

Texas League of United Latin American Citizens

All for One—One for All



A Draft of an Action Plan to Transform the Education of English Language
Learners and Latino Youth in Texas

For Public Comment and Review

Committee Members:

Velma Ybarra—San Antonio—LULAC Education Chair jyb5789@aol.com 210-251-5589
Mary Almendarez—Houston—Community Relations Specialist
Uriel Ramos—Ft. Worth—Educational Consultant
Cynthia Valadez-Mata—Austin—Parent Advocacy Specialist
Jill Ramirez—Austin—Parent Advocacy Specialist
Claudia Sanchez—San Antonio—Deputy State Director for Young Adults
Loren Campos—UT Austin—Young Adult
Maricela Martinez—Austin—Young Adult
Becca Garcia—Victoria—Parent Training Specialist
Dr. Yolanda Salgado—Odessa—Professor UTPB
Rosalia Cruz—Austin—Educator
Rosina Valle—San Marcos—Educator
Idolina Vasquez—Weslaco—Parent Advocate
Joey Cardenas—Director—Texas LULAC

Special Assistance Groups:

Intercultural Development Research Associates—San Antonio, Texas
Center for High School Equity--Grant—LULAC National Office
LULAC Local Council #4631-Velma Ortega President

Texas League of United Latin American Citizens

All for One--One for All

Action Plan to Transform the Education of Latino Youth in Texas

With a Focus on English Language Learners

LULAC of Texas acknowledges the many efforts, programs, and initiatives to improve the education of all students in our State. Successful bilingual education and ESL (English as a Second Language) teaching models have been and continue to be identified. Some colleges and universities offer courses, degree programs, and institutes that focus on the needs of English Language Learners--ELLs. The requirement to include the ELPS--English Language Proficiency Skills-- across all content areas, in conjunction with other successful practices (Marzano, et al.), provides promise and hope. HB 3 provisions now require desegregated data on ELLs, by district. Upgraded skills lists in core academic areas are now tied to college preparatory standards for all students.

Efforts by the Gates Foundation to address the dropout crisis throughout the country, via development of collaborative Action Plans, are promising. Indicators of graduation, college, and work readiness have been identified.

However, the data* continues to cite dropout rates that are unacceptable and growing for large numbers of ELLs in our State. This special population group continues to increase in number in Texas schools, but lags further behind each academic year. As more rigorous standards are adopted, LULAC calls for remedies to ensure that economically-disadvantaged children and children of color are not left behind in this blitz of increased accountability.

In 2008, a Federal District Court ruled that services for LEP (ELL) students in Texas schools are inadequate. However, the Texas Attorney General appealed the ruling. "Without political pressure, there is no assurance that

the State will fix the serious flaws in the services for ELLs that were uncovered by the District Federal Court.” (See *Education of English Language Learners in US and Texas Schools*, 2009 Update, IDRA Publication.)

In March, 2010, the Fifth Circuit Court ruled in favor of the TEA appeal, and failed to respond to the needs of ELLs in our State.

We are aware of the negative economic impact for Texas, if the dropout rates continue as currently recorded. Limited English proficient students continue to constitute almost 17% of the total student population in Texas and have lowest academic achievement, lowest graduation rates, and lowest college readiness rate of all special population groups.

To fix the economy, improve our neighborhoods, and increase the quality of life for families in Texas, we have to lower the dismal dropout rates. LULAC proposes a plan to improve funding, staff development, and instructional practices in ELL programs that should positively impact the high school graduation rates for Hispanic students in Texas.

We acknowledge the financial crisis that our State faces, including high unemployment, and a need for fiscal conservatism. However, the need to improve educational opportunities for all is critical. We must heed to the reality of dwindling fiscal resources, but likewise, we must advocate for needed changes. Note that most of the cited recommendations call for re-direction of already-allocated funds, in the absence of new monies.

This committee also recommends that the National LULAC office fund raise and acquire no less than 1 million dollars to support MALDEF and other support groups for impending legal costs if the TEA does not respond adequately to the needs of Hispanic youth, poor children, and children of color who are not meeting high school and work/college readiness requirements in our schools.

