

**Annual Report of
Delaware's Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Students, Staff, and Programs**



Delaware Department of Education

2000 - 2001

OFFICERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Valerie A. Woodruff
Secretary of Education

Jennifer W. Davis
Deputy Secretary of Education

Mark Dufendach, Ed.D., Associate Secretary
Robin Taylor, Associate Secretary
Nancy Wilson, Ph.D., Associate Secretary

Townsend Building
P.O. Box 1402
Dover, Delaware 19903-1402

Delaware State Board of Education

Joseph A. Pika, Ph.D., President

Jean W. Allen, *Vice President*

Robert J. Gilsdorf

Mary B. Graham, Esquire

Valarie Pepper

Dennis J. Savage

Claibourne D. Smith, Ph.D.

Valerie A. Woodruff, *Executive Secretary*

Doc. No. 95-01/02/04/02

The Department of Education does not discriminate in employment or educational programs, services or activities based on race, color, national origin, sex, age, or handicap in accordance with state and federal laws. Inquiries should be directed to the Department of Education, Administrative Services Branch, PO Box 1402, Dover, Delaware 19903, (302) 739-4604.

**Annual Report of
Delaware's Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Students, Staff, and Programs**

Delaware Department of Education

2000 - 2001

**This report was prepared by Francine Simmons Beyer, Consultant
with the assistance of staff in the
School Improvement Work Group
Delaware Department of Education**

Ronald L. Houston, Director

For further information, please contact:

**Margaret M. Loveland, Education Specialist
Bilingual/ESL/Migrant Programs
School Improvement Group
Department of Education
P.O. Box 1402
Dover, DE 19903-1402
(302) 739-2767**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Report Purpose, Design, and Guiding Questions	1
The 2000-2001 Delaware Student Population	4
Findings	5
Conclusions	24
General Implications	27
References	29
Appendix	30

**Annual Report of Delaware's Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Students, Staff, and Programs
Delaware Department of Education
2000-2001**

This report presents information on limited English proficient (LEP) students, staff, and programs in Delaware schools during the 2000–2001 school year. LEP students are identified through a Home Language Survey and an English proficiency assessment as having difficulty speaking, reading, writing, and/or understanding the English language. The focus of this report is on an annual data collection effort conducted in the spring of 2001.

The following sections of this report describe the purpose, design, and guiding questions of the report; the Delaware student population; findings; conclusions; and some general implications based on these findings and conclusions.

Report Purpose, Design, and Guiding Questions

A brief description of the purpose of the report, the design, and the guiding questions that structure the report follows:

Purpose

During the past ten years, public schools in this country have experienced a sharp increase in their enrollments of language minority students. These linguistically and culturally diverse students, traditionally referred to as LEP (limited English proficient) students, present a new challenge for our education system; that is, the challenge of enabling linguistically diverse students, from a wide variety of cultural heritages, to achieve the same challenging content and performance standards as English-proficient students. The Delaware State Department of Education has developed a policy for school districts to follow in meeting this challenge. This report provides data on LEP students for the 2000–2001 school year.

The purpose of this annual report of LEP (limited English proficient) and NEP (non English proficient) students, staff, and programs is threefold. First, documentation and reporting of LEP students, staff, and programs are required by state and federal regulations. Second, these findings inform the Delaware constituency on demographics and instruction provided to LEP students. And third, the report provides districts and schools with information to support their planning and ongoing decision-making on issues related to LEP students, thus enabling them to be proactive in meeting these students' needs and providing them with the opportunity to learn successfully in classrooms where instruction is in English.

* The term “limited English proficiency child” means an individual—

(A) who—

- (1) is aged 2 through 21;
- (2) was not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English and comes from an environment where a language other than English is dominant; or
- (3) is a Native American or Alaska Native or is a native resident of the outlying areas and comes from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant impact on such individual’s level of English language proficiency; or
- (4) is migratory and whose native language is other than English and comes from an environment where a language other than English is dominant; and

(B) who—

has sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language and whose difficulties may deny such individual the opportunity to learn successfully in classrooms where the language of instruction is English or to participate fully in our society.

* Defined by the U. S. Department of Education.

Design

The Delaware Department of Education developed a format for school districts and charter schools to follow for entering data on language minority students into the Delaware Student Information System (DELSIS). For the 2000-2001 school year, the deadline for entering the student and teacher data was by the end of the school year, June 8, 2001.

The format for student data covered information in seven areas: 1) student background, 2) type of instruction, 3) other services received, 4) initial Language Assessment Scales (LAS) results, 5) LAS annual test data, 6) English proficiency level, and 7) reclassification information. Data were submitted by all 19 school districts and charter schools. Charter school responses are not included in this survey as they all indicated that their populations did not include students classified as LEP in the spring of 2001.

The format for the teacher data is for districts to submit the number of teachers certified in ESL or bilingual, the number of certified teachers assigned to teach LEP students, and the number of teachers that received any in-service training in ESL or bilingual education.

Guiding Questions

The guiding questions used to structure the report were those developed for the 1999–2000 Annual Report of Delaware’s LEP Students, Staff, and Programs. In addition, a seventh question was developed which focuses on LEP student performance on the Delaware State Testing Program (DSTP).

Questions one and two address LEP students:

1. Was there a change in the reported number of LEP/NEP students being served by Delaware school districts and counties from 1999–2000 to 2000–2001?
2. What are the characteristics of the LEP students being served in Delaware school districts (i.e., grade levels, languages spoken) and how do they compare to the previous year?

Question three addresses LEP student instruction:

3. What type of instruction did LEP students receive; specifically, did it incorporate students’ native language?

Questions four addresses reclassification, an outcome of LEP programs:

4. Was there a change in the reported number of LEP students being reclassified as non-LEP during the 2000–2001 school year when compared to the previous school year?

