A bilingual instructional model to teach limited English proficiency (LEP) students vocational skills was developed and implemented at Waubonsee Community College (Illinois). Bilingual vocational and vocational English as a second language (VESL) courses were developed and conducted in the areas of machine tools and secretarial science. A total of five one-semester vocational Machine Tool courses were offered, with 60 LEP students enrolled; and two one-semester vocational Secretarial Science courses were offered, enrolling 22 students. Related VESL courses were offered along with both subjects. In order to conduct the courses, instructional materials were developed by rewriting and adapting regular course materials, in the Machine Tool course; and finding texts and materials at the appropriate levels for the Secretarial Science course. Materials were field tested in two semesters of the courses and revised as needed. Translated materials for the bilingual model were developed as necessary from the revised English models. In addition, the project provided information and referral services and support services to the LEP students and provided inservice training for Waubonsee Community College staff. The project was found to be successful after its first fiscal year. Recommendations for implementing such a project were made. A plan for conducting both the developed bilingual instructional model and a core English language model in 1982 and comparing the effectiveness of the two models was presented. (KC)
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a. DAVTE Funding Agreement: R-32-21-J-2106-407

b. Official Project Title: A Plan to Develop and Compare Two Vocational Education Models For Limited English Proficiency Students

c. Project Director: Michael G. Kelly

d. Funded Agency: Waubonsee Community College
Route 47 at Harter Road
Sugar Grove, IL 60554
(312) 466-4811

e. Time Period: August 1, 1980, to June 30, 1981
Title of Project: A Plan to Develop and Compare Two Models of Vocational Training for Limited English Proficiency Students

Funding Agreement Number: R-32-21-J-2106-407

Principal Investigators: Michael G. Kelly, Patricia A. Menges, Kebir Marti-Lambert

Institution: Waubonsee Community College

Location: Route 47 at Harter Road
Sugar Grove, IL 60554

Time Period Covered: August 1, 1980 to June 30, 1981

Objectives of the Project:

I. To develop and implement a bilingual instructional model in vocational education for limited English proficiency (LEP) students.
II. To provide information and referral services and support services to a minimum of 80 LEP Students.
III. To provide in-service training for Waubonsee Community College staff and the community.
IV. To examine the strengths and weaknesses of the bilingual instructional model.
V. To develop English core language instructional materials for Machine Tool and Secretarial Science.
VI. To evaluate the program and its components.

Summary of the Final Report: The major accomplishments of the FY81 Waubonsee LEP Project lie in the areas of materials development and program development and implementation. These accomplishments, keyed to the six Project Objectives, are discussed in Part 2, the main body of the Final Report. Also presented in Part 2 are data on the LEP student population and an analysis of the problems encountered by the Project. Conclusions and recommendations are offered for other vocational programs serving LEP persons.

Parts 1 and 3 contain background information and appendices.

Expected Contribution or Potential Impact on Vocational Education: The information contained in this Final Report will assist local and state educational agencies and their staffs in planning and implementing vocational education programs for limited English proficiency students.

Products Delivered: Twelve copies of the FY81 Final Report: A Plan to Develop and Compare Two Models of Vocational Education for Limited English Proficiency Students, will be delivered to the Research and Development Section, Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, in October, 1981.
The Project expended $71,411 of the approved budget.
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<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved Budget</td>
<td>$75,993</td>
<td>$19,468</td>
<td>$95,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Expenditures</td>
<td>$71,411</td>
<td>$13,120</td>
<td>$84,531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The major accomplishments of the FY81 Waubonsee LEP Project lie in the areas of materials development and program development and implementation. These accomplishments, keyed to the six Project Objectives, are discussed in Part 2, the main body of the Final Report. Also presented in Part 2 are data on the LEP student population and an analysis of the problems encountered by the Project. Conclusions and recommendations are offered for other vocational programs serving LEP persons. Parts 1 and 3 contain background information and appendices.

The information contained in this Final Report will assist local and state educational agencies and their staffs in planning and implementing vocational education programs for limited English proficiency students.
Limited English proficiency (LEP) persons have the same urgent need and desire for vocational training as native English speakers. However, language and traditional instructional materials and delivery systems present major obstacles to LEP students' participation in vocational education programs. It is clear that traditional vocational education programs do not possess the expertise and resources to overcome these obstacles.

Central to the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Project is the belief that LEP students can succeed in vocational education, given the appropriate program and instructional materials. The Project's objectives reflect this belief, and the major accomplishments of the FY81 Project lie in the areas of materials development and program development and implementation.

During the FY80 Planning Grant, initial practical decisions vital to the research design and to the instructional models were made on the basis of budgetary concerns, community needs assessments done by El Centro Pan Americano, a resource assessment, and past experience. One of the major decisions was to implement a short term, part-time training program. The goal was and is to provide students with technical and language skills necessary for entry-level employment, job upgrading and/or further education and training. An outline of the FY81 program design is presented on the following page.
OBJECTIVE I. To develop and implement a bilingual instructional model in vocational education and enroll 48 LEP students for the Fall and Spring terms.

As planned and outlined in the FY81 proposal, the Project succeeded in implementing bilingual vocational and VESL courses in the areas of Machine Tool and Secretarial Science. The Project recruited and enrolled LEP students in Machine Tool Laboratory (TE 151 and 152) and Secretarial Science (SE 101), developed and field-tested instructional materials, completed the courses, and provided support services to those students and other LEP clients.

The Project met its enrollment goals for FY81. A total of five one-semester vocational Machine Tool courses (three day ones; two evening ones) were offered, together with their respective VESL courses, and 60 LEP students were enrolled. One of these courses was a Machine Tool Laboratory II course that was not part of the FY81 Proposal, but a necessary response to students' needs and to a request made by CETA. (See section o, Problems.) Two one-semester vocational Secretarial Science courses (evening) were offered together with their respective VESL courses, and 22 LEP students enrolled. A detailed breakdown of these data is presented in section r, Summations of Evaluation Data Collected.

In a comprehensive vocational education program for LEP students, the major factors in the implementation process are funding, staffing, scheduling, recruitment, student support services, and instructional materials. Each factor is connected to the other factors much like the links of a chain.

Funding

The funding level of the FY81 budget was adequate to meet the Project's fiscal needs. The monies in the FY80 Planning Grant provided the necessary staff and time to plan an effective FY81 budget and Project, although the late start of the Project Director (5/8/80) in FY80 and of the Curriculum Developer (9/2/80) in FY81 put curricula/materials development far behind schedule.
Staffing

Given the scope of the curriculum and materials development necessary for the successful implementation of the two instructional models, adequate funding for full-time staff was essential. The majority of the Project Director's time and 80% of the Curriculum Developer/Vocational English as a Second Language Instructor's time was spent developing instructional materials. Also, the majority of the Secretary's time was spent typing the various drafts of the materials.

Recruitment and Student Support Services are a vital component of both instructional models and have required the full-time services of the bilingual Information and Referral Person/Counselor.

Identifying qualified part-time bilingual vocational and VESL instructors was difficult; however, these difficulties did not prove insurmountable.

(See section 0, Problems.)

Scheduling

Despite the active support of the Dean of Social/Economic Sciences and Technologies, scheduling conflicts were unavoidable and could not be entirely resolved. (See section 0, Problems.) However, classroom facilities and times were secured.

Support Services/Recruitment

In FY81, the Project provided support services to over 340 participant LEP persons. Of these participants, the Information and Referral Person/Counselor counseled, assessed, and referred 137 to the LEP Project's vocational courses. (See OBJECTIVE II of this section for specific details.)

Instructional Materials

The previously mentioned factors are the foundation of a successful vocational program; however, in the classroom and shop/lab appropriate instructional materials and delivery systems are of paramount importance to the
success of LEP students and their instructors. Research and evaluation of existing vocational and vocational English as a second language (VESL) materials during FY80 and FY81 pointed out the lack of appropriate instructional materials for LEP students and the need for curriculum adaptation and for extensive materials development, especially Machine Tool materials.

The development of instructional materials has been a high priority of the Waubonsee LEP Project. The Project is based on the premise that LEP students can be taught the same vocational content and skills in the same amount of vocational class time as native English speakers, but that in order to accomplish this, vocational materials must be adapted in format and language, and corresponding Vocational ESL courses must be offered. The Project further has aimed at making the content covered in its courses parallel to that covered in existing courses at the College for two reasons:

- the LEP courses should be able to continue after the special Project terminates, and they should be as economical as possible. When the LEP Project's courses parallel existing ones, their students are enrolling in regular college credit courses and the institution can utilize other reimbursements and funding resources, to pay the instructors.