MISSION:

To cultivate a **culture** of support for dropout prevention for all students, with a focus on English Language Learners (ELLs).

To insure that all teacher and administrator **certification courses** at every institute of higher education address the specific learning needs of English Language Learners (ELLs).

To insure that parents are trained as the “promotoras” or agents of change to foster long-range implementation of and adherence to the recommended improvements in this Plan and serve as the best advocates for the academic success of their children.

• **RECOMMENDATIONS**

RECOMMENDATION # I: It is time to revise Bilingual and ESL Education Laws in the state of Texas. To do this, the TEA should form a Task Force with representatives from school districts, higher education, LULAC, MALDEF, and other educational associations to formulate an improved bill and its subsequent funding. AS PART OF THIS REVISED BILL, TEA SHOULD PROVIDE A COMPOSITE REPORT (AEIS, PBMAS, NCLB) TO THE LEGISLATURE NOW ON THE STATE OF LATINOS EDUCATION IN TEXAS AS OF THE CURRENT SCHOOL YEAR, INCLUDING CLEAN, STRAIGHT-FORWARD, NON-ADJUSTED DATA ON HIGH SCHOOL DROP OUT RATES FOR HISPANIC YOUTH.

- i. Assess the costs of upgrading specialized instructional programs for ELLs. This study should include a **per pupil cost analysis**.

The per pupil cost analysis should consider revenues needed to implement best practices in this educational area. It should include cost studies already underway by other states, IDRA, the Department of Education, and TEA.

- ii. Add 20% to the current method of weighted funding for bilingual and ESL programs so as to address higher costs for specialized instruction **OR, to avoid increased spending**, undo the SBOE action that allowed districts to use up to 45% of special population programs funds for “indirect” costs by school districts. (This action was taken in accordance with HB 2646, 81st Legislative Session.)
- iii. The requested report on the State of Latino Education in Texas should include an assessment of the number of ELL students, the number of teachers assigned to serve these students who are alternative or not teacher certified, the number of their teachers who are Bilingual or ESL certified, the number of students with a home language survey that states that a language “other than English” is spoken in the home, the completion date of the subsequent assessment for each of the above identified students with the recommendation, and the number of parent denials by campus, district, region and for the State.

LULAC leadership should meet with the Commissioner and voice opposition to the redirection of funds from special population programs that occurred this year, as a way to mask the real need -- equitable funding of education in Texas.

Does the possibility exist to acquire a “hold harmless” funding clause commitment from the Legislature to avoid this “redirection” of funds from happening again? Redirecting dollars from special programs to offset operating costs for school districts **is** a reaction to the lack of adequate school funding and not an acceptable response as the stimulus monies will end this upcoming fiscal year 2011.

- iv. TEA should commission a report that would enumerate the funds provided to charter profit or nonprofit schools and assess the impact that such redirected funding has had on the public school system per school district.

RECOMMENDATION # II: Reporting and Auditing

1. Eliminate the “**loopholes**” in current practices for reporting dropouts in Texas high schools. This change would require Education Service Centers and TEA to report a student ultimately as a dropout or as “disappeared” unless graduation or completion for that student can be confirmed at another institution.

To do this, it is necessary to **establish policy** that would require Districts, Education Service Centers, and TEA to report as dropouts students who withdraw to enroll in alternative schools, **unless** they remained in attendance until the end of the academic year in a GED or high school diploma-granting institution. *This will stop the stream of high school at-risk youth who are “quickly” enrolled in alternative settings and not reported as dropouts.*

2. Establish policy that would require Education Service Centers to **report to local media outlets or most widely-circulated newspapers, the number of students in their member districts who dropout every grade reporting period (6 or 9 weeks)**. This data would be in the form of an **economic-impact** report. It would cite the decreased income-earning potential and lost taxing revenue for the dropouts, their families, and the general community.