Questions five and six address teacher qualifications:

5. Did the school districts have and use ESL and/or bilingual certified teachers to instruct LEP students?
6. Were teachers provided with in-service or pre-service training specific to ESL or bilingual education?

Question seven, added this year, addresses LEP student performance:

7. To what extent do LEP students meet or exceed the standards on the DSTP assessments?

The 2000–2001 Delaware Student Population

The following section of this report disaggregates Delaware student enrollment by grade, by county, and by race/ethnicity. All data are as reported as of June 8, 2001. The Delaware student enrollment, including both regular and special education students for 2000–2001, was as follows:

<u>Grades</u>	<u>% of Enrollment</u>	<u>No. of students</u>
Pre–K & K	7.7%	8,764
1–3	24.2%	27,662
4–8	39.5%	45,181
9–12	28.7%	32,913
TOTAL	100.1%	114,520

The Delaware student enrollment, by county for 2000–2001, was as follows:

<u>County</u>	<u>No. of Districts</u>	<u>% of Enrollment</u>	<u>No of Students</u>
New Castle	6	57.7%	66,101
Kent	6	21.3%	24,375
Sussex	7	18.7%	21,461
Charter	4	2.3%	2,582
Unknown		<.1%	1*
TOTAL	23	100.0%	114,520

* One student is in a state agency that does not track to a county

The Delaware student enrollment, by race/ethnicity for 2000–2001, was as follows:

<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>	<u>% of Students</u>	<u>No. of Students</u>
American Indian	0.3%	295
Asian American	2.4%	2,723
Hispanic	6.1%	6,951
African American	31.0%	35,465
Caucasian	60.3%	69,078
Unknown	<.1%	8*
TOTAL	100.1%	114,520

* Not reported

Findings

The findings presented in this section relate to each of the six questions developed to structure the report.

Question 1: Was there a change in the reported number of LEP/NEP students being served by Delaware school districts and counties from 1999–2000 to 2000–2001?

Table 1 presents the reported number of LEP/NEP students enrolled during the 1999–2000 and 2000–2001 school years, the percent enrolled, and the change in the number and percent enrolled from year-to-year. As indicated in Table 1:

- Overall, there were 2,371 LEP/NEP students reported being enrolled and served in Delaware school districts in 2000–2001; almost two-thirds were LEP, one-third was NEP. The number of NEP was not separately collected and identified in 1999-2000.
- The 2000–2001 LEP/NEP enrollment increase of 87 students reflects an increase of +.1%, from 2.0% in 1999–2000 to 2.1% in 2000–2001.

Table 1. Reported number of LEP/NEP students enrolled in and served by Delaware districts, 1999–2000 and 2000–2001.

Students	1999–2000	2000-2001	Change +/-
NEP	Not identified	610	
LEP		1,761	
Total LEP/NEP	2284 *	2,371	+87
% of Total Enrollment**	2.0%	2.1%	.1%

* NEP not identified

** based on 1999–2000 population of 113,598 and 2000-2001 population of 114,520

Table 2 summarizes the number of LEP students in 1999–2000 and 2000–2001 by district and county, along with the change from 1999–2000 to 2000–2001.

- New Castle County, with 58% of the state’s enrollment, reported 1,434 LEP/NEP students or 60% of all reported LEP students; four out of six districts reported increases in the number of LEP students, and two districts reported a decrease. District changes in New Castle County ranged from +103 LEP students in Colonial School District to –172 LEP students in Red Clay School District.
- Kent County, with 21% of the state’s enrollment, reported 298 LEP students or 13% of all reported LEP students; four out of six districts reported increases in the number of LEP students, and two districts reported decreases. District changes in Kent County ranged from +26 LEP students in Milford School District to –14 LEP students in Caesar Rodney School District
- Sussex County, with 19% of the state’s enrollment, reported 639 LEP students or 27% of all reported LEP students. Five out of seven districts reported increases in the number of LEP students, one district reported a decrease, and one district reported no LEP students for either school year. District changes in Sussex County ranged from +74 LEP students in Indian River School District to –28 LEP students in Woodbridge School District.

Table 2. LEP/NEP students by District and County, 1999–2000 and 2000–2001

District	No. of LEP/NEP Students		+/- Change
	1999–2000	2000–2001	
New Castle County			
Appoquinimink	26	33	+7
Brandywine	157	248	+91
Christina	419	345	-74
Colonial	192	295	+103
NCC Vo–Tech	0	2	+2
Red Clay	683	511	-172
Total New Castle County	1477 (2.2%)*	1,434 (2.1%)*	-43 (-0.1%)
Kent County			
Caesar Rodney	46	32	-14
Capital	83	88	+5
Polytech	6	0	-6
Lake Forest	26	30	+4
Milford	103	129	+26
Smyrna	11	19	+8
Total Kent County	275 (1.1%)*	298 (1.2%)*	+23 (0.1%)
Sussex County			
Cape Henlopen	37	54	+17
Delmar	1	11	+10
Indian River	281	355	+74
Laurel	37	42	+5
Seaford	84	113	+29
Sussex Vo–Tech	0	0	-
Woodbridge	92	64	-28
Total Sussex County	532 (2.5%)*	639 (2.9%)*	+107 (+0.4)
TOTAL STATE	2284 (2.0%)**	2,371 (2.1%***)	+87 (0.1%)

* % of the county's school population

** based on a student population of 113,598

*** based on a student population of 114,520

Question 2: What are the characteristics of the LEP students being served in Delaware school districts (i.e., grade levels, languages spoken) and how do they compare to the previous year?

The data in Table 3 on the grade levels of the LEP students show:

- In 2000–2001, the largest number of LEP students reported were enrolled in kindergarten (345 students), followed by grade 1 (336 students), grade 2 (259 students), and grade 3 (226 students).
- In 2000–2001, pre-kindergarten reported the smallest number of LEP students (4 students), followed by grade 12 (54 students), and grade 11 (70 students).
- Ten grade levels reported increases in the number of LEP students, from 1999–2000 to 2000–2001, and four grade levels reported decreases; these changes ranged from +26 LEP students, for grade 8, to –26 LEP students, for grade 9.