In making its vocational course content parallel that of existing courses at the College, the LEP Project followed different approaches to curriculum and materials development in each of its two vocational areas.

For the Project's Secretarial Science program, curriculum adaption proved to be a greater need than materials development. In FY81 the Project began by matching its Secretarial Science vocational curriculum to the existing college curriculum for SE 101, Beginning Typing. However, it became apparent after field-testing, evaluation, and various consultations, that the curriculum adaptations made by the Project's instructors in response to their LEP Secretarial students' needs in this short-term training program had in fact resulted in a
curriculum much closer to that of the college's SE 181-182-183, Office Skills I-II-III, than to that of SE101. Appropriate changes have been made in the Secretarial Science LEP vocational curriculum for FY82. As has been the case in FY81, the FY82 Secretarial Science VESL curriculum will correspond to that of the vocational course.

Development of extensive special vocational materials for the LEP Secretarial Science course was not necessary, because of the existence of various typing, filing and telephone skills texts (at different levels of language proficiency) for beginning instruction in clerical careers, as well as numerous ABE materials and some ESL Business English materials. An additional consideration was the fact that high level ESL entrance requirements are advisable, and that consequently there should be less materials adaptation necessary than is the case for other technical areas. The important task was thus the selection of the most effective vocational and VESL instructional materials for the Project's Secretarial Science courses, from among the diverse resources available.

On the other hand, while the existing college TE 151 Machine Tool Laboratory I curriculum did not require major changes in order to be made more appropriate for LEP students, extensive development of vocational Machine Tool materials and corresponding VESL materials was necessary. The FY81 Proposal outlined the steps for this necessary materials development. However, the necessary materials development was hindered in the first place by the very limited time for materials development that was actually available in the FY80 Planning Grant due to the late start of the Project Director (5/8/80), and in the second place by the late start of the Curriculum Developer (9/2/80) in FY81. Consequently the Project had to develop and implement its curricula and instructional materials and its bilingual instructional model simultaneously while it was also dealing with the complications involved in
starting up a new special training program (staffing, institutional adjustment, establishment of recruitment procedures and linkages with other agencies, etc.)

In essence, the first drafts of the Machine Tool curriculum and instructional materials as well as corresponding VESL materials were fieldtested and revised from August to December, 1980. The second drafts were fieldtested and revised from January to May, 1981. The final versions of the Machine Tool curriculum and instructional materials and corresponding VESL materials will be completed in FY82. These instructional materials will include a machine tool curriculum, the Machine Shop Fundamentals student textbook, the Machine Shop Fundamentals student workbook (Technical Vocabulary, Study Questions, Review Questions, and Worksheets), the Machine Shop Fundamentals Instructor’s Manual, including student native language supplements (Spanish, Lao, and Vietnamese), a VESL curriculum, and VESL instructional materials.

In Secretarial Science, the Project fieldtested existing typing textbooks and Business English VESL textbooks for two semesters. Additionally, the Project developed, fieldtested, and revised vocational and VESL curricula and materials. The final versions of the Secretarial Science curriculum and instructional materials and corresponding VESL materials will be completed in FY82. These instructional materials will include a Secretarial Science curriculum, a corresponding Business English VESL curriculum, an instructor’s manual with an annotated bibliography of typing and Business English (VESL) textbooks, and supplementary Secretarial Science and VESL instructional materials.

The investment of time and monies in materials development has been great, but thus far the results definitely justify this investment. This investment has been a key factor in the successful development of appropriate vocational curricula and instructional materials for LEP students.

The major objective of the Project is to compare a bilingual and an English
core language (non-bilingual) instructional model in vocational education for LEP adults. The key factor differentiating the models is the use of the native language by instructors and in materials. To make a valid comparison of the two instructional models, all factors other than native language use should be as equal as possible. These factors include:

- Operational framework, i.e., start-up time, staffing, institutional adjustments, recruitment procedures, establishment of linkages with social service agencies, state offices, business and industry.
- Instructional program development, i.e., appropriate curricula and English vocational materials, and scheduling, especially of available shop time.

The Project will profit greatly in FY82 from the foundations of operational framework and materials development that were laid in its first year. An effective vocational program for LEP students does not spring from a vacuum. For a continuing Project, problems associated with start-up time, staffing, and institutional adjustments are minimal. Recruitment procedures are established, as are linkages with social agencies, state offices, business and industry. Furthermore, the cornerstone of any vocational program for LEP students in the United States is the existence of appropriate curricula and vocational materials in English. These English vocational materials are the main instructional materials in either the bilingual or English core language instructional model, and it is evident that their development must precede that of effective bilingual vocational materials. Appropriate bilingual instructional materials must be closely coordinated with the main English vocational materials in organization, format, and language level. The bilingual instructional model underwent an evolutionary process which is described in Objective IV of this section.

The Project did achieve its major FY81 objective of developing and implementing a bilingual instructional model. At this juncture, however, dramatic differences in the status of the operational framework and instructional materials
development in FY81 and in FY82 can be seen. These differences would inevitably affect the comparision of the bilingual instructional model in FY81 and the English core language instructional model in FY82 as originally planned. The full benefits of the FY81 development and fieldtesting are only now available and this would give the FY82 instructional model obvious built-in advantages which are unrelated to the Project's research variable of native language use in instruction. Therefore, the LEP Project plans to implement the bilingual instructional model in the fall semester of FY82 and the English core language instructional model in the spring semester of FY82, and to compare them in the FY82 Final Report. Both models will use the operational framework and English vocational materials developed in FY81. In this manner, other variables will be as equal as possible and a much more accurate and comparison of the two instructional models can be made.
OBJECTIVE II. To provide information and referral services and support services to a minimum of 80 LEP adults during FY81.

The support services component has been a vital factor in achieving the Project's goal and objectives. The support services component is a vital link between the LEP community and the Project and other institutions and agencies. In FY81, the Project provided support services to over 250 participants (non-students) and 82 students, far surpassing its original target and thus demonstrating the need for these kinds of services for LEP persons in the Aurora area. It is evident that many LEP persons have difficulties utilizing existing resources and services. The support services provided by the Information and Referral Person/Bilingual Counselor and other Project staff are divided into 3 main categories:

1) Direct services

Those services that were provided directly by the counselor/referral person and other LEP Project staff, without referrals to any other agencies. They fall into the following categories:

a) Intake
The acquisition and proper recording of each participant's personal information such as name, S.S. number, address, telephone number, sex, age, and other pertinent information useful in putting together statistical data that would throw light on the significant characteristics of the participants in general and the students in particular, such as ethnic origin, economic and educational status, etc.

b) Assessment
Determining the kinds of supportive services and referrals the participants and students will require, as well as administering English language entrance exams and post-tests to the students.

c) Orientation
Explaining the various aspects of the program to participants and students and making them aware of the options available to them.

d) Counseling
Aiding the participants in the problem solving process, making them aware of the options they have and of the possible consequences of choosing these options.

e) Translation
Serving as a translator/interpreter when there is a communication breakdown in a problem-solving situation outside of the classroom.
f) **Transportation**
Providing transportation in emergency situations, as well as arranging rides to and from class for students without their own individual transportation.

g) **Job Development**
Teaching students and participants effective job hunting techniques, in a classroom situation and on an individual basis, following an Educational and Employment Development Plan (EEDP), established during assessment; establishing links with prospective employers, for the purposes of future employment of our students and of obtaining their input to make the program more relevant to the needs of the job market in the area.

h) **Job Referrals**
Searching for employment openings in the area, and referring students and participants to these openings.

i) **Follow-Up**
Keeping a constant check on the status of present and former students and the results of referrals provided to the participants to establish the current status and progress of their cases, making sure that they are receiving the full extent of the services they are entitled to.

