

TRANSITIONAL BILINGUAL EDUCATION

and

TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM OF INSTRUCTION

EVALUATION REPORT

FISCAL YEAR 1997

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Center for Policy, Planning and Resource Management
Division of Research and Policy Development

June 1998

Louis Mervis, Chairperson
State Board of Education

Joseph A. Spagnolo
State Superintendent of Education

At the direction of the Illinois State Board of Education, the Division of Research and Policy Development 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 the Division of Research and Policy Development at 217/782-3950.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE FY 97 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 that they can transition into the mainstream education curriculum.

- ◆ Based on the FY97 Fall Housing Report, schools identified 118,246 students as being eligible for bilingual education services.
- ◆ TBE and TPI programs served 133,815 students in FY97. This is an increase of 4.6% over the number of students served in FY96. The number of students served exceeds the number identified as eligible because the Fall Housing Report data reflects only the number eligible as of the reporting date while the data on number served is collected throughout the year.
- ◆ Most of the students were served in TBE programs (105,567 students) as opposed to TPI programs (28,248).
- ◆ Over 60% of the students served were in grades 4 and below.
- ◆ Over 57% of the students were served in Chicago District #299. About 19% of students were served elsewhere in Cook County and another 19% were in the collar counties of DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, and Will. The remainder of the students were from downstate.
- ◆ Most students (69%) 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 or guardians must consent.
- ◆ Over 20% of the students served exited their programs. Of all students served, 8.95% transitioned to mainstream education, while the remaining 11.13% left for other reasons (parental withdrawal, graduation, drop-out, transfer or unknown).
- ◆ A follow-up study conducted on a sample of students transitioned during FY93 indicates that their mainstream performance is generally favorable. The students had an overall retention rate of 6.5% for the three-year period following their transition, and most IGAP scores met or exceeded state goals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Background	1
Data Sources	2
Bilingual Education Programs	3
Who Is Eligible to Receive Services?	3
How Many Students Are Enrolled in TBE/TPI Programs?	3
What Are The Characteristics of Participants?	5
Where Are These Students Located?	8
What Types of Programs Have These Students Experienced and to What Extent?	9
What Are The Students' Rates of Transition and Exit?	11
What Types of Achievement Tests Have These Students Taken?	14
How is Instruction Provided?	16
How Are Parents Involved?	19
How Did Transitioned Students Perform in Mainstream Classrooms?	20
How Can Collection and Evaluation of Bilingual Education Program Data Be Improved?	23

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	LEP Students Identified and Served in TBE/TPI Programs	4
2.	Native Languages Spoken by Students Participating in TBE and TPI in Illinois Schools, 1996-1997	5
3.	The Twenty-Five Most Common Languages in TBE and TPI Programs by Location....	6
4.	Number of Students in Bilingual Programs by Grade Level and Location	7
5.	Grade Levels of Students by Program Type	7
6.	TBE and TPI Program Enrollments by Geographic Location	8
7.	The Twenty Largest Bilingual Program Districts Outside Chicago District #299	8
8.	Years of Participation in Bilingual Education Programs by Grade Level	9
9.	Years of Participation in Bilingual Education Programs by Geographic Location	10
10.	Years of Participation by Program	10
11.	Bilingual Program Students Receiving Other Services	11
12.	Transition Rate and Exit Rate by Grade Level.....	12
13.	Reasons for Exiting by Grade Level	13
14.	Years of Participation for Transitioned Students.....	14
15.	Transitioned Students' Years of Participation by Program Type and Location	14
16.	Number of School Districts Reporting Testing Practices.....	15
17.	Testing Practices by Subject Area	16
18.	TBE Instructional Modes by Grade Band.....	17
19.	TPI Instructional Modes by Grade Band	17
20.	Instructional Services in TBE Programs.....	18
21.	Instructional Services in TPI Programs	18
22.	Inservice Training Sources for TBE Programs	18
23.	Inservice Training Sources for TPI Programs.....	19
24.	Modes of Parental Involvement in TBE Programs	19
25.	Modes of Parental Involvement in TPI Programs	20
26.	Enrollment Status of Transitioned Students.....	21
27.	Transitioned Students Advanced to Next Grade Compared to Retentions	21
28.	Downstate IGAP Results.....	22
29.	Chicago IGAP Results	23

INTRODUCTION

This evaluation report describes TBE and TPI programs that served limited-English-proficient students in Illinois during the 1996-97 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 type of achievement tests have these students taken?

How is instruction provided?

How are parents involved?

How did transitioned students perform in mainstream classrooms?

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 using four instruments: 1) the Public School Fall Enrollment/Housing Report, 2) the Annual Student Report, 3) the Program Staffing and 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 Staffing and Delivery Report collects program data on staffing, instruction modes, instructional services, and information on achievement testing. The Bilingual Education Follow-Up Survey reports individual student performance in mainstream classroom education.

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,
- b) the number of non-English-language-background students identified as having limited English proficiency, and
- c) the number of non-English-language-background students whose English proficiency level is equal to or above the 50th percentile (or its equivalent) on a nationally normed English-language-proficiency test.