Table 3. Number of LEP/NEP students, by grade, 1999–2000 and 2000-2001.

Grade	No. of LEP/NEP Students		+/- Change
	1999–2000	2000–2001	
Pre-K	23	4	-19
K	351	345	-6
1	333	336	+3
2	235	259	+24
3	203	226	+23
4	184	188	+4
5	163	183	+20
6	121	145	+24
7	155	150	-5
8	132	158	+26
9	159	133	-26
10	109	120	+11
11	67	70	+3
12	49	54	+5
TOTAL	2,284	2,371	+87

Table 4 summarizes the reported frequency of the various languages spoken by LEP students; percents are listed in parentheses for each language spoken by four or more students. From one to three students speak the languages listed in the “other” category (see Appendix for a list of all languages spoken by LEP/NEP students).

- 54 different languages were reported to be spoken by LEP students; 34 different languages were reported to be spoken by from one to three LEP students (listed as “other” in Table 4).
- Spanish was the most frequently reported language and was spoken by 72.3% of LEP students (1,714 students).
- The next most frequently reported languages were: Creole, spoken by 7.3% of LEP students (173 students); Korean, spoken by 3.3% of LEP students (78 students); and Chinese, spoken by 2.7% of LEP students (63 students).

Table 4. Frequency of reported languages spoken by LEP students, 2000–2001

Number of LEP Students	Languages Spoken by 4 or more LEP Students	Number of LEP Students	Languages Spoken by 4 or more LEP Students
1,714 (72.3%)	Spanish	16 (<1.0%)	French
173 (7.3%)	Creole	15 (<1.0%)	Turkish
78 (3.3%)	Korean	12 (<1.0%)	Bengali
63 (2.7%)	Chinese	8 (<1.0%)	German
32 (1.3%)	Africans	7 (<1.0%)	Tagalog
31 (1.3%)	Arabic	7 (<1.0%)	Haitian Creole
28 (1.2%)	Hindi	4 (<1.0%)	Albanian
25 (1.1%)	Gujarathi	4 (<1.0%)	Polish
24 (1.0%)	Vietnamese	4 (<1.0%)	Swahili
23 (1.0%)	Russian	53 (2.2%)	<i>Other*</i>
19 (<1.0%)	Urdu	31 (1.3%)	<i>Not Reported</i>

* “Other” includes 34 languages, each spoken by 1 to 3 students (see Appendix)

Question 3. What type of instruction did LEP students receive; specifically, did it incorporate students' native language?

Districts were asked which of four types of instruction were provided to each LEP student; 1) bilingual (instruction in native language and English, across the curriculum), 2) ESL (instruction in English, across the curriculum), 3) Dual Language (language minority students and language majority students are taught in both languages, across the curriculum), or 4) regular class instruction. These data are presented in tables 5 and 6. Table 5 summarizes the number and percent of LEP students receiving the four types of instruction in 2000–2001. As the table shows:

- The districts reported that 70% of the LEP students received ESL instruction.
- 21% of the LEP students received bilingual instruction, and 7% received dual instruction.
- 3% of the LEP students received regular classroom instruction.

Table 5. Types of instruction provided to LEP Students, 2000-2001

Type of LEP Instruction	Number of LEP Students	% of LEP Students
ESL	1,648	70%
Bilingual	487	21%
Dual Language	163	7%
Regular Classroom Instruction	62	3%
Total	2,360*	100%

* 11 students' type of instruction was not reported

As shown in Table 6:

- In 2000–2001, the districts reported that 28% of LEP students received instruction incorporating their native language as opposed to 14% in 1999–2000.
- With the exception of grade 1, there were increases at every grade level in the percent of LEP students receiving instruction incorporating their native language, ranging from a 9% increase at kindergarten to a 28% increase at grade 6; grade 1 had a 7% decrease.
- Grades 7 through 12 provided from 11% (grade 9) to 20% (grade 8) of their LEP students with instruction incorporating students' native language, a change from 0% at these grade levels during the previous year.
- The highest percents of LEP students receiving instruction incorporated into their native language were in grade 6 (41%), grades 5 and 4 (both 36%), grade 2 (34%), and grade 1(32%).

Table 6. Native Language Instruction by grade, 1999–2000 and 2000-2001

Grade	LEP Students whose Instruction Incorporates Native Language*		Change +/-
	1999–2000	2000–2001	
PK	0 (-)	0 (-)	-
K	62 (18%)	93 (27%)	+31 (+9%)
1	131 (39%)	108 (32%)	-23 (-7%)
2	29 (12%)	89 (34%)	+60 (+22%)
3	31 (15%)	60 (27%)	+29 (+12%)
4	20 (11%)	67 (36%)	+47 (+25%)
5	31 (19%)	66 (36%)	+35 (+17%)
6	16 (13%)	59 (41%)	+43 (+28%)
7	0 (-)	25 (17%)	+25 (+17%)
8	0 (-)	32 (20%)	+32 (+20%)
9	0 (-)	14 (11%)	+14 (+11%)
10	0 (-)	18 (15%)	+18 (+15%)
11	0 (-)	11 (16%)	+11 (+16%)
12	0 (-)	8 (15%)	+ 8 (+15%)
TOTAL	320 (14%) **	650 (28%) ***	+330 (+14%)

* includes bilingual instruction and/or dual language instruction

** based on enrollments of 2284

*** based on enrollments of 2360 (11 students not reported)

The districts were asked if LEP/NEP students were provided with one or more of the following additional services: Title I, Extra Time, Special Education, Basic Skills, Home

Bound, other services, or no other services. Table 7 summarizes district responses, by grade level. As indicated in the table:

- The majority of LEP students (73%) were not provided with these additional instructional services.
- The most frequently reported additional instructional services provided to LEP students were Extra Time (14%), Title I (11%), and Special Education (6%).
- No LEP students were provided with Home Bound services; few were provided with “other” services (1%) or Basic Skills (<1%).