2) **Referral to Education Resources**

Referring participants that did not meet the entrance requirements for our program, or those with different educational or vocational interests or needs, to other programs available in the area. The majority of these referrals have been to the following programs:

a) Waubonsee Community College (W.C.C.), ESL
b) W.C.C., Basic Skills Program
c) GED Programs
d) ABE Programs
e) Other W.C.C. Vocational courses and programs, especially welding (i.e., mainstreaming)
f) Other W.C.C. courses and programs (i.e., mainstreaming)
g) CETA Educational Programs

3) **Referral to Services**

Referring students and participants to the outside agencies and departments best suited to provide the services they need.
The most common areas of services required include:

a) **Emergency Food:** Township Offices, Illinois Migrant Council, Salvation Army, Wayside Cross Mission, Marie Wilkinson Center, Centro Cristo Rey, other religious and civic organizations.

b) **Food Stamps:** Department of Public Aid
c) **Public Aid:** Department of Public Aid AFDC and GA benefits

e) Medical: Department of Public Aid, Hill-Burton Act for the Medically Indigent, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

f) Housing: City of Aurora Department of Neighborhood and Housing Services, Aurora Neighbors, United Neighborhood Housing Services, Plus Incorporated.

g) Legal Services: Prairie State Legal Assistance Foundation, Public Defender's Office, State's Attorney's Office.

h) Immigration: U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Services, legal assistance for immigration.

i) Child and dependent care: Aurora Child Development Center, Marie Wilkinson Child Development Center, Private babysitters, Department of Children and Family Services, Centro Pan-Americano.

j) Other: Miscellaneous services.

For recordkeeping and documentation, the Project divided LEP persons served by the support services component into two groups: participants and students. Participants were non-students who received support services. Students were those persons who received support services, were referred to the Project's courses, and attended eight or more classes. LEP person who received support services, were referred to the Project's courses, but attended less than eight classes have been counted as participants.

For the support services component of the Project, the first step was to hire a full-time Information and Referral Person/Counselor. In FY81, this position was filled by a bilingual/bicultural person (English-Spanish) and he will continue in this position in FY82. The second step was to develop and implement an Information and Referral System which identifies existing educational, occupational, and social services and resources for each area. This Information and Referral System was submitted to the Advisory Council, the Illinois Migrant...
Council, and El Centro Pan Americano in August 1981, for review and recommendational changes. (Please see Appendix II: Information and Referral System.)

The Project developed and disseminated materials to inform LEP adults and the community about the Project and its services and to recruit students. The dissemination of information and student recruitment must start the first day of the Project and be on-going activities. The Project utilized the following techniques:

- letters, phone calls, and visits to individuals, companies, community organizations, social services agencies, etc.
- brochures (English and Spanish)
- posters (English and Spanish)
- announcements in ESL classes (English and native language)
- notices in church bulletins (English and Spanish)
- radio announcements (English and Spanish)
- news releases
- word of mouth

Those LEP persons who indicated interest in the courses were assessed and those who met the entrance requirements were given written referral forms to enter and enroll in the courses. While the Project exceeded its recruitment goals each semester, improvements can be made. Several factors affecting recruitment and retention in the area of Machine Tool differed from those operating in the area of Secretarial Science (see section o, Problems, and section t, Conclusions and Recommendations.)

Once participants were referred to the LEP Project's vocational courses, support services to retain these students began. During the year, the Information and Referral Person/Counselor continued to counsel students, assess their progress, identify concerns and problems, make referrals, provide support services, develop jobs, make follow-ups, and act as a liaison to CETA, the Illinois Migrant Council, Public Aid, the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation and other agencies.

Although the Project utilized its human and material resources to the fullest degree, many students experienced problems in completing the courses, problems...
which proved to require help that went beyond the scope of the Project. While many such problems will probably remain unsolvable by the Project, there appear to be certain improvements in student retention that can be made. (See section o, Problems, and section t, Conclusions and Recommendations.)

Contacts with local business and industry were made, to evaluate employer/employee training needs, to recruit students, and for job development activities. During our discussions, several companies voiced their need for a Spanish/English questionnaire to assess employee education/training needs. The Project developed such a questionnaire and four companies used it. Based on the results of the questionnaire one company established an in-plant ESL class, and the other two companies referred employees to the Waubonsee ESL program. All the companies referred employees interested in Machine Tool or Secretarial Science to the LEP Project.

These Support Services, provided by a full-time Information and Referral Person/Bilingual Counselor and other LEP staff, have been another key factor in the successful development and implementation of an instructional model for LEP students. Without LEP students, the fieldtesting and development of the instructional program and appropriate materials would have been impossible. In many cases, the availability of Support Services and on-going counseling and follow-up activities has been critical in enabling LEP students to continue their participation in the courses and to complete the courses. While many difficulties faced by the LEP students were beyond the resources of the LEP Project and its staff, they did everything humanly possible to resolve these difficulties. From our experiences, it is evident that the Support Services component of a successful LEP Project serves as a visible commitment and link to the LEP community and plays an essential role in the recruitment and retention of LEP students.
OBJECTIVE III. To provide in-service training for administrators, staff, and faculty to acquaint them with the needs, problems, and concerns of LEP students.

In FY81, the Project staff participated in in-service training activities for Waubonsee Community College administration, faculty, and staff, local agencies, and other interested persons.

August 7, 1980
Michael G. Kelly, Project Director
Kebir Marti-Lambert, Information and Referral Person/Bilingual Counselor
Cynthia Miller, Director Aurora CETA

Informed CETA about Project and established referral linkages.

September 12, 1980
Michael G. Kelly, Director
Kebir Marti-Lambert, Bilingual Counselor
Patricia Menges, Curriculum Developer/VESL Instructor
Ann Dermody, Coordinator CETA Office Skills Program
Guadalupe Lambert, Secretarial Science Instructor
Kathy Johnson, Secretarial Science VESL Instructor

Assessed and selected materials and instructional strategies for the Secretarial Science course.

September 19, 1980
Michael G. Kelly, Director
Carol Viola, WCC Dean of Humanistic Studies and Services
David Oatman, Director WCC Adult Basic Education
Doug Fraley, Director WCC Assessment Center
Richard Healy, Director WCC Reading Academy

Further explained services of LEP Project, formalized linkages and services, and discussed 1 and 5 year plans to expand services for LEP students.

October 16, 1980
Michael G. Kelly, Director
16 members of Aurora CETA staff

Presentation about LEP students and Indochinese refugees.
October 28, 1980
Michael G. Kelly, Director
Leland Thompson, WCC Dean of Social/Economic Sciences and Technologies
Kebir Marti-Lambert, Bilingual Counselor
Cynthia Miller, Director Aurora CETA
Ann Dermody, Coordinator CETA Office Skills Program

Discussed LEP Secretarial courses, linkage to CETA Office Skills courses, and CETA funding possibilities for students in LEP Project's courses.

November 6, 1980
Michael G. Kelly, Director
18 members of Aurora Chamber of Commerce, Committee of Education

Presentation about LEP Project

December 10, 1980
Michael G. Kelly, Director
Kebir Marti-Lambert, Bilingual Counselor
Kenneth Shibata, WCC Executive Vice-President
Leland Thompson, WCC Dean Soc./Ec. Sciences and Technologies
Cynthia Miller, Director Aurora CETA
Hermelinda Ortega, Director Illinois Migrant Council Aurora
Homero Balsadua, Director Centro Pan Americano

Discussed services and funding for LEP students, and status report on CETA clients in the LEP Project courses.

January 21, 1981
Michael G. Kelly, Director
Vocational instructor at Benito Juarez High School, Chicago, Illinois

In-service training

January 29, 1981
Michael G. Kelly, Director
Private Industry Council members (Aurora CETA Advisory Council)

Presentation about LEP Project
March 5, 1981

Michael G. Kelly, Director
Patricia Menges, Curriculum Developer
Martha Price, Coordinator Secretarial Science

Discussed curricula of college Secretarial Science courses and LEP courses.

March 17, 1981

Michael G. Kelly, Director
Patricia Menges, Curriculum Developer
Dr. Shibata, WCC Executive Vice-President
Leland Thompson, WCC Dean of Social/Economic Sciences and Technologies

Gave FY81 Progress Report and discussed plans for FY82

The Project staff, particularly the Bilingual Counselor, participated in many other meetings with various agencies, and educational institutions and programs.

The Project Director and the Curriculum Developer made formal presentations at several professional conferences. (See section k, Conference/Workshop Summaries.)
OBJECTIVE IV. To examine and report the advantages [strengths] and disadvantages [weaknesses] of the bilingual instructional model in terms of adoptability, teaching effectiveness, language and vocational skills acquisition, student completion, performance, and attitudes.

The key element in a bilingual instructional program is the use of both English and the students' native language(s) as the media of instruction. Within the practical constraints of a given program (e.g., mainstream, special programs, etc.), the question of language use arises primarily with regard to the instructional staff and the materials used in the classroom. In a bilingual vocational program, the demands of the vocational area(s) being taught will affect the use of the two languages, working toward the goals of student success in the technical training itself, and student employability after training.

Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL) support is very important in any vocational program for LEP students, unless the students' proficiency in English is very high. The scope that the VESL support will have in a particular program depends upon the students' English levels, their vocational training field, and the program's funding. Since the VESL course concentrates on the English used in training and on the job, the role of the native language in the VESL class should be a small one.

In the FY81 bilingual program model of the LEP Project, the instructional staff included bilingual/bicultural vocational instructors, bilingual VESL instructors, and bilingual/bicultural peer tutors.

There is of course a wide range in the amount that an individual instructor will rely upon the native language. How much or how little an instructor will choose to use the native language in the classroom will depend upon his/her perceptions of individual students' needs and of his/her role as a bilingual instructor in a particular vocational area. Due to the interplay of these factors, the LEP Project's Machine Tool instructors found it necessary and effective to use the native language (Spanish) to a greater degree than did
The Secretarial Science instructor. The VESL instructors used the native language (Spanish) only when necessary for clarification of a key concept.

The Project was not unusual in having students from more than one native language background, necessitating a multilingual approach. In one of the Fall semester's Machine Tool Laboratory I courses and in the Spring Machine Tool Laboratory II course, two Indochinese students (one Lao, one Vietnamese) acted as voluntary teacher's aides in the classroom; in addition, there was a paid Spanish peer tutor for supplementary help outside of class. No such bilingual aides were available for the Indian student and Lao student in one of the Spring Machine Tool Laboratory I courses; however, these students' English proficiency levels were relatively high. Two Indochinese students in the Secretarial Science courses whose English proficiency was not high did encounter difficulties. In this context it should be mentioned that, although the LEP Project's FY81 bilingual instructional model was originally conceived of and developed as Spanish-English, with recruitment publicity aimed at Aurora's Hispanic Community, the Project admitted any LEP adult who applied to the program and passed its ESL entrance exams.

There are numerous alternative ways of using the native language in the instructional materials of a bilingual vocational program model. These range from complete translations of traditional English textbooks to native language supplements to bilingual (English-native language) glossaries. While each alternative has inherent strengths and weaknesses, the most appropriate alternative for a particular LEP student population and vocational/VESL course will depend on the vocational area, goals of the training, length and scope of training, the students' educational backgrounds in their native language and English, the students' vocational backgrounds in their native country and the United States, the English vocational materials used in the program, and the availability of native language vocational materials for that area.
Initially, the Project staff saw the need for adapted/rewritten vocational instructional materials in English for LEP students, especially Machine Tool materials, and for native language support for these materials. The Project's instructional staff used Kravy St. Amand, Entrenamiento En El Taller Mecánico, McGraw-Hill de Mexico, 1971, and some translated materials as its bilingual (English-Spanish) instructional materials. However, just as traditional English vocational textbooks prove to be too academic in language and format for native English speakers with backgrounds of low educational achievement, Entrenamiento En El Taller Mecánico was not appropriate for use by most of the LEP Project's Hispanic students. That is, the reading level of this textbook, its technical vocabulary in Spanish, and its general academic format made it too difficult for them. The students clearly preferred the materials developed by the LEP Project (first/second drafts of Machine Shop Fundamentals in English) to the Spanish textbook. The Project also showed the students two machine tool films in Spanish from the Bilingual Vocational Education Project library. The students' primary reaction to both these films and to the traditional Spanish textbook was to articulate their goal as being a good machinist's job here in the U.S., for which they wanted to learn to use the proper English technical terms. Since the Spanish technical terms were as unfamiliar to them as the English ones, they saw it as double work to try to learn these terms in both languages.

Therefore, the Project began to experiment with translations of selected parts of its Machine Shop Fundamentals lessons because exact and technical translations of traditional English textbooks, as well as bilingual technical glossaries, proved to be of limited use for the students.

Field testing led to the decision to translate the first introductory lessons in their entirety, but leaving certain key technical terms in English. For all subsequent lessons, only the first page (objectives and procedures),
any safety rules, and certain introductions and summaries were completely translated, and selected key concepts and vocabulary were also explained or translated; the selection process required a complex blend of vocational and ESL expertise. This format achieves an optimum blend of the English necessary for learning and demonstrating the technical skills and the most effective native language support for that learning. The rationale to not translate English technical words is sound: the students must know the terminology in English; there may not be an exact or equivalent translation in the native language; students may not know the technical word in the native language; and the technical terminology in the native language may vary from country to country. Using the native language to clarify, explain, or define English technical concepts and terminology can be useful for students. However, accurate translations and/or definitions and explanations of sub-technical terminology are critical to technical accuracy and student comprehension. We must point out that translators must be bilingual with expertise in the vocational area, since the translations of technical and especially sub-technical terminology can be literally accurate but very inaccurate and unclear when used in a technical/sub-technical context in a specific vocational area.

Thus, after considerable experimentation and fieldtesting in FY81, the LEP Project has chosen what it has perceived to be the most effective format for its Machine Tool bilingual materials, i.e., native language supplements (Spanish, Lao, Vietnamese) for the Machine Shop Fundamentals textbook it developed. An adapted/rewritten vocational text in English is the focal point. A unique blend of subject matter knowledge and language expertise was utilized in developing Machine Shop Fundamentals. The result is a vocational text which is technically accurate and complete, while using "simplified" English to explain and demonstrate the technical concepts. The native language supplements are keyed to the Machine Shop Fundamentals text. They serve to explain/
define vocational concepts and their applications and perform an effective supportive role without reducing the relevance and necessity of English language skills in the classroom and/or job situation.

The issues of how much and what kind of bilingual vocational materials to utilize differ from one vocational area to another. Although all vocational areas require the acquisition of technical skills, the required level of English proficiency and kinds of language skills (oral/written) differ greatly from one position to another within the same area, and even more so among different areas.

Generally speaking, satisfactory job performance requires a much lower minimum level of English proficiency in the area of Machine Tool than it does in Secretarial Science. Language skills occupy a central place in clerical careers, which demand a high level of oral and written proficiency. Without fairly high English skills, including grammar, spelling, and punctuation, a person is unlikely to obtain or be able to perform satisfactorily in even a lower level clerical position. A Secretarial Science student who needs a good deal of native language support in order to learn basic technical office skills such as typing, filing, and handling the telephone, probably has little chance of employability in any but a primarily native language setting. Because of this and because of its students' needs, the LEP Project chose to utilize primarily English instructional materials, although some experimentation with Arizona Bilingual Business Education (Arizona Department of Education, 1975) was done. A true bilingual secretary must have high oral and written skills in two languages as well as secretarial skills in both languages. The constraints on the scope of the LEP Project program model necessitated a major focus on developing secretarial skills in English.

The adoptability of a bilingual instructional model in a specific-vocational area and institution will depend upon the interplay of a complex set
of interrelated factors: (1) the vocational area; (2) relationship of this vocational area to the community job market; (3) the institution's commitment and resources; (4) the needs and resources of the LEP community forming the target student population; (5) the scope and length of the chosen program model; (6) the availability of qualified bilingual instructional personnel; (7) availability of appropriate bilingual materials for the vocational area; and (8) funding for program development, including necessary materials development; and funding for program implementation. When deciding whether or not to adopt a bilingual instructional model for vocational education, each institution/project must evaluate the interplay of these factors in its own situation.

In its FY82 Final Report, the Waubonsee LEP Project plans to examine and compare the respective strengths and weaknesses of its two instructional models, the bilingual one and the English core language one, and to discuss these results in relation to commonly occurring clusters of factors. During the implementation of the bilingual instructional model, the Project has seen that the key element of such a model, i.e., the use of the native language as well as English, carries with it certain strengths and weaknesses in terms of teaching effectiveness, student performance as demonstrated by the acquisition of vocational and language skills, and student attitudes and completion.

One of the most important strengths of a bilingual instructional model is its potential for insuring student comprehension. The native language is sometimes the most efficient means for explaining many difficult key technical and particularly sub-technical concepts/terms. A bilingual instructor, especially one who has appropriate bilingual materials to use in class, can utilize the native language whenever necessary to get meaning, including important nuances, across to students having trouble breaking the English language barrier. (It is assumed that English will be the primary language of instruction in any bilingual vocational program designed to provide LEP students with
The use of the native language to insure comprehension can mean the difference between success or failure in the training program for a student whose English proficiency is lower than that of his/her classmates. The vital importance of the use of the native language in vocational instruction was especially apparent in the cases of one Vietnamese student and two Hispanic students in Machine Tool courses whose English level was far below the levels of the others in their classes.