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 1997 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

	Number*	Number**	Percent
	Identified	Served	Served
State Totals	118,246	133,815	113.17
City of Chicago School District #299	66,595	76,550	114.95
Cicero School District #99	4,902	5,029	102.59
School District #46	6,240	4,408	70.64
Waukegan Community Unit School District #60	3,231	3,285	101.67
Aurora East Unit School District #131	2,922	2,571	87.99
Palatine Community Consolidated School District #15	1,330	1,802	135.49
Rockford School District #205	1,314	1,487	113.17
Community Unit Schools District #300	1,187	1,399	117.86
Community Cons Schools District #59	1,155	1,396	120.87
Wheeling Community Consolidated School District #21	1,017	1,092	107.37
West Chicago School District #33	931	986	105.91
Round Lake Area Schools - District #116	727	843	115.96
Schaumburg Community Consolidated School District #54	647	794	122.72
Township High School District #214	n/a	787	n/a
Joliet School District #86	785	695	88.54
Addison School District #4	442	615	139.14
Des Plaines Community Consolidated Schools District #62	385	560	145.45
Cook County School District #130	513	531	103.51
Maywood-Melrose Park-Broadview-#89	560	525	93.75
Marquardt School District #15	436	491	112.61
Mannheim School District #83	385	490	127.27
J. S. Morton High School District #201	387	486	125.58
North Shore School District ##112	414	481	116.18
Township High School District #211	352	480	136.36
Bensenville School District #2	376	465	123.67
All Other Districts	21,013	25,567	121.67

*FY 97 Public School Bilingual Census

**FY 97 Annual Student Report

n/a - data not available

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 20 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 133,815 students served in TPI and TBE programs. There were over 97 languages reported in FY97 and over 101 languages reported in FY96. 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, 1996-1997

Language	Number	Language	Number	Language	Number
Spanish	103,250	Slovak	93	Sinhalese	9
Polish	7,459	Telugu	92	Yiddish	8
Arabic	2,175	Turkish	75	Cebuano	7
Urdu	2,122	Taiwanese	73	Estonian	7
Gujarati	1,774	Yoruba	66	Norwegian	7
Korean	1,720	Amharic	57	Algonquin	6
Cantonese	1,496	Hungarian	47	Nepali	6
Vietnamese	1,417	Hmong	44	Winnebago	6
Russian	1,361	Czech	42	Hakka	5
Serbo/Croatian	1,224	Malay	42	Sindhi	5
Pilipino	1,090	Bengali	39	Tuluau	5
Assyrian	984	Hebrew	37	Chamorro	4
Japanese	861	Macedonian	34	Ewe	4
Romanian	633	Armenian	31	Samoan	4
Mandarin	526	Afrikaans	28	Cherokee	3
Cambodian	424	Romany	28	Gaelic	3
Lao	327	Tamil	27	Hausa	3
Malayalam	325	Indonesian	26	Marathi	3
Hindi	318	Ibo	25	Sioux	3
Albanian	305	Swahili	25	Chippewa	2
Greek	301	Burmese	21	Hopi	2
Italian	279	Swedish	21	Kannada	2
Ukrainian	219	Latvian	19	Shona	2
Bulgarian	218	Pashto	18	Apache	1
Panjabi	207	Finnish	17	Choctaw	1
Portuguese	180	Akan	16	Creek	1
French	173	Dutch	16	Crow	1
Thai	138	Kurdish	14	Guyanese	1
German	134	Balinese	13	Konkani	1
Haitian-Creole	126	Tibetan	12	Krio	1
Lithuanian	118	Danish	11	Lingala	1
Farsi	109	Slovenian	11	Others	588

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

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

Language	State		Chicago		Downstate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Spanish	103,250	77.16	61,416	80.23	41,834	73.05
Polish	7,459	5.57	4,987	6.52	2,472	4.32
Arabic	2,175	1.63	1,154	1.51	1,021	1.78
Urdu	2,122	1.59	1,260	1.65	862	1.50
Gujarati	1,774	1.33	338	0.44	1,436	2.51
Korean	1,720	1.29	227	0.30	1,493	2.61
Cantonese	1,496	1.11	1,122	0.15	374	0.65
Vietnamese	1,417	1.06	841	1.10	576	1.00
Russian	1,361	1.01	504	0.66	857	1.50
Serbo/Croatian	1,224	0.92	870	1.38	354	0.62
Pilipino	1,090	0.82	438	0.57	652	1.14
Assyrian	984	0.74	733	0.96	251	0.44
Japanese	861	0.64	14	0.02	847	1.48
Romanian	633	0.47	450	0.59	183	0.32
Mandarin	526	0.39	96	0.13	430	0.75
Cambodian	424	0.32	344	0.45	80	0.14
Lao	327	0.24	29	0.04	298	0.52
Malayalam	325	0.24	82	0.11	243	0.42
Hindi	318	0.24	113	0.15	205	0.36
Albanian	305	0.23	77	0.10	228	0.40
Greek	301	0.23	105	0.14	196	0.34
Italian	279	0.21	61	0.08	218	0.38
Ukranian	219	0.16	77	0.10	142	0.25
Bulgarian	218	0.16	94	0.12	124	0.22
Panjabi	207	0.15	24	0.03	183	0.32

Table 4 shows that more than half (60%) 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, including Chicago, do not. Table 5 shows that of the students served, 78% are served in TBE programs and the remaining 22% in TPI programs.