3. Immediately require an annual TEA report that lists the number of non-certified teachers hired through “alternative” programs in high-poverty schools for the past 3 years. Alternative certification was intended as a method of hiring non-certified instructors IN THE ABSENCE of qualified and certified teachers. The reports would corroborate the concern by LULAC that districts are hiring non-certified teachers with no experience to save money and allowing, in some reported instances, up to 4 years to renew permits. This is unacceptable and subject to immediate reform. **The research clearly shows the connection between poor districts, non-certified staff, and low performance of children -- a formula destined for failure. (Fuller, et al.)**

RECOMMENDATION # III: Parental Responsibility -- Building the capacity of “Promotoras”-- parents who will promote LULAC’s plan of action.

1. LULAC and IDRA would partner to create community-based councils, independent of the campus PERCS, which could serve as the liaisons for parents of ELLs. These “promotoras” would be trained on how to address issues of accountability with the schools. Promotoras can be trained on how to internalize the institutional systemic changes recommended by the LULAC education committee. These councils would review data, make recommendations, and meet with School Board members. The staff and leadership of the Inter-cultural Development Research Associates have already developed a training methodology that can be replicated throughout the state. IDRA, LULAC, and other service organizations can work collaboratively to seek the funding for this type of parent advocacy and capacity building group.

Possible funding for this process: the Greater Texas Foundation, the Gates Foundation, the Campaign for High School Equity, and others.

What would these parent groups do? They will work with the appropriate entities to compile baseline data, examine interventions provided by schools before students drop out, and recommend programmatic changes and/or supports based on results. These “promotoras” will review student tracking information from various sources that will reflect the number of students who have dropped out and research, first hand, the reasons causing the exit from their high schools. They will also be able to incorporate information garnered from district information systems such as the Austin ISD LPASS system which monitors the success of English Language Learners throughout their academic years. These reports would become the topic of presentations to School Board leaders at the local school district level.

These groups would also serve as **“Promotoras”--or promoters--of the revised plan for Bilingual and ESL education for the next five years, and will form their own governance structure.**

LULAC and IDRA could partner with agencies such as United Way, an agency that is already providing staffing and resources for San Antonio ISD parents to meet at their sites, or other similar agencies and organizations.

2. Re-direct funds to train parents to become advocates for their ELL children, teach them how to navigate the various school processes such as the Special Education ARD and Bilingual LPAC systems, and how to better participate and make more informed choices in the campus-based decision making process. There are various culturally competent advocacy training models that can be utilized to promote the involvement of traditionally under-represented parents in the decision-making processes of schools. Auerelio Montemayor with IDRA serves on the National Board of the PTA and is a possible resource to help facilitate the aforementioned process.

3. Re-align current resources to fund culturally competent and bilingual personnel who will communicate directly with parents of highest at risk ELLs in the home, as needed,

either during the regular instructional day, or after school/work hours (1 per 300 highest at risk students as per lowest income, lowest TAKS scores, and lowest attendance rates).

4. Highlight the work of parent advocates like Jill Ramirez and Cynthia Valadez of Austin Texas, and Rebecca Garcia of Victoria Texas, with parents of ELL and special-needs children. These and other noted Latino and other minority student advocates have demonstrated their ability to successfully involve parents to help the schools and their children. The aforementioned should be among those involved in re-writing the parental-involvement component of a revised Bilingual Education Act.

5. Utilize the resources provided in the CHSE Advocacy Tool Kit to support parents and community representatives who will advocate at the state, local and national level for educational reform.

RECOMMENDATION # IV: Staff Development

Embrace the IDRA recommendation that..... “It is time for major changes in the way that schools and communities prepare administrators, teachers, and support staff for serving ELLs and other special populations or minority groups...”

(The following recommendations do not exclude any ethnic or racial groups. LULAC’s goal is to provide opportunities for success of all students. **Low socio economic status** is the most significant indicator -- poor children are not achieving as expected in our schools. This plan is critical to our State’s economic future and for the well being of our families.)