Table 7. Services provided to LEP/NEP students, 2000–2001

Grade	Type of Additional Service Provided to LEP Students*						
	Title I	Extra Time	Special Ed	Basic Skills	Home Bound	Other	None
Pre-K	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
K	19	34	17	0	0	3	280
1	33	39	23	0	0	2	249
2	44	34	16	1	0	5	173
3	41	41	23	1	0	1	135
4	18	37	14	2	0	1	122
5	23	39	17	0	0	1	115
6	46	48	13	0	0	1	63
7	3	15	2	0	0	1	132
8	27	30	8	0	0	0	106
9	0	11	2	0	0	1	121
10	0	7	2	0	0	0	111
11	0	3	0	0	0	0	67
12	0	2	0	0	0	1	51
Total **	254 (11%)	341 (14%)	137 (6%)	4 (<1%)	0 –	17 (1%)	1728 * (73%)

* students may have received more than one of these additional services

** based on a 2000–2001 enrollment of 2,371

Question 4. Was there a change in the reported number of LEP students being reclassified as non-LEP during the 2000–2001 school year, when compared to the previous school year?

The data in table 8 includes the total number of students whose proficiency levels were

reclassified anytime during the school year, as a percent of the total numbers of students classified as LEP/NEP anytime during the school year. As shown in Table 8:

- Overall, 110 LEP/NEP students, or 4%, were reclassified as non-LEP during the 2000–2001 school year, compared to 241 LEP/NEP students, or 11% in 1999–2000.
- In 2000–2001, grade 1 had the largest percent of LEP students reclassified (10%, 37 students), followed by Kindergarten (6%, 22 students); the previous year grade 6 had the largest percent of LEP students reclassified (20%, 24 students), followed by grade 4 (14%, 25 students).
- Districts reported that all grades had decreases in the number of LEP students reclassified as fully English proficient (FEP), ranging from –17% at grade 6 to –2% at grades 1, 3, and 12.

Table 8. Number of LEP students reclassified as non-LEP during the 1999–2000 and 2000–2001 school years

Grade	LEP students reclassified		Change +/-
	1999–2000	2000–2001	
PK	3 (13%)	0 (–)	-3 (-13%)
K	43 (12%)	22 (6%)	-23 (-6%)
1	40 (12%)	37 (10%)	-3 (-2%)
2	21 (9%)	6 (2%)	-15 (-7%)
3	12 (6%)	9 (4%)	-3 (-2%)
4	25 (14%)	8 (4%)	-17 (-10%)
5	15 (9%)	8 (4%)	-7 (-5%)
6	24 (20%)	4 (3%)	-20 (-17%)
7	12 (8%)	3 (2%)	-9 (-6%)
8	13 (10%)	2 (1%)	-11 (-9%)
9	14 (9%)	1 (1%)	-13 (-8%)
10	9 (8%)	5 (4%)	-4 (-4%)
11	8 (12%)	4 (5%)	-4 (-7%)
12	2 (4%)	1 (2%)	-1 (-2%)
TOTAL	241(11%)*	110 (4%) **	-131 (-7%)

* based on a total of LEP/NEP by grade in 1999-2000

** based on a total of LEP/NEP by grade in 2000-2001

For those students reclassified, districts were asked to indicate which of nine reclassification methods were used: 1) student record, 2) Home Language Survey, 3) student grades, 4) teacher interview, 5) teacher observation, 6) informal assessment, 7) parent information, 8) referral, and 9) LAS (Language Assessment Scales). The LAS is administered to grades 2 through 12, and the pre-LAS is administered to younger students in pre-K, K, or grade 1.

The frequency that these methods were reported to be used for reclassification, as well as the grade levels at which they were used, is summarized in Table 9. As the table shows:

- The Language Assessment Scale (LAS) was used in reclassifying 76% of the LEP/NEP students.
- The next most frequent methods used for reclassification of LEP/NEP students were: student records (32%), student grades (25%), teacher observation (25%), informal assessment (21%), and teacher interview (18%).
- Infrequently used methods for reclassification were: Home Language Survey (10%), parent information (6%), and referral (1%).

Table 9. Frequency of methods used to reclassify LEP students as Non-LEP, 2000–2001

Method **	Student Grade Level(s)	Used for Reclassification	
		Frequency *	Percent
Language Assessment Scales	K-12	84	76%
Student Records	K-11	35	32%
Student Grades	K-6, 8-10	27	25%
Teacher Observation	K-6, 8	27	25%
Informal Assessment	K-6	23	21%
Teacher Interview	K-3, 5-6, 8-11	20	18%
Home Language Survey	K-2, 4	11	10%
Parent Information	K-3, 5	6	6%
Referral	5	1	1%

* based on 110 students reported as reclassified during the 2000-2001 school year

** multiple methods could be used to reclassify a student

Question 5. Did the school districts have and use ESL and/or bilingual certified teachers to instruct LEP students?