Another very important strength of a bilingual instructional model is its potential for helping the instructor to evaluate accurately the student's acquisition of technical knowledge and skills. A serious problem for LEP students in non-bilingual vocational courses is that the instructor may evaluate student performance in the lab or classroom as poor, but be unable to judge to what extent this is due to the student's difficulties with the English language. In a bilingual instructional model, the native language is a valuable resource for monitoring each student's true acquisition of the technical knowledge and skills being taught and practiced. Data on student performance in the Project's FY81 vocational courses is presented in section r, Summation of Evaluation Data, as is data on language skill acquisition.

Furthermore, a bilingual instructional model plays a vital role in bolstering the self-confidence of LEP students in vocational as in other courses. The use of their native language by the teaching staff and in the instructional materials can build empathy between teachers and students, and gives their language and culture a legitimacy and value in the classroom that they probably did not have in the students' previous experiences with formal education in the U.S. (Of course, this is more likely to be so in the case of Hispanic students than in the case of Indochinese.) Because the pressing nature of their economic needs and desire for a good job strongly motivates LEP students in vocational training, the language barrier is especially discouraging in these courses.
Being able to express themselves in their own language and thus perform in the lab/shop/classroom free from the frustrating handicap of their limited English increases not only their chances of success but also their confidence in their ability to learn. This is very important for LEP adults who have had little previous experience and/or success in academic situations, and also for LEP students of relatively high English proficiency and academic sophistication. The success of the latter student in a bilingual program can be the stepping stone he/she needs in order to feel able to mainstream into regular vocational courses of further training, with native English speaking classmates. Several students who completed the LEP Project's courses in Machine Tool and Secretarial Science have enrolled or will enroll in the College's regular vocational programs and courses. (See section I; Summations of Evaluation Data Collected.)

A program wishing to adopt a bilingual instructional model frequently encounters difficulty in finding qualified bilingual vocational instructors, in obtaining funds for bilingual teacher's aides/tutors, and in finding qualified bilingual VESL instructors (if these are part of the model). It also faces the scarcity of appropriate bilingual instructional materials in most vocational areas, coupled with the difficulty of finding staff members with the vocational and ESL qualifications necessary for adapting or writing such materials and the difficulty of funding the staff time necessary for materials development. Logically enough, such difficulties in finding bilingual staff and materials are compounded in a multilingual class.

Besides these practical problems, the adoption of a bilingual instructional model for vocational educations means that the program must try to minimize the effect of certain weaknesses in the model. One of these is the possibility that the use of the native language may work against the students' improving their job-related English skills. In the eagerness of LEP students to acquire vocational skills and of their bilingual instructor to facilitate this skills
acquisition, it is quite possible to use too little English. This can lead to technically capable graduates of the course whose English proficiency is too low to allow them to get and/or keep a job. Methods for lessening this danger that the Waubonsee LEP Project has found to be effective include: discussion with instructor and student, realistic ESL entrance requirements for the vocational area and amount of training offered, a strong VESL component in model, and encouragement of students to take concurrently an appropriate level course in ESL for general purposes. When a program's vocational training time is limited and its goal is employability in the U.S., its instructional staff must be careful not to slight English by too much reliance on the native language. This problem can become much more severe if a bilingual course is in fact multilingual due to the presence of students from more than one native language background. The more native languages are involved in a bilingual classroom the less class time may be available for the use of English.

Another potential weakness of a bilingual instructional model of vocational education can surface if technical vocabulary is taught in both English and the native language. In the first place, too much emphasis on native language technical terms may slow the acquisition of the English technical terms. In the second place, to learn new technical terms in both languages is doubly difficult for students and, in many cases, unnecessary. That is, the majority of students will be unfamiliar with technical terms in their native language and, in nearly all situations, they will only need to use the English technical terms. This point was frequently brought up by students, especially those with work experience in the United States. This carries a warning to programs who plan to rely heavily on bilingual technical glossaries.

With respect to student attitudes, the use of the native language(s) in vocational instruction does not always have favorable effects. LEP students
of all English proficiency levels realize the importance that improving their English has for improving their employability, and they articulate their awareness of the dangers of too much native language use discussed above. They demand that a high priority be placed on English. The higher a student's English level is, the more likely it is that he/she will strongly prefer English. A further complication is the fact that LEP students vary in the level of their proficiency in the native language. Unless they have been well educated in the native language, their reading and writing skills and their skills in the more formal social registers of this language may be low, sometimes lower than in English. This of course depends upon an individual student's educational background and experience in the U.S. and/or in his/her native country. Different LEP students will profit differently from different priorities placed on native language use by bilingual instructors and materials in vocational education.
OBJECTIVE V. To develop English core language curricula, vocabulary, and instructional materials for Machine Tool and Secretarial Science from January to June, 1981.

During FY81, the Waubonsee LEP Project investigated the concept and practical applications of an English core vocabulary. The staff reviewed the Caterpillar Fundamental English (CFE) course and instructional materials; Technical English as a Second Language materials for Machine Shop developed by the Vocational-Technical Division of the Minnesota Department of Education, Pre-Vocational English by the Institute of Modern Languages, The Arizona Bilingual Business Education by the Arizona Department of Education as well as numerous vocational and vocational English as a Second Language instructional materials for Machine Tool and Secretarial Science. Furthermore, the staff has researched the literature related to the English core language concept and its application to vocational training for LEP students.

As part of its research, the Project staff cross-referenced the Dolch Reading List, Ogden's 850 Basic Word List, the CFE vocabulary list, and the core list of Development Associates, Inc. This cross-referencing produced 183 very general, high frequency words which appear in at least three of the four word lists. There are few, if any sub-technical words. Comparing these 183 words and almost any vocabulary list from beginning general purpose English as a Second Language (ESL) textbooks will yield a high correlation. Any researcher who carries out a selection process relying on word frequency will produce a basic, general purpose list of English words like that found by the Waubonsee LEP Project. These words are the keys to learning to use the English language in any situation, and to call them the English core for vocational training is deceptive. It implies that a student needs to know only these words in order to be able to learn the technical terms for any vocational area and to succeed in any vocational course. In our experience, the greatest obstacle for an LEP student is sub-technical vocabulary (not to mention syntactic struc-
Sub-technical words, such as adjust, tighten, set, length, width, etc., are neither high frequency words nor general purpose words, but nonetheless are vital vocabulary for many vocational areas. Of the four core word lists cross-referenced by the Waubonsee LEP Project, only the CFE list contains sub-technical words. It is unrealistic and unfair to expect LEP students with little or no English to succeed in anything but a long term intensive training course (including intensive ESL), and then to succeed in finding jobs in the United States. Employees must be able to communicate in English with supervisors and fellow employees in nearly every job. Even a highly skilled person must have a basic command of English if he/she is to be employable in the United States. The concept of a core English vocabulary list for all vocational areas is attractive, but its application is impossible. The development of such a list is an unnecessary duplication of what already exists in general purpose ESL textbooks and materials. Furthermore, words cannot be taught in isolation; they must be taught in a relevant context which includes syntactic structures and social functions. ESL textbooks and teachers provide such a context, while word lists do not. Appropriate vocational and language instructional materials can be developed for LEP students, and the idea of using an English core language as the basis for these materials makes good sense. The difficulty lies in the selection of the elements of this core language. Too many materials developers think that a word list or glossary is sufficient for LEP students in vocational programs. However, a vocational English core language for LEP students, like any language, must consist of much more than isolated vocabulary words. Sentence structures, word formation, different registers and social functions are at least equally important to using a language. A truly effective English core language should limit and standardize not only vocabulary but also these other elements. Another factor critical to the effectiveness of a vocational English core language for LEP students is its focus. The language needs for training and employment differ greatly from one vocational area to
another, for example, from machine tool technology to secretarial science. At the same time, some vocational areas share many similar language needs, for example, machine tool technology and welding. The effectiveness of a vocational English core language in instructional materials for LEP students will hinge upon its being specific in the first place to a particular vocational cluster, and its being specific in the second place to a particular vocational area within that cluster.
The foundations of English for general purposes (vocabulary, sentence structure, etc.) should be and can be taught in ESL programs and/or learned independently, and a certain level of proficiency should be required of an LEP student before entry into a pre-vocational or vocational program. ("Pre-vocational" should not be confused with "pre-employment.") It is at the sub-technical level that the application of the English core language concept can be most effective. At this level, the English core language should concentrate on the sub-technical vocabulary required in a vocational cluster. This sub-technical vocabulary is later used in specific vocational courses to teach technical concepts and vocabulary. Additional sub-technical vocabulary can then be taught as needed.