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

Grade Level	Total	Chicago	Downstate
Pre-Kindergarten	828	0	828
Kindergarten	18,505	10,441	8,064
01	18,569	10,364	8,205
02	15,809	8,760	7,049
03	14,496	8,119	6,377
04	11,944	6,969	4,975
05	10,080	6,051	4,029
06	8,308	5,048	3,260
07	7,295	4,358	2,937
08	6,637	4,012	2,625
09	6,847	4,339	2,508
10	5,822	3,284	2,538
11	4,189	2,216	1,973
12	3,473	1,877	1,596
Ungraded	1,013	712	301
Total	133,815	76,550	57,265

Table 5. Grade Levels of Students by Program Type

Grade Level	TBE Students		TPI Students	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Pre-K	544	0.52	284	1.00
Kindergarten	15,222	14.42	3283	11.62
01	14,915	14.13	3654	12.94
02	12,726	12.06	3,083	10.91
03	11,756	11.14	2,740	9.70
04	9,576	9.07	2,368	8.38
05	8,088	7.67	1,992	7.05
06	6,509	6.17	1,799	6.37
07	5,588	5.30	1,707	6.04
08	4,975	4.71	1,662	5.88
09	5,366	5.08	1,481	5.24
10	4,200	3.98	1,622	5.74
11	2,872	2.72	1,317	4.66
12	2,380	2.25	1,093	3.87
Ungraded	850	0.81	163	0.58
Total	105,567	100.00	28,248	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 about 96% of all students in Illinois' bilingual education programs. Chicago District #299 serves the highest percent of students at 57% (76,550 students). The remaining 39% of the students were served in the outlying districts of DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, and Will counties.

Table 6. TBE and TPI Program Enrollments by Geographic Location

Geographic Location	Number	Percent
Chicago	76,550	57.20
Cook (excluding Chicago)	25,841	19.31
Collar Counties (DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, Will)	25,754	19.25
Downstate Illinois	5,670	4.25
Total	133,815	100.00

Table 7 shows the concentration of TBE and TPI programs outside Chicago District #299. The 20 districts listed below served about 22% 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 District #99	5,029	3.76	3.76
School District #46	4,408	3.29	7.05
Waukegan District #60	3,285	2.45	9.51
Aurora East District #131	2,571	1.92	11.43
Palatine District #151	1,802	1.35	12.78
Rockford District #205	1,487	1.11	13.89
Community Consolidated District #59	1,399	1.05	14.93
Wheeling District #21	1,396	1.04	15.98
West Chicago District #33	1,092	0.82	16.79
Schaumburg Community Consolidated District #54	986	0.74	17.53
Township H.S. District #214	843	0.63	18.16
Round Lake District #116	794	0.59	18.75
Joliet District #86	787	0.59	19.34
Addison District #4	615	0.46	20.32
Des Plaines District #62	560	0.42	20.74
Cook County School District #130	531	0.40	21.14
Maywood-Melrose Park-Broadview-#89	525	0.39	21.53
Marquardt School District #15	491	0.37	21.90
Mannheim School District #83	490	0.37	22.26

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 (69%) received services for three years or less. About 33% of the students that received services for more than four years are in grades 5, 6, and 7, supporting the data in Table 4 which show that most LEP students are in grades Pre-K through 4.

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

Grade Level	Three Years or Less		Four Years or More	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Pre-Kindergarten	828	0.89	0	0.00
Kindergarten	18,496	19.94	9	0.02
01	18,279	19.71	290	0.70
02	14,364	15.48	1,445	3.52
03	6,804	7.33	7,692	18.74
04	5,160	5.56	6,784	16.53
05	4,383	4.72	5,697	13.88
06	4,000	4.31	4,308	10.49
07	3,789	4.08	3,506	8.54
08	3,574	3.85	3,063	7.46
09	4,109	4.43	2,738	6.67
10	3,829	4.13	1,993	4.85
11	2,796	3.01	1,393	3.39
12	1,858	2.00	1,615	3.93
Ungraded	494	0.53	519	1.26
Total	92,763	100.00	41,052	100.00

Table 9 compares years of participation statewide, in the Chicago area, and downstate. Table 8 shows that the majority observe the three-year program participation limit. The data show that 17.5% of the downstate students have been in a bilingual education program for four or more years, while 40.6% of the Chicago District #299 students have been in the program for four or more years. Chicago district program policies for FY 97 particularly those relating to transition, are directed toward long-term exposure of bilingual students to TBE and TPI programs, while other districts generally promote earlier transition of their bilingual students to mainstream classrooms.

