TRANSITIONAL BILINGUAL EDUCATION

and

TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM OF INSTRUCTION

EVALUATION REPORT

FISCAL YEAR 2000

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Research Division

December 2000

Ronald J. Gidwitz, Chairman
State Board of Education

Glenn W. M^CGee
State Superintendent of Education

At the direction of the Illinois State Board of Education, the Division of Research evaluated the Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) program and Transitional Program of Instruction (TPI). The interpretations and conclusions do not necessarily reflect the position or the policy of the Illinois State Board of Education. For more information, please contact Steve Scaife of the Research Division at 217/782-3950.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE FY00 PROGRAMS

Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) and Transitional Programs of Instruction (TPI) help limited-English-proficient (LEP) students whose native language is other than English become proficient in English so they can transition into the mainstream education curriculum.

- Based on the FY00 Fall Enrollment Housing Report, schools identified 122,365 students as being eligible for bilingual education services.

- TBE and TPI programs served 143,855 students in FY00. This number is 17.56% over the number of students identified as being eligible for services. The primary reason for this difference is that the number of students served includes all students served during the entire school year, whereas the number of students reported as eligible includes only those students enrolled as of the reporting date.

- The 143,855 students served represents an increase of 4.5% over the number of students served in FY99. While the number of students downstate increased by 10.7% from FY99, the number served in Chicago District #299 decreased slightly by 1.2%.

- Most of the students were served in TBE programs (114,402 students) as opposed to TPI programs (32,453 students).

- Over 63% of the students served were in grades 4 and below.

- Over 49% of the students were served in Chicago District #299. This year marks the first year that Chicago District #299's portion of total students served has fallen below 50%. About 22% of the students were served elsewhere in Cook County and another 23% were in the collar counties of DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, and Will. The remainder of the students were from downstate.

- Most students (77%) attended bilingual education programs for three years or less, with the remainder receiving services for four or more years. Under Illinois law, students can receive bilingual program services for three years; to receive services beyond three years, both the district and the students' parents must consent.

- Over 28.94% of the students served exited their programs. Of all students served, 13.62% transitioned to mainstream education, while the remaining 15.32% left for other reasons (parental withdrawal, graduation, drop-out, transfer, or unknown). These are the highest transition and exit rates reported in the past ten years and are attributable to new program participation policies in Chicago District #299. These policies impose a mandatory review of each student's academic performance at the end of the third year service and require students be transitioned to mainstream classroom instruction if they meet District #299's performance standards. Those students who do not meet standards are permitted to continue in the program for a fourth year. If needed, students may receive a fifth year in the program if the performance review at the end of the fourth indicates a need for additional service.

- A follow-up study conducted on a sample of students transitioned to mainstream education during FY97 indicates that their mainstream performance is generally favorable. The students had an overall retention rate of 5.1% for the three-year period following their transition, and most test scores met or exceeded standards.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

This evaluation report describes TBE and TPI programs that served limited-English-proficient students in Illinois during the 1999-2000 school year and addresses the following evaluation questions:

Who is eligible to receive services?

How many students are enrolled in TBE/TPI programs?

What are the characteristics of participants?

Where are these students located?

What types of programs have these students experienced and to what extent?

What are the students' rates of transition and exit?

What are the major areas of staff development activity, and what areas are needed in the future?

How are parents involved?

How is assessment information used?

How is instruction provided?

How did transitioned students perform in mainstream classrooms?

How did students perform on the IMAGE Assessment?

How can collection and evaluation of bilingual education program data be improved?

Background

The School Code requires that one of two types of programs be provided for all K-12 limited-English-proficient students to help them become proficient in English so that they can transition into the mainstream education curriculum.

Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE)

In 1973, legislation was passed requiring school districts to offer a Transitional Bilingual Education program whenever there are 20 or more LEP students with a common native language enrolled in one school. TBE programs must be taught by a certificated teacher who is fluent in one of the native languages spoken by the students.

Transitional Program of Instruction (TPI)

A Transitional Program of Instruction may be provided in lieu of a TBE program whenever there are fewer than 20 LEP students of a common native language at an attendance center. However, a TPI program must always be made available to any LEP student if a TBE program

is not otherwise available. TPI programs may or may not involve certificated teachers, and a wide range of services may be provided. Typical examples of TPI services involve part-time instruction in English as a second language, the use of tutors and aides in the classroom, and other native language resource persons (parents, peers, and volunteers from the community).

Data Sources

Data were collected by the Research Division using four instruments: 1) the Pubic School Fall Enrollment/Housing Report, 2) the Annual Student Report, 3) the Program Delivery Report, and 4) the Bilingual Education Follow-Up Survey. The annual Public School Fall Enrollment/ Housing Report records the number of limited-English-proficient students enrolled in each district. School districts reporting LEP students on their annual Public School Fall Enrollment/Housing Report complete the Annual Student Report and the Program Staffing and Delivery Report. The Annual Student Report collects individual student data on native language, grade level, other services, time in the TPI or TBE program, and program exit (if applicable). The Program Delivery Report collects program data on staff development, parental involvement, instructional services, and student assessment. The Bilingual Education Follow-Up Survey reports individual student performance in mainstream classroom education.

In addition, this report presents data from the Illinois Measures of Annual Growth in English (IMAGE) Assessment Test. These data were collected by the Assessment Division of the Illinois State Board of Education. The IMAGE test measures English reading and writing proficiency for students whose first language is not English. The test is administered annually to those students who were enrolled in an approved TBE or TPI program in their first, second, and third years of instruction.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Who is eligible to receive services?

School districts are required to identify limited-English-proficient students using a home language survey which indicates the languages they speak and the languages used in their homes. Once students with non-English language backgrounds are identified, districts are then required to conduct individual language assessments.

The individual language assessment measures students' listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in English. Students are considered limited-English-proficient and eligible for bilingual education services if their individual language assessment indicates:

a) that their performance on a nationally-normed English-language-proficiency test is below the 50th percentile (or its equivalent), or

b) that their performance is at or above the 50th percentile on a nationally-normed English-language-proficiency test, but other performance indicators show that they are more than one year behind the average of district age/grade level peers in any required subject, or

c) when no nationally-normed English-language-proficiency test can be administered, a review of other indicators shows they are unable to succeed in English-only classes or are more than one year behind the average of district/grade level peers in any required subject.

Public School Fall Enrollment/Housing Report

The Public School Fall Enrollment/Housing Report provides the following information for each attendance center:

a) the number of non-English-language-background students, and

b) the number of non-English-language-background students identified as having limited English proficiency.

The students having limited-English-proficiency are referred to as LEP students and are eligible to be served in TBE/TPI programs.

How many students are enrolled in TBE/TPI programs?

Data on LEP students reported in the 2000 Public School Fall Enrollment/Housing Report are shown in Table 1 along with bilingual program participation data. These data are presented for the state as a whole and for the 25 largest bilingual program districts.

Table 1.   LEP Students Identified and Served in TBE/TPI Programs; 1999-2000

	Number* Identified	Number** Served	Percent Served
City Of Chicago School District 299	58,541	71,664	122.42
Cicero School District 99	4,901	5,993	122.28
School District 46	7,198	5,048	70.13
Waukegan C. U. School District 60	2,840	3,703	130.39
Aurora East Unit School District 131	3,387	3,411	100.71
Community Consolidated School District 59	1,371	2,004	146.17
Palatine C. C. School District 15	1,837	1,947	105.99
Rockford School District 205	2,185	1,939	88.74
Comm Unit School District 300	1,620	1,731	106.85
Wheeling C. C. School District 21	1,513	1,648	108.92
Round Lake Area Schools – District 116	1,073	1,400	130.48
West Chicago School District 33	1,101	1,215	110.35
Schaumburg C. C. School District 54	861	1,167	135.54
Township High School District 214	810	1,057	130.49
Des Plaines C. C. School District 62	766	910	118.80
Joliet Public School District 86	964	900	93.36
Addison School District 4	608	825	135.69
Indian Prairie C. U. School District 204	568	745	131.16
Maywood-Melrose Park-Broadview-89	663	741	111.76
Bensenville School District 2	495	653	131.92
Community Unit School District 200	508	631	124.21
Marquardt School District 15	468	593	126.71
Berwyn South School District 100	476	592	124.37
East Maine School District 63	632	590	93.35
Cook County School District 130	545	564	103.49
All Other Districts	26,434	32,184	121.75
State Totals	122,365	143,855	117.56

 *FY00 Public School Fall Enrollment/Housing Report
**FY00 Annual Student Report

The data show that over 100% of the students identified as eligible for bilingual education programs in the Public School Fall Enrollment/Housing Report were served, with 21 school districts reportedly serving more than 100% of the eligible students in their areas. Those numbers may be skewed by student migration into and between schools and the fact that data collected on students served covers the entire school year, while the Fall Enrollment/Housing Report includes only students enrolled as of the reporting date.

