apply to these districts, their experiences can be instructive for Abbott districts with LEP students.

Below is a list of the salient characteristics of each of the three featured schools. The numbers in parentheses correspond to the implementation strategies discussed above and summarized in Figure 2.

Graham and Parks Elementary School, Cambridge, MA

- A student support team is made up of people in different roles with various types of knowledge and experience. (1.a)
- Support staff are bilingual and able to work with parents and family members as well as students. (1.a)
- The school collaborates with an outside agency (TERC—a non-profit educational research firm). (1.b)
- The school is working with multiple organizations on ways to improve science education. (1.b)

- There is a Haitian social worker and mediation specialist on staff. They make referrals to community agencies. (1.b)
- The school provides health and social services. (1.b)
- The school has a bilingual parent coordinator. (1.c)
- Teachers and other school staff participate in extensive professional development. Teachers have regular opportunities to discuss science learning with other teachers. Teachers are paid for participating. (2.b)
- There is an emphasis on high expectations for LEP students. The inquiry approach to instruction involves students in conducting “real” science. (3.a)
- An after-school homework center and tutorials provide extra support for LEP students. (3.b)
- Bilingual and mainstream teachers team-teach. (4.b)
- Groups of teachers have common planning times. (4.b)
- Flexible mixing and grouping of students predominates. Haitian students are grouped with monolingual English speakers for part of the day. (4.c)
- Annual tests of oral fluency, reading and writing are administered. (5)
- There is an annual review of LEP students’ progress toward mainstreaming. (5)

Linda Vista Elementary School, San Diego

- Teachers actively participated in redesigning the school. (1.a)
- There is a process of committee-based decision-making. (1.a)
- The school has several grants and partnerships with outside agencies. (1.b)
- Resources teachers plan parent activities, work to involve parents. (1.c)
- Three community aides reach out the parents and community (translate materials, serve as interpreters, plan parent workshops, help families get medical and other services). (1.c)
- A high priority is given to professional development. (2.b)

- Every other Wednesday afternoon, students are released early providing teachers with time to plan, collaborate, and participate in learning activities. (2.b, 4.b)
- There are many opportunities for teacher collaboration, team-teaching, and peer observation. (2.b, 4.b)
- There is an emphasis on high expectations for LEP students. Students write biographies and autobiographies, carry out dramatic interpretation of literature, write multimedia book reports. Some teachers use computer-based instruction. The goal is to expose all students to math every day and to a wide range of math concepts. (3.a)
- Resource teachers, part-time teachers, and aides assist teachers. (4.b)
- LEP students are “totally integrated into the whole school program.” There are no pull-out programs. (4)
- The school uses an innovative structure—“wings”—with students of mixed English proficiency. (4.b, 4.c)
- In some classes, LEP students are mixed with non-LEP students (e.g., math). (4.b, 4.c)
- The school structure was designed specifically to foster interaction between LEP and non-LEP students. (4.c)
- The school has revamped the assessment system to use portfolios. The school uses an authentic assessment system to monitor LEP students’ progress. (5)

Horace Mann Middle School, San Francisco

- A wide range of constituents is involved in site governance and planning. (1.a)
- The school is expanding its health and social services. (1.b)
- The school has a social services coordinator. (1.b)
- A large number of staff are bilingual. (2.a)
- There is “considerable professional development” – including a focus on bicultural awareness and language acquisition. (2.b)
- There is a strong community of learners among the teachers. This encourages documentation of their efforts. (2.b, 4.b)

- A block schedule provides time for students to carry out in-depth work. (3.a)
- There is an emphasis on high expectations for LEP students. Instructional approaches emphasize active, cooperative, project-based learning, and problem-solving. (3.a)
- There is an after-school program to provide extra support to LEP students. (3.b)
- The school seeks supplemental funding. (3.b)
- Teacher collaboration, joint planning time, and interdisciplinary planning are common. (4.b)
- Time is allocated during the day for teachers to collaborate to plan projects and integrate curriculum. (4.b)
- The school is organized according to heterogeneously grouped “families.” (4.c)
- Authentic assessment is used to monitor LEP students’ progress. (5)

V. Resources

Agencies, Organizations, and On-line Resources With Information about Standards-Based, Whole-School Reform and LEP Students

California Tomorrow
 1904 Franklin St., Suite 300
 Oakland, CA 94610
 (510) 496-0220
www.californiatomorrow.org

California Tomorrow is a nonprofit organization dedicated to contributing to building a strong and fair multiracial, multicultural, multilingual society that is equitable for everyone. This organization has produced many publications on educational reform and diverse student populations, immigrant education, and the education of linguistic minority students.