1. Establish policy requiring practicum-based Bilingual or ESL Education training for all new and currently-assigned school leaders.

- *Currently-certified* administrators and supervisors assigned to lead schools with ELL enrollments would complete a minimum of 18 clock hours of training on such topics as best practices, ELPS (English Language Proficiency Skills), and salient research findings regarding ELL instruction. All educational leaders would **demonstrate successful teaching and administrative strategies** for schools with ELL enrollments.

To continue in their assignment as administrators, school leaders would complete a minimum of 18 hours on successful ESL teaching practices in order to maintain certification, every 5 years.

- **Newly certified** administrative and supervisory certificates issued in Texas, in 2012-2013 and thereafter by institutes of higher education, would include no less than 6 hours of instruction in the aforementioned topics, including pedagogy and applied ELL learning methods, in a practicum setting.

2. Establish policy that would require practical and proficiency-based training for new and currently-practicing teachers.

- ***New teachers*** hired in 2012-2013 and thereafter will possess certification in bilingual education or ESL instruction, if districts serve ELLs, regardless of enrollment numbers.
- ***Currently-practicing teachers*** who serve ELLs and are not certified, endorsed, or degreed in bilingual or ESL education **must be provided**, by 2012-2013, a minimum of 18 staff development clock hours on proficiency-based training on the ELPS--English Language Proficiency Skills. Districts that show evidence of providing such training and success in closing the ELL academic achievement gap can be exempted. This requirement would include all teachers: ESL, core academic, and electives course instructors, as they all deal daily with the students.
- A minimum of 18 hours of practicum and proficiency-based training on successful practices in ESL instruction will be required for all teachers in grades 6-12, every 5 years.

3. Require Texas Education Agency and Education Service Center staff to prioritize assistance to districts so that they may comply with the cited staff development and continuing education recommendations in this report.

4. Add, as an AEIS or PBMAS reporting indicator, a measure of a district’s progress in meeting established targets for hiring and continued training of Bilingual or ESL-certified staff, including both teachers and administrators.

5. Support increased enrollment of high school students who are bilingual in “Grow Your Own” high school programs for **education careers preparation**. Offering courses such as Ready, Set, Teach! Can provide internships for high school students directly in classrooms to explore careers in education. These students, prospective college graduates, are our most important resource to dramatically increase the number of bilingually-certified teaching staff in Texas.

6. Embrace the findings on staff development of the National Latino/a Education Research Agenda Project (NLERAP) as headed by Dr. Angela Valenzuela at the University of Texas at Austin, et al.

No Additional Funding Required for Recommended Staff Development:

- i. Enact a Higher Education Coordinating Board rule that will require all Colleges and Universities to amend their education programs and offer the endorsements and certifications cited above for teachers and administrators, if not offered currently.
- ii. Re-direct funds for staff training needs cited in order to endorse, within a 3-year period, all teachers who already serve ELLs. The 18-hour training requirement could be met via enrollment in an IHE, via district-provided staff development programs, or via ESCs–Education Service Centers staff development programs.
- ii. Provide, by 2012-2013, special commendations and recognition to Education Service Centers and districts that promote and **hire** more certified bilingual, regular, and special education teachers and administrators.

RECOMMENDATION # V: Instructional Services for ELLs.

First and foremost, demand immediate compliance with the Bilingual Education Law and its provisions. The State of Texas has failed to monitor compliance with current rules, in spite of plentiful data regarding inappropriate daily instructional practices in bilingual education program across the state. ELL students are “rushed” through language development in their home language, exited early from bilingual programming, and immersed in English only classes, while parents are not fully educated and informed of the benefits of bilingualism for building social, emotional, and academic intelligence. Ultimately, the foundation for acquiring language does not occur and these students become dropout casualties, failing in both academics and life.