In addition, parents have the right to decline bilingual education services for their children. This is one possible explanation for the number of LEP students identified being lower than the number served.

What are the characteristics of participants?

Table 2 lists the languages spoken by the 143,855 students served in TPI and TBE programs. There were over 113 languages reported in FY00 and over 107 languages reported in FY99. In general, the language diversity among TBE/TPI students in Illinois has remained constant over the past several years, with Spanish-speaking students continuing to represent the largest group.

Table 2.   Native Languages Spoken by Students Participating in TBE and TPI in Illinois Schools; 1999-2000

Language	Number	Language	Number	Language	Number
Spanish	110,831	Thai	141	Marathi	11
Polish	6,550	Yoruba	113	Danish	10
Serbian	2,412	Albanian (Tosk)	109	Ilonggo	10
Arabic	2,312	Slovak	101	Nepali	10
Urdu	2,303	Turkish	100	Pashto	10
Korean	1,803	Taiwanese	90	Akan	9
Gujarati	1,680	Bengali	78	Kurdish	9
Cantonese	1,566	Czech	67	Sindhi	9
Russian	1,246	Hebrew	59	Balinese	8
Vietnamese	1,210	Croatian	58	Norwegian	7
Pilipino	905	Tamil	54	Fukien	6
Japanese	812	Macedonian	52	Tuluau	6
Assyrian	786	Amharic	50	Cebuano	5
Albanian (Gheg)	702	Afrikaans	49	Hausa	5
Romanian	609	Hmong	47	Konkani	5
Mandarin	595	Tibetan	44	Samoan	5
Bulgarian	523	Malay	43	Shanghai	5
Hindi	434	Dutch	37	Chippewa	4
Ukrainian	385	Swahili	36	Guyanese	4
German	377	Armenian	35	Yiddish	4
Panjabi	359	Swedish	33	Chamorro	3
Cambodian	340	Hungarian	32	Gaelic	3
Malayalam	338	Ibo	29	Lingala	3
Bosnian	335	Indonesian	26	Shona	3
Lithuanian	318	Slovenian	26	Kache	2
French	277	Chaochow	22	Navajo	2
Greek	269	Burmese	20	Sotho	2
Lao	239	Latvian	17	Cherokee	1
Italian	224	Estonian	15	Choctaw	1
Haitian-Creole	201	Kannada	15	Comanche	1
Portuguese	192	Romany	15	Creek	1
Farsi	162	Sinhalese	15	Efik	1
Telugu	143	Finnish	13	Others	611

Table 3 shows the distribution of the 25 most common languages. Statewide, Spanish is the most common language, followed by Polish, Serbian, Arabic, and Urdu. In Chicago, significant numbers of students speak Polish, Serbian, Urdu, and Cantonese. Among downstate bilingual students, significant numbers speak Polish, Korean, Gujarati, and Arabic.

Table 3. The Twenty-Five Most Common Languages in TBE and TPI Programs by Location

	State		Chicago		Downstate	
Language	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Spanish	110,831	77.04	57,386	80.08	53,445	74.03
Polish	6,550	4.55	4,010	5.60	2,540	3.52
Serbian	2,412	1.68	1,262	1.76	1,150	1.59
Arabic	2,312	1.61	971	1.35	1,341	1.86
Urdu	2,303	1.60	1,228	1.71	1,075	1.49
Korean	1,803	1.25	252	0.35	1,551	2.15
Gujarati	1,680	1.17	253	0.35	1,427	1.98
Cantonese	1,566	1.09	1,212	1.69	354	0.49
Russian	1,246	0.87	360	0.50	886	1.23
Vietnamese	1,210	0.84	624	0.87	586	0.81
Pilipino	905	0.63	338	0.47	567	0.79
Japanese	812	0.56	18	0.03	794	1.10
Assyrian	786	0.55	480	0.67	306	0.42
Albanian (Gheg)	702	0.49	214	0.30	488	0.68
Romanian	609	0.42	373	0.52	236	0.33
Mandarin	595	0.41	114	0.16	481	0.67
Bulgarian	523	0.36	214	0.30	309	0.43
Hindi	434	0.30	136	0.19	298	0.41
Ukrainian	385	0.27	155	0.22	230	0.32
German	377	0.26	47	0.07	330	0.46
Panjabi	359	0.25	34	0.05	325	0.45
Cambodian	340	0.24	202	0.28	138	0.19
Malayalam	338	0.23	61	0.09	277	0.38
Bosnian	335	0.23	178	0.25	157	0.22
Lithuanian	318	0.22	70	0.10	248	0.34
Others	4,124	2.87	1,472	2.05	2,652	3.67

Table 4 shows that more than half (63%) of the students served are in grades Pre-K through 4 and that the numbers of students in grades 5 and above tend to decrease at each grade level. This pattern generally holds true in both Chicago and downstate. Bilingual services for Pre-K students are optional; some districts choose to offer Pre-K services while other districts do not. Table 5 shows that of the students served, 77% are served in TBE programs and the remaining 23% in TPI programs.

Table 4. Number of Students in Bilingual Programs by Grade Level and Location

Grade Level	Total	Chicago	Downstate
Pre-Kindergarten	1,753	609	1,144
Kindergarten	19,165	9,076	10,089
01	19,088	8,730	10,358
02	19,403	10,006	9,397
03	17,719	9,454	8,265
04	13,334	6,641	6,693
05	10,570	5,318	5,252
06	9,698	5,635	4,063
07	7,869	4,283	3,586
08	7,105	3,927	3,178
09	5,575	2,407	3,168
10	4,912	1,929	2,983
11	3,570	1,267	2,303
12	4,038	2,345	1,693
Ungraded	56	37	19
Total	143,855	71,664	72,191

Table 5. Grade Levels of Students by Program Type

Grade Level	TBE Students		TPI Students	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Pre-Kindergarten	1,376	1.24	377	1.16
Kindergarten	15,587	13.99	3,578	11.03
01	15,088	13.54	4,000	12.33
02	15,660	14.06	3,743	11.53
03	14,421	12.95	3,298	10.16
04	10,584	9.50	2,750	8.47
05	8,250	7.41	2,320	7.15
06	7,630	6.85	2,068	6.37
07	5,912	5.31	1,957	6.03
08	5,179	4.65	1,926	5.93
09	3,627	3.26	1,948	6.00
10	3,131	2.81	1,781	5.49
11	2,116	1.90	1,454	4.48
12	2,803	2.52	1,235	3.81
Ungraded	38	0.03	18	0.06
Total	111,402	100.00	32,453	100.00

Where are these students located?

Table 6 shows the number of LEP students in TBE and TPI programs by geographic location. Cook County and the collar counties serve over 94% of all students in Illinois' bilingual education programs. Chicago District #299 serves the highest percent of students at over 49% (71,664 students). The remaining students were served in the outlying districts of Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, and Will counties.

Table 6.   TBE and TPI Program Enrollments by Geographic Location

	Number	Percent
Chicago	71,664	49.82
Cook County (excluding Chicago)	31,941	22.20
Collar Counties (DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, Will)	32,821	22.82
Downstate Illinois	7,429	5.16
Total	143,855	100.00

The data reported above indicate a major shift in the geographic locations where students are served. For the first time in over 10 years, District #299's portion of students served has fallen to less than half of the statewide total. In addition, the 71,664 District #299 students served in FY00 is less than the 72,490 served in FY99.