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	9,793	7.32	3,719	4.86	6,074	10.61
1	34,334	25.66	15,293	19.98	19,041	33.25
2	27,570	20.60	14,105	18.42	13,465	23.51
3	21,064	15.74	12,386	16.18	8,678	15.15
4	13,985	10.45	9,143	11.94	4,842	8.46
5	9,464	7.07	6,956	9.09	2,508	4.38
6	6,708	5.01	5,232	6.83	1,476	2.58
7	4,407	3.29	3,677	4.8	730	1.27
More than 7	6,490	4.85	6,039	7.89	451	0.79
Total	133,815	100.00	76,550	100.00	57,265	100.00

Table 10 shows years of participation by program type. Data show that 34.87% of the TBE and 17.48% 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 learning.

Table 10. Years of Participation by Program

Years of Participation	TBE		TPI	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than 1	6,152	5.83	3,641	12.89
1	24,204	22.93	10,130	35.86
2	21,095	19.98	6,475	22.92
3	17,306	16.39	3,758	13.30
4	11,991	11.36	1,994	7.06
5	8,497	8.05	967	3.42
6	6,178	5.85	530	1.88
7	4,138	3.92	269	0.95
More than 7	6,006	5.69	484	1.71
Total	105,567	100.00	28,248	100.00

One concern of TBE and TPI programs is the extent to which these students are participating in other non-mainstream programs. ISBE's experience with Title 1 programs suggests that a large percentage of LEP students may be eligible for Title 1 services. In addition, it is reasonable to expect the percentages of LEP students eligible for gifted and special education services to be approximately equal to those of mainstream students. Table 11 shows that only 1.13% of the bilingual education students are receiving other services. The majority of bilingual education students receiving other services are in Title I and special education. In comparison to FY96, the overall percentage of bilingual students receiving other services has risen slightly from .91%. The percentage of LEP students receiving other services remains below the 4.6% rate reported in FY94.

Table 11. Bilingual Program Students Receiving Other Services

Other Services	Number	Percent
1. Special Education	519	0.39
2. Title 1	581	0.43
3. Gifted	19	0.01
4. Combination of 1, 2, 3	22	0.01
5. Other services offered by local districts	366	0.27
Total receiving other services	1,507	1.13
Not receiving other services	132,308	98.87

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 FY97 was 8.95%, slightly above the 8.8% rate reported for FY96, but lower than the 9.3% rate reported for FY95. In FY97, the highest transition rates by grade level were for students in the 4th, 5th, 6th and 12th grades. Since many districts require all Grade 12 students to meet the district's transition criteria to graduate, the transition rate for Grade 12 students is substantially higher than for any other grade. The overall exit rate of 20.08% for FY97 is lower than the 21.19% rate reported for FY96.

The FY96 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, 950 students had district-to-district transfers, and the ASR data were adjusted to reflect these transfers.

Table 12. Transition Rate and Exit Rate by Grade Level

Grade Level	Total Students	Number Transitioned	Transition Rate (%)	Number Exited	Exit Rate (%)	Difference*
Pre-K	828	28	3.38	92	11.11	7.73
Kindergarten	18,505	319	1.72	1,962	10.60	8.88
01	18,569	504	2.71	2,053	11.05	8.34
02	15,809	521	3.30	1,800	11.39	8.09
03	14,496	1,544	10.65	2,629	18.00	7.35
04	11,944	1,804	15.10	2,802	18.14	3.04
05	10,080	1,736	17.22	2,575	25.55	8.33
06	8,308	1,173	14.12	1,930	23.23	9.11
07	7,295	861	11.80	1,498	20.53	8.73
08	6,637	827	12.46	2,497	37.62	25.16
09	6,847	355	5.18	1,707	24.93	19.75
10	5,822	361	6.20	1,292	22.19	15.99
11	4,189	349	8.33	1,046	24.97	16.64
12	3,473	1,526	43.94	2,842	81.83	37.89
Ungraded	1,013	66	6.52	143	14.12	7.60
Total	13,3815	11,974	8.95	26,868	20.08	11.13

* Difference equals the exit rate minus the transition rate.

The exit data in Table 13 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 13. First, transition to mainstream classrooms accounts for over 41% of all exits. In addition, relatively few students in TBE and TPI programs reportedly dropped out of school (1.2%).