1. Currently, Texas funds bilingual education programs IF THE STUDENT PARTICIPANTS ARE OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY. The reality is that parents of more affluent NES (native English speakers) are enrolling their children in State bilingual education programs in large numbers. This is an admirable and desirable goal; however Texas does NOT provide funding for NES children in its bilingual funding formulas. Therefore, it is necessary for school districts to insure that funds provided for our ELLs be identified and monitored. Funds to support bilingual education and ESL programs are a civil right of our ELLs. In those districts that enroll non-ELLs in dual language programs, the State should provide a per-pupil allocation for NES participants and insure that there is NO competition for resources or expenditure of bilingual funds to support OTHER than ELLs.

It is apparent that many parents and consumers in our state value the importance of dual language programs. The participation of all children is admirable and should be a desired goal. However, the closure of our ELL students’ academic achievement gap is first and foremost our # 1 priority. LULAC will not support the expansion of language acquisition programming for English speakers when there exists a competition for resources necessary to support our English Language Learners (ELLs) and closure of that academic gap has not been achieved.

2. LULAC supports the expansion of successful and appropriate dual language maintenance models to our ELLs. RESEARCH CITING DUAL LANGUAGE PROGRAMS AS THE MOST EFFECTIVE MODEL FOR OUR ELLS TO SUCCEED IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION IS ALREADY APPARENT AND AVAILABLE. RESEARCH ALSO SHOWS THAT ELLS IN A LOW SES AREA ARE BEST SERVED IN A 90/10 MODEL (See research listing at end of this document). For our ELLs not enrolled in dual language programs, school districts must provide evidence and insure that the quality and level of bilingual programming has not been diminished, nor that designated bilingual funds be diverted, in any way, to support any NES student.

3. Implementation of a Policy that will require ESCs (Education Service Centers) to report to the TEA all services that have been offered to their member school districts on

successful **scheduling practices for ELL Elementary, Middle, and High School students**. The report should include a listing of training sessions offered to districts, specifically on Bilingual/ESL program delivery models. In addition, the report by the ESCs should include the increased number of Bilingual/ESL-trained teachers assigned to serve ELLs in all classrooms (Bilingual/ESL, core academic and electives). These sessions will simultaneously assist districts in meeting the 2012-2013 recommendations for Bilingual/ESL certification and training noted in the staff development section of this document.

4. In the interim, and prior to 2012-2013 implementation of proposed certification requirements, the TEA would require Educational Service Centers (ESCs) to report, annually, progress of their member districts in meeting the training and endorsements requirements for already-practicing school leaders and teachers (18-hour staff development program).
5. Annually require that ESCs report to the TEA the number of ELL parents who deny, or turn down, services for bilingual or ESL programs in their ESC member districts AND cite recommendations on how to improve the participation rates, including proof that the ELLs academic achievement gap is closing. Being bilingual is an avenue for high-wage employment, and this opportunity should be available for all students, including ELLs.
6. Identify in District Improvement and Campus Improvement Plans (CIPS), more specific interventions and instructional delivery models for low-achieving ELLs, including the training of culturally competent bilingual staff (Examples: Daily time on task on specialized interventions that are systemic and research-proven as effective for ELLs; programs that are sequential, long-term, and proven as effective to deal with ELLs specialized needs).
7. Establish policy that would require Education Service Centers (ESCs) to provide support to their member districts in the identification and integration of culturally-sensitive curriculum that highlights the ***history, culture, and contributions of the various ethnic groups*** represented in their Region. Compliance with this policy would be evidenced by ESC audits that would reflect the ***actual fiscal resources allotted for this need and actual curriculum products*** developed. Calendars of events from the Service Centers, and all associated departments, offices, and agencies, should likewise recognize the cultural and historical contributions of the various racial and ethnic groups in their communities.
8. Audit the percentage of funds allotted from all local, ESC, state TEA, and federal budgets to support, directly in the classroom, the learning needs of ELLs. For example, if in Texas only 3% of ELLs are meeting college-readiness standards (PEIMS 2009), **significant increased funding to improve and monitor this indicator** should be reflected in the campus, district, Region Education Service Centers, and TEA budgets.
9. Re-direct funds to provide *specialized* services for ELL special education students, including bilingual/ESL instruction and bilingual speech therapy, to ELL students with autism and other disabilities. In some districts, ELL students in Special Education are instructed only in English or are not provided Bilingual Speech Therapy when identified as ELLs eligible for this instructional service.

