

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



Delaware Department of Education

2001 - 2002

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*

Mary B. Graham, Esquire

Valarie Pepper

Dennis J. Savage

Claibourne D. Smith, Ph.D.

Valerie A. Woodruff, *Executive Secretary*

Doc. No. 95-01/03/06/01

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

2001 - 2002

**This report was prepared by Francine Simmons Beyer, Consultant
with the assistance of Ted Jarrell and Margaret Loveland in the
School Improvement 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**

**Ted Jarrell, Education Specialist
Data Support
School Improvement Group
Department of Education
P.O. Box 1402
Dover, DE 19903-1402
(302) 739-2767**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Background	1-2
Data Sources, Purpose, Design, and Guiding Questions	2-4
The 2001-2002 Delaware Student Population	5
Findings	6-24
Conclusions	25-28
General Implications	28-29
References	30
Appendix	31

Introduction

This report presents information on limited English proficient (LEP) students, staff, and programs in Delaware schools during the 2001-2002 school year. LEP students are identified through a home language survey and an English proficiency assessment. The focus of this report is on data that is entered into the Delaware Department of Education (DOE) LMS/LEP webpage in the Delaware Student Information System (DELSIS).

The following section of the report provides some background information, and is followed by the data sources, purpose, design, and guiding questions that structure the report. Later sections of the report describe the Delaware student population, findings, conclusions, and some general implications based on these findings and conclusions.

Background

An LEP student, as defined by the U. S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for LEP Students is:

A. An individual who:

1) 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

2) is a Native American or Alaskan Native or who 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

3) 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. An individual who:

1) 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.

The number of students from non-English language backgrounds is a rapidly growing segment of the United States K-12 student population. These linguistically and

culturally diverse students, also 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. In order to determine if this challenge is being met, it is necessary that these LEP students fully participate in local and state accountability systems. The information provided will then reflect on both the school system and the students.

The Delaware State Department of Education has a statewide policy for the education of students from non-English language backgrounds. Since 2000-2001, districts and charter schools enter data on LEP students into the state database, DELSIS. The major findings were that the LEP student population was slowly increasing in Delaware school districts; the percent of students receiving instruction incorporating their native language doubled; and more teachers were being provided with in-service training related to ESL or bilingual education. At the same time, there was wide variability among districts in the number of ESL/bilingual certified staff and in the amount of training they received. Student outcomes were less positive. In 2000-2001, the percent of students reclassified as fully English proficient (FEP) decreased, when compared to the previous year, and few LEP students were meeting or exceeding state performance standards in major academic areas (Delaware Department of Education, 2002).

This report documents Delaware school districts' LEP students, programs, and staff during the 2001-2002 school year. It also includes a brief summary of performance on the Delaware Student Testing Program (DSTP) for LEP students.

Data Sources, Purpose, Design, and Guiding Questions

A brief description of the data sources, purpose, design, and guiding questions that structure the report follows.

Data Sources

The data collected on language minority students, as well as teachers providing ESL and bilingual instruction, are based on seven areas: 1) student background, 2) type of instruction, 3) other services received, 4) entry Language Assessment Scales (LAS) results', 5) LAS annual test data, 6) English proficiency level, and 7) reclassification information. These data are to be entered electronically either directly into DELSIS, or through the Data Service Center (DSC) for the four districts in New Castle County. Electronic updates are to be provided throughout the school year as changes occur. For the 2001-2002 school year, data were submitted by all 19 school districts. Charter Schools did not report any LEP students. Descriptive data regarding LEP students (see Guiding Questions 1-3 below) and the students' progression to full English proficiency

(see Guiding Question 6 below) are based on a snapshot of all LEP students enrolled as of April 30, 2002.

The data regarding teacher qualifications are entered directly into DELSIS by each district and represent an annual summary of teacher qualifications and training (see Guiding Questions 4 and 5 below).

DSTP data (see Guiding Question 7 below) reflect the performance of LEP students present at the times of DSTP test administration (Reading, Writing, and Mathematics in March 2002 – Grades 3, 5, 8, and 10; Science and Social Studies in May 2002 – Grades 8 and 11; Science and Social Studies in October 2002 – Grades 4 and 6).

Finally, summary enrollment data shown on page 5 reflects the September 30, 2001 enrollment count.

Purpose

The purpose of this annual report of LEP, which includes NEP (non English proficient) students, staff, and programs, is threefold. First, documentation, analysis, 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.

Design

The data were summarized to describe LEP students, staff, and education both within Delaware school districts, counties, and statewide. In addition, the results of the Delaware Student Testing Program (DSTP) were examined to compare academic outcomes of LEP and non-LEP students.

Consistent with the state's emphasis on meeting state standards, the DSTP data are reported here as performance levels, which tell how well students are performing relative to the state's content standards in that subject area. 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. DSTP scores are aggregated statewide rather than by district as, in most cases, the LEP district groups tested were below the minimum N of 15 for reporting.

Guiding Questions

A number of guiding questions were used to structure the report; five of these questions were descriptive and two addressed LEP student outcomes.

Descriptive Questions

Questions one and two address the LEP student population.

1. Was there a change in the reported number of LEP/NEP students being served by Delaware school districts and counties, from 2000-2001 to 2001-2002?
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 and five address teacher qualifications.

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

Outcome Questions

Question six addresses LEP student reclassification.

6. Was there a change in the reported number of LEP students being reclassified as FEP during the 2001-2002 school year, when compared to the previous school year?

Question seven addresses LEP student academic performance.

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

The 2001-2002 Delaware Student Population

The following section of the report disaggregates Delaware student enrollment by grade, by county, and by race/ethnicity. These numbers are as reported on September 30, 2001. They are included here for reference as they are used in comparisons in later sections of the report.