Table 7 shows the concentration of TBE and TPI programs outside Chicago District #299. The 20 districts listed served over 26% of Illinois' bilingual education students, which represents over half of the students served outside of Chicago District #299.

Table 7.   The Twenty Largest Bilingual Program Districts outside Chicago District # 299

District Name	Number of Students	Percent of State Total	Cumulative Percent of State Total
Cicero School District 99	5,993	4.17	4.17
School District 46	5,048	3.51	7.68
Waukegan C. U. School District 60	3,703	2.57	10.25
Aurora East Unit School District 131	3,411	2.37	12.62
Comm Consolidated School District 59	2,004	1.39	14.02
Palatine C. C. School District 15	1,947	1.35	15.37
Rockford School District 205	1,939	1.35	16.72
Comm Unit School District 300	1,731	1.20	17.92
Wheeling C. C. School District 21	1,648	1.15	19.07
Round Lake Area Schools – District 116	1,400	0.97	20.04
West Chicago School District 33	1,215	0.84	20.89
Schaumburg C. C. School District 54	1,167	0.81	21.70
Township High School District 214	1,057	0.73	22.43
Des Plaines C. C. School District 62	910	0.63	23.06
Joliet Public School District 86	900	0.63	23.69
Addison School District 4	825	0.57	24.26
Indian Prairie C. U. School District 204	745	0.52	24.78
Maywood-Melrose Park-Broadview-89	741	0.52	25.30
Bensenville School District 2	653	0.45	25.75
Community Unit School District 200	631	0.44	26.19

What types of programs have these students experienced and to what extent?

Since some research indicates that students benefit from long-term participation in bilingual programs, tracking years of participation is important. Although the School Code requires that limited-English-proficient students stay in transitional bilingual education programs for no more than three years or until they can demonstrate a locally determined grade-level proficiency in English, whichever comes first, a student can remain in a transitional bilingual education program beyond three years as long as the parents and the local school district consent.

Table 8 compares the number of bilingual education students in programs for three years or less to those who have been in programs for four or more years. Most of the students (77%) received services for three years or less. About 66% of the students that received services for four years or more are in grades 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Table 8. Years of Participation in Bilingual Education Programs by Grade Level

	Three Years or Less		Four Years or More	
Grade Level	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Pre-Kindergarten	1,753	1.57	0	0.00
Kindergarten	19,165	17.22	0	0.00
01	19,031	17.10	57	0.18
02	18,679	16.78	724	2.22
03	14,681	13.19	3,038	9.34
04	6,208	5.58	7,126	21.90
05	5,020	4.51	5,550	17.05
06	4,431	3.98	5,267	16.18
07	4,244	3.81	3,625	11.14
08	3,986	3.58	3,119	9.58
09	4,638	4.17	937	2.88
10	4,059	3.65	853	2.62
11	2,988	2.68	582	1.79
12	2,401	2.16	1637	5.03
Ungraded	28	0.03	28	0.09
	111,312	100.00	32,543	100.00

Table 9 compares years of participation statewide in the Chicago area and downstate. The data show that 13.5% of the downstate students have been in a bilingual education program for four or more years, while 31.88% of the Chicago District #299 students have been in the program for four or more years.

Table 9. Years of Participation in Bilingual Education Programs by Geographic Location

Years of Participation	State		Chicago		Downstate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than 1	41,201	28.64	16,687	23.29	24,514	33.96
1	31,480	21.88	12,286	17.14	19,194	26.59
2	21,479	14.93	9,880	13.79	11,599	16.07
3	17,149	11.92	9,966	13.91	7,183	9.95
4	12,295	8.55	7,445	10.39	4,850	6.72
5	7,731	5.37	5,106	7.12	2,625	3.64
6	5,209	3.62	3,970	5.54	1,239	1.72
7	3,358	2.33	2,820	3.94	538	0.75
More than 7	3,953	2.75	3,504	4.89	449	0.62
Total	143,855	100.00	71,664	100.01	72,191	100.02

Table 10 shows years of participation by program type. Data show that 25.97% of the TBE and 11.12% of the TPI participants have been in the program four or more years. Although there are many possible explanations for this difference, one may be that many students become English-language-proficient more quickly in the TPI programs, which generally use more one-on-one instruction.

Table 10. Years of Participation by Program

Years of Participation	TBE		TPI	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than 1	29,162	26.18	12,039	37.10
1	22,699	20.38	8,781	27.06
2	16,388	14.71	5,091	15.69
3	14,218	12.76	2,931	9.03
4	10,689	9.59	1,606	4.95
5	6,899	6.19	832	2.56
6	4,752	4.27	457	1.41
7	3,068	2.75	290	0.89
More than 7	3,527	3.17	426	1.31
Total	111,402	100.00	32,453	100.00

What are the students' rates of transition and exit?

The students' rate of transition into mainstream classrooms is the most critical factor in evaluating transitional bilingual education programs. The overall transition rate for FY00 was 13.62%, well above the 11.5% rate reported for FY99, and the 9.65% rate reported for FY98. Over the past five years, the statewide transition rate has averaged about 9.38%. The higher than average rate reported for FY00 is attributable to a disproportionately large number of students that transitioned in Chicago District #299. District #299's transition rate has averaged about 8.26% from FY94 to FY98, but jumped to 12.23% in FY99 and to 16.69% in FY00. District #299 changed its policies on the length of time that students may participate in TBE and TPI programs, and this change accounts for the rise in the percent of District #299 students that transitioned in FY99 and FY00.

As shown in Table 11, the highest rates for meeting transition criteria by grade level were for students in the 3rd, 4th, and 12th grades. Since some districts require all Grade 12 students to meet the district's transition criteria to graduate, the rate for meeting transition criteria for Grade 12 students is among the highest reported for any grade.

The FY99 Annual Student Report (ASR) identified students that transferred from a TPI or TBE program in one district and entered a bilingual education program in another district. Within the state, 997 students had district-to-district transfers in FY00, and the ASR data were adjusted to reflect these transfers.

Table 11.   Transition Rate and Exit Rate by Grade Level

Grade Level	Total Students	Number Transitioned	Transition Rate (%)	Number Exited	Exit Rate (%)	Difference* (%)
Pre-Kindergarten	1,753	13	0.74	491	28.01	27.27
Kindergarten	19,165	442	2.31	1,873	9.77	7.47
01	19,088	637	3.34	2,567	13.45	10.11
02	19,403	774	3.99	2,630	13.55	9.57
03	17,719	3,954	22.32	5,549	31.32	9.00
04	13,334	2,837	21.28	4,039	30.29	9.01
05	10,570	2,185	20.67	4,526	42.82	22.15
06	9,698	1,967	20.28	4,759	49.07	28.79
07	7,869	1,539	19.56	3,379	42.94	23.38
08	7,105	1,117	15.72	4,087	57.52	41.80
09	5,575	455	8.16	1,373	24.63	16.47
10	4,912	581	11.83	1,543	31.41	19.58
11	3,570	517	14.48	1,238	34.68	20.20
12	4,038	2,567	63.57	3,568	88.36	24.79
Ungraded	56	1	1.79	14	25.00	23.21
TOTALS	143,855	19,586	13.62	41,636	28.94	15.33

* Difference equals the exit rate minus the transition rate

The exit data in Table 12 are categorized by the following six exit codes used in the Annual Student Report:

1 - Student has achieved an English proficiency level that is equal to or above the 50th percentile (or its equivalent) on a nationally normed English-language-proficiency test and has been assigned to a mainstream program.

2 - Student has been withdrawn from the program at the request of parents.

3 - Student has graduated, but has not fulfilled the criteria for transition.

4 - Student has dropped out of school. (Student voluntarily leaves the school district prior to graduation without entering another institution for formal education.)

5 - Student has transferred to another school and has not re-entered a TBE or TPI program.

6 - Student has left the program for reasons other than those listed above.

Several noteworthy findings emerge from the data in Table 12. First, transition to mainstream classrooms accounts for over 47% of all exits. In addition, relatively few students in TBE and TPI programs reportedly dropped out of school (0.9%).