10. Review and distribute findings of work being done by Dr. Rosalinda Barrera, Dean of Education at Texas State University, and educational leaders in collaboration with Region XIII on exemplary ELL teaching processes so that school districts can incorporate these exemplary “best practices” in their instruction of ELLs.

11. In light of the low academic performance of ELLs, how can the data collection by TEA focus on dissemination of successful practices?

What type of data on bilingual education can the newly-acquired one-stop portals provide? Will it provide data on successful academic ELL interventions, the type of interventions, and the percentage of time allotted for successful bilingual and ESL teaching practices? How can this portal help report on best teaching practices and training models for English language learners in our State? For example, currently, on AEIS reports, data on bilingual education program participants, by instructional model and their TAKS scores, is reported only by District, and not by campus.

Action Plan
**Recommendations for Next Steps for LULAC local, district,
and state leadership**

1. LULAC has, and should, continue to allocate staff, funding, and organizational support to insure that this Plan is publicized in every major newspaper, AND that it be submitted to partnering organizations (MASB, ALAS, TABE, TASB, TASSP, TAEP, TSTA, et al.), and to media outlets.
2. LULAC staff and the LULAC State Education Advisory Committee will present this plan to partnering organizations, monthly or as necessary, during this upcoming year.
3. LULAC, in partnership with other state, regional, and local leaders, should require the TEA and ESCs to inform the general public **that 80% of ELLs in Texas who are underachieving are not “illegals” or “undocumented” students in our schools!** Most low-achieving ELLs are born and raised in our Texas neighborhoods and often have parents that have lived in Texas for decades. Nonetheless, quality education is a right extended to ALL children, regardless of residency or citizenship status.
4. If necessary, through the open records act, ***require the TEA to provide a report on the number of educators, by ethnicity, race, and district, who have filed grievances*** for alleged or perceived retaliation in Texas school districts. This data is critical for School Board members, superintendents, and legislators. LULAC contends that in many instances, Latino administrators have been marginalized or retaliated against for advocating openly for improved services for ELLs. Although some school districts with large Latino student populations may hire qualified and certified Latino administrators and staff, a review of AEIS staff information for Texas will also reflect that there are districts that have made little or no progress in the hiring of more qualified, certified, and readily-available Latino administrators. For example, currently AEIS reports do not reflect the ethnicity of campus and Central office administrators.
5. LULAC will submit a news story every month on the progress and status of this Action Plan for the next five years, with copies to other support organizations, such as TABE, MALDEF, NAACP, MASB, TASB, TASSP, TASA, TAESP, and to the media.
6. LULAC’s education committee will provide a synopsis of this plan to all media outlets and schedule presentations, as necessary, to all associations, organizations, councils, committees, college/university groups, et al, to further promote support for and implementation of this Action Plan.

Tasks For Education Committee Members

1. After the Education committee prepares the above recommendations in form of possible legislation, LULAC leadership must meet with a supportive legislative team. Joey Cardenas, state Chair will direct this process.
2. Members of the committee must meet with every LULAC district director who in turn may/should assign council members to present this plan to their local School Board of Trustees.
3. Members of the LULAC State Education Committee must meet with leadership in higher education on the merits of this plan and formalize the staff development recommendations.
4. The LULAC State Education Committee will host an educational summit during 2010 with LULAC Young Adult involvement.
6. LULAC will recruit and support candidates for election to the SBOE and other educational entities who will more effectively and appropriately represent the needs of under performing students and ELLs in our schools, in light of Texas' changing student demographics.
7. Work in partnership with MASB and TASB by meeting with leadership in these organizations. Encourage School Boards to direct Superintendents to hire HIGHLY QUALIFIED administrators, including bilingual administrators that are more reflective of their student populations. Candidates' for administrative positions should have a work history that includes teaching and administrative work with bilingual education and ESL programs.