The Delaware student enrollment, including both regular and special education students, for 2001-2002, was as follows:

<u>Grades</u>	<u>% of Enrollment</u>	<u>No. of students</u>
Pre-K & K	7.5%	8,651
1-3	23.9%	27,475
4-8	39.8%	45,848
9-12	28.8%	33,129
TOTAL	100.0%	115,103

The Delaware student enrollment, by county, for 2001-2002, was as follows:

<u>County</u>	<u>No. Of Districts</u>	<u>% of Enrollment</u>	<u>No. of Students</u>
New Castle	6	57.1%	65,710
Kent	6	21.4%	24,598
Sussex	7	18.5%	21,272
Charter	4	3.1%	3,523
TOTAL	23	100.1%	115,103

The Delaware student enrollment, by race/ethnicity, for 2001-2002, was as follows:

<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>	<u>% of Students</u>	<u>No. of Students</u>
American Indian	0.3%	324
Asian American	2.5%	2,911
Hispanic	6.7%	7,710
African American	31.2%	35,955
Caucasian	59.3%	68,203
TOTAL	100.0%	115,103

Findings

The findings presented in this section relate to each of the seven guiding questions previously cited.

Question 1: Was there a change in the reported number of LEP/NEP students being served by Delaware school districts and counties, from 2000-2001 to 2001-2002?

Table 1 presents the reported number of LEP/NEP students enrolled during the 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 school years, LEP students as a percent of total enrollment, and the number and percent change in the number of LEP students from year-to-year. As indicated in the table:

- There were 2,978 LEP/NEP students reported being enrolled and served in Delaware school districts in 2001-2002. Almost two-thirds were LEP and one-third was NEP.
- In 2001-2002, the increase in the number of NEP students was more than twice the increase in the number of LEP students (416 vs. 191).
- Overall, there was a 25.6% increase, from 2000-2001 to 2001-2002, in the number of LEP/NEP students reported enrolled and served by Delaware school districts.

Table 1. Reported number of LEP/NEP students enrolled in and served by Delaware districts- 2000-2001 and 2001-2002.

Students	2000-2001	2001-2002	Number and Percent Change +/-
NEP	610	1,026	+416 (68.2%)
LEP	1,761	1,952	+191 (18.0%)
Total LEP/NEP	2,371	2,978	+607 (25.6%)
% of Total Enrollment*	2.1%	2.6%	+0.5%

* based on 2000-2001 population of 114,520 and a 2001-2002 population of 115,103.

Table 2 presents a summary of the number of LEP/NEP students in 2000-2001 and 2001-2002, by district and county, along with the change from 2000-2001 to 2001-2002. As the table illustrates:

- In 2001-2002, New Castle County, with 57% of the state's enrollment, reported 2,090 LEP/NEP students, an increase of 45.7% from 2000-2001. All six districts reported increases in the number of LEP students. District increases in New Castle County ranged from +278 LEP students in Christina School District to +1 LEP student in Appoquinimink School District.

- In 2001-2002, Kent County, with 21% of the state's enrollment, reported 352 LEP/NEP students, an increase of 18.1% from 2000-2001. Three out of six districts reported increases in the number of LEP students, two districts reported a decrease, and one district reported no change. District changes in Kent County ranged from +31 LEP students in Milford School District to -15 LEP students in Lake Forest School District.
- In 2001-2002, Sussex County, with approximately 18% of the state's enrollment, reported 536 LEP/NEP students, a decrease of -16.1% from 2000-2001. One out of seven districts reported an increase in the number of LEP students, four districts reported a decrease, and two districts reported no change. District changes in Sussex County ranged from +8 LEP students in Cape Henlopen School District to -96 LEP students in Indian River School District.

Table 2. LEP students, by District and County- 2000-2001 and 2001-2002.

District	No. of LEP/NEP students		Number and Percent Change +/-
	2000-2001	2001-2002	
New Castle County			
Appoquinimink	33	34	+1 (3.0%)
Brandywine	248	280	+32 (12.9%)
Christina	345	623	+278 (80.6%)
Colonial	295	387	+92 (31.2%)
NCC VoTech	2	10	+8 (400.0%)
Red Clay	511	756	+245 (47.9%)
Total New Castle County	1,434	2,090	+656 (45.7%)
% of Total Enrollment*	2.1%*	3.2%*	+1.1%

Table 2 (continued). LEP students by District and County- 2000-2001 and 2001-2002.

District	No. of LEP/NEP students		Number and Percent Change +/-
	2000-2001	2001-2002	
Kent County			
Caesar Rodney	32	28	-4 (-12.5%)
Capital	88	116	+28 (31.8%)
Polytech	0	0	--
Lake Forest	30	15	-15 (-50.0%)
Milford	129	160	+31 (24.0%)
Smyrna	19	33	+14 (73.7%)
Total Kent County	298	352	+54 (18.1%)
% of Total Enrollment*	1.2%*	1.4%*	+0.2%
Sussex County			
Cape Henlopen	54	62	+8 (14.8%)
Delmar	11	11	0 (0.0%)
Indian River	355	259	-96 (-27.0%)
Laurel	42	40	-2 (-4.8%)
Seaford	113	108	-5 (-4.4%)
Sussex Tech	0	0	--
Woodbridge	64	56	-8 (-12.5%)
Total Sussex County	639	536	-103 (-16.1%)
% of Total Enrollment*	2.9%*	2.5%*	-0.4%
TOTAL STATE	2,371	2,978	+607 (25.6%)
% of Total Enrollment	2.1%**	2.6%***	+0.5%

* % of the county's school population ** based on a student population of 114,520

*** based on a student population of 115,103

Table 3 summarizes each county's percent of Delaware's total LEP population, for 2000-2001 and 2001-2002, as well as the change from year-to-year.

As shown in Table 3:

- New Castle County, with 70% of the state’s LEP population, had an increase of 656 LEP students or 45.7%.
- Kent County, with 12% of the state’s LEP population, had an increase of 54 LEP students or 18.1%.
- Sussex County, with 18% of the state’s LEP population, had a decrease of 103 LEP students or -16.1%.

Table 3. Distribution of LEP/NEP students across counties 2000-2001 and 2001-2002.