Center for Applied Linguistics

4646 40th Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20016-1859

(202) 362-0700

www.cal.org

The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) is a private, nonprofit organization founded in 1959 that aims to promote and improve the teaching and learning of languages, identify and solve problems related to language and culture, and serve as a resource for information about language and culture. The major issues that are addressed in CAL's publications and projects are:

- English as a second language
- Immigrant education
- Foreign language education
- Language proficiency assessment
- Bilingual and vernacular language education
- Refugee education and services
- Language policy and planning
- Cross-cultural communication.

Center for Equity and Excellence in Education (CEEE)

George Washington University

1730 N. Lynn St., Suite 401

Arlington, VA 22209

(703) 528-3588

www.ceee.gwu.edu

CEEE is one of fifteen Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers funded by the U.S. Department of Education under the Improving America's Schools Act. New Jersey is in the CEEE's service area. CEEE provides technical assistance and service to state education agencies, school districts, and schools to facilitate the success of comprehensive education reform and school improvement initiatives. They emphasize schools with a high percentage of children in poverty. They focus on five areas:

- School reform and improvement
- Parent involvement
- Teaching and learning
- Standards and assessment
- Safe and drug-free environments

Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (CREDE) (Formerly National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning)

University of California
1156 High Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
www.crede.ucsc.edu

CREDE is one of 12 national research and development centers funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students. CREDE's mission is to assist the nation's population of diverse students, including those at risk of educational failure, to achieve academic excellence. The purpose of CREDE's research is to identify and develop effective educational practices for linguistic and cultural minority students, such as those placed at risk by factors of race, poverty, and geographic location. Resources include publications and a newsletter.

CREDE's work is focused on six issues:

- Language learning
- Professional development
- Family, peers, and community
- Instruction in context
- Integrated school reform
- Assessment

The Equity Assistance (EAC) Center at the Metropolitan Center for Urban Education (Metro Center)

The Metro Center
82 Washington Square East, Room 72
New York, NY 10003
(212) 998-5100
www.nyu.edu/education/metrocenter/eac

The EAC is one of ten federal Desegregation Assistance Centers funded by the U.S. Department of Education under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. New Jersey is one of the states in the service area of the EAC. The EAC's provides services that promote equal educational opportunities within school districts for culturally and linguistically diverse students. These services include:

- Training in effective teaching/learning models for ESL and mainstreamed language minority students.
- Training in linguistic and ethnic group awareness (including prejudice reduction).
- Turnkey teacher training in ESL methodology.
- Training in cooperative learning strategies.

- Training in education that is multicultural.
- Training in second language acquisition processes.
- Training in effective educational strategies for LEP students with limited school experience.
- Assisting in identifying and developing alternative assessments for LEP students.
- Identifying and eliminating biased instructional materials and placement tools.

Mid-Atlantic Laboratory for Student Success (LSS)

933 Ritter Annex

1301 Cecil B. Moore Avenue

Philadelphia, PA 19122

(215) 204-3001

www.temple.edu/departments/lss

LSS is one of ten regional laboratories funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. New Jersey is one of the states in the service area of LSS. LSS works with teachers, parents, schools, state departments of education, community agencies, professional groups, and policymakers to promote student success. LSS emphasizes six areas:

- Educational leadership
- Improving teacher quality
- Building and sustaining comprehensive school reform
- Developing school-family-community connections
- Integrating technology as a catalyst for high-performing learning communities
- Urban education

National Association for Bilingual Education

www.nabe.org

National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE) is the only professional organization at the national level wholly devoted to representing both the interests of language-minority students and the bilingual education professionals who serve them. NABE recognizes the importance of providing all children with access to a world-class education. In light of this, the Association's priorities include:

- Improving instructional practice for linguistically and culturally diverse students;
- Expanding professional development programs for teachers serving language-minority students;
- Securing adequate funding for the federal Bilingual Education Act and other programs serving limited-English-proficient students;
- Defending the rights of language-minority Americans; and

- Keeping language-minority Americans clearly in focus as states and communities move forward with educational reforms.