PROMISING PRACTICES IN THE EDUCATION OF ELLs in TEXAS

LULAC's Goal: To increase teachers' knowledge in the acquisition of research-based successful practices for English Language Learners.

- 1. Study and implement successful effective and appropriate models of dual-language bilingual education programs.**
- 2. Study and implement successful and comprehensive implementation of the TEA-required English Language Proficiency Skills-ELPS.**
- 3. Study and implement successful and comprehensive implementation of the Structured Instruction Observation Protocol–SIOP model.**
- 4. Study and implement successful and comprehensive implementation of staff development that incorporates SIOP, ELPS, and related research and teaching methodologies.**
- 5. Identify “coaches” or lead teachers in high schools that can observe in classrooms, video-tape successful lessons, and provide access of these best practices to all.**
- 6. Support teachers in their quest to implement successful Bilingual/ESL methodologies in their Bilingual/ESL, core academic, and electives classes.**
- 7. Implement book studies and professional learning community sessions for high school teachers that focus on successful ELL learning methodologies**
- 8. Insure that ELLs are part of a mentor group, club, or other support organization, at their elementary, middle, and high schools.**

Sampling of ESL/Bilingual Education Terminology

ESL—English as a Second Language—A program in which students attend one or more classes to learn to speak and write in English and sometimes go over material studied in other classes. All of the students' other classes are conducted in English. ESL is a component of virtually all transitional and maintenance programs in the United States.

ESOL—English for Speakers of Other Languages

ELL—English Language Learner

SLL—Second Language Learner

LEP—Limited English Proficient—Students who demonstrate lower English comprehension, verbal and written skills than other students in their age group.

NEP—Non- English Proficient

NES—Native-English Speaking (in some documents NES can refer to Non English speakers)

BE—Bilingual Education—Educational programs that use two languages as the media of instruction. The teacher develops English skills while teaching content in the native language.

TBE—Transitional Bilingual Education—A program that teaches academic subjects in the students' primary language but progressively uses more English. As the students' English-language proficiency increases, the primary language is dropped.

DBE—Developmental Bilingual Education—Programs that foster parallel learning in two languages. Bilingual instructors teach academic subjects in the students' primary language. Its objective is to create bilingual students. This approach is often used with k-6 students.

DL—Dual Language—A Bilingual Education Model that employs two languages (the most common being English and Spanish) for the purpose of instruction. It adheres to the State's high expectations for all students. It is a model that can incorporate English speaking students with English Language Learners whereby both student groups work toward the goal of becoming bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural in a shared learning environment.

LI—Language Immersion—Programs where teachers use “sheltered English,” also known as “alternate immersion,” which is a simplified vocabulary and sentence structure to teach school subjects.

HLS—Home Language Survey

L1, L2—First Language; Second Language

References:

“Two-Way Bilingual Education—Students Learning Through Two Languages.” Christian 1994; Santa Cruz, California and Washington, DC: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

The City-La Cuidad, Glossary of Bilingual Education Terms

New Horizons in Education, Inc. Jo Gusman & Associates-1-800-573-NHIE

Sample Research Findings:

- **Texas Dual Language Program Cost Analysis:** associated with implementation and **maintenance of dual language programs** The transitional bilingual **program model** serves **language** minority students who

ldn.tamu.edu/Archives/CBARreport.pdf -

- **Dueling Models of Dual Language Instruction**

The outcomes of **dual language programs** for **language** minority populations demonstrate ... A **model** of **dual language** instruction serves several functions. ... find three **program** models: (a) **dual maintenance** bilingual education for **language** ...

www.joanwink.com/pub/pub-duel.php

- **Dual Language** Program Models and Features. **Dual Language** Program Models. ... and **maintenance** of effective **dual language** bilingual education programs in a clear, ... an effective **dual language** program in order to maintain a **model program**, ...

www.pearsonhighered.com/educator/academic/product/0,3... - [Similar](#)