Table 13. 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	Not Exited	Total Students
Pre-K	28	9	0	1	46	8	736	828
Kindergarten	319	373	0	64	950	256	16,543	18,505
01	504	323	0	52	967	207	1,6516	18,569
02	521	185	0	49	889	156	14,009	15,809
03	1,544	188	0	29	714	154	11,867	14,496
04	1,804	189	0	29	651	129	9,142	11,944
05	1,736	175	0	22	532	110	7,505	10,080
06	1,173	163	0	24	478	92	6,378	8,308
07	861	99	0	27	439	72	5,797	7,295
08	827	85	995	72	470	48	4,140	6,637
09	355	334	0	409	542	67	5,140	6,847
10	361	166	0	331	352	82	4,530	5,822
11	349	156	0	253	226	62	3,143	4,189
12	1,526	116	867	183	97	53	631	3,473
Ungraded	66	2		12	43	20	870	1,013
TOTALS	11,974	2,563	1,862	1,557	7,396	1,516	106,947	133,815

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 14 shows that nearly three-fourths of the transitions occur among students with three or more years of participation in TBE/TPI programs.

Since Chicago District #299 accounts for about 58 percent 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 (55%) is about the same as the District #299 portion of all bilingual education students in the state (58%). In addition, the transition rate for TBE students (8.1%) is substantially lower than the transition rate among TPI students (12.0%). This finding is particularly noteworthy in view of the more extensive program content provided by TBE programs.

The years of service highlight some interesting contrasts. Among those transitions reported by District #299, the majority occurred among students receiving more than three years of service, while the percentage of transitions among downstate students with more than three years of service is substantially less. Also noteworthy is the fact that 45% of the TPI transitions shown in Table 15 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 (85%) is considerably larger.

The differences among transitioned students that have been identified by program (TBE vs.

TPI) and location (Chicago vs. downstate) raise a number of policy questions on program

content and the amount of time that program services should be offered. While such questions ought to be investigated, any effort to do so must be preceded by research on the mainstream education experience of all transitioned students to determine what effects (if any) these differences really have.

Table 14. Years of Participation for Transitioned Students

Years of Participation	Total Number of Transitions	Total Number of Students	Percentage Transitioned
Less than one year	172	9,793	1.76
One to two years	1,258	34,334	3.66
Two to three years	1,684	27,570	6.11
More than three years	8,860	62,118	14.26
Total	11,974	133,815	8.95

Table 15. Transitioned Students' Years of Participation by Program Type and Location

Years in Program	TBE Programs				TPI Programs			
	Chicago		Downstate		Chicago		Downstate	
	No.	Pct.*	No.	Pct.*	No.	Pct.*	No.	Pct.*
Less than one year	6	0.05	54	0.45	1	0.01	111	0.93
One to two years	118	0.99	325	2.71	35	0.29	780	6.51
Two to three years	355	2.97	399	3.33	92	0.77	838	7.00
More than three years	5,469	45.67	1,842	15.38	571	4.77	978	8.17
Total	5,948		2,620		699		2707	

* Percentages were calculated on the total number of students transitioned (11,974).

What Types of Achievement Tests Have These Students Taken?

Section 14C-3 of the School Code requires an examination in the oral comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing of English, as prescribed by the State Board, to be administered annually to children of limited English speaking ability enrolled and participating in a program of transitional bilingual education. In FY97, achievement test information was collected as a part of each district's response to the Program Staffing and Delivery Report (ISBE Form 92-07). Below are descriptions of the achievement testing practices being used in districts offering bilingual education programs.

Testing Conducted by Districts

Of the 403 districts offering bilingual education programs, 370 offered some type of formal achievement tests to their bilingual education students. No achievement testing was undertaken by 19 districts, and the remaining seven districts offered no information as to whether any achievement testing was conducted.

Table 16. Number of School Districts Reporting Testing Practices

Response by District	Number of Districts	Number of Students Served
Conducted testing and provided data	370	133,547
No testing conducted	19	241
No response from district	6	27
Total	403	133,815

The number of students served in districts that conducted testing is not the same as the number of students that were actually tested. Some bilingual students may not have been tested because they were not enrolled in a program or were absent at the time testing was conducted. Other bilingual students may have been excluded because they lacked sufficient English skills to take the tests. The number of bilingual students served in districts offering achievement testing does indicate the level of compliance with the statutory requirements for achievement testing.

Subject Areas Tested

Table 17 shows the various subject areas tested along with information on the scope of testing among students receiving services. The most common subject area tested was reading, followed by writing, and then oral comprehension. The reported pattern of achievement testing in various subject areas falls somewhat short of what is required by the statute. Of the 370 programs that reported testing practices, 190 indicated that all students were tested in all four areas specified in the School Code. Although the practice of testing selected students is at variance with the requirements of law as it applies to testing for oral comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing in English, it is usually driven by teacher and program administrator perceptions and beliefs of what constitutes meaningful and feasible achievement testing practices. For example, many programs test students in grades 3 and below in oral comprehension only.

The data also indicate that a substantial number of programs are not testing bilingual students in the content areas of mathematics, sciences, and social studies. Although achievement testing of bilingual students in these areas is not required by law, such testing would serve to document the effectiveness of bilingual education programs in providing the skills necessary to succeed in those areas.