NABE publishes a journal—The Bilingual Research Journal—sponsors an annual conference, serves as a legislation and policy advocate, and produces other publications.

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education

The George Washington University
Center for the Study of Language and Education
2121 K Street, N.W., Suite 260
Washington, D.C. 20037
(800) 321-NCBE (6223)
www.ncbe.gwu.edu

The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE) is funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, to collect, analyze, and disseminate information relating to the effective education of linguistically and culturally diverse learners in the U.S.

NCBE is one of the best sources of information and links to other organizations regarding the education of LEP students. NCBE produces various types of publications, a weekly on-line newsletter, and on-line roundtable forums. It also serves as a link among various information and service providers, including those providing professional development regarding instructional practices. People in the field can contact NCBE staff via email, and they will answer any relevant questions.

National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform

2121 K Street, N.W., Suite 250
Washington, D.C. 20037-1801
(877) 766-4277
www.goodschools.gwu.edu

National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform (NCCSR), funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, collects and disseminates information that builds the capacity of schools to raise the academic achievement of all students. NCCSR is the gateway to good information on comprehensive school reform. NCCSR staff conduct workshops and make presentations. NCCSR holds an annual conference and makes publications available. Web resources include:

- The CSR Library—various publications, databases, reports, frequently asked questions, and a reference help desk.
- Step by Step—a “how-to” guide for planning, implementing, and evaluating comprehensive school reform.

- Catalog of School Reform Models—descriptions of over 60 comprehensive school reform models.
- Issues and Research Briefs—address major trends and issues concerning comprehensive school reform.
- Newsletters.
- Reference and Referrals—Questions and requests for assistance can be submitted via email, fax, mail, or phone.
- Resource Directory—List of links to agencies, research centers, technical assistance providers, and national organizations.

National Coalition of Advocates for Students

100 Boylston Street, Suite 737

Boston, MA 02116

(617) 357-8507

www.igc.org/ncas

National Coalition of Advocates for Students (NCAS) is a national nonprofit, education advocacy organization with 20 member groups in 14 states. NCAS works to achieve equal access to a quality public education for students who are most vulnerable to school failure. NCAS's constituencies include low-income students, members of racial, ethnic and/or language minority groups, recent immigrants, migrant farmworkers, and those with disabilities. NCAS produces a number of relevant publications. National projects are focused on the following issues:

- Mobilization for Equity—training parents and communities to bring equity to local schools.
- Clearinghouse for Immigrant Education—providing education resources to advocates, parents, and educators.
- National Asian Family School Partnership Project—supporting Asian family and community involvement in local schools.
- School Counseling in Today's Real World—preparing school counselors to serve diverse schools
- Nosotras Viviremos—Developing appropriate HIV prevention materials and education processes for female migrant farm worker youth ages 10-18.

Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory at Brown University (LAB)

222 Richmond Street, Suite 300

Providence, RI 02903-4226

(800) 521-9550

www.lab.brown.edu

The LAB at Brown is one of ten regional laboratories funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. The LAB's purpose is to promote school improvement through collaboration of researchers with schools and their

communities. The major focus of the LAB's work is on understanding the educational needs of linguistically and culturally diverse students and on developing classroom-level and systemic approaches to meet those needs. The LAB's on-line resources and printed publications are available to anyone in the U.S. Special areas of focus are:

- Standards and assessment
- School services
- Professional development.
- Community involvement.