Table 10 presents data on ESL and bilingual certified teachers, by district and county, for the 2000-2001 school year. Included in the table are, the number of certified ESL teachers, the number of certified bilingual teachers, by district and county, the number of ESL and bilingual certified teachers assigned to teach LEP students, and the LEP student/certified teacher ratio. As the table shows:

- Overall, Delaware districts reported 39 certified ESL teachers, and 31 certified bilingual teachers; 61 of these teachers were assigned to teach LEP students.
- New Castle County, with 58% of the state's enrollment, reported the largest number of certified ESL teachers (18) and certified bilingual teachers (30); most of these teachers were in Red Clay School District (20) and Christina School District (18); 44 of 48 certified teachers were assigned to teach LEP students.
- Kent County, with 21% of the state's enrollment, reported 10 certified ESL teachers and one certified bilingual teacher; the district with the largest number of certified teachers was Milford (4); 8 of 11 certified teachers were assigned to teach LEP students.
- Sussex County, with 19% of the state's enrollment, reported having 11 certified ESL teachers and no certified bilingual teachers; five of these teachers were in Indian River School District; 9 of 11 certified teachers were assigned to teach LEP students.
- There was wide variation in the ratio of LEP students to teachers, ranging from 1 certified teacher to 16 LEP students in the Caesar Rodney School District, to 1 certified teacher to 295 LEP students in the Colonial School District.

Table 10. Number of certified ESL and bilingual teachers, number assigned to teach LEP students, and LEP student/certified teacher ratio by district and county, 2000-2001

District	LEP Students	Certified teachers ESL Bilingual	Certified and LEP Assigned	Certified Teacher/ LEP Student Ratio
New Castle County				
Appoquinimink	33	2 3	2	1:17
Brandywine	248	3 0	3	1:83
Christina	345	7 11	18	1:19
Colonial	295	2 0	1	1:295
NCC Vo-Tech	2	0 0	–	–
Red Clay	511	4 16	20	1:26
Total New Castle Cty	1434 (2.1%) *	18 30	44	NA
Kent County				
Caesar Rodney	32	3 0	2	1:16
Capital	88	2 0	2	1:44
Polytech	0	0 0	–	–
Lake Forest	30	1 0	1	1:30
Milford	129	3 1	2	1:65
Smyrna	19	1 0	1	1:19
Total Kent Cty	298 (1.2%) *	10 1	8	NA
Sussex County				
Cape Henlopen	54	1 0	1	1:54
Delmar	11	1 0	0	–
Indian River	355	5 0	5	1:71
Laurel	42	1 0	1	1:42
Seaford	113	2 0	1	1:113
Sussex Vo-Tech	0	-- --	--	--
Woodbridge	64	1 0	1	1:64
Total Sussex Cty	639 (2.9%) *	11 0	9	NA
TOTAL STATE	2371	39 31	61	NA

* percent of total enrollment by county

Question 6. Were teachers provided with in-service or pre-service training specific to ESL or bilingual education?

Each district was asked to report the number of teachers who were provided with in-service or pre-service training specific to ESL or bilingual education, during the 2000–2001 school year. District responses are summarized in Table 11; the number of LEP students in each district is included for reference.

- Overall, 314 teachers participated in in-service or pre-service training specific to ESL or bilingual education.
- Four districts did not provide any ESL/bilingual related in-service. They reported having from 2 (NCC Vo-Tech) to 345 (Christina) LEP students.
- Six districts reported providing ESL/bilingual related in-service for from 1 to 4 teachers. They reported having from 19 (Smyrna) to 113 (Seaford) LEP students.
- Two districts reported providing ESL/bilingual related in-service for from 11 to 12 teachers. They reported having from 32 (Caesar Rodney) to 355 (Indian River) LEP students.
- Two districts providing ESL/bilingual related in-service for from 32 to 37 teachers. They reported having from 54 (Cape Henlopen) to 511 (Red Clay) LEP students.
- Two districts trained a large number of teachers; Colonial provided ESL/bilingual related in-service for 75 teachers, and reported having 295 LEP students; Brandywine provided ESL/bilingual related in-service for 100 teachers, and reported having 248 LEP students.

Table 11. Number of teachers receiving ESL/bilingual in-service by district and number of LEP students, 2000–2001

District	Number of Teachers Receiving ESL/Bilingual In-service *	Number of LEP Students
Christina	0	345
NCC Vo-Tech	0	2
Capital	0	88
Delmar	0	11
Appoquinimink	1	33
Smyrna	1	19
Laurel	1	42
Seaford	2	113
Woodbridge	3	64
Lake Forest	4	30
Caesar Rodney	11	32
Indian River	12	355
Cape Henlopen	32	54
Red Clay	35	511
Milford	37	129
Colonial	75	295
Brandywine	100	248
TOTAL	314	2,371

* includes all teachers who received any in-service in this area

Question 7. Do LEP students meet or exceed the standards on the DSTP assessments?

In order to determine if LEP students are achieving academic standards, the results of the Delaware Student Testing Program (DSTP) were examined. The DSTP was administered to all students, in reading, writing, and math – in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 – in the spring of 2001. Consistent with the state’s recent emphasis on meeting state standards, the DSTP data are reported as performance levels, which tell how well students are performing relative to the state’s content standards in the three subject areas. The five performance levels are: 1) well below the standard, 2) below the standard, 3) meets the standard, 4) exceeds the standard, and 5) distinguished performance.

The following three tables show the percent of LEP students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 meeting or exceeding the standard in reading (Table 12), writing (Table 13), and math (Table 14) (PL3, PL4, and PL5), as well as the percent of LEP students at each grade level who took the test. Comparison scores for non-LEP students and for Spring 2000 testing are also included. Scores are aggregated statewide and are not presented by district as, in most cases, the LEP district groups tested were small, and the testing company did not analyze scores for groups smaller than 15.

As shown in Table 12:

- The percent of LEP students taking the DSTP reading assessment in 2001 ranged from 37% for grade 5 to 49% for grade 8.
- In 2001, the percent of tested LEP students meeting/exceeding the standard in reading ranged from 38% for grade 3 to 20% for grade 10.
- In 2001, the percent of tested LEP students meeting/exceeding the reading standard was from 38% (grade 3) to 45% (grade 5), lower than the percent of non-LEP students.
- In 2001, the percent of LEP students meeting/exceeding the reading standard increased for one grade level (grade 10, +12%) and decreased for three grade levels (-2%, -5%, and -14% for grades 3, 5, and 8, respectively).