Table 17. Testing Practices by Subject Area

Subject Area	Programs Having All Students Tested		Programs Having Elected Students Tested		Programs Having No Students Tested		Programs Not Reporting	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
English Oral Comprehension	303	65.16	87	18.71	33	7.10	42	9.03
English Reading	279	60.00	148	31.83	26	5.59	12	2.58
English Writing	267	57.42	151	32.47	27	5.81	20	4.30
English Speaking	285	61.29	84	18.07	33	7.10	63	13.54
Mathematics	166	35.70	205	44.09	32	6.88	62	13.33
Science	125	26.88	217	46.67	49	10.54	74	15.91
Social Studies	124	26.67	213	45.81	51	10.97	77	16.56

How Is Instruction Provided?

An important component of bilingual education programs is the way in which bilingual program services are delivered by individual school districts. Data on program delivery were collected from 81 TBE programs and 384 TPI programs.

Instruments

The data for this section were obtained through the use of the Program Staffing and Delivery Report form (ISBE Form 92-07). This form is used to obtain data on bilingual education services, instruction modes, staff development, and other features of bilingual education programs. The data presented in this section cover all school districts that offered TBE and TPI programs.

Instructional Modes

Tables 18 and 19 show the instructional modes used in delivering bilingual education services. Since districts may use more than one instructional mode, the data show the number of reporting districts that use a given mode within each of the four grade bands.

For TBE programs, the pull-out model and self-contained classrooms are the most common instructional modes used in the Pre-K-Grade 3 band as well as the Grades 4-6 band. In Grades 7-9, the most common instructional modes is the departmental model, while in Grades 10-12, the departmental model and tutoring in bilingual classrooms appear most frequently.

Among TPI programs, the pull-out model, pull-out tutoring, and tutoring in regular classrooms are the most commonly used modes in the Pre-K-Grade 3 and Grades 4-6 bands. In the Grades 7-9 band, pull-out tutoring, the pull-out model, and tutoring in regular classrooms are the three most frequently used modes, while pull-out tutoring, tutoring in the regular classroom, and the departmental model are most frequently used in the Grades 10-12 band.

Table 18. TBE Instructional Modes by Grade Band

Number of Responses = 81 (Respondents may indicate use of more than one instruction mode.)

Instructional Mode	Grade Bands							
	Pre-K-3		4-6		7-9		10-12	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Pull-Out	46	56.79	47	58.02	25	30.86	8	9.88
Self-Contained Classroom Model	33	40.74	31	38.27	28	34.57	15	18.52
Departmental	2	2.47	5	6.17	31	38.27	24	29.63
Team-Teaching	24	29.63	23	28.40	25	30.86	10	12.35
Integrated Self-Contained Classroom	18	22.22	15	18.52	12	14.81	3	3.70
Tutoring in Regular Classroom	26	32.10	31	38.27	23	28.40	9	11.11
Tutoring in Bilingual Classroom	25	30.86	29	35.80	28	34.57	17	20.99
Pull-Out Tutoring	27	33.33	28	34.57	25	30.86	13	16.05
Others	2	2.47	4	4.94	6	7.41	4	4.94

Table 19. TPI Instructional Modes by Grade Band

Number of Responses = 384 (Respondents may indicate use of more than one instruction mode.)

Instructional Mode	Grade Bands							
	Pre-K-3		4-6		7-9		10-12	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Pull-Out	185	48.18	190	49.48	159	41.41	41	10.68
Self-Contained Classroom Model	42	10.94	37	9.63	52	30.77	38	9.89
Departmental	4	1.04	17	4.42	59	46.46	47	12.24
Team-Teaching	62	16.15	56	14.58	49	27.07	14	3.64
Integrated Self-Contained Classroom	31	8.07	28	7.29	29	29.29	11	2.86
Tutoring in Regular Classroom	147	38.28	134	34.90	118	26.05	54	14.06
Tutoring in Bilingual Classroom	24	6.25	25	6.51	32	31.68	20	5.20
Pull-Out Tutoring	165	42.97	169	44.01	170	29.57	71	18.49
Others	17	4.42	19	4.94	26	33.77	15	3.90

Instructional Services

Among TBE programs, the three most common services are ESL instruction, tutorial assistance in specific content area via English, and tutorial assistance in specific content area via native language. For TPI programs, the most commonly reported instructional services include tutorial assistance in specific content area via English, ESL instruction, and computer-assisted instruction/other media service.

Table 20. Instructional Services in TBE Programs

Number of Programs = 81 (Respondents may indicate more than one instructional service.)

Instructional Service	Number	Percent
ESL Instruction	77	95.06
Native Language Arts Instruction	57	70.37
Computer-Assisted Instruction/Other Media Service (e.g. VCR, audio)	66	81.48
Tutorial Assistance in Specific Content Area via English	68	83.95
Tutorial Assistance in Specific Content Area via Native Language	64	79.01
Content-Area Instruction through Native Language	64	79.01
Other	7	8.64

Table 21. Instructional Services in TPI Programs

Number of Programs = 384 (Respondents may indicate more than one instructional service.)