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

700 South Washington Street, Suite 200

Alexandria, VA 22314

(703) 836-0774

www.tesol.org

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) is a professional association whose mission is to develop the expertise of its members and others involved in teaching English to speakers of other languages to help them foster effective communication in diverse settings while respecting individuals' language rights. TESOL has produced standards for teaching ESL in grades K-12, for the education of ESL teachers, and for the ongoing professional development of ESL teachers. It also publishes a variety of documents of relevance to the teaching of LEP students.

U.S. Department of Education

www.ed.gov

www.ed.gov/pubs/IASA/newsletters/standards/

The U.S. Department of Education provides access to numerous resources of relevance to standards, standards-based reform, whole-school reform, and the education of LEP students. Above, we have provided the general web site and the web site for publications on standards.

WestEd

730 Harrison Street

San Francisco, CA 94107

(877) 493-7833

www.WestEd.org

WestEd is a nonprofit research, development, and service agency. WestEd directs one of ten regional laboratories funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. With 400 employees, WestEd is a large agency

with many different programs. Those of relevance to the education of LEP students in the Abbott districts are:

- Assessment and Standards Development Services
- Comprehensive School Assistance Program
- Culture and Language in Education
- Educational and Community Initiatives

WestEd also publishes a variety of documents of relevance to the teaching of LEP students.

References Used in Preparing This Chapter

Note: Those marked with an asterisk (*) include practical suggestions for school-based educators.

- Anstrom, K. (1996). Federal policy, legislation, and educational reform: The promise and the challenge for language minority students. NCBE Resource Collection Series. Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Available: www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs
- *Anstrom, K. (1997). Academic achievement for secondary language minority students: Standards, measures and promising practices. Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Available: www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs
- August, D., & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). 1997. Improving schooling for language-minority students: A research agenda. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- August, D., Hakuta, K., & Pompa, D. (1994). For all students: Limited English proficient students and Goals 2000. NCBE Focus: Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education, Number 10. Available: www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs
- *Berman, P., McLaughlin, B., Minicucci, C., Nelson, B., & Woodworth, K. (1996). School reform and student diversity: Case studies of exemplary practices for LEP students. Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Available: www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs
- Council of Chief State School Officers & the Stanford Working Group. (1996). Systemic reform and limited English proficient students. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Dixon, C., Green, J., Yeager, B., Baker, D., & Fránquiz, M. (2000). "I used to know that": What happens when reform gets through the classroom door. Bilingual Research Journal, 24(1&2). Available: www.brj.asu.edu
- Elmore, R. F., & Fuhrman, S. H. (1995). Opportunity to learn and the state role in education. Center for Policy Research in Education. Available: www.ncbe.gwu.edu/miscpubs
- Erlichson, B. A., Goertz, M., & Turnbull, B. J. (1999). Implementing whole school reform in New Jersey: Year one in the first cohort schools. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University.
- Erlichson, B. A., & Goertz, M. (2001). Implementing whole school reform in New Jersey: Year two. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University.

- Gándara, P. (1994). The impact of the education reform movement on limited English proficient students. In B. McLeod (Ed.), Language and learning: Educating linguistically diverse students (pp. 45-70). Albany, NJ: SUNY Press.
- *Gándara, P. (2000). The dimension of time and the challenge of school reform. Albany: SUNY Press.
- *García, E. (2002). Student cultural diversity: Understanding and meeting the challenge, 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- *García, E., Casimir, M., Sun Irminger, A., Wiese, A., & García, E. (1999). Authentic literacy assessment (ALA) development: An instruction-based assessment that is responsive to linguistic and cultural diversity. Educators for Urban Minorities, 1, 51-60.
- *García, G. E., & Pearson, P. D. (1994). Assessment and diversity. Review of Research in Education, 20, 337-391.
- Goldenberg, C., & Sullivan, J. (1994). Making change happen in a language minority school: A search for coherence. Santa Cruz, CA: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.
- González, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). New concepts for new challenges: Professional development for teachers of immigrant youth. Washington, D.C. & McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics & Delta Systems.
- González, V., Brusca-Vega, R., & Yawkey, T. (1996). Assessment and instruction of culturally and linguistically diverse students with or at-risk of learning problems: From research to practice. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- *Henze, R., & Lucas, T. (1993). Shaping instruction to promote the success of language minority students: An analysis of four high school classes. Peabody Journal of Education, 69(1), 54-81.
- Jones, B. S. (2000). Crafting and implementing a school vision for all students: How access to resources and participation in the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program helps schools that enroll limited English proficient students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Lachat, M. A. (2000). Standards, equity and cultural diversity. Providence, RI: Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory at Brown University (LAB).
- *Lara, J. 1995. Second language learners and middle school reform: A case study of a school in transition. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.