County	No. (%) of LEP/NEP students		Number and Percent Change +/-
	2000-2001	2001-2002	
New Castle County	1,434 (60%)	2,090 (70%)	+656 (45.7%)
Kent County	298 (13%)	352 (12%)	+54 (18.1%)
Sussex County	639 (27%)	536 (18%)	-103 (-16.1%)
TOTAL	2,371 (100%)	2,978 (100%)	

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?

Tables 4 and 5 present summaries of the characteristics of the LEP students reported being served in 2000-2001 and 2001-2002, along with changes from year-to-year.

The data in Table 4 on the grade levels of the LEP students show:

- In 2001-2002, the largest number of LEP students reported were enrolled in kindergarten (448 students), followed by grade 1 (382 students), grade 2 (348 students), and grade 3 (278 students). This pattern was the same as that of the previous year.
- In 2001-2002, pre-kindergarten reported the smallest number of LEP students (5 LEP students), followed by grade 12 (74 LEP students), and grade 11 (108 LEP students). This pattern was the same as that of the previous year.

The increase of 607 LEP students from 2000-2001 to 2001-2002 was distributed across all grades, from +103 LEP students for kindergarten, to +1 LEP student for both grade 5 and pre-Kindergarten. After kindergarten, grade levels with the largest increase were grade 9 (97 LEP students) and grade 2 (89 LEP students).

Table 4. Number of LEP students by grade 2000-2001 and 2001-2002.

Grade	No. of LEP students		Change +/-
	2000-2001	2001-2002	
Pre-K	4	5	+1
K	345	448	+103
1	336	382	+46
2	259	348	+89
3	226	278	+52
4	188	235	+47
5	183	184	+1
6	145	195	+50
7	150	187	+37
8	158	168	+10
9	133	230	+97
10	120	136	+16
11	70	108	+38
12	54	74	+20
TOTAL	2,371	2,978	+607

Table 5 summarizes the reported frequency of the various languages spoken by LEP students. Percents are listed in parentheses for each language spoken by five or more students. Languages spoken by from one to four students are included in the "other" category (see Appendix for a list of all languages spoken by LEP students).

As shown in Table 5:

- 61 different languages were reported to be spoken by Delaware's LEP students.
- 2,178 LEP students (73%) reported Spanish to be their primary language, followed by Creole (183 students or 6%), Chinese (99 students or 3%), and Korean (81 students or 3%).
- 9 different languages were reported spoken by 17 to 43 LEP students (@1%); 10 different languages were reported spoken by 6 to 13 LEP students (<1%); 38 different languages were reported spoken by 1 to 4 students. Three LEP students did not report a language.

Table 5. Frequency of reported languages spoken by LEP students- 2001-2002.

Number of LEP students (%)	Languages spoken by 5 or more LEP students	Number of LEP students (%)	Languages spoken by 5 or more LEP students
2,178 (73%)	Spanish	17 (1%)	Bengali
183 (6%)	Creole	13 (<1.0%)	Panjabi
99 (3%)	Chinese	13 (<1.0%)	Swahili
81 (3%)	Korean	12 (<1.0%)	Pashto
43 (1%)	Arabic	11 (<1.0%)	Tagalog
43 (1%)	Gujarati	10 (<1.0%)	Farsi
38 (1%)	Turkish	8 (<1.0%)	Cantonese
34 (1%)	French	8 (<1.0%)	Telugu
26 (1%)	Urdu	7 (<1.0%)	Afrikaans
26 (1%)	Vietnamese	7 (<1.0%)	Akan
21 (1%)	Hindi	6 (<1.0%)	Serbo-Croatian
21 (1%)	Russian		

38 other languages were spoken by from 1 to 4 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 LEP students; 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 (RCI). District responses are presented in tables 6 and 7.

Table 6 summarizes the number and percent of LEP students receiving the four types of instruction in 2000-2001 and 2001-2002, and the change from year-to-year. As the table shows:

- In 2001-2002, most LEP students (60%) were provided with ESL instruction, although there was a 10% decrease from 2000-2001.
- In 2001-2002, 21% continued to be provided with bilingual instruction. Approximately 12% of LEP students received regular classroom instruction (an increase of 9%). Approximately 8% of LEP students were provided with dual language instruction (an increase of 1%).

- Data on type of instruction were not provided for two LEP students.

Table 6. Types of instruction provided to LEP students- 2000-2001 and 2001-2002.

Type of LEP instruction	No. of LEP students		% of LEP students*		Change +/-
	00-01	01-02	00-01	01-02	
ESL	1,648	1,784	70%	60%	- 10%
Bilingual	487	613	21%	21%	0
Regular Class (RCI)	62	347	3%	12%	+9%
Dual Language	163	232	7%	8%	+1%
Not reported	11	2	<1%	<1%	-
Total	2,371	2,978	101%	101%	

* percents are rounded and approximate

Table 7 compares the number and percent of LEP students at each grade level receiving instruction that incorporated their native language (i.e., bilingual instruction or dual language instruction). For comparison purposes, the table includes 2000-2001 data, as well as the change from year-to-year. As indicated in the table:

- The percent of LEP students receiving instruction incorporating their native language was approximately the same as the previous year (28%). The number of LEP students receiving instruction incorporating their native language increased from 650 students in 2000-2001 to 845 students in 2001-2002.
- There were increases at six grade levels in the percent of LEP students receiving instruction incorporating their native language, grades 3 (+10%), 10 (+9%), 7 (+8%), 9 (+7%), Kindergarten (+6%), and grade 11 (+1%). The increase in the number of LEP students receiving this type of instruction ranged from +53 Kindergarten students to +3 LEP students at grade 12.
- Five grade levels showed decreases in the percent of LEP students receiving instruction incorporating their native language, grades 4 (- 11%), 6 and 8 (- 4%), and 5 and 2 (- 3%). Pre-K, grade 1, and grade 12 all showed no change.
- In 2001-2002, the grade levels with the highest percent of LEP students receiving instruction incorporating their native language were: grades 6 and 3 (both 37%), Kindergarten and grade 5 (33%), grade 1 (32%), and grade 2 (31%). Others ranged from 25% (grades 4 and 7) to 15% (grade 12).