Instructional Service	Number	Percent
ESL Instruction	254	66.15
Native Language Arts Instruction	36	9.38
Computer-Assisted Instruction/Other Media Service (e.g. VCR, audio)	184	47.92
Tutorial Assistance in Specific Content Area via English	321	83.59
Tutorial Assistance in Specific Content Area via Native Language	145	37.76
Content-Area Instruction through Native Language	50	13.02
Other	43	11.20

Inservice Training Sources

For both TBE programs, the Illinois Resource Center, the local district, and the Illinois State Board of Education were the most common training sources. Among TPI programs, the local district and the Illinois Resource Centers were the most frequent providers of training. These data also show that TBE programs appear to use inservice training more extensively than do TPI programs.

Table 22. Inservice Training Sources for TBE Programs

Number of Programs = 81 (Respondents may indicate more than one inservice training source.)

Training Source	Number	Percent
Local District	63	77.78
State Board of Education	55	67.90
Illinois Resource Center	67	82.71
Midwest Resource Center	5	6.17
Professional Associates (e.g. NABE)	41	50.62
Other	18	22.22

Table 23. Inservice Training Sources for TPI Programs

Number of Programs = 384 (Respondents may indicate more than one inservice training source.)

Training Source	Number	Percent
Local District	233	60.68
State Board of Education	106	27.60
Illinois Resource Center	201	52.34
Midwest Resource Center	20	5.21
Professional Associates (e.g. NABE)	89	23.18
Other	75	19.53

How Are Parents Involved?

Among TBE programs, over 85 percent report parental involvement occurs through a parent advisory committee. The high rate of involvement in this mode is due largely to the TBE program regulations that require a parent advisory committee. The rate of parental involvement at school functions for TBE programs is over 90 percent and is somewhat higher than the rate for parent advisory committees. Over half of the TBE programs report parents actively involved in classroom instruction.

By comparison, the reported rates of parental involvement for all modes is lower for TPI programs than for TBE programs. For TPI programs, the most commonly reported involvement mode is attendance at school functions. Approximately 22 percent of the TPI programs indicated involvement through a parent advisory committee and about 29 percent reported assistance in the classroom. Unlike TBE programs, TPI programs are not required to have parent advisory committees.

Table 24. Modes of Parental Involvement in TBE Programs

Number of Programs = 81 (Respondents may indicate more than one parental involvement mode.)

Type of Parental Involvement Activity	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Parent Advisory Committee	69	85.19
Assistance in Classroom	45	55.56
Assistance in Supportive Services	26	32.10
Attendance at School Function	76	93.83
Other	14	17.28

Table 25. Modes of Parental Involvement in TPI Programs

Number of Programs = 384 (Respondents may indicate more than one parental involvement mode.)

Type of Parental Involvement Activity	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Parent Advisory Committee	85	22.14
Assistance in Classroom	111	28.91
Assistance in Supportive Services	91	23.70
Attendance at School Function	304	79.17
Other	77	20.05

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 achievement tests?

Survey Sample and Survey Procedures

The sample for this survey included all students from grades 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8 reported as transitioning to mainstream education (i.e. exit code 1) during FY 94. Transitioned students from FY 94 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 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8 were selected because those students should have advanced to grades 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11 respectively in FY 97 and therefore would be scheduled for participation in statewide IGAP testing. Using the selection criteria described above, a total of 4,543 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 4,543 students in the sample. There were 1,910 students in this sample from Chicago District #299, and the remaining 2,633 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 26 below.

Table 26. Enrollment Status of Transitioned Students

	Chicago	Downstate	Total
Currently Enrolled	2,462	1,448	2,910
Transferred to another district	376	694	1,070
Dropped Out	69	48	117
Other/Unknown	3	443	446
Total	1,910	2,633	4,543

These data show that approximately 64 percent of the students in the sample were still enrolled in their district of transition. The percentage of transitioned students currently enrolled in District #299 (76%) is considerably higher than the 55% currently enrolled in downstate districts.

Approximately 24% of the students transferred to another districts and less than 3% dropped out of school.

Grade Level Advancement and Retention

The data in Table 27 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 6.47% of these students have been retained since transition. The retention rate for downstate districts (8%) is slightly higher than the 5% rate reported by Chicago District #299.

Table 27. Transitioned Students Advanced to Next Grade Compared to Retention

Students	Chicago		Downstate	
	At Grade Level*	Below Grade Level**	At Grade Level*	Below Grade Level**
Grade 3	0	0	155	9
Grade 4	6	2	215	28
Grade 6	405	3	426	25
Grade 7	418	9	332	31
Grade 8	322	20	171	10
Grade 10	148	22	24	3
Grade 11	86	21	27	2

* Transitional students who have advanced to the next grade level annually.

** Transitional students who have been retained at least once.

IGAP Test Data

Tables 28 and 29 present the IGAP test data for transitioned students. The IGAP data presented in these tables are taken from the tests administered in March 1997. One notable feature of these data is that a substantial number of downstate students do not have scores reported. Although these missing scores have been a problem in the past, the percentages of missing scores for downstate students are substantially higher than in previous years. For example, in FY 96, missing scores ranged from a low of 16.3% for downstate Grade 4 Science and Social Science scores to a high of 41.7% for downstate Grade 10 Writing scores. For the current year, the range of missing scores is from a low of 24.5% for downstate Grade 3 Reading scores to a high of 49.4% for downstate Grade 7 Science scores.