Table 12.   Reasons for Exiting by Grade Level

Grade Level	Exit Code #1 Transition	Exit Code #2 Parental Withdrawal	Exit Code #3 Graduated	Exit Code #4 Drop-Out	Exit Code #5 Transfer	Exit Code #6 Unknown	Total Students
Pre-K	13	30		24	337	87	1,753
Kindergarten	442	309		61	783	278	19,165
01	637	294		84	1,182	370	19,088
02	774	277		86	1,158	335	19,403
03	3,954	233		65	1,017	280	17,719
04	2,837	127		57	777	241	13,334
05	2,185	107		56	625	1,553	10,570
06	1,967	68		51	617	2,056	9,698
07	1,539	70		48	491	1,231	7,869
08	1,117	54	1,108	133	582	1,093	7,105
09	455	39		195	343	341	5,575
10	581	35		195	345	387	4,912
11	517	33		153	193	342	3,570
12	2,567	36	676	105	77	107	4,038
Ungraded	1			3	5	5	56
TOTALS	19,586	1,712	1,784	1,316	8,532	8,706	143,855

Transitioned bilingual education students represent the successes of the program, and consequently, it is important to examine the differences among transitioned students with respect to their years in bilingual programs and types of programs. Table 13 shows that over 72% of the transitions occur among students with three or more years of participation in TBE/TPI programs.

Since Chicago District #299 accounts for about 50% of the state's bilingual students, data are also separated into Chicago and downstate categories by program type. These data show that the District #299 portion of all students who transitioned (61%) is well above the District #299 portion of all bilingual education students in the state. District #299' s disproportionate share of transitions is explained by its recent implementation of a policy that limits the amount of time that students may participate in TBE/TPI programs. Large numbers of students who have been served for three or more years were transitioned to mainstream instruction this year in order to comply with the policy.

In addition, the transition rate for TBE students (13.3%) is slightly lower than the transition rate among TPI students (14.6%). In the past, the TBE vs. TPI transition rate difference has been greater than that reported here. The TBE transition rate has always been substantially lower than the TPI transition rate. With over 91% of District #299 students being served in TBE programs, the most likely explanation for the shift in the rate difference appears to be District #299's new program participation policy.

The years of service for transitioned students highlight some interesting contrasts. Among those transitions reported by District #299, the vast majority occurred among students who received more than three years service (91%), while the percentage of transitions among downstate students with more than three years service is substantially less (41%). Also noteworthy is the

fact that 39% of the TPI transitions shown in Table 14 occurred among students with more than three years of service, while the percentage of the TBE transitions among students with more than three years of service is considerably larger (83%). Once again, the District #299 program participation policy is the probable cause for both of the differences described above.

Table 13. Years of Participation for Transitioned Students

Years of Participation	Total Number of Transitions	Total Number of Students	Percentage Transitioned
Less than one year	1,179	41,201	2.86
One to two years	1,987	31,480	6.31
Two to three years	2,311	21,479	10.76
Three years or more	14,109	49,695	28.39
Total	19,586	143,855	13.62

Table 14. Transitioned Students' Years of Participation by Program Type and Location

| | TBE Programs | | | | TPI Programs | | | |
| | Chicago | | Downstate | | Chicago | | Downstate | |
Years in Program	No.	Pct.*	No.	Pct.*	No.	Pct.*	No.	Pct.*
Less than one year	33	0.17	446	2.28	9	0.05	691	3.53
One to two years	133	0.68	628	3.21	31	0.16	1,195	6.10
Two to three years	650	3.32	697	3.56	125	0.64	841	4.29
Three or more years	10,195	52.05	2,069	10.56	788	4.02	1,055	5.39
Total	11,011		3,840		953		3,782	

*Percentages were calculated on the total number of students transitioned (19,586).

Program Data

The following tables (Tables 15 through 34) present information on TBE and TPI programs and offer comparisons between the two program types on a wide range of factors. Program data from all school districts that served one or more LEP students, is included in these tables, regardless of whether the school received ISBE funding for their program. Those school districts that provided services but received no funding, have been classified as TPI programs and their program data are treated as such in these tables. Including these "unfunded" districts among those districts offering TPI programs appears to be reasonable, since their program operations and services are similar to those of many funded TPI programs. In all, 129 of the 397 districts that served LEP students are in this "unfunded" group. The total number of students served in these districts is quite small (1,491) and represents only about one percent of all students served statewide.

What are the major areas of staff development activity, and what areas are needed in the future?

Table 15 shows that, among TBE programs, TBE teachers had the higher rate of staff development participation than all other types of staff in all topic areas. TBE teacher aides had the next highest participation rate, followed by administrators and general education staff. The leading staff development topic among TBE programs was multicultural awareness, followed by language acquisition, bilingual/ESL methods, and bilingual/ESL assessment.

Like the preceding table for TBE programs, Table 16 shows that TPI teachers had the highest rate of staff development participation than all other types of staff in all topic areas. TPI teacher aides had the next highest rate of participation, followed by general education staff, and administrators. Multicultural awareness was the leading staff development topic for TPI programs, followed by language acquisition, bilingual/ESL methods, and technology for TBE/TPI programs.

In comparing the staff development activities of the two types of programs, TBE programs show higher rates of participation than TPI programs in all topic areas and for all staff categories. The pattern of participation by staff category and the leading staff development topics, are generally similar for both programs.

Table 15.   TBE Staff Development Participation by Staff Category and Topic

| | Staff Development Topics | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Language Acquisition | | Multicultural Awareness | | Bilingual/ESL Assessment | | Bilingual/ESL Methods | | Technology for TBE/TPI Programs | | Other | |
Staff Categories	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TBE teachers	79	66.39	85	71.43	97	81.51	91	76.47	78	65.55	18	15.13
TBE teacher aides	52	43.70	62	52.10	53	44.54	54	45.38	50	42.02	14	11.76
General education staff	44	36.97	75	63.03	21	17.65	36	30.25	33	27.73	15	12.61
Special education staff	43	36.13	59	49.58	26	21.85	29	24.37	23	19.33	13	10.92
Administrators	46	38.66	64	53.78	36	30.25	41	34.45	38	31.93	17	14.29
Title I staff	33	27.73	47	39.50	20	16.81	28	23.53	17	14.29	10	8.40
Other staff	5	4.20	4	3.36	2	1.68	3	2.52	5	4.20	2	1.68

Number of programs = 119

Table 16.   TPI Staff Development Participation by Staff Category and Topic

| | Staff Development Topics | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Language Acquisition | | Multicultural Awareness | | Bilingual/ESL Assessment | | Bilingual/ESL Methods | | Technology for TBE/TPI Programs | | Other | |
Staff Categories	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TPI teachers	180	47.49	193	50.92	197	51.98	204	53.83	172	45.38	28	7.39
TPI teacher aides	97	25.59	104	27.44	82	21.64	96	25.33	84	22.16	12	3.17
General education staff	108	28.50	154	40.63	57	15.04	74	19.53	71	18.73	20	5.28
Special education staff	98	25.86	123	32.45	64	16.89	66	17.41	64	16.89	20	5.28
Administrators	80	21.11	129	34.04	68	17.94	72	19.00	68	17.94	18	4.75
Title I staff	58	15.30	74	19.53	30	7.92	35	9.23	37	9.76	10	2.64
Other staff	7	1.85	9	2.37	3	0.79	6	1.58	7	1.85	6	1.58

Number of programs = 379

Tables 17 and 18 show staff development needs for TBE and TPI programs in FY00. The leading areas identified for TBE staff are multicultural awareness, followed by language acquisition, bilingual/ESL methods, and bilingual/ESL assessment. This pattern is identical to the one for the areas in which staff were trained during the 1999-2000 school year. TBE teachers were the leading staff category identified as needing staff development during the coming year, followed by TBE teacher aides. General education teachers were ranked next ahead of administrators.

For TPI programs, the pattern of leading topics for staff development was the same as for TBE programs. TPI teachers were the leading category of staff identified for training in the upcoming year. General education teachers were the next leading staff category, followed by TPI administrators and teacher aides.