Table 7. Instruction provided to LEP students that incorporates students' native language by grade 2000-2001 and 2001-2002.

Grade	LEP students whose instruction incorporates native language*		Change +/-
	2000-2001	2001-2002	
PK	0 (-)	0 (-)	-
K	93 (27%)**	146 (33%)	+53 (+6%)
1	108 (32%)	123 (32%)	+15 (0)
2	89 (34%)	108 (31%)	+19 (- 3%)
3	60 (27%)	102 (37%)	+42 (+10%)
4	67 (36%)	58 (25%)	- 9 (- 11%)
5	66 (36%)	60 (33%)	- 6 (- 3%)
6	59 (41%)	73 (37%)	+14 (- 4%)
7	25 (17%)	46 (25%)	+21 (+8%)
8	32 (20%)	26 (16%)	- 6 (- 4%)
9	14 (11%)	42 (18%)	+28 (+7%)
10	18 (15%)	32 (24%)	+14 (+9%)
11	11 (16%)	18 (17%)	+7 (+1%)
12	8 (15%)	11 (15%)	+ 3 (0)
TOTAL	650 (28%)	845 (28%)	+195 (0)

* includes bilingual instruction and dual language instruction

** percents are rounded and approximate; based on grade-level LEP enrollments

The districts were asked if their LEP 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 8 summarizes district responses by grade level. As indicated in the table:

- Districts reported that 75% of LEP students were not provided with additional services.
- The most frequently reported additional instructional services provided to LEP students were Title I (10%), Extra Time (8%), and Special Education (7%).
- Few districts reported that LEP students were provided with "other" additional services (3%), Basic Skills (<1%), Home Bound services (<1%), or Alternative Placements (<1%).

Table 8. Services provided to LEP students- 2001-2002.

Grade	Title I	No. (%) of LEP students receiving additional services*						No additional services
		Extra Time	Special Ed	Basic Skills	Home Bound	Alternate Placement	Other	
Pre-K	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1
K	34	1	12	0	0	0	6	404
1	60	24	31	1	0	0	13	278
2	70	30	32	1	0	0	18	221
3	49	28	22	0	0	0	11	178
4	39	26	25	1	0	0	17	148
5	25	24	21	0	1	0	2	120
6	11	29	20	0	0	0	2	135
7	8	33	22	0	0	1	3	127
8	6	14	8	0	0	1	3	140
9	1	19	12	0	0	0	5	194
10	0	11	4	0	0	0	6	117
11	0	5	3	0	0	0	6	94
12	0	4	1	0	0	0	4	65
Total	303 (10%)**	248 (8%)	217 (7%)	3 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	2 (<1%)	96 (3%)	2222 (75%)

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

** based on a 2001-2002 LEP enrollment of 2,978

Question 4. Did the school districts assign ESL and/or bilingual certified teachers to instruct LEP students?

Table 9 presents data on ESL and bilingual certified teachers by district and county for the 2001-2002 school year. Included in the table are the number of certified ESL teachers assigned to teach LEP students, the number of certified bilingual teachers assigned to teach LEP students, the total number of certified teachers assigned to teach LEP students, the certified teacher/LEP student ratio for 2000-2001 and 2001-2002, and the change in the ratio from year-to-year. As shown in Table 9:

- Overall, Delaware districts reported 89 certified teachers assigned to LEP students, 56 were ESL certified, 33 were bilingual certified teachers.

- New Castle County, with 70% of the state’s LEP enrollment, reported the largest number of certified teachers assigned to LEP students (61), almost half were ESL certified (29) and the other half were bilingual certified (32). Most of these teachers were in Red Clay School District (22 teachers) and Christina School District (19 teachers).
- Kent County, with 12% of the state’s LEP enrollment, reported 9 certified teachers assigned to LEP students, all of whom were ESL certified. Most of these teachers were in the Caesar Rodney (4 teachers), Capital (2 teachers), and Milford (2 teachers) School Districts.
- Sussex County, with 18% of the state’s LEP enrollment, reported 19 certified teachers assigned to LEP students, 18 were ESL certified, and one teacher was bilingual certified. The majority of these teachers (13) were in the Indian River School District.
- There was wide variation in the ratio of certified teachers to LEP students across school districts, ranging from 1 certified teacher to 4 LEP students in the Appoquinimink School District, to 1 certified teacher to 108 LEP students in the Seaford District.
- Compared to the 2000-2001 school year, certified teacher/LEP student ratio was smaller in 2 out of 6 New Castle County districts, in 1 out of 6 Kent County districts, and in 5 out of 7 Sussex County districts. The ratio increased in 3 New Castle County districts and 3 Kent County districts. Each of the three counties had 1 district without certified staff assigned to the LEP population (NCC VoTech, Lake Forest, Delmar). Polytech and Sussex Tech did not report any LEP students.

Table 9. Number of certified ESL and bilingual teachers assigned to teach LEP students, and LEP student/certified teacher ratio by district and county- 2000-2001 & 2001-2002.

District	No. of LEP students	Certified teachers & LEP assigned			Certified teacher/LEP student ratio		Ratio change
		ESL	Bilingual	Total	00-01	01-02	
New Castle County							
Appoquinimink	34	2	6	8	1:17	1:4	smaller
Brandywine	280	3	0	3	1:83	1:93	larger
Christina	623	9	10	19	1:19	1:33	larger
Colonial	387	9	0	9	1:295	1:43	smaller
NCC VoTech	10	0	0	0	0:2	0:10	0
Red Clay	756	6	16	22	1:26	1:34	larger
Total New Castle Cty	2,090	29	32	61			

Table 9 (Continued). Number of certified ESL and bilingual teachers assigned to teach LEP students, and LEP student/certified teacher ratio by district and county- 2000-2001 & 2001-2002.