- *Lucas, T. (1993a). Applying elements of effective secondary schooling for language minority students: A tool for reflection and stimulus to change. Program Information Guide. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Available: www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs
- Lucas, T. (1993b). Secondary schooling for students becoming bilingual: Issues and practices. In B. Arias & U. Casanova (Eds.), Bilingual Education: Politics, Research, and Practice. Annual Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 113-143). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.
- Lucas, T. (1993c). Secondary schools and language minority students: A framework for restructuring. Educating Students from Immigrant Families: Meeting the Challenge in Secondary Schools. Paper commissioned by the National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning. Santa Cruz, CA, October 1992.
- Lucas, T. (1993d). What have we learned from research on successful secondary programs for LEP students? A synthesis of findings from three studies. Proceedings of the Third National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues: Focus on Middle and High School Issues, Volume I (pp. 81-111). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs.
- *Lucas, T. (1997). Into, through and beyond secondary school: Critical transitions for immigrant youths. Washington, D.C. & McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics & Delta Systems.
- *Lucas, T. (2000). Facilitating the transitions of secondary English language learners: Priorities for principals. NASSP Bulletin, 84(619), 2-16.
- *Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (1990). Promoting the success of Latino language minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools. Harvard Educational Review, 60(3), 315-340.
- *Lucas, T., & Katz, A. (1994). Reframing the debate: The Roles of native languages in “English-only” programs for language minority students. TESOL Quarterly, 28(3), 537-561.
- *Lucas, T., & Wagner, S. (2000). Facilitating secondary English language learners’ transition into the mainstream. TESOL Journal, 8(4), 6-13.
- *Mace-Matluck, B. J., Alexander-Kasparik, R., & Queen, R. M. (1998). Through the golden door: Educational approaches for immigrant adolescents with limited schooling. Washington, D.C. & McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics & Delta Systems.

- *McLeod, B. (1996). School reform and student diversity: Exemplary schooling for language minority students. NCBE Resource Collection Series. Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Available: www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs
- Menken, K. (2000). Standards-based education reform and English language learners. Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Available: www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs
- *Minicucci, C. (2000). Effective use of time in the education of English language learners. In P. Gándara (Ed.), The dimension of time and the challenge of school reform (pp. 49-67). Albany: SUNY Press.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. 1996. Breaking ranks: Changing an American institution. Reston, VA: Author.
- Nieto, S. 1999. The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities. New York: Teachers College Press.
- *Olsen, L., & Jaramillo, A. (1999). Turning the tides of exclusion: A guide for educators and advocates for immigrant students. San Francisco: California Tomorrow. Available: www.californiatomorrow.org
- *Olsen, L., Jaramillo, A., McCall-Perez, Z., & White, J. (1999). Igniting change for immigrant students: Portraits of three high schools. San Francisco: California Tomorrow. Available: www.californiatomorrow.org
- Ruiz-de-Velasco, J., & Fix, M. With B. Clewell. (2000). Overlooked and underserved: Immigrant students in U.S. secondary schools. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- *Short, D. J. 1994. Expanding middle school horizons: Integrating language, culture, and social studies. TESOL Quarterly, 28, no. 3, pp. 581-608.
- Stringfield, S., Datnow, A., Ross, S. M., & Snively, F. (1998). Scaling up school restructuring in multicultural, multilingual contexts: Early observations from Sunland County. Education and Urban Society, 30(3), 326-357.
- Tikunoff, W. J. 1983. An emerging description of successful bilingual instruction: Executive summary of Part I of the SBIF Study. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