A comparison of staff development needs for the two programs shows that the pattern of needed staff development topics is identical, but that TPI programs indicate that training general education teachers is a higher priority than training teacher aides. In addition, TBE programs indicate a greater need for staff development than TPI programs in all staff categories and in all topics.

Table 17.   TBE Staff Development Needs for the Coming School Year by Staff Category and Topic

| | Staff Development Topics | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Language Acquisition | | Multicultural Awareness | | Bilingual/ESL Assessment | | Bilingual/ESL Methods | | Technology for TBE/TPI Programs | | Other | |
Staff Categories	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TBE teachers	78	65.55	73	61.34	93	78.15	88	73.95	91	76.47	16	13.45
TBE teacher aides	62	52.10	60	50.42	58	48.74	69	57.98	71	59.66	11	9.24
General education staff	77	64.71	87	73.11	42	35.29	62	52.10	52	43.70	8	6.72
Special education staff	65	54.62	68	57.14	46	38.66	50	42.02	36	30.25	7	5.88
Administrators	64	53.78	69	57.98	54	45.38	58	48.74	43	36.13	11	9.24
Title I staff	50	42.02	51	42.86	1	29.41	43	36.13	28	23.53	5	4.20
Other staff	4	3.36	5	4.20		0.84	2	1.68	1	0.84	1	0.84

Number of programs = 119

Table 18.   TPI Staff Development Needs for the Coming School Year by Staff Category and Topic

| | Staff Development Topics | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Language Acquisition | | Multicultural Awareness | | Bilingual/ESL Assessment | | Bilingual/ESL Methods | | Technology for TBE/TPI Programs | | Other | |
Staff Categories	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TPI teachers	161	42.48	165	43.54	186	49.08	193	50.92	196	51.72	20	5.28
TPI teacher aides	110	29.02	108	28.50	98	25.86	128	33.77	114	30.08	10	2.64
General education staff	165	43.54	206	54.35	103	27.18	148	39.05	117	30.87	15	3.96
Special education staff	120	31.66	135	35.62	98	25.86	103	27.18	85	22.43	7	1.85
Administrators	125	32.98	156	41.16	112	29.55	123	32.45	105	27.70	11	2.90
Title I staff	75	19.79	84	22.16	53	13.98	58	15.30	51	13.46	8	2.11
Other staff	6	1.58	11	2.90	4	1.06	7	1.85	6	1.58	2	0.53

Number of programs = 379

How are parents involved?

Districts offering TBE and TPI programs support various types of groups and committees that are designed to foster parental involvement. Table 19 shows that among districts offering TBE programs, a parent-teacher group is the leading type of organization, followed by a parent advisory committee. A school improvement team is the third-ranked group followed by a local school council. The pattern is somewhat different for districts offering TPI programs as shown in Table 20. The overall parent-teacher group is the leading parent involvement mechanism, followed closely by a school improvement team.

Table 21 shows that TBE program districts indicate that parents of TBE students participate in more than 48% of the parent-teacher groups and slightly more than 15% of the school improvement teams. Parents of TBE students fulfill a leadership role as decision-makers in about 25% of the school improvement teams in TBE program districts and in more than 27% of the parent-teacher groups. For TPI program districts, Table 22 shows that parents participate in over 39% of the parent-teacher groups and in about 14% of the school improvement teams. Parents of TPI students act as decision-makers in about 15% of the school improvement teams and about 19% of the parent-teacher groups.

Table 19. Parental Involvement Groups and Committees in Districts Offering TBE Programs

Type of Group or Committee	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Parent Advisory Council for TBE Program	102	85.71
Local School Council	33	27.73
PTA/PTO/PFC	104	87.39
School Improvement Team	96	80.67
Other	29	24.37

Number of Districts = 119

Table 20. Parental Involvement Groups and Committees in Districts Offering TPI Programs

Type of Organization	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Parent Advisory Council for TPI Program	97	25.59
Local School Council	89	23.48
PTA/PTO/PFC	303	79.95
School Improvement Team	302	79.68
Other	72	19.00

Number of Districts = 379

Table 21.   TBE Parental Involvement in School-Based Committees, Councils, and Organizations

Type of Group or Committee	Groups or committees with TBE parents as **participants**		Groups or committees with TBE parents as **decision-makers**	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Local School Council	8	6.72	14	11.76
PTA/PTO/PFC	58	48.74	33	27.73
School Improvement Team	18	15.13	30	25.21
Other	9	7.56	11	9.24

Number of Programs = 119

Table 22.   TPI Parental Involvement in School-Based Committees, Councils, and Organizations

Type of Group or Committee	Groups or committees with TPI parents as **participants**		Groups or committees with TPI parents as **decision-makers**	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Local School Council	23	6.07	17	4.49
PTA/PTO/PFC	148	39.05	72	19.00
School Improvement Team	55	14.51	57	15.04
Other	26	6.86	23	6.07

Number of Programs = 379

TBE and TPI programs employ a number of resources and strategies, in addition to groups and committees, as means to enhance parental involvement. Table 23 shows that among TBE programs, native language interpreters and translators at meetings was a leading resource, followed by Even Start Family Literacy and outreach with community organizations.

TPI programs use these same resources and strategies, but to a lesser extent than TBE programs as shown in Table 24. Among TPI programs, social services for counseling was the leading resource used by about 73% of the programs. Health services for physical exams and vaccinations, literacy classes in native language for adults, outreach with community organizations, and parent workshops and tutoring were used in over 45% of the TPI programs.

Table 23.   Resources Used to Enhance Involvement of TBE Parents

Resource	Number of Programs	Percent of Programs
Native language translators/interpreters at meetings	107	89.92
Social services for counseling	65	54.62
Literacy classes in native language for adults	19	15.97
Parent workshops and tutoring related to parenting, child development, and academics	40	33.61
Health services for physical exams and vaccinations	21	17.65
Even Start Family Literacy	84	70.59
GED classes	63	52.94
English as a Second Language Classes for adults	63	52.94
Outreach with community organizations	78	65.55
Classroom instructional volunteers	63	52.94

Number of Programs = 119

Table 24.   Resources Used to Enhance Involvement of TPI Parents

Resource	Number of Programs	Percent of Programs
Social services for counseling	275	72.56
Even Start Family Literacy	116	30.61
English as a Second Language Classes for adults	13	3.43
GED classes	87	22.96
Native language translators/interpreters at meetings	45	11.87
Literacy classes in native language for adults	192	50.66
Parent workshops and tutoring related to parenting, child development, and academics	171	45.12
Outreach with community organizations	188	49.60
Health services for physical exams and vaccinations	203	53.56
Classroom instructional volunteers	160	42.22

Number of Programs = 379

How is assessment information used?

TBE and TPI programs use several kind of student assessment measures to accomplish a number of different purposes. Table 25 shows that among TBE programs, monitoring programs is the most frequent assessment purpose. This purpose was followed by transitioning students to mainstream instruction, reclassifying LEP students, and placement of LEP students. The leading assessment measure used by TBE programs is a standardized test of language proficiency followed by standardized norm-referenced achievement tests and performance-based tasks and rubrics.

The pattern of assessment purposes for TPI programs was somewhat different than that shown for TBE programs. Table 26 shows that among TPI programs, transitioning students to mainstreamed classes was the leading assessment purpose, followed by placement of LEP students. Program monitoring was the third ranked purpose, followed by attainment of state learning standards and reclassifying LEP students. A standardized test of language proficiency was the most frequently used type of assessment measure, followed by standardized norm-referenced achievement tests and performance-based tasks and rubrics.