Table 12. Percentage of LEP/non-LEP students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 meeting/exceeding the standard on the DSTP Reading Assessment, Spring 2000 and 2001.

Grade	Group	Meeting/Exceeding Reading Standards				
		2000		2001		+/-
		#	% **	#	% **	
3	LEP	49	43%	102 (45%)*	38%	-5%
3	non-LEP	7,840	77%	8,075	76%	-1%
5	LEP	21	38%	68 (37%)*	24%	-14%
5	non-LEP	7,534	69%	7,717	69%	-
8	LEP	39	26%	78 (49%)*	24%	-2%
8	non-LEP	8,049	68%	7,976	68%	-
10	LEP	37	8%	49 (41%)*	20%	12%
10	non-LEP	7,241	62%	7,416	61%	-1%

* percent of LEP students tested at each grade level - 2001

** percent of LEP/non-LEP students meeting/exceeding the standards

As shown in Table 13:

- The percent of LEP students taking the DSTP Writing Assessment in 2001 ranged from 54% for grade 8, to 44% for grade 5.
- In 2001, the percent of tested LEP students meeting/exceeding the writing standard ranged from 30% for grade 8, to 16% for grade 10.
- In 2001, the percent of tested LEP students meeting/exceeding the writing standard was from 15% (grade 3) to 41% (grade 10) lower than the percent of non-LEP students.
- In 2001, the percent of LEP students meeting/exceeding the writing standard decreased for one grade level (grade 3, -15%) and increased for three grade levels (+3%, +4%, and +9% for grades 5, 8, and 10, respectively).

Table 13. Percentage of LEP/non-LEP students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 meeting/exceeding the standard on the DSTP Writing Assessment, Spring 2000 and 2001.

Grade/Group	Meeting/Exceeding Writing Standard				
	2000		2001		+/-
	#	% **	#	% **	
3 LEP	45	33%	114 (50%) *	18%	-15%
3 non-LEP	7,472	37%	8,585	33%	-4%
5 LEP	23	22%	80 (44%) *	25%	3%
5 non-LEP	7,061	35%	8,343	51%	16%
8 LEP	34	26%	86 (54%) *	30%	4%
8 non-LEP	7,651	51%	8,481	68%	17%
10 LEP	28	7%	61 (51%) *	16%	9%
10 non-LEP	6,866	48%	7,866	57%	9%

* percent of LEP students tested at each grade level - 2001

** percent of LEP/non-LEP students meeting/exceeding the standards

As shown in Table 14:

- The percent of LEP students taking the DSTP Math Assessment in 2001 ranged from 46% for grade 3, to 39% for grade 5.
- In 2001, the percent of tested LEP students meeting/exceeding the math standard ranged from 39% for grade 3, to 17% for grade 10.
- In 2001, the percent of tested LEP students meeting/exceeding the math standard was from 17% (grade 8) to 37% (grade 5) lower than the percent of non-LEP students.
- In 2001, the percent of LEP students meeting/exceeding the math standard decreased for two grade level (grade 3, -11%; grade 5, -4%), increased for one grade level (+3%, for grade 10), and did not change for one grade level (grade 8).

Table 14. Percentage of LEP/non-LEP students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 meeting/exceeding the standard on the DSTP Math Assessment, Spring 2000 and 2001.

Grade/Group	Meeting/Exceeding Math Standard				
	2000		2001		+/-
	#	% **	#	% **	
3 LEP	50	50%	104 (46%) *	39%	-11%
3 non-LEP	7,844	73%	8,199	74%	1%
5 LEP	22	32%	72 (39%) *	28%	-4%
5 non-LEP	7,548	62%	7,832	65%	3%
8 LEP	39	26%	70 (44%) *	26%	-
8 non-LEP	8,026	41%	7,819	43%	2%
10 LEP	37	14%	53 (44%) *	17%	3%
10 non-LEP	7,207	36%	7,258	37%	1%

* percent of LEP students tested at each grade level - 2001

** percent of LEP/non-LEP students meeting/exceeding the standards

In the spring of 2000 and 2001, 8th and 11th grade students were administered the DSTP in science and social studies. Tables 15 and 16 present the percent of LEP students in grades 8 and 11 meeting or exceeding the standard in these two content areas (PL3, PL4, and PL5), the percent of LEP students at each grade level who took the test, and the change from Spring 2000 to Spring 2001. Again, scores are not presented by district as LEP district groups tested at each grade level were small. As Table 15 shows:

- The percent of LEP students taking the DSTP Science Assessment in 2001 was 54% for grade 8, and 70% for grade 11.
- In 2001, the percent of tested LEP students meeting/exceeding the science standard was 9% for both grade 8 and grade 11.
- In 2001, the percent of tested LEP students meeting/exceeding the science standard was 37% lower than the percent of non-LEP students at grade 11 and 35% lower than the percent of non-LEP students at grade 8.
- In 2001, the percent of LEP students meeting/exceeding the science standard decreased 6% for grade 8 and did not change for grade 11.

Table 15. Percentage of LEP students in grades 8 and 11 meeting/exceeding the standard on the DSTP Science Assessment Spring 2000 and 2001.