- Tikunoff, W. J., Ward, B. A., van Broekhuizen, D., Romero, M., Castaneda, L. V., Lucas, T., & Katz, A. 1991. A descriptive study of significant features of exemplary special alternative instructional programs. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Villegas, A. M. (1992). Immigrant education in New Jersey: Programs, services, and policies. Executive summary. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- *Villegas, A. M. (1994). Helping immigrant students. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- *Villegas, A. M., Bruschi, B., Clewell, B. C., Gant, J., Goertz, M., Joy, M. F., & Wlodkowski, T. (1992). Immigrant education in New Jersey: Programs, services, and policies. Part II: Case studies of districts with effective programs. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (In press). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Villegas, A. M., Bruschi, B., Clewell, B. C., Gant, J., Goertz, M., Joy, M. F., & Wlodkowski, T. (1992). Immigrant education in New Jersey: Programs, services, and policies. Part I: Results from the district survey. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Villegas, A. M., & Young, J. W. (1997). Immigrant education in New Jersey: Policies and practices. In T. J. Espenshade (Ed.), Keys to successful immigration: Implications of the New Jersey experience, (pp. 173-198). Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- *Walqui, A. (2000). Access and engagement: Program design and instructional approaches for immigrant students. Washington, D.C. & McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics & Delta Systems.

Appendix A

Abbott District Enrollments 1999-2000:

LEP and English as a Second Language (ESL) Speakers

County	District	Number of LEP Students	Percent of LEP Students	Number of ESL Speakers	Percent of ESL Speakers	Total Number of Students
Atlantic	Pleasantville	351	9.2	783	2.1	3,800
Bergen	Garfield	682	17.6	1,811	46.8	3,873
Burlington	Burlington City	35	2.0	71	4.1	1,718
	Pemberton Twp.	34	0.6	99	1.8	5,643
Camden	Camden	1,104	6.0	6,287	34.2	18,393
	Gloucester City	3	0.1	3	0.1	2,096
Cumberland	Bridgeton	370	9.0	370	9.0	4,107
	Millville	101	1.7	520	8.9	5,848
	Vineland	439	4.7	1,974	21.0	9,380
Essex	East Orange	318	2.8	571	5.0	11,427
	Irvington	335	4.3	848	10.9	7,756
	Newark	3,729	8.9	12,448	29.6	42,101
	City of Orange Twp.	192	4.4	872	19.8	4,400
Hudson	Harrison	237	12.8	1,117	60.4	1,848
	Hoboken	83	3.4	771	31.8	2,424
	Jersey City	2,463	7.8	12,335	39.0	31,668
	Union City	3,312	31.4	7,277	69.0	10,553
	West New York	956	16.3	5,089	86.6	5,876
Mercer	Trenton	709	5.9	2,127	17.8	11,929
Middlesex	New Brunswick	1,247	27.4	2,316	50.9	4,552
	Perth Amboy	1,589	19.4	5,465	66.7	8,195
Monmouth	Asbury Park	125	3.8	632	19.3	3,267
	Keansburg	17	0.9	139	7.0	1,978
	Long Branch	262	5.5	1,256	26.6	4,723
	Neptune Twp.	28	0.7	286	7.0	4,073
Passaic	Passaic City	3,012	29.2	7,911	76.7	10,308
	Paterson	3,630	14.8	12,412	50.5	24,563
Union	Elizabeth	3,080	16.1	11,047	57.9	19,075
	Plainfield	479	6.4	1,117	14.9	7,477
Warren	Phillipsburg	33	1.0	66	2.0	3,308
TOTAL		28,955	10.5	98,020	35.5	276,359

Appendix B

DEFINITIONS

Limited English proficient students are those “whose native language is other than English and who have sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing or understanding the English language as measured by an English language proficiency test, so as to be denied the opportunity to learn successfully in the classrooms where the language of instruction is English.” (New Jersey Administrative Code, Title 6A:15-1.2 Definitions)

English language learners are students who speak a native language other than English. They include LEP students as well as those who are considered proficient enough in academic English to succeed in classes taught in English. They may still need some support to do so, however.