District	No. of LEP students	Certified teachers & LEP assigned			Certified teacher/ LEP student ratio		Ratio change
		ESL	Bilingual	Total	00-01	01-02	
Kent County							
Caesar Rodney	28	4	0	4	1:16	1:7	smaller
Capital	116	2	0	2	1:44	1:58	larger
Polytech	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
Lake Forest	15	0	0	0	1:30	0:15	0
Milford	160	2	0	2	1:65	1:80	larger
Smyrna	33	1	0	1	1:19	1:33	larger
Total Kent Cty	352	9	0	9			
Sussex County							
Cape Henlopen	62	1	1	2	1:54	1:31	smaller
Delmar	11	0	0	0	0:11	0:11	-
Indian River	259	13	0	13	1:71	1:20	smaller
Laurel	40	1	0	1	1:42	1:40	smaller
Seaford	108	1	0	1	1:113	1:108	smaller
Sussex Tech	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
Woodbridge	56	2	0	2	1:64	1:28	smaller
Total Sussex Cty	536	18	1	19			
TOTAL STATE	2978	56	33	89			

Question 5. 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 2001-2002 school year. District responses are summarized in Table 10. The number of LEP students in each district is included for reference. As shown in the table:

- Overall, in 2001-2002, 1,399 teachers participated in in-service or pre-service training specific to ESL or bilingual education, compared to only 314 teachers in 2000-2001. In 2001-2002, 1,085 additional teachers received training.

- Six districts trained over 100 teachers in ESL/bilingual-related content. Colonial trained 523 teachers, Christina trained 200 teachers, Red Clay trained 150 teachers, Milford trained 140 teachers, Brandywine trained 135 teachers, and Seaford trained 130 teachers.
- Laurel trained 71 teachers in ESL/bilingual-related content, Appoquinimink trained 30 teachers, and Indian River trained 13 teachers.
- Five districts trained 1 teacher in ESL/bilingual-related content: Capital, Cape Henlopen, Smyrna, Lake Forest, and Delmar. Woodbridge trained two teachers.
- Caesar Rodney and NCC VoTech did not provide any teacher training in ESL/bilingual related content.

Table 10. Number of teachers receiving ESL/bilingual in-service by district and number of LEP students -2001-2002.

District	No. of LEP students	No. of teachers receiving ESL/bilingual in-service*		
		00-01	01-02	+/-
Red Clay	756	35	150	+115
Christina	623	0	200	+200
Colonial	387	75	523	+448
Brandywine	280	100	135	+35
Indian River	259	12	13	+1
Milford	160	37	140	+103
Capital	116	0	1	+1
Seaford	108	2	130	+128
Cape Henlopen	62	32	1	- 31
Woodbridge	56	3	2	- 1
Laurel	40	1	71	+70
Appoquinimink	34	1	30	+29
Smyrna	33	1	1	0
Caesar Rodney	28	11	0	- 11
Lake Forest	15	4	1	- 3
Delmar	11	0	1	+1
NCC Vo-Tech	10	0	0	0
TOTAL	2,978	314	1,399	+1,085

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

Question 6. Was there a change in the reported number of LEP students being reclassified as FEP during the 2001-2002 school year, when compared to the previous school year?

Students were reclassified in the Fall of 2002 for the 2001-2002 school year. These responses are summarized by grade level in Table 11. As shown in the table:

- Overall, 184 LEP students were reclassified as FEP during the 2001-2002 school year, compared to 110 LEP students in 2000-2001.

- Overall, ten grades had increases in the number of LEP students reclassified as FEP, three grades had decreases (a decrease of 18 students reclassified in grade 1, two fewer students reclassified in grade 10, and one fewer Kindergarten student reclassified).
- In 2001-2002, grade 2 had the largest numbers of students reclassified (28 students), followed by grade 4 (26 students), grade 5 (23 students), Kindergarten (21 students), and grade 1 (19). In 2000-2001, grade 1 had the largest number of LEP students reclassified (37 students), followed by Kindergarten (22 students), and grade 3 (9 students).

Table 11. Number of LEP students reclassified as FEP during 2000-2001 and 2001-2002.

Grade	LEP students reclassified		Change +/-
	2000-2001	2001-2002	
K	22	21	- 1
1	37	19	- 18
2	6	28	22
3	9	18	9
4	8	26	18
5	8	23	15
6	4	12	8
7	3	8	5
8	2	8	6
9	1	5	4
10	5	3	- 2
11	4	8	4
12	1	5	4
TOTAL	110	184	+74

For those students reclassified, districts were asked to indicate which of nine reclassification methods were used: 1) A "Home Language Survey," which Delaware schools administer to parents of all new students to identify the language(s) spoken at home by both student and parents, 2) An English language proficiency assessment, the Language Assessment Scales (LAS), which assesses speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills), 3) student records, 4) student grades, 5) teacher interview, 6) teacher observation, 7) informal assessment, 8) parent information, and 9) referral.

The frequency that these reclassification methods were reported to be used for assessing LEP student readiness for mainstreaming, as well as the grade levels at which they were used, is summarized in Table 12. It should be noted that more than one method could be used in reclassifying a student. As the table shows:

- The Language Assessment Scales (LAS) was most frequently used in reclassifying LEP students (94% of reclassified students).
- The next most frequent methods used for reclassification of LEP students were: teacher observation (26%), student grades (20%), student records (13%), Home Language Survey (11%), and informal assessment (10%).
- The most infrequently used reclassification methods were: teacher interview (7%), parent information (4%), and referral (2%).
- A method was not identified for 6% of the reclassified students.

Table 12. Frequency of methods used to reclassify LEP students as FEP and grade levels- 2001-2002.