There is no mystical or magical list of English words which will meet the needs of all LEP students in every vocational area, although the concept of an English core language to assist LEP students in a specific vocational training program can be effectively applied in the development of vocational and language instructional materials. This application should be one component in the overall materials development.

The LEP Project has incorporated practical applications of the English core language concept in the development of its instructional models and delivery systems. For both instructional models, the identification of vocational concepts, key technical and sub-technical vocabulary, and essential structures is of paramount importance to the development of appropriate instructional materials and delivery systems for the vocational and VESL courses, as is the organization of the presentation of the vocational concepts. For both its vocational areas, the Project completed in FY81 the necessary identification of concepts, vocabulary, and structures, as well as their organization into vocational curricula. The Machine Tool and Secretarial Science curricula will be finalized in FY82.

First and second drafts of nearly all the lessons of the Project's Machine Tool vocational materials, Machine Shop Fundamentals, were developed, field-tested, and revised in FY81 as planned, and final versions of the first one-
fourth of the lessons were also completed in this funding period. Final versions of the rest of the lessons will be completed during the first half of FY82, in time for Machine Shop Fundamentals to be used as the main vocational textbook in both instructional models in FY82. The on-going progress on the development of these materials was discussed in the Quarterly Progress Reports. A major focus of the Project in FY82 will be the completion of many Machine Tool VESL materials which were developed and fieldtested in FY81.

Several typing textbooks and numerous other vocational and VESL supplementary materials were fieldtested and evaluated for their appropriateness for the Project's Secretarial Science program. Selection was then made of the best materials to use in the Project's courses. Work on Secretarial Science VESL materials will continue in FY82.
OBJECTIVE VI. To evaluate the program and its components after completion of fiscal year 1981.

Program and student files and monthly claim forms have been monitored by the Project Director to insure accuracy of information and accountability. Periodic staff meetings and monthly staff reports evaluated the day-to-day operations of the Project. Progress toward achieving the objectives of the Project was outlined in Quarterly Progress Reports to DAVTE.

The Project has been fortunate to have the active support of the Waubonsee Community College administration which has also assisted in the evaluation of the Project. Furthermore, the services of the staff of the Waubonsee Audio Visual Department have been instrumental in the development of high quality illustrations and technical drawings for the Machine Tool instructional materials.

The instructional component of the Project was evaluated by the Project Director, Curriculum Developer, bilingual vocational and VESL instructors, consultants, and the students. (See OBJECTIVES I, IV, and V in this section; section o, Problems; section r, Summations of Evaluation Data; and section t, Conclusions and Recommendations.

The support services component was evaluated by the Advisory Council, local agencies, the Project Director, Information and Referral Person/Counselor, and the students. (See OBJECTIVE II in this section; section o, Problems; section r, Summations of Evaluation Data; and section t, Conclusions and Recommendations.) The major results of evaluations of all phases of this Project are included in this Final Report.
I. PROJECT TITLE AND STAFF
   A. TITLE: A Plan to Develop and Compare Two Vocational Education Programs for Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Students
   B. STAFF:
      1. Michael J. Kelly, Director
      2. Patricia Menges, Curriculum Developer/Instructor
      3. Kebir Marti-Lambert, Information and Referral Person/Counselor
      4. Mary Diaz, Secretary
      5. Part-Time Instructors (see VII)
      6. Part-Time Bilingual Peer Tutor (Spanish-English)

II. FUNDING FOR PROJECT
    The Research and Development Section of the Illinois State Board of Education, Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education (DAVTE/ISBE)

III. GOAL OF PROJECT
    To provide data for statewide/local planning and implementation of vocational programs for LEP adults after developing and comparing a bilingual vocational training program and an English core language training program

IV. VOCATIONAL TRAINING AREAS
    A. Machine Tool
    B. Secretarial Science

V. STUDENT POPULATION
    A. ETHNIC BACKGROUND: Primarily Hispanic, Lao, Vietnamese
    B. EMPLOYMENT STATUS:
       1. Unemployed (72%)
          Public Aid recipient, Stipended by CETA or Illinois Migrant Council, Unemployment Compensation, others.
       2. Employed/Underemployed (28%)
          Some companies provided/tuition.
    C. STUDENT GOALS
       To develop vocational and English skills for entry level employment, job upgrading, and/or further training and education
    D. ESL LEVELS
       The Illinois Oral Interview and the written English-Second-Language Placement Test are given to each applicant. A minimum 200 level score on the EPT is required for entrance in the program. Range of levels: 200 (mid-beginning) to 600 (advanced).
    E. APPROXIMATE CLASS SIZE
       8-15 students.
VI. KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM MODEL
A. Special program for LEP students
B. Vocational courses and corresponding Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL) courses
C. Use of vocational curricula adapted from existing Waubonsee Community College curricula
D. Short-term Training program
E. Part-time training program
F. Goal: skills for entry-level employment and/or further training
G. No program stipends for students
H. FY81 bilingual instructional model:
   1. Bilingual instructional personnel
   2. Selected use of bilingual materials

VII. INSTRUCTORS
A. Bilingual Vocational Instructors, part-time (3 for Machine Tool, 1 for Secretarial Science)
B. Bilingual VESL Instructors, part-time (2 + Curriculum Developer for Machine Tool, 1 for Secretarial Science)

VIII. INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS (Available in FY82)
A. Machine Tool
   The project developed, field-tested, and revised Machine Shop Fundamentals (Student textbook, student workbook, native language supplements in Spanish, Lao, and Vietnamese, instructor's manual) and Technical English (VESL) curriculum and materials.
B. Secretarial Science
   The project developed, field-tested, and revised vocational and VESL curricula using existing materials and some project materials.

IX. SUPPORT SERVICES
Assessment, counseling, referral, job development, and follow-up, by full-time counselor

X. SCHEDULING AND FACILITIES
A. One 16-week semester plus a one-week orientation
   Vocational Training: 96 contact hours
   VESL: 8-10 contact hours/week
B. Day and evening classes
C. Available Waubonsee Community College facilities: Machine Shop, Typing Lab, classrooms
n. Major Activities and Events

August 1, 1980  Funding Year 1981 begins for LEP Project.  Development of first drafts of curricula and instructional materials continues.

August 18, 1980  First semester classes begin.

December 12, 1980  First semester classes end.  Revisions of first drafts/development of second drafts of instructional materials begins.

January 12, 1981  Second semester classes begin.


June 30, 1981  FY81 ends.

The Project staff conducted 10 local in-service workshops and made formal presentations at professional conferences. (See Objective III in section m: Accomplishments; and section k, Conference/Workshop Summaries.)
o. Problems

The Project implemented all Objectives and Procedures in the FY81 Proposal with a high degree of completion; however, several elements beyond the control of the Project staff hindered the 100% completion of each Objective and Procedure within the planned time lines and have affected the Project as a whole. The three Quarterly Reports included detailed discussions of these elements.

Staffing

Most positions in a special project usually require a unique blend of expertise, education, and experience. However, such a project position must fit into similar existing positions at the institution that houses the project, job descriptions for those positions, and the institution's salary range for those positions. In addition, the institution's own hiring policies, hiring procedures, and time lines must be followed, as well as those of the funding agency.

Although the LEP Project's position of Curriculum Developer/Vocational English as a Second Language Instructor had an approved starting date of July 7, 1980, this position could not be filled until September 2, 1980, because of delays caused by the institution's hiring policies and procedures. As a result, the development of curricula and instructional materials fell behind schedule and it remained behind schedule during the year. Fall 1980 classes began on time, on August 18, 1980, and the Project Director taught the VESL course that was part of the Curriculum Developer's position from this date until the curriculum Developer was able to begin work.

Qualified part-time bilingual vocational instructors are difficult to identify. That is, this person must have knowledge and skills in a vocational area, in teaching, and in two languages. Once he/she is identified and hired,
his/her full-time employment obligations, such as a shift change, can create problems. One of the LEP Project's bilingual vocational Machine Tool instructors withdrew from that position (due to family problems) the first day of class. The Project Director filled in for four weeks until a new instructor was found. The other bilingual vocational Machine Tool instructor had his shift changed four times during the fall semester. The Project Director taught the vocational classes as necessary until the instructor's schedule could be stabilized. This took time away from the Project Director's other responsibilities and duties and is a luxury most projects do not have. Furthermore, a qualified bilingual instructor for the evening Machine Tool VESL course could not be found before the beginning of either semester. This position required an almost impossible combination of fluency in Spanish and English, ESL teaching experience, some knowledge of machine tool operation, and availability to work part-time 3-4 evenings per week. It proved necessary for the Project Director to teach this course outside of his regular full-time job duties.