Immigrant students are those who were born outside the United States and have spent fewer than three full academic years in school in this country. They include both documented and undocumented immigrants as well as refugees. Technically, they do not include students from Puerto Rico and other U.S. territories, though these students are foreign-born.

Language minority students are those who speak a native language other than English. They include LEP students as well as those who are considered proficient enough in academic English to succeed in classes taught in English. This term emphasizes the minority status of the languages spoken by these students—which, in the United States, applies to any language other than English.

A **bilingual education program** is “a full-time program of instruction in all those courses or subjects which a child is required by law or rule to receive, given in the native language of the limited English proficient students enrolled in the program and also in English; in the aural comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing” in the students’ native language and in English; “and in the history and culture” of the United States as well as “of the country, territory or geographic area which is the native land” of the students’ parents. “All students in bilingual education programs receive English as a second language instruction.” (New Jersey Administrative Code, Title 6A:15-1.2 Definitions)

An **English as a second language (ESL) program** provides up to two periods each day of “developmental second language” instruction “based on student needs.” The program “teaches aural comprehension, speaking, reading and writing in English...and incorporates the cultural aspects of the students’ experiences in their ESL instruction.” (New Jersey Administrative Code, Title 6A:15-1.2 Definitions)

Mainstream teachers are those who are prepared to teach students whose native language is English—not LEP students. Mainstream classes/programs are those intended for students whose native language is English—not for LEP students. LEP students exit bilingual education programs and ESL programs and enter mainstream classes/programs when they have met certain exit criteria that show they are proficient enough in English to succeed in regular (mainstream) classes.

Appendix C

LAWS AND REGULATIONS REGARDING THE EDUCATION OF LEP STUDENTS

Federal Court Decision

In the *Lau v. Nichols* decision of 1974, the U. S. Supreme Court ruled that, under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, schools must take affirmative steps to provide a comprehensible education to LEP students. Until they can benefit from instruction entirely in English, they are entitled to special instructional services. The court did not specify the exact nature of those services.

New Jersey Laws and Regulations

The New Jersey Bilingual Education Act of 1975 and Administrative Code Title 6A require districts to identify students who speak native languages other than English and to determine which of those students are LEP students. They must then provide access to academic courses, non-academic courses, and support services “to prepare LEP students to meet the Core Curriculum Content Standards for high school graduation” (New Jersey Administrative Code, Title 6A:15-1.4 Bilingual programs for limited English proficient students). Specific program requirements are as follows:

- Districts with 20 or more LEP students in any one language must implement bilingual education programs. In these programs, all required courses and subjects are taught in the students’ native language and in English, students develop language proficiency in their native language as well as in English, and they learn about the history and culture of their native countries as well as of the United States. Students also receive English as a second language (ESL) instruction. A district can seek a waiver of this requirement and permission to establish an alternative program if it is not able to provide a full bilingual program.
- Districts with 10 or more LEP students (but no more than 20 in any one language) must implement English as a second language (ESL) programs that offer ESL instruction based on students’ needs.

- Districts with fewer than 10 LEP students must provide English language services to improve the English language proficiency of the students.

In addition to these programmatic guidelines, the Administrative Code requires that districts:

- Develop plans for inservice training so that bilingual, ESL, and mainstream teachers can help LEP students meet Core Curriculum Content Standards and ESL Standards.
- Assess all LEP students annually to determine their readiness for exit from special programs.
- Take steps to involve parents of LEP students in their education and establish a parents advisory committee on bilingual education.

Appendix D

DESCRIPTIONS OF SCHOOLS WORKING TO INTEGRATE LEP STUDENTS INTO SCHOOL REFORM

Graham and Parks Elementary School, Cambridge, MA

- **Summary of Case Study (from McLeod, 1996)**
- **Full Case Study (From Berman, et al., 1995)**

Linda Vista Elementary School, San Diego

- **Summary of Case Study (from McLeod, 1996)**
- **Full Case Study (From Berman, et al., 1995)**

Horace Mann Middle School, San Francisco

- **Summary of Case Study (from McLeod, 1996)**
- **Full Case Study (From Berman, et al., 1995)**