Table 25.   TBE Programs' Use of Assessment Measures by Purpose and Language

	Standardized Test of Language Proficiency		District-Made Criterion Referenced Tests		Performance Based Tasks and Rubrics		Standardized Norm-Referenced Achievement Tests		District Assessment Portfolios	
Purposes	L_1	L_2	L_1	L_2	L_1	L_2	L_1	L_2	L_1	L_2
Placing of LEP Students	71	94	18	33	26	40	21	40	23	30
Monitoring Programs with Bilingual/ESL Services	50	86	23	46	33	59	32	58	25	45
Reclassifying LEP Students within Bilingual/ESL Services	48	90	16	47	30	61	19	55	24	43
Transitioning Students to Mainstream from Bilingual/ESL Services	41	95	12	55	19	64	24	69	15	49
Monitoring Programs after Transition from Bilingual/ESL Services	14	33	4	51	15	54	14	77	10	45
Attaining of State Learning Standards	14	33	15	48	20	52	28	67	14	38

Types of Assessment Measures

L_1 = Assessment Measure Administered in Student's Native Language

L_2 = Assessment Measure Administered in English

Number of Programs = 119

26

Table 26.   TPI Programs' Use of Assessment Measures by Purpose and Language

Purposes	Standardized Test of Language Proficiency		District-Made Criterion Referenced Tests		Performance Based Tasks and Rubrics		Standardized Norm-Referenced Achievement Tests		District Assessment Portfolios	
	L_1	L_2	L_1	L_2	L_1	L_2	L_1	L_2	L_1	L_2
Placing of LEP Students	81	263	18	96	26	142	21	127	22	95
Monitoring Programs with Bilingual/ESL Services	42	198	24	114	20	143	22	149	17	112
Reclassifying LEP Students within Bilingual/ESL Services	40	195	14	96	20	132	13	131	18	92
Transitioning Students to Mainstream from Bilingual/ESL Services	37	227	16	132	22	166	22	178	16	118
Monitoring Programs after Transition from Bilingual/ESL Services	14	101	8	121	11	150	13	177	12	100
Attaining of State Learning Standards	19	104	21	136	16	161	30	205	15	114

L_1 = Assessment Measure Administered in Student's Native Language
L_2 = Assessment Measure Administered in English

Number of Programs = 379

Districts offering TBE and TPI programs often use assessment information from LEP students to determine their eligibility to receive other services. Tables 27 and 28 show that assessment information is used most frequently with special education services, followed by gifted programs, and Title 1 services. This pattern is the same for both TBE and TPI programs, and the extent of assessment information used is also about the same for both programs.

Table 27.   **TBE Programs' Use of Assessment Information in Determining Students' Eligibility for Other Programs, by Program**

Program	Number	Percent
Gifted	80	67.23
Special Education	95	79.83
Title I	70	58.82
Truant Alternatives and Optional Education	10	8.40
Education-to-Careers	13	10.92
Other	10	8.40

Number of Programs = 119

Table 28.   **TPI Programs' Use of Assessment Information in Determining Students' Eligibility for Other Programs, by Program**

Program	Number	Percent
Gifted	233	61.48
Special Education	288	75.99
Title I	198	52.24
Truant Alternatives and Optional Education	11	2.90
Education-to-Careers	33	8.71
Other	36	9.50

Number of Programs = 379

TBE and TPI programs also use student assessment information for overall program administration purposes. Table 29 shows that among TBE programs assessment information is used most frequently for planning bilingual/ESL services, followed by evaluating bilingual/ESL services. School improvement planning is the third ranked activity for TBE programs. Among TPI programs, planning bilingual/ESL services is the leading use of information, followed by coordinating educational services. Evaluating bilingual/ESL services is the third ranked use of assessment information among TPI programs. Overall, TBE programs show a pattern of using assessment information in program administration more frequently than TPI programs.

Table 29. Uses of Assessment Information in Educational Administration by Districts Offering TBE Programs

Administrative Activity	Number	Percent
Planning bilingual/ESL services	108	90.76
Evaluating bilingual/ESL services	102	85.71
Planning the general education program	72	60.50
Evaluating the general education program	59	49.58
School Improvement Planning	92	77.31
Coordinating educational services	85	71.43
Grouping students for instructional purposes	88	73.95
Planning professional development	70	58.82
Others	4	3.36

Number of Districts = 119

Table 30. Uses of Assessment Information in Educational Administration by Districts Offering TPI Programs

Administrative Activity	Number	Percent
Planning bilingual/ESL services	309	81.53
Evaluating bilingual/ESL services	265	69.92
Planning the general education program	243	64.12
Evaluating the general education program	184	48.55
School Improvement Planning	241	63.59
Coordinating educational services	285	75.20
Grouping students for instructional purposes	232	61.21
Planning professional development	178	46.97
Others	10	2.64

Number of Districts = 379

How is instruction provided?

Table 31 shows the types of instructional delivery in TBE programs. Since districts may use more than one type, the data show the number of reporting programs that use a given type of instruction within each of the six grade bands. For TBE programs, out-of-class resource instruction, and in-class resource instruction were the most common instructional modes in the K-2, grades 3-5, and grades 6-8 bands. For Pre-K students, in-class resource instruction was the most frequent approach, followed by self-contained instruction. For the grades 9-10 and grades 11-12 bands, the departmental mode was used most often, followed by out-of-class resource instruction. Table 32 shows that, among TPI programs, out-of-class resource instruction was used most often followed by in-class resource instruction in all grade bands except Pre-K. In the Pre-K band, in-class resource instruction was used more often than the out-of-class resource approach.

Table 31.   Types of Instructional Delivery in TBE Programs

Instructional Delivery Type	Pre-K	Grades K-2	Grades 3-5	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-10	Grades 11-12
Resource (out-of-class)	6	64	69	54	34	29
Resource (in-class)	18	59	61	47	28	26
Team teaching	5	42	40	35	16	15
Self-contained (less than 50% of the day)	10	36	36	33	20	21
Self-contained (more than 50% of the day)	11	46	41	35	18	18
Departmental				32	34	33
Other	0	6	5	5	2	2

Number of Programs = 119

Table 32.   Types of Instructional Delivery in TPI Programs

Instructional Delivery Type	Pre-K	Grades K-2	Grades 3-5	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-10	Grades 11-12
Resource (out-of-class)	37	213	217	208	93	89
Resource (in-class)	49	169	156	144	71	68
Team teaching	16	72	73	74	20	19
Self-contained (less than 50% of the day)	8	32	33	51	38	39
Self-contained (more than 50% of the day)	9	27	30	23	18	18
Departmental				61	57	58
Other	5	27	31	30	19	17

Number of Programs = 360

Table 33 shows the various instructional strategies that are used in TBE programs. Among TBE programs, the leading instructional strategies are: 1) use of textbooks, 2) use of computers, 3) use of instructional materials and resources other than textbooks, and 4) interaction among students. For every approach or strategy listed, English is used more frequently than the native language. In TBE programs, the various strategies and approaches listed are used more frequently by bilingual/ESL teachers than by mainstream teachers. Table 34 shows that the approaches and strategies used in TPI programs have different patterns than for TBE programs. The leading strategies are: 1) use of materials and resources other than textbooks, 2) use of textbooks, 3) use of computers, and 4) interaction among students. Again, English is the predominant language used with these approaches, and to a much greater extent than in TBE programs. In contrast to TBE programs, mainstream teachers are more likely than bilingual/ESL teachers to be involved in using these instructional methods.

Table 33.   Instructional Approaches and Strategies Used in TBE Programs

	Approach or Strategy Used		Language of Use		Type of Teacher	
	Yes	No	L_1	L_2	Bilingual/ESL Teachers	Mainstream Teachers
Instructional Approach/Strategy	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number
Integrated language and content	110	9	85	100	107	76
Use of textbooks	113	6	81	106	111	91
Use of instructional materials and resources other than textbooks	112	7	93	105	110	88
Use of computers	113	6	76	105	109	99
Use of other instructional technology	105	14	65	96	99	89
Use of manipulatives and real objects	111	8	78	100	104	93
Use of graphic and visual support	109	10	87	101	106	91
Sheltered instruction	87	32	51	78	82	49
Interaction among students	112	7	87	101	105	100
Community resource people	88	31	59	78	76	72

L_1 – Instructional approach or strategy
 implemented in student's native
 language

L_2 – Instructional approach or strategy
 implemented in English

Number of Programs = 119

Table 34.   Instructional Approaches and Strategies Used in TPI Programs

Instructional Approach/Strategy	Approach or Strategy Used		Language of Use		Type of Teacher	
	Yes Number	No Number	L_1 Number	L_2 Number	Bilingual/ESL Teachers Number	Mainstream Teachers Number
Integrated language and content	311	68	75	298	254	248
Use of textbooks	361	18	67	349	271	329
Use of instructional materials and resources other than textbooks	362	17	110	345	288	319
Use of computers	361	18	95	348	262	342
Use of other instructional technology	306	73	58	291	223	280
Use of manipulatives and real objects	336	43	76	320	261	309
Use of graphic and visual support	342	37	78	329	271	316
Sheltered instruction	201	178	41	186	177	129
Interaction among students	350	29	116	335	256	320
Community resource people	255	124	96	225	171	211

L_1 - Instructional approach or strategy
 implemented in student's native
language

L_2 - Instructional approach or strategy
 implemented in English

Number of Programs = 360

How did transitioned students perform in mainstream classrooms?