There are a number of possible causes for these missing scores (student non-participation, reporting problem, etc.) that need to be investigated further in order to identify ways to minimize them. The scores that were reported generally show that most transitioned students' IGAP scores either meet or exceed state standards.

Table 28. Downstate IGAP Results for Transitioned Students

Subject Area	Not Meeting Standards		Meeting Standards		Exceeding Standards		Missing Data	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Grade 3 Reading	26	16.80	65	41.90	26	16.80	38	24.50
Grade 3 Mathematics	4	2.60	78	50.30	34	21.90	39	25.20
Grade 3 Writing	16	10.20	68	43.70	29	19.00	42	27.10
Grade 4 Social Sciences	16	7.4	89	41.4	39	18.1	71	33.0
Grade 4 Science	19	8.8	89	41.4	35	16.3	72	33.5
Grade 6 Reading	91	21.4	98	23.0	17	4.0	220	51.6
Grade 6 Mathematics	30	7.0	133	31.2	42	9.9	221	51.9
Grade 6 Writing	9	2.1	95	22.3	98	23.0	224	52.6
Grade 7 Social Sciences	20	6.0	122	36.7	27	8.1	163	49.1
Grade 7 Science	48	14.5	81	24.4	39	11.7	164	49.4
Grade 8 Reading	60	35.1	41	24.0	10	5.8	60	35.1
Grade 8 Mathematics	20	11.7	66	58.6	23	13.5	62	36.3
Grade 8 Writing	9	5.3	68	39.8	32	18.7	62	36.3
Grade 10 Reading	11	45.8	5	20.8	0	0.0	8	33.3
Grade 10 Mathematics	5	20.8	9	37.5	2	8.3	8	33.3
Grade 10 Writing	7	29.2	7	29.2	1	4.2	9	37.5
Grade 11 Social Sciences	3	11.1	11	40.7	1	3.7	12	44.4
Grade 11 Science	10	51.0	3	11.1	1	3.7	13	48.1

Table 29. Chicago IGAP Results for Transitioned Students

Subject Area	Not Meeting Standards		Meeting Standards		Exceeding Standards		Missing Data	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Grade 4 Social Sciences	1	16.7	1	16.7	2	38.3	2	33.3
Grade 4 Science	2	33.3	1	16.7	1	16.7	2	33.3
Grade 6 Reading	12.6	31.0	208	51.2	36	8.9	36	8.9
Grade 6 Mathematics	5	1.2	274	67.5	91	22.4	36	8.9
Grade 6 Writing	10	2.5	246	60.6	111	29.3	39	9.6
Grade 7 Social Sciences	11	2.6	320	76.4	65	15.5	23	5.5
Grade 7 Science	49	11.7	266	63.5	82	19.6	23	5.3
Grade 8 Reading	176	54.2	132	40.6	7	2.2	10	3.1
Grade 8 Mathematics	48	14.8	251	77.2	14	4.3	12	3.7
Grade 8 Writing	56	17.2	210	64.6	39	12.0	20	6.2
Grade 10 Reading	95	63.8	48	32.2	3	2.0	3	2.0
Grade 10 Mathematics	64	43.0	64	43.0	11	7.4	10	6.7
Grade 10 Writing	91	61.1	39	26.2	9	6.0	10	6.7
Grade 11 Social Science	4	4.7	73	84.9	1	1.2	8	9.3
Grade 11 Science	38	44.2	33	44.2	3	3.5	7	8.1

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

The following findings reported from the FY 96 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 6.5%.
- 2) The percentage of students whose IGAP 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 Can the Collection and Evaluation of Bilingual Education Program Data Be Improved?

In the FY 96 report, a recommendation was presented concerning the Illinois Bilingual Advisory Council's proposed changes to the Annual Evaluation Report. Those proposed changes are reflected in the revised Program Delivery Report (ISBE Form 92-07). The data collected using the revised Program Delivery Report will be reported in the FY 98 Annual Evaluation Report.

The FY 96 report also contained a recommendation to present data from the Illinois Measure of Annual Growth in English (IMAGE) examination. The data from that first administration of the IMAGE exam were not available in time to be presented in this report. It is expected, though, that the data from the 1998 IMAGE exam will be available for reporting in the FY 98 Annual Evaluation Report.

As discussed previously, the percentages of missing IGAP scores for downstate students have increased over the previous year. These missing data make it difficult to present a clear picture of how transitioned students are performing in mainstream classrooms.

To address these missing scores, we have prepared a summary of the sources of missing IGAP scores and have provided this information to the Division of Student Assessment for their review. Following their review, consideration needs to be given to possible actions to provide a more complete body of IGAP test scores for transitioned students.