Scheduling

The College's 1980-81 schedule for the Machine Tool and Secretarial Science Labs was finalized in March of 1980, long before the start of the LEP Project and vocational courses, especially the Project's Machine Tool vocational courses, which had to be squeezed in during the lunch and supper hours. The amount of lab time thus provided was sufficient for instruction and adequate skills acquisition, but certainly not optimal. The evening Machine Tool course met on Tuesday and Thursday from 4:50 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. in the lab and on Wednesdays from 4:50 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. in a classroom. The Secretarial Science course met on Thursday and Friday from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. These scheduling limitations sometimes frustrated the students, and affected student motivation, recruitment, attendance and retention. Although the Project
offered day and evening course, time conflicts for employed students, i.e., the work schedule and shift change vs. the course schedule, could not be avoided. Thus, many employed students could not participate in the course, especially the evening ones. The Project and the college have been able to work out a much better lab schedule for the FY82 LEP Machine Tool vocational courses.

Scheduling difficulties with regard to the Secretarial Science typing lab and a VESL classroom could only be resolved for the fall semester courses by utilizing typing labs in two different school sites, and a VESL classroom in yet a third school. Spring Semester scheduling included improvements in facilities and lab time.

Support Services
For many LEP adult students, support services are essential to their participation in and successful completion of vocational programs. While the Project offered and provided support services such as counseling, assessment, referrals, translation/interpretation, job development and follow-ups, other needed support services were beyond the scope and resources of the Project. First and foremost, most unemployed students needed financial assistance for stipends, tuition, transportation, materials, and childcare. Of the Project's 82 students, 59 or 72% were unemployed. Thirty-one students or 38% received stipends. Twenty-six students or 32% were Public Aid recipients. (See section r, Summations of Evaluation Data Collected.)

Originally, the Project did not plan to rely heavily on a stipended student population and did not think that CETA support and services would play a major role in the recruitment and retention of students. However, because of their economic status and the current job market, many students needed CETA support services to participation in the LEP Project courses. In the fall semester, twelve of the twenty-five Machine Tool Laboratory I students were CETA
clients. Without these students, a day Machine Tool class could not have been implemented. CETA's decision not to fund any slots for the Secretarial Science course was not made definite until the fall semester was more than half over. (See also below, Recruitment and Retention in Secretarial Science.)

For the spring semester, CETA was reluctant to give additional slots for the Machine Tool Laboratory I until the fall graduates were placed in employment or further training. Given the poor job market at the time, the best alternative for the students and the Project was to offer a Machine Tool Laboratory II course with a corresponding VESL course and encourage students to take concurrent ESL or ABE/GED classes. When this was done, CETA gave five slots for the Machine Tool Laboratory I course.

Establishing and maintaining a working linkage with CETA has been time-consuming for the Information and Referral Person/Counselor and the Project Director. The Information and Referral Person/Counselor acted as a liaison to CETA and this necessitated his doing CETA timesheets and monthly evaluations with each client. CETA funding for LEP clients was limited, and the Project staff first had to convince CETA of the value of vocational and VESL training for LEP clients. Differing funding years and time tables of CETA and the Project were obstacles. Despite these difficulties, the Project assisted CETA in recruiting CETA-eligible students for the LEP Machine Tool Vocational and VESL course. In FY81, CETA approved a total of fifteen LEP students for twenty hours per week of vocational and language training for one or two semesters. CETA paid tuition and stipends for these students; however, CETA did not provide monies for childcare or transportation.

The Project also had two stipended students who were clients of the Illinois Migrant Council. A good working relationship between the Project and the staff of the Illinois Migrant Council was established early and maintained throughout FY81.
The Project will continue to work to the best of its ability with CETA, The Illinois Migrant Council, and other agencies to make inter-agency referrals and recruit students.

**Recruitment and Retention**

It is evident that recruitment must be a well-organized on-going activity, and that effective recruitment is actually the first step in student retention. In FY81 several factors hindered recruitment: the late start-up time of the Project; the length of time needed to write promotional materials; delays in printing letters, brochures, and posters; limited time for making personal contacts with agencies, business and industry, and individuals; and the short time between the two semesters.

In addition to his extensive recruiting responsibilities, the Information and Referral Person/Counselor's time was more than filled by his duties with respect to intake counseling, assessment, participant data collection/records, and providing various support services for the over 340 participants and students, as well as follow-up counseling and job development for students, once each semester was underway.

While the Project exceeded its recruitment goals each semester, retention proved to be a stumbling block. Financial hardship -- especially related to family economic obligations and transportation expenses -- stood out as the primary motive for students' withdrawal before completion of the courses; other important motives were health and personal/family problems. (See section r, Summations of Evaluation Data Collected.) Although solutions to these major problems lie outside the scope of the Project, several improvements in recruitment, assessment, and student selection are planned for FY82. These improvements are discussed below and in Section t, Conclusions and Recommendations.

In FY82, recruitment will begin in July. Promotional materials have been written and printed, and will be distributed on a wider yet more targeted scale.
than in FY81. During the spring semester of FY81, the Project contacted and followed up on 39 companies to determine employer/employee training needs, develop jobs, and recruit students. It is hoped that these contacts will be a resource for students from the private sector. Existing contacts and linkages with other educational institutions, programs, and agencies will be utilized. Once students have been recruited, a much more rigorous screening process will be applied, and students' progress and outside problems will be followed even more closely than in FY81. The improvements in the FY82 lab schedules will also be of value (see discussion above), the Machine Tool classes will have 100% time in the Machine Tool Laboratory instead of the 60%-70% of FY81, and Secretarial Science lab and VESL classes will all be in the same facility. While the times and days for the lab schedules are not ideal, they are a marked improvement over FY81.

Attendance

Attendance is closely connected to a student's acquisition of technical and language skills, and thus to his/her successful completion of the courses. Irregular attendance has especially-serious results in the case of students with relatively low English proficiency. A downward spiral effect can be seen of missing a day, getting behind, getting discouraged, missing more days, getting more behind, etc. Follow-ups and encouragement by the Bilingual Counselor have been invaluable in helping to break this cycle in several cases. As with retention problems, certain factors beyond the Project's scope and resources were the primary causes of attendance difficulties: transportation, family obligations, and financial hardships.

Recruitment and Retention in Secretarial Science

The Project's Secretarial Science courses encountered special problems in connection with recruitment and retention of students. In the first place, there was very little interest in a day class either semester, too little
interest for such a class to be implemented. In the second place, several
students who began but did not complete the Project's Secretarial courses
needed and anticipated CETA stipends which never materialized (see previous
discussion). In addition, follow-up interviews brought out the fact that the
evening class schedule conflicted with family duties of would-be (primarily
women) students. Nevertheless, this schedule was the best one, in terms of
adequate amount of training time, that could be worked out for evening use
of the Waubonsee Secretarial lab and classrooms. Another factor that may
have affected recruitment for the Project's Secretarial courses may have been
the existence of a full-time CETA Office Skills program which, however, had a
prerequisite of a high school diploma/GED and was not aimed at LEP students.

**Instructional Materials**

The development of curricula and instructional materials fell far behind
schedule because of the late starting dates of the Project Director in FY80
and the Curriculum Developer/Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL)
Instructor in FY81, and the extra demands on the Project Director's time that
were made by the necessity of substituting for vocational Machine Tool and
VESL instructors, especially during the first month of the fall semester. In
addition, it quickly became very evident that the scope and range of Machine
Tool materials development had to increase greatly. A comparison of the first
drafts (fall semester of 1980), the second drafts (spring semester of 1981) of
the finalized versions of the Machine Tool instructional materials demonstrates
the dramatic evolution and improvement of these materials.

This adaptation/development process did produce appropriate English
Machine Tool instructional materials, vocational English as a second language
materials, and native language materials. The process required extensive
adaptation/re-writing, drawing of original technical illustrations, field-
testing, additional re-writing, additional drawing of technical illustrations
and additional revisions made by subject matter specialists and language specialists who fieldtested and/or supervised the fieldtesting of these materials in the classroom/shop situation. This adaptation/development process inevitably absorbed more staff time than orginally planned, and actually consumed the vast majority of the Project Director's, the Curriculum Developer's, and the Secretary's time. The support of the college's administration, Faculty Services staff, and Audio-Visual Department staff has been invaluable in completing these materials. The high quality of the Machine Tool instructional materials and the high degree of adoptability of these materials by other institutions will provide the basis for best possible instructional models and their comparision.