In response to the findings of the external evaluation of TBE and TPI programs conducted in 1992, a follow-up survey was undertaken with a sample of TBE and TPI students that transitioned to mainstream classroom education. The purpose of this survey was to assess the mainstream performance of students previously in TBE and TPI programs.

Survey Questions

The survey was designed to address the following questions:

1) To what extent are transitioned students exhibiting a pattern of annual grade level advancement following their transition to mainstream classrooms?

2) How well are these transitioned students performing on statewide standardized assessment tests?

Survey Sample and Survey Procedures

The sample for this survey included all students from grades kindergarten, 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7 reported as transitioning to mainstream education (i.e., exit code 1) during FY97. Transitioned students from FY97 were selected to permit an assessment of their mainstream classroom experience at a point when the length of that mainstream experience was approximately equal to the amount of time spent in a TBE or TPI program. Transitioned students from grade levels kindergarten, 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7 were selected because those students should have advanced to grades 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 10 respectively in FY00 and therefore, would be scheduled for participation in statewide assessment testing. Using the selection criteria described above, a total of 5,743 students were included in this follow-up survey.

Data collection was accomplished by sending a survey form to the district from which the students were transitioned. The survey instrument included items on the student's current enrollment status in the district, current grade level, and current attendance center. The response rate for all of the questionnaires was 100%. Although there were several students who had left their transitioning districts, and whose whereabouts were unknown, the responding districts provided a response for each of the 5,743 students in the sample. There were 2,825 students in this sample from Chicago District #299, and the remaining 2,918 students were enrolled in downstate districts.

Enrollment Status of Transitioned Students

The first matter addressed in the follow-up survey was whether the student was still enrolled in the district from which the transition was reported. The data on enrollment status is presented in Table 35.

Table 35. Enrollment Status of Transitioned Students

	Chicago	Downstate	Total
Currently Enrolled	2,302	1,917	4,219
Transferred to Another District	426	499	925
Dropped Out	92	4	96
Other/Unknown	5	498	503
Total	2,825	2,918	5,743

These data show that approximately 73% of the students in the sample were still enrolled in their district of transition. The percentage of transitioned students currently enrolled in District #299 (81%) is considerably higher than the 66% currently enrolled in downstate districts.

Approximately 16% of the students transferred to another district and less than 2% dropped out of school.

Grade Level Advancement and Retention

The data in Table 36 present the findings on the extent to which transitioned students are advancing annually from one grade level to the next versus being retained. These data show that 5.1% of these students have been retained since transition. The retention rate for downstate districts (3.9%) is somewhat lower than the 6.2% rate reported by Chicago District #299.

Table 36. Transitioned Students' Grade Level Advancement

Students	Chicago			Downstate		
	At Grade Level *	Below Grade Level**	Ahead of Grade Level***	At Grade Level *	Below Grade Level**	Ahead of Grade Level***
Grade 3	25	2	0	181	4	25
Grade 4	7	1	3	275	15	20
Grade 6	17	1	0	310	14	13
Grade 7	918	13	7	488	6	33
Grade 8	821	39	25	448	23	4
Grade 10	337	86	0	42	13	3
Total	2,125	142	35	1,744	75	98

  * - Transitioned students who have advanced to the next grade level annually.
  ** - Transitioned students who have been retained at least once.
*** - Transitioned students who have skipped over the next grade level at least once.

ISAT Test Data

Tables 37 through 40 present the ISAT test data for transitioned students. The ISAT data presented in these tables are taken from tests administered in February 2000. One notable feature of these data is that the percentage of missing scores among downstate students has decreased substantially from previous years. In general, the scores that were reported show that most transitioned students' ISAT scores either met or exceeded state standards. There are, however, some test areas where this did not occur. Among downstate students, most of the reported scores did not meet state standards in Grade 7 social science and Grade 8 math. Among Chicago students, most reported scores did not meet state standards in Grade 4 science, Grade 4 social science, Grade 6 writing, Grade 8 writing and, Grade 8 math.

Table 37.   Downstate ISAT Results for Transitioned Students – Science and Social Studies

Subject Area	Academic Warning		Below Standards		Meeting Standards		Exceeding Standards		Missing Data	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Grade 4 Science	0	0.0	61	22.2	145	52.7	29	10.5	40	14.5
Grade 4 Social Science	6	2.2	76	27.6	136	49.5	17	6.2	40	14.5
Grade 7 Science	56	11.5	101	20.7	229	46.9	18	3.7	84	17.2
Grade 7 Social Science	10	2.0	228	46.7	148	30.3	20	4.1	82	16.8

Table 38.   Downstate ISAT Results for Transitioned Students – Reading, Math, and Writing

Subject Area	Academic Warning No.	Pct.	Below Standards No.	Pct.	Meeting Standards No.	Pct.	Exceeding Standards No.	Pct.	Missing Data No.	Pct.
Grade 3 Reading	2	1.1	54	29.8	77	42.5	27	14.9	21	11.6
Grade 3 Mathematics	8	4.4	26	14.4	87	48.1	40	22.1	20	11.0
Grade 3 Writing	5	2.8	58	32.0	92	50.8	4	2.2	22	12.2
Grade 6 Reading	0	0.0	74	23.9	125	40.3	40	12.9	71	22.9
Grade 6 Mathematics	10	3.2	37	11.9	126	40.6	67	21.6	70	22.6
Grade 6 Writing	1	0.3	40	12.9	153	49.4	46	14.8	70	22.6
Grade 8 Reading	1	0.2	159	35.5	160	35.7	12	2.7	116	25.9
Grade 8 Mathematics	21	4.7	225	50.2	78	17.4	12	2.7	112	25.0
Grade 8 Writing	14	3.1	132	29.5	173	38.6	17	3.8	112	25.0

Table 39. Chicago ISAT Results for Transitioned Students – Science and Social Science

Subject Area	Academic Warning No.	Pct.	Below Standards No.	Pct.	Meeting Standards No.	Pct.	Exceeding Standards No.	Pct.	Missing Data No.	Pct.
Grade 4 Science	0	0.0	4	57.1	2	28.6	0	0.0	1	14.3
Grade 4 Social Science	2	28.6	2	28.6	2	28.6	0	0.0	1	14.3
Grade 7 Science	47	5.1	167	18.2	612	66.7	55	6.0	37	4.0
Grade 7 Social Science	4	0.4	382	41.6	459	50.0	33	3.6	40	4.4

Table 40. Chicago ISAT Results for Transitioned Students – Reading, Math, and Writing

Subject Area	Academic Warning No.	Pct.	Below Standards No.	Pct.	Meeting Standards No.	Pct.	Exceeding Standards No.	Pct.	Missing Data No.	Pct.
Grade 3 Reading	2	8.0	9	36.0	8	32.0	3	12.0	2	12.0
Grade 3 Mathematics	2	8.0	7	28.0	8	32.0	5	20.0	3	12.0
Grade 3 Writing	0	0.0	11	44.0	9	36.0	0	0.0	5	20.0
Grade 6 Reading	1	5.9	7	41.2	6	35.3	1	5.9	2	11.8
Grade 6 Mathematics	2	11.8	2	11.8	11	64.7	0	0.0	2	11.8
Grade 6 Writing	0	0.0	11	64.7	4	23.5	0	0.0	2	11.8
Grade 8 Reading	0	0.0	246	30.0	491	59.8	44	5.4	40	4.9
Grade 8 Mathematics	46	5.6	543	66.1	169	20.6	17	2.1	46	5.6
Grade 8 Writing	12	1.5	295	35.9	3	53.6	33	4.0	41	5.0

The follow-up data in this report represent the eighth year these findings have been reported by ISBE for TBE and TPI programs.