- **Bilingual Education - Need for Bilingual Education, Benefits ...**

Benefits of Bilingualism and Theoretical Foundations of **Bilingual Education**. **Bilingual education** is grounded in common sense, experience, and **research**. ...

education.stateuniversity.com/pages/1788/Bilingual-Ed... - [Similar](#)

- **"The benefits of bilingual education for English language ...**

Oct 26, 2007 ... He cited **research** affirming the value of **bilingual education**, ... Mason University that compared dual language **programs** and found those most ...

www.nysut.org/endingthegap_8779.htm - [Similar](#)

- <http://texasedequity.blogspot.com/> **Educational Equity, Politics and Policy in Texas, Dr. Angela Valenzuela**

- **Ten Common Fallacies about Bilingual Education**

Apr 5, 2000 ... Fallacy 9: **Research** is Inconclusive on the **Benefits of Bilingual Education**. Some critics argue that the great majority of bilingual **program** ...

www.kidsource.com/education/ten.fallacy.biling.ed.html - [Similar](#)

●Dropout Risk Factors and Exemplary Programs (available at http://www.dropoutprevention.org/resource/major_reports/communities_in_schools.htm)

●***Boosting Hispanic enrollment increasingly urgent, Texas officials say. Poverty, lack of health insurance, other social ills complicate the challenge.***

By [Ralph K.M. Haurwitz](#)

AMERICAN-STATESMAN STAFF Friday, July 31, 2009

●**From Remediation to Enrichment:
Transforming Texas Schools through Dual Language Education**
Virginia Collier, Wayne Thomas, and Josefina Tinajero
George Mason University and the University of Texas at El Paso

●*TABE Journal v.9 #1 Spring/Summer 2006*
23

**From Remediation to Enrichment:
Transforming Texas Schools through Dual Language Education**

●Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed.) Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

●Collier, V. P. (1992). A synthesis of studies examining long-term language minority student data on academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16(1-2), 187- 212.

●Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2006). Predicting second language academic success in English using the Prism Model. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *The International Handbook of English Language Teaching, Volume 1*. Norwell, MA: Springer Publications (formerly Kluwer).

Statistics:

Texas High Schools

DROPOUTS AND POORLY PREPARED STUDENTS HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE ECONOMY

Nearly 133,200 students did not graduate from Texas' high schools in 2009; the lost lifetime earnings in Texas for that class of dropouts alone total more than **\$34.6 billion**.¹

Texas would save more than **\$1.6 billion** in health care costs over the lifetimes of each class of dropouts had they earned their diplomas.²

If Texas' high schools graduated all of their students ready for college, the state would save almost **\$282.4 million** a year in community college remediation costs and lost earnings.³

Texas' economy would see a combination of crime-related savings and additional revenue of about **\$691 million** each year if the male high school graduation rate increased by just 5%.⁴

THE BEST ECONOMIC STIMULUS IS A DIPLOMA

Texas High School Graduation Rates (Class of 2006)

State-Reported: U.S. Department of

Education-Reported: Reported⁷

80% 73% 65%

Texas High School Graduation Rates by Race (Class of 2006):

Texas Nation

All Students 65% 69%

White 76% 76%

Black 53% 51%

Hispanic 56% 55%

Asian 85% 79%

Native American 52% 50%

Texas College Graduation Rates⁹

Four-Year National Two-Year National

Institution* Average* Institution** Average**

All Students 51% 56% 23% 32%

White 57% 59% 20% 33%

Black 35% 41% 26% 27%

Hispanic 39% 48% 24% 34%

Asian 65% 66% 19% 34%

Native American 47% 39% 22% 29%

*Graduation within six years of entrance (Cohort from 2000–2006)

**Graduation within three years of entrance (Cohort from 2003–2006)

THE ACHIEVEMENT GAP REMAINS A CHALLENGE

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Reading Scores for Texas Eighth Graders:¹⁰

Insufficient or no data was reported for other subgroups.

52% of Texas eighth graders report being eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.