Grade/Group	Meeting/Exceeding Science Standard				
	2000		2001		+/-
	#	% **	#	% **	
8 LEP	41	15%	86 (54%) *	9%	-6%
8 non-LEP	8,024	42%	8,320	44%	+2
11 LEP	32%	9%	46 (70%) *	9%	-
11 non-LEP	6,025	48%	6,092	46%	-2%

* percent of LEP students tested at each grade level

** percent of LEP/non-LEP students meeting/exceeding the standards

As Table 16 shows:

- The percent of LEP students taking the DSTP Social Studies Assessment in 2001 was 54% for grade 8, and 60% for grade 11.
- In 2001, the percent of tested LEP students meeting/exceeding the social studies standard was 16% for grade 8, and 7% for grade 11.
- In 2001, the percent of tested LEP students meeting/exceeding the social studies standard was 33% lower than the percent of non-LEP students at grade 8 and 26% lower than the percent of non-LEP students at grade 11.
- In 2001, the percent of LEP students meeting/exceeding the social studies standard increased 3% for grade 8, and did not change for grade 11.

Table 16. Percentage of LEP students in grades 8 and 11 meeting/exceeding the standard on the DSTP Social Studies Assessment, Spring 2000 and 2001.

Grade/Group	Meeting/Exceeding Social Studies Standard				
	2000		2001		+/-
	#	% **	#	% **	
8 LEP	40	13%	86 (54%) *	16%	3%
8 non-LEP	7,991	41%	8,302	49%	8%
11 LEP	30	7%	42 (60%) *	7%	—
11 non-LEP	5,960	29%	6,003	33%	4%

* percent of LEP students tested at each grade level

** percent of LEP/non-LEP students meeting/exceeding the standards

Conclusions

The following section summarizes the findings related to each of the seven questions that structured the report.

Question 1. Was there a change in the reported number of LEP students being served by Delaware school districts and counties, from 1999–2000 to 2000–2001?

In the Spring of 2001, Delaware school districts reported 2,371 LEP students enrolled and being served, an increase of 87 students from the previous year, or .1%, from 2.0% to 2.1%.

- **New Castle County**, the state's largest county, reported 1,434 LEP students, a decrease of 43 LEP students, or -.1%; four of six districts had large changes in their LEP populations, Brandywine had an increase of +91 LEP students, Christina had a decrease of -74 LEP students, Colonial had an increase of +103 LEP students, and Red Clay had a decrease of -172 LEP students.
- **Kent County**, with about one-fifth of the state's enrollment, reported 298 LEP students, an increase of 23 LEP students, or +.1%; district changes in this county ranged from +26 LEP students in Milford School District to -14 LEP students in Caesar Rodney School District.
- **Sussex County**, with about one-fifth of the state's enrollment, reported 639 LEP students, an increase of 107 students, or +.4%; district changes in this county ranged from +74 LEP students in Indian River School District to -28 LEP students in Woodbridge School District.

Question 2. What are the characteristics of the LEP students being served in Delaware school districts (i.e., grade levels, languages spoken) and how do they compare to the previous year?

In 2000–2001, the grade levels with the greatest number of LEP students were kindergarten (345 students), grade 1 (336 students), grade 2 (259 students), and grade 3 (226 students). The grade levels with the fewest LEP students were pre-kindergarten (4 LEP students), grade 12 (54 LEP students), and grade 11 (70 LEP students). There was an increase in the number of LEP students at ten grade levels; grade level changes ranged from +26 LEP students at grade 8, to -26 LEP students at grade 9.

Districts reported their LEP students spoke 54 different languages; 20 languages were each spoken by four or more students, and 34 languages were each spoken by from one to three students. Spanish was the most frequently reported language (spoken by 72.3% of LEP students), followed by Creole (spoken by 7.3% of LEP students), Korean (spoken by 3.3% of LEP students), and Chinese (spoken by 2.7% of LEP students).

Question 3. What type of instruction did LEP students receive: i.e., did it incorporate students' native language?

The districts reported that 70% of their LEP students received ESL instruction, 21% received bilingual instruction, 7% received dual instruction, and 3% received regular classroom instruction. Compared to the previous year, the percent of LEP students receiving instruction that incorporated their native language (i.e., bilingual and dual language) doubled, from 14% to 28%. With the exception of grade 1, there were increases at every grade level in the percent of LEP students receiving instruction that incorporated students' native language, with the largest increase at grade 6 (+43 students or 28%).

Question 4. Was there a change in the reported number of LEP students being reclassified as non-LEP during the 2000–2001 school year, when compared to the previous school year?

Overall, 110 LEP students, or 4% of the LEP population, were reclassified as non-LEP during the 2000–2001 school year, 131 fewer reclassifications or 7% fewer than the previous year; grade 1 had the largest number of LEP students reclassified (37 students or 10%), followed by kindergarten (22 students or 6%). With the exception of pre-kindergarten, which had a 13% increase, districts reported that all grades had decreases in the number of LEP students reclassified as non-LEP, ranging from –2% (grades 1, 3, and 12) to -17% (grade 6). The most frequently used methods for reclassification reported by school districts were Language Assessment Scales (76%), followed by student records (32%), student grades (25%), teacher observation (25%), and informal assessment (21%).

Question 5. Did the school districts have and use ESL and/or bilingual certified teachers to instruct LEP students?

In the 2000-2001 school year, there were 39 ESL certified teachers and 31 bilingual certified teachers in Delaware districts, 61 of whom were assigned to teach LEP students; 9 of whom were not assigned to teach LEP students. There was wide variability in the ratio of certified ESL/bilingual teacher to LEP student, ranging from 1 certified teacher to 16 LEP students in the Caesar Rodney School District, to 1 certified teacher to 295 LEP students in the Colonial School District.

- **New Castle County**, the state's largest county, reported 48 ESL/bilingual teachers, 44 of whom were assigned to teach LEP students; most of these teachers were in the Red Clay (23 teachers) and Christina (12 teachers) School Districts.

- **Kent County**, with about one-fifth of the state's enrollment, reported 11 ESL/bilingual teachers, 8 of whom were assigned to teach LEP students; most of these teachers were in the Milford (4 teachers) and Caesar Rodney (3 teachers) School Districts.
- **Sussex County**, with about one-fifth of the state's enrollment, also reported 11 ESL/bilingual teachers, 9 of whom were assigned to teach LEP students; most of these teachers were in the Indian River School District (5 teachers).