Method**	Used for Reclassification		
	Grade	Frequency	Percent*
Language Assessment Scales	K-12	173	94%
Teacher Observation	K-9, 11-12	48	26%
Student Grades	K-3, 5-12	36	20%
Student Records	2-12	24	13%
Home Language Survey	1-3, 5, 8-9, 11-12	20	11%
Informal Assessment	K-6, 9, 11-12	18	10%
Teacher Interview	1-4, 6-7, 10-11	13	7%
Parent Information	K-2, 5,	7	4%
Referral	1-2	4	2%
Not identified	K, 2, 4-5, 7-9, 12	11	6%
TOTAL RECLASSIFIED	K-12	184	100%

*based on 184 students reported as reclassified during the 2001-2002 school year

**multiple methods could be used to reclassify a student

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

The following three tables show the percent of LEP students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 meeting or exceeding the standard (PL3, PL4, and PL5) on the DSTP in reading (Table

13), math (Table 14), and writing (Table 15). Scores are aggregated statewide and are not presented by district as, in most cases, the LEP district groups tested were small, and numbers smaller than 15 are not reported to the public. For comparison, the tables also include scores for non-LEP students and for the Spring 2001 testing.

As shown in Table 13:

- In 2002 the percent of tested LEP students meeting/exceeding the reading standard decreased as grade level increased from 73% for grade 3 to 32% for grade 10.
- The percent of LEP students meeting/exceeding the reading standard were from 6% (grade 3) to 35% (grades 8 and 10), lower than the percents for non-LEP students.
- Compared to 2001, the percent of LEP students meeting/exceeding the reading standard increased for all four grade levels from +12% for grade 10 to +35% for grade 3. All four non-LEP groups had small increases, from +3% for grade 3 to +9% for grade 5.

Table 13. Percent of LEP/non-LEP students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 meeting/exceeding the standard on the DSTP Reading Assessment- Spring 2001 and 2002.

Grade/ Group	Meeting/Exceeding Reading Standards				
	2001		2002		+/-
	#	%	#	%	
3 LEP	102	38%	142	73%	35%
3 non-LEP	8,075	76%	8,223	79%	3%
5 LEP	68	24%	119	45%	21%
5 non-LEP	7,717	69%	8,127	78%	9%
8 LEP	78	24%	92	37%	13%
8 non-LEP	7,976	68%	8,675	72%	4%
10 LEP	49	20%	113	32%	12%
10 non-LEP	7,416	61%	7,760	67%	6%

Analysis of the DSTP math scores in Table 14 shows:

- In 2002, the percent of tested LEP students meeting/exceeding the math standard decreased as grade level increased, from 65% for grade 3 to 27% for grade 10.
- The percent of LEP students meeting/exceeding the math standard were from 7% (grade 3) to 24% (grade 5) lower than the percents for non-LEP students.
- Compared to 2001, the percent of LEP students meeting/exceeding the math standard increased for all four grade levels from +6% for grade 8 to +26% for grade 3. Three out of four non-LEP groups had increases, from +3 % for grade 5 to +6% for grade 10. Grade 3 had a -2% decrease.

Table 14. Percent 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 Standards				
	2001		2002		+/-
	#	%	#	%	
3 LEP	104	39%	144	65%	26%
3 non-LEP	8,199	74%	8,608	72%	- 2%
5 LEP	72	28%	144	44%	16%
5 non-LEP	7,832	65%	8,410	68%	3%
8 LEP	70	26%	95	32%	6%
8 non-LEP	7,819	43%	8,752	48%	5%
10 LEP	53	17%	113	27%	10%
10 non-LEP	7,258	37%	7,779	43%	6%

Analysis of the DSTP writing scores in Table 15 shows:

- In 2002, the percent of tested LEP students meeting/exceeding the writing standard decreased from grade 3 (40%) to grade 5 (30%), increased at grade 8 (53%), and decreased at grade 10 (30%).
- The percent of LEP students meeting/exceeding the writing standard were from 6% (grade 3) to 20% (grades 5 and 10) lower than the percents for non-LEP students.

- Compared to 2001, the percent of LEP students meeting/exceeding the writing standard increased for all four grade levels, from +5% for grade 5, to +23% for grade 8. Two non-LEP groups had increases, +13% for grade 3 and +4% for grade 8 and two had decreases, -1% for grade 5, and -7% for grade 10.

Table 15. Percent of LEP/non-LEP students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 meeting/exceeding the standard on the DSTP Writing Assessment-Spring 2001 and 2002.

Grade/ Group	Meeting/Exceeding Writing Standards				+/-
	2001		2002		
	#	%	#	%	
3 LEP	114	18%	154	40%	22%
3 non-LEP	8,585	33%	8,601	46%	13%
5 LEP	80	25%	125	30%	5%
5 non-LEP	8,343	51%	8,445	50%	- 1%
8 LEP	86	30%	94	53%	23%
8 non-LEP	8,481	68%	8,852	72%	4%
10 LEP	61	16%	115	30%	14%
10 non-LEP	7,866	57%	7,884	50%	- 7%

The following two tables present a statewide summary of the percent of LEP students in grades 4, 6, 8 and 11 meeting or exceeding the standard (PL3, PL4, and PL5) in science (Table 17) and social studies (Table 18). For comparison purposes, scores are included for non-LEP students and for the 2001 testing.

Analysis of the DSTP science scores in Table 17 shows:

- In 2002, among tested LEP students, 79% in grade 4, 39% in grade 6, 22% of in grade 8, and 23% in grade 11 met/ exceeded the science standard.
- The percent of LEP students meeting/exceeding the science standard was 19% lower than the percent for non-LEP students for grade 4, 35% lower for grade 6, 22% lower for grade 8 and 32% lower for grade 11.

Table 17. Percent of LEP students in grades 8 and 11 meeting/exceeding the standard on the DSTP Science Assessments, Spring (Grades 8 and 11) or Fall (Grades 4 and 6)- 2001 and 2002.

Grade/ Group	Meeting/Exceeding Science Standards				
	2001		2002		+/-
	#	%	#	%	
4 LEP	189	60%	239	79%	19%
4 non-LEP	8,616	87%	8,412	90%	3%
6 LEP	172	29%	204	39%	10%
6 non-LEP	8,718	71%	8,888	74%	3%
8 LEP	86	9%	90	22%	13%
8 non-LEP	8,320	44%	8,693	44%	0
11 LEP	46	9%	77	23%	14%
11 non-LEP	6,092	46%	6,421	55%	9%

Analysis of the DSTP social studies scores in Table 18 shows:

- In 2002, among tested LEP students, 37% in grade 4, 33% in grade 6, 25% of in grade 8, and 9% in grade 11 met/ exceeded the social studies standard.
- The percent of LEP students meeting/exceeding the social studies standard was 23% lower than the percent for non-LEP students for grade 4, 31% lower for grade 6, 23% lower for grade 8 and 35% lower for grade 11.