For Secretarial Science, much less materials adaptation/development was necessary. With regard to the VESL materials for Secretarial Science, the selection, fieldtesting, and adaptation of appropriate VESL materials required considerable time and energy from the VESL instructional and Curriculum Developer.
r. Summations of Evaluation Data Collected

The LEP Project has compiled extensive data about its students and participants to help evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of:

- the bilingual instructional model (Objectives I, IV)
- the Project's vocational courses, curricula, instructional materials and delivery systems (Objectives I, IV, V)
- the Project's vocational English as a second language courses, curricula, instructional materials and delivery systems (Objectives I, IV, V)
- the Support Services component (Objective II)
- the Project as a whole (Objectives I-VI)

This data is presented in three parts:

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS: Tables I - XXI
Data on student characteristics such as age, ethnic and educational background, economic and family status.

STUDENT STATUS: Tables XXII - XXIII
Status of Students (per course) at Start of Semester and at Follow-Up.

Data on student status and achievement of program objectives.

STUDENT ENGLISH, MATH, AND READING SKILLS: Tables XXIV - XLI
Data on the students' English, math, and reading skills, as measured by various pre-tests and post-tests.

Although the Project's students were too few in number to reach levels of statistical significance, these data give a picture of a group of not unusual LEP adult students in vocational education that may be helpful in the planning and implementation of other similar projects.
STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS: Tables I - XXI

Table I. FY81 LEP Participants and Students. (n=340)

In FY81, 340 LEP persons responded to the Project's publicity and recruitment efforts. Of these LEP persons served by the Project, 137 -- approximately one-third -- were referred to the Project's own vocational and corresponding VESL courses in Machine Tool or Secretarial Science. The Project referred to its courses only those LEP persons who were indeed interested in one of its vocational areas and who met its English proficiency entrance requirements. The majority of the 203 participants did not meet these requirements, even though these requirements were relatively low, and were referred to ESL courses as part of the support services they were offered. Most of the rest of the participants had training interests and needs in other career fields, and were referred accordingly:

Of the 137 LEP persons referred to the Project's courses, 82 (or 60%) became students. There were four main reasons for the early withdrawal of 55 others (the Referred Participants), discussed in Tables XXI and XXXIII:

1. differences between the actual courses and their expectations
2. financial hardship
3. scheduling problems
4. employment obtained between assessment/referral and course start-up.

Table II. FY81 Machine Tool I LEP students: Age, Sex, and Ethnic Background. (n=48)

The majority of the Machine Tool students (77% *) were Hispanic males, and 62% of these (48% of all the students) were in the 26-35 age group. The 26-35 age group accounted for 60% of all the students and the 21-25 age group accounted for another 20%, while the 36-45 and the 18-20 age groups accounted for 20%
for only 13% and 6%, respectively. The only two female students were Asian (1 Lao, 1 Vietnamese). Of all the students, 19% were Asian.

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest 1.0%

Table III. FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students: Education and Age. *(n=48)*

Table IV. FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students: Education and Ethnic Background. *(n=48)*

In FY81, 42% of the Machine Tool students had had only six years or less of formal education, and only 31% had finished high school.

Table V. FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students: Marital Status, Age, Family Status. *(n=48)*

The majority of all the Machine Tool students (63%) were married and between 26 and 35 years of age. Only 21% of all the students were single. Fully 75% of all the students were Family Heads with all the obligations thereof, while only 21% of all the students could be classified as Unrelated.

Table VI. FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students: Employment Status, Hourly Wage, and Age. *(n=48)*

Only 38% of all the Machine Tool students were employed full-time. Nearly all of them were earning five dollars or more per hour. The remaining 62% of the students were unemployed. There is a surprising absence of students employed at the lower wage levels.

Table VII. FY81 Unemployed Machine Tool I LEP Students: Economic Status and Age. *(n=30)*

Table VIII. FY81 Unemployed Machine Tool I LEP Students receiving Income Assistance. *(n=24)*

Of the unemployed Machine Tool students, 80% received some form of income assistance. Of these, however, only 13% received unemployment insurance, while 54% were Public Aid recipients. Fully 80% of the unemployed Machine Tool students were below the Lower Living Standard Income Level as defined by the U.S. Department of Labor, whether or not they received income assistance.

These data on employment, economic, and family status combined to produce
financial hardships which affected the students' ability to complete the Project's courses.

Table IX. FY81 Secretarial Science LEP students: Age, Sex and Ethnic Background. (n=22)

The majority of the Secretarial Science students (82%) were Hispanic females. Although there is some spread across the age groups, 48% of these students were 20 years of age or less.

Table X. FY81 Secretarial Science LEP Students: Education and Age. (n=22)

Nearly all the Secretarial Science students had had some high school, although only 23% had completed high school.

Table XI. FY81 Secretarial Science LEP Students: Marital Status, Age, and Family Status. (n=22)

Most of the Secretarial Science students (68%) were single and under the age of 26. Only 14% were Family Heads.

Table XII. FY81 Secretarial Science LEP Students: Employment Status, Hourly Wage, and Age. (n=22)

Table XIII. FY81 Unemployed Secretarial Science LEP Students: Economic Status and Age. (n=18)

Most of the Secretarial Science students (82%) were unemployed and of those students, 61% were below the Lower Living Standard Income Level as defined by the U.S. Department of Labor.

Table XIV. FY81 LEP students in Waubonsee Community College English as a Second Language/Adult Basic Education Program. (n=964)

Table XIV has been included for purposes of comparison. In the FY81 LEP student population of Waubonsee's ESL/ABE Program, as in the Project's student population, by far the majority are Hispanics in the 21-35 age group.
The data presented in Tables XV - XXI point to major differences between the LEP Project's Machine Tool I students and those of Waubonsee's "regular", non-LEP Machine Tool courses. (A random sample was taken of the latter group.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEP Project Mach. Tool I Students</th>
<th>Non-LEP &quot;Regular&quot; Mach. Tool I Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Background: High School Graduates</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 18 - 20</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 35</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status: Married</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Status: Family Heads</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to these two groups of Machine Tool I students' previous vocational education background (e.g., machine shop, drafting, welding, woodworking), we see that 88% of the LEP Project's students had never before attended a vocational course, compared to only 22% of the non-LEP "regular" students. Of the non-LEP group, 59% had in fact taken three semesters or more, while only one LEP Project student (2%) had done so.
TABLE I. FY81 LEP Participants and Students. (n=340)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants¹</th>
<th>Referred Participants²</th>
<th>Students³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Participants: LEP persons who received support services from the Project but were not referred to the Project's courses.

² Referred Participants: LEP persons who received support services, were referred to the Project's courses, but attended less than eight classes.

³ Students: LEP persons who received support services, were referred to the Project's courses, and attended eight or more classes (in Machine Tool I, Machine Tool II, or Secretarial Science).
TABLE II. FY81 Machine Tool I LEP students: Age, Sex, and Ethnic Background.
(n=48)

| HISPANIC          | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
| MEXICAN           |   |   | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| MEXICAN-AMERICAN  | 5 |   | 4 |   | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| PUERTORICAN       | 1 |   | 3 |   | 2 |   |   | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| OTHER HISPANIC    | 2 |   | 1 |   | 1 |   | 7 |   | 2 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ASIAN 1           |   |   | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| OTHERS 2          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| TOTAL             | 24| 6 | 5 |   | 2 |   | 7 | 2 | 2 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

1 Five Lao, three Vietnamese, one Korean
2 One Indian, one Hungarian
### TABLE III. FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students: Education and Age. (n = 48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRIMARY</th>
<th>SECONDARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NONE 1-3</td>
<td>4-6 SOME SEC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE IV. FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students: Education and Ethnic Background. (n = 48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRIMARY</th>
<th>SECONDARY</th>
<th>H.S. GRAD.</th>
<th>POST SEC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NONE 1-3</td>
<td>4-6 SOME SEC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPÁNIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE V. FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students: Marital Status, Age, and Family Status. (n = 48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Family Head</th>
<th>Family Member</th>
<th>Unrelated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARRIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Department of Labor classifications.
2. Family Head: An individual