Question 6. Were teachers provided with in-service or pre-service training specific to ESL or bilingual education?

Districts reported that 314 teachers participated in in-service or pre-service training related to ESL or bilingual instruction during the 2000-2001 school year. In most cases the number of teachers provided with training was not directly related to the number of LEP students enrolled; for example, four districts that did not provide teachers with any ESL/bilingual training reported serving from 2 to 345 LEP students, and two districts that trained 11 or 12 teachers reported serving 32 and 355 LEP students, respectively.

Question 7. To what extent do LEP students meet or exceed the standards on the DSTP assessments?

In the Spring of 2001, from 37% (for grade 5 reading) to 70% (for grade 11 science) of LEP students were administered the various DSTP Assessments. The percent of LEP students meeting or exceeding the standard for the assessments ranged from 15% (for 3rd grade reading) to 45% (for 5th grade reading) lower than the percent for non-LEP students. Specifically:

- The percent of LEP students meeting or exceeding the **reading** standard ranged from 20%, for grade 10, to 38%, for grade 3.
- The percent of LEP students meeting or exceeding the **writing** standard ranged from 16%, for grade 10, to 30%, for grade 8.
- The percent of LEP students meeting or exceeding the **math** standard ranged from 17%, for grade 10, to 39%, for grade 3.
- The percent of LEP students meeting or exceeding the **science** standard was 9% for both grade 8 and grade 11.
- The percent of LEP students meeting or exceeding the **social studies** standard was 7% for grade 11, and 16% for grade 8.

General Implications

Some general implications and recommendations based on the findings and conclusions are presented below.

The enrollment of limited and non-English proficient students in Delaware school districts is slowly increasing with increases distributed across grade levels. The data summarized in this report suggest that, while steps are being taken to address these students' language needs, districts need to evaluate whether their programs are improving English proficiency and are based on research and best practice.

During the 2000–2001 school year, the Delaware school districts made progress in improving the education and educational programs for LEP/NEP students. First, in response to a recommendation in the 1999–2000 evaluation, the Delaware Department of Education standardized the procedure and format for districts to use to enter data on language minority students into the Delaware Student Information System. As a result, the 2001 data was more accurate and consistent. Second, the percent of students receiving instruction incorporating their native language doubled, from 14% in 1999–2000 to 28% in 2000–2001. Third, although there is wide variability between districts, increasing numbers of teachers are being provided with in-service or pre-service training specific to ESL or bilingual education.

At the same time there are findings which cause concern, particularly those related to student outcomes. First, disaggregated DSTP data show a wide gap between the performance of LEP and non-LEP students. In addition, few LEP students are meeting or exceeding state performance standards in academic areas. Second, there was a decrease in the number of students reclassified as non-LEP; 4% were reclassified in 2000–2001 in contrast to 11% reclassified in 1999–2000. And third, the data show wide variability between districts, e.g., in the ratio of certified ESL/bilingual teacher to LEP student, in the number of certified assigned ESL/bilingual teachers, and in the provision of in-service or pre-service training specific to ESL or bilingual education.

Recommendations:

- The number of certified ESL/bilingual teachers in Delaware districts should be increased in order to lower the ratio between LEP student and assigned certified teachers. This is especially true in several districts who have large numbers of LEP students. Currently, the number of certified ESL/bilingual teachers in the districts is not directly related to the number of LEP students.
- The amount of teacher training specific to ESL or bilingual education should be increased, particularly in districts with a large LEP students population. The quality of the staff development should also be addressed. Staff development should take into account the most frequently spoken languages and cultures (i.e., Spanish), and the grade levels with the highest number of LEP students enrolled (i.e., grades K–3).

- LEP students should be provided with other services in order to better meet the needs of these students. The data show that only a small percent of LEP students participated in Extra Time (14%) or Title I programs (11%). In addition, districts reported that 73% of the LEP population was not provided with any of the additional instructional support services.
- While many LEP students are participating in compensatory programs, an inquiry should be made to determine if their participation in Title I, Extra Time, and Special Education is adequate. This is especially true for grades 1 – 5 where most of the students fail to meet or exceed state standards.
- ESL and bilingual/dual language programs need to be annually evaluated by the district. This needs to be included in the annual evaluation of the programs in the Consolidated Application that is sent to the Delaware Department of Education in January.
- The webpage was improved, as recommended in last year's annual report. The Department of Education should continue to improve and expand the data collection process in order to improve reliability and validity of the data and for improvement of the reporting to districts, schools, and the community.
- Districts and schools need to explore and implement effective strategies for instructing LEP students in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics.

References

Delaware Department of Education. (2000). Annual Report of Delaware's Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students, Staff, and Programs. (Document No. 95-01/01/04/09). Dover, DE: Delaware Department of Education.

Delaware State Board of Education & Department of Education. (1999). A Study of Programs and Demographics for students of Limited English Proficiency in Delaware Schools. (Document No. 95-01/99/09/01). Dover, DE: Delaware Department of Education.

Appendix

Languages Spoken by LEP students, 2000–2001

Afrikaans	Loma
Akan	Mandarin
Albanian	Mandinka
Amharic	Manya
Arabic	Marathi
Bengali	Mende
Bulgarian	Panjabi
Cambodian	Pashto
Cantonese	Polish
Chinese	Portuguese
Creole	Punjabi
Dutch	Romanian
Farsi	Russian
French	Serbo-Croatian
French/Fulani	Spanish
German	Swahili
Greek	Tagalog
Gujarati	Tamil
Gujarathi	Telugu
Haitian Creole	Thai
Hindi	Tigrina
Indonesian	Turkish
Italian	Twi
Japanese	Ukrainian
Konkani	Urdu
Korean	Vai
Kran	Vietnamese