Table 18. Percent of LEP students in grades 8 and 11 meeting/exceeding the standard on the DSTP Social Studies Assessments, Spring (Grades 8 and 11) or Fall (Grades 4 and 6)- 2001 and 2002.

Grade/ Group	Meeting/Exceeding Social Studies Standards				
	2001		2002		+/-
	#	%	#	%	
4 LEP	187	30%	239	37%	7%
4 non-LEP	8,613	56%	8,408	60%	4%
6 LEP	172	16%	203	33%	17%
6 non-LEP	8,695	53%	8,885	64%	11%
8 LEP	86	16%	91	25%	9%
8 non-LEP	8,302	49%	8,672	48%	-1%
11 LEP	42	7%	75	9%	2%
11 non-LEP	6,003	33%	6,394	44%	11%

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 2000-2001 to 2001-2002?

In the Spring of 2001, Delaware school districts reported 2,978 LEP students enrolled and being served, an increase of 607 students, or 25.6% from the previous year.

- New Castle County, with more than half of the state's enrollment (57.1%), reported 2,090 LEP students or 70% of Delaware's LEP population, an increase of 656 LEP students (45.7%) from 2000-2001. All districts reported an increase, from 1 LEP student in Appoquinimink to 278 LEP students in Christina.
- Kent County, with a little more than one-fifth of the state's enrollment (21.4%), reported 352 LEP students or 12% of Delaware's LEP population, an increase of 54 LEP students (18.1%) from 2000-2001. District changes in this county ranged from -15 LEP students in Lake Forest to +31 LEP students in Milford.
- Sussex County, with almost one-fifth of the state's enrollment (18.5%), reported 536 LEP students or 18% of Delaware's LEP population, a decrease of 103 students (-16.1%) from 2000-2001. District changes in this county ranged from 96 LEP students in Indian River School District to +8 LEP students in Cape Henlopen.

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 2001-2002, the grade levels with the largest number of LEP students enrolled were kindergarten (448 students), grade 1 (382 students), grade 2 (348 students), and grade 3 (278 students). The grade levels with the fewest LEP students enrolled were pre-kindergarten* (5 LEP students), grade 12 (74 LEP students), and grade 11 (108 LEP students). All grade levels had an increase in the number of LEP students, although the largest increases were for Kindergarten (+103 LEP students), grade 9 (+97 LEP students), and grade 2 (+89 LEP students).

Overall, 61 different languages were spoken by Delaware's LEP students. Districts reported the majority of LEP students spoke Spanish (73% or 2,178 students), followed by Creole (6% or 183 students), Chinese (3% or 99 students), and Korean (3% or 81 students). Nineteen different languages were spoken by 6 to 43 LEP students, 38 languages were spoken by from 1 to 4 LEP students.

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

Although districts reported that the majority of LEP students were being provided with ESL instruction (60%), this was a 10% decrease from the previous year. The percent of LEP students receiving instruction that incorporated their native language (bilingual and dual language instruction) was approximately the same as the previous year (i.e., 28%). The grade levels with the highest percent of LEP students receiving instruction incorporating their native language were, grades 6 and 3 (both 37%), Kindergarten and grade 5 (both 33%), grade 1 (32%), and grade 2 (31%). The percent of LEP students provided with regular class instruction increased from 3% to 12%.

Services that were provided to LEP students included, Title I (10%), Extra Time (8%), and Special Education (7%). Few LEP students received "other" non-specified services (3%), Basic Skills (<1%), Home Bound services (<1%), or Alternative Placements (<1%).

Question 4. Did the school districts assign ESL and/or bilingual certified teachers to instruct LEP students?

In the 2001-2002 school year, districts reported 89 ESL and/or bilingual certified teachers 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 4 LEP students in the Appoquinimink School District, to 1 certified teacher to 108 LEP students in the Seaford School District. However, compared to the previous year, eight districts had smaller LEP certified teacher/student ratios, six districts had larger ratios.

- New Castle County, with 70% of Delaware's LEP enrollment reported 61 assigned ESL/bilingual teachers. Most of these teachers were in the Red Clay (22 teachers) and Christina (19 teachers) School Districts.
- Kent County, with 12% of Delaware's LEP enrollment, reported 9 assigned ESL/bilingual teachers. Most of these teachers were in the Caesar Rodney (4 teachers), Capital (2 teachers), and Milford (2 teachers) School Districts.
- Sussex County, with 18% of Delaware's LEP enrollment, reported 19 assigned ESL/bilingual teachers. Most of these teachers were in the Indian River School District (13 teachers).

Question 5. Were teachers provided with in-service or pre-service training specific to ESL or bilingual education?

Districts reported a large increase in the number of teachers provided with in-service or pre-service training related to ESL or bilingual instruction during the 2001-2002 school year (1,399 teachers in 2001-2002, compared to 314 in 2000-2001). With two exceptions, the districts with the largest LEP student groups (over 100 LEP students) provided the largest number of teachers (over 100 teachers) with ESL/bilingual in-service training. The two exceptions were the Indian River School District, which reported 259 LEP students and trained 13 teachers, and the Capital School District, which reported 116 LEP students and trained 1 teacher.

Question 6. Was there a change in the reported number of LEP students being reclassified as non-LEP during the 2001-2002 school year, when compared to the previous school year?