The following findings reported from the FY00 study should be considered as indicators of the effectiveness of TBE and TPI programs:

    1)   The reported retention rate for the three-year period was 5.1%.

    2)   The percentage of students whose IGAP/ISAT test scores meet or exceed state standards is higher than the percentage of students whose scores do not meet state standards.

These findings are applicable only to that limited number of transitioned students included in this follow-up study. They should not be generalized to all transitioned students and applied alone or independently to judge the overall effectiveness of TBE and TPI programs. Given these limitations, these data indicate generally positive student outcomes for the study sample.

How did students perform on the IMAGE Assessment?

Students who are enrolled in a state-approved bilingual education program for less than three academic years are not required to participate in ISAT. However, the law requires that an alternative assessment be administered to these students. In 1994, an Illinois General Assembly Task Force recommended that the ISBE develop a standardized reading and writing English proficiency assessment for eligible LEP students. The ISBE subsequently developed the Illinois Measure of Annual Growth in English (IMAGE) test and began administering the test statewide in 1997.

The purpose of the IMAGE test is to measure English reading and writing proficiency for students whose first language is not English. The test is administered annually to those students who were enrolled in an approved TBE or TPI program in their first, second, and third years of instruction. Those LEP students who have been served for more than three years are required to take the ISAT tests for their grade level.

Students who participate in IMAGE represent a wide range of proficiency levels. IMAGE is designed to allow students, at the beginning levels of proficiency, to experience some success and also to challenge students at the upper levels of proficiency. Tasks and items are structured so that some material within the test is appropriate for each student. The IMAGE tests are administered in three grade level clusters: grades 3-5, grades 6-8, and grades 9-11. All students within a grade cluster take the same test form. For example, all students in grades 3, 4, and 5 who are taking IMAGE complete one test form, while students in grades 6, 7, and 8 complete another test form.

Each IMAGE test is designed to ensure that its results validly and fairly assess students' proficiency in reading and writing English. In the IMAGE reading assessment, students read and answer questions about material that is presented graphically (pictures, maps, charts, etc.) as well as textually (stories and articles). A reading test is made up of four parts: a full-age graphic, a short narrative with a supportive graphic, a longer narrative passage, and an expository passage. Each of the four parts relates to an overall larger theme. Students respond to six items in each of the four parts. The reading assessment consists of two reading themes administered in two forty-minute sessions.

The IMAGE writing assessment is also administered in two forty-minute sessions. In each session, students respond to one graphic writing prompt and one textual writing prompt for a total of four prompts in 80 minutes. As in the reading assessment, the two tasks within one test session are related to an overall theme. Different kinds of writing are required for each prompt. Descriptive prompts require students to describe what they see in a picture, and narrative prompts require students to tell a story based on a series of pictures, completing the story with an original ending. Expository prompts require students to explain or interpret something objectively and clearly. Persuasive prompts require the students to take a position on an issue or to state a problem and solution.

The student's raw scores on the reading test are transformed and placed on a continuous scale that ranges from 50 to 450. This means that IMAGE tests of different years and grades are reported on the same scale, thus making it easier to make comparisons over time and to document students' growth in reading proficiency. The continuous scale also encompasses all grades, regardless of which form in the series the student completed.

Similarly, writing essays are scored using the same rubric for all students, regardless of grade level or age. This also allows for comparisons over time and for documenting increases in writing proficiency. Writing scores range from 5 to 26.

During the 1998-1999 school year, the Illinois State Board of Education established performance categories for IMAGE reading and writing to facilitate interpretation of individual test scores. The purpose in developing these performance categories was to give teachers and administrators milestones to use in monitoring student progress in language acquisition.

In developing the performance categories, data were analyzed that compared scores on IMAGE with scores on the 1997 state assessment administered to the same students. Validity data that had accumulated since the IMAGE test was first administered statewide in 1997 were also considered. Of particular importance were data that showed the average gains per year in reading and writing made by students who were tested with IMAGE after one or two years of bilingual education.

A four-category framework has been adopted that delineates a student's progress in acquiring English-language reading and writing skills: Beginning, Strengthening, Expanding, and Transitioning. The highest category, Transitioning, was intended to reflect proficiency levels in reading and writing that indicated the student was nearly ready to participate in the regular state assessment. Other categories represent students' progress as they acquire increasing levels of proficiency in reading and writing.

Performance categories are defined by the probability that students scoring at a given level on IMAGE will meet state standards. At each higher category, students have a higher probability of meeting state standards. The category boundaries reflect specific probability levels. Students in the Transitioning category have a very high probability (.80) of scoring at or above state reading and writing standards. Students described as Expanding have a .50 probability of meeting the state standards, while the probability of meeting standards for students described as Beginning is less than .20. This probability-based interpretation holds for both reading and writing performance categories.

The cutoffs for the four levels of performance in the four grade groupings are shown in Table 41. The interpretation of these scores is straightforward. IMAGE reading scores of 250-299 for a 7th-grade student places that student in the Expanding category. These scores suggest that the student has a 50-50 chance of meeting state reading standards. Similarly, writing scores between 23 and 26 for a 10th grade student would place that student in the Transitioning category and suggest the student would likely meet the writing standard.

Table 41.   IMAGE Reading and Writing Cutoff Scores

Grade(s)	Beginning	Strengthening	Expanding	Transitioning
		READING		
3	1-174	175-204	205-229	230+
4-5	1-194	195-229	230-254	255+
6-8	1-214	215-249	250-299	300+
9-11	1-244	245-294	295-334	335+
		WRITING		
3	5-10	11-12	13-15	16-26
4-5	5-13	14-15	16-18	19-26
6-8	5-15	16-17	18-20	21-26
9-11	5-17	18-19	20-22	23-26

The results of applying these cutoffs to the 2000 test scores are shown in Table 42. These data represent all students who took the IMAGE test in 2000. Since IMAGE is designed as a tool for assessing individual performance and local uses, the aggregated statewide results provide only limited information on students' acquisition of English language skills. There are, however, two findings that emerge from these data. In general, the vast majority of the tested students are performing below the "Transitioning" level. This indicates that their placement in TBE and TPI programs is appropriate given their level of English reading and writing skills. In addition, the greatest number of students is at the "Beginning" performance level, followed by "Strengthening," "Expanding," and then "Transitioning."   This profile is consistent with the expectation that would follow from the years of service for students in TBE and TPI programs. Since the number of students served diminishes as the years of service increase, it would be reasonable to expect the number of students at each performance level to decrease as performance levels rise. With the exception of the Form 1 writing test, this expectation is supported by the data.

Table 42. IMAGE Reading and Writing Results by Performance Level and Test Form Type

Form	Beginning (Number of Students)	Strengthening (Number of Students)	Expanding (Number of Students)	Transitioning (Number of Students)
		READING		
1 (Grades 3-5)	8,359	5,699	3,419	1,520
2 (Grades 6-8)	3,469	1,865	1,446	192
3 (Grades 9-11)	4,061	2,350	433	0
		WRITING		
1 (Grades 3-5)	4,761	4,081	6,121	2,040
2 (Grades 6-8)	3,376	1,593	1,210	191
3 (Grades 9-11)	3,984	1,378	652	45

How can the collection and evaluation of bilingual education program data be improved?

One step that will be undertaken to improve ISBE's bilingual education data will be to include information on students who are retained. Currently, information on TBE/TPI students who have been retained is not available. Adding this information to the Annual Student Report will provide an additional measure of local program effectiveness and will improve the agency's capability to respond to federal reporting requirements.

In addition, the method for collecting information on students who are receiving other services needs to be improved. The current approach (which has local programs providing district-wide summaries) is not providing accurate information. Consequently, the Annual Student Report will be revised to collect individual student information on other services that are being provided. This information will hopefully provide a better body of data and also improve the agency's information base on critical programs like Title I and Special Education.

RE\2000 bilingual bac