Overall, 184 LEP students were reclassified as non-LEP during the 2001-2002 school year, 74 more reclassifications than in 2000-2001. The majority of these students were in Kindergarten through grade 5, ranging from 18 students in grade 3, to 28 students in grade 2. Compared to 2000-2001, with the exception of three grade levels, districts reported increases in the number of LEP students reclassified as non-LEP, ranging from +4 students in grades 9, 11, and 12, to +22 students in grade 2. The three grades with decreases were Kindergarten (-1 reclassification), grade 10 (-2 reclassifications), and grade 1 (-18 reclassifications).

The most frequently used methods for reclassification reported by school districts were the Language Assessment Scales (94% of reclassifications), followed by teacher observation (26%), and student grades (20%).

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

In the Spring of 2002, from 51% (grade 5, reading) to 85% (grade 10, writing) of LEP students participated in the DSTP Assessments. Comparisons with the performance of non-LEP students show that the percent of LEP students meeting or exceeding the various standards ranged from 6% (grade 3 reading, grade 3 writing) to 35% (grades 8 and 10 reading, grade 8 social studies) lower. Comparisons with the performance of LEP students in the Spring 2001 show all positive changes, ranging from +2% (grade 11 social studies) to +35% (grade 3 reading).

Specifically, 2002 LEP test data show:

- The percent of LEP students meeting or exceeding the reading standard decreased with grade level, from 73%, for grade 3, to 32%, for grade 10.

- The percent of LEP students meeting or exceeding the math standard decreased with grade level, from 65%, for grade 3, to 27%, for grade 10.
- The percent of LEP students meeting or exceeding the writing standard decreased from grade 3 (40%), to grade 5 (30%), increased for grade 8 (53%), and decreased for grade 10 (30%).
- The percent of LEP students meeting or exceeding the science standard was 22% for grade 8 and 23% for grade 11.
- The percent of LEP students meeting or exceeding the social studies standard was 25% for grade 8, and 9% for grade 11.

General Implications

Recommendations based on the findings and conclusions presented in this report are summarized below.

The number of students from non-English language backgrounds is continuing to increase in Delaware school districts. The total LEP/NEP population grew by 0.5%, or 607 students, from Spring 2001 to Spring 2002. This increase reflected more growth in the non-English proficient (NEP) student group than in the limited English proficient (LEP) group. The NEP student group grew from about one-quarter of the English language learners in 2001 to about one-third of the English language learners in 2002. The largest increases in the LEP/NEP student population were in New Castle County school districts, which enroll 70% of the state's LEP population, grew in Kindergarten, grade 9, and grade 2. However, Kent and Sussex Counties both had districts with increases in their LEP/NEP enrollments. Statewide there were increases in the number of LEP/NEP students at all grade levels.

In 2001-2002, Delaware made progress in addressing two major recommendations from the previous report (2002). First, the number of certified ESL/bilingual teachers in Delaware districts increased by 28, from 61 assigned teachers in 2000-2001 (2002), to 89 teachers in 2001-2002. Second, the number of teachers provided with in-service or pre-service training specific to ESL or bilingual education increased dramatically, from 314 teachers last year to 1,399 teachers in 2001-2002.

Other positive findings include: Increases in all grade levels and subjects tested in 2002 in the percent of LEP students meeting/exceeding performance standards. The number of LEP students reclassified as non-LEP increased from 110 in 2000-2001 to 184 in 2001-2002. The English proficiency assessment, the Language Assessment Scales, was used in 94% of reclassifications. And, although there was wide variation across districts, some districts provided increased numbers of LEP students with instruction which

incorporated their native language, and some districts lowered their certified teacher/LEP student ratio.

However, LEP academic performance is still cause for concern. First, in only three cases did more than half of LEP students tested meet or exceed the standard (73%, for grade 3 reading; 65% for grade 3 math; 53% for grade 8 writing). In many cases, the percent meeting/exceeding the standard was very small, e.g., for grade 10 reading (32%), math (27%), writing (30%); for grade 8 science (22%) and social studies (25%); and for grade 11 science (23%) and social studies (9%). Second, disaggregated DSTP data continue to show a wide gap between the performance of LEP and non-LEP students, and the gap increases with grade level.

Other findings also need to be addressed, including the lack of additional services provided to LEP students, and the large variability between districts. For example, one school district (Appoquinimink) reported 8 certified teachers and 34 LEP students, while another district (Seaford) reported 1 certified teacher and 108 LEP students. Another example is one school district (Colonial) with 387 LEP students providing ESL/bilingual-related in-service to 523 teachers, and another district (Capital) with 116 LEP students providing in-service training to 1 teacher.

Why are LEP students in Delaware performing on such low academic levels? The question is complex, yet the findings in this report lead to several recommendations to support LEP students to achieve high standards.

- In light of the increasing LEP population, the number of certified ESL/bilingual teachers in Delaware districts is insufficient. Although the number of teachers increased in 2001-2002, there are still districts with large LEP populations and few certified teachers.
- The amount of teacher training specific to ESL or bilingual education has greatly increased and should continue, particularly in districts with large LEP student populations. Based on the numbers of teachers provided with training, some districts have still not made LEP/bilingual related training a priority. Also, the specific content and quality of the staff development is unclear. Perhaps teachers could be asked for feedback on the training sessions or a needs assessment could be conducted.

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 Department of Education. (2002). Annual Report of Delaware's Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students, Staff, and Programs. (Document No. 95-01/02/04/02). 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-2001-2002

Afrikaans	Norwegian
Akan	Panjabi
Albanian	Pashto
Amharic	Philippine
Arabic	Polish
Bandi	Portuguese
Bengali	Romanian
Bulgarian	Russian
Burmese	Serbo-Croatian
Cantonese	Spanish
Chinese	Swahili
Creole	Swedish
Dutch	Tagalog
Farsi	Taiwanese
Fijian	Tamil
French	Telugu
German	Thai
Greek	Tigrigna
Gujarati	Turkish
Gujari	Twi
Hebrew	Ukranian
Hindi	Urdu
Ibu	Vai
Indonesian	Vietnamese
Italian	Yoruba
Japanese	
Khmer	
Konkani	
Korean	
Krahn	
Lithuanian	
Loma	
Mandinka	
Manya	
Marathi	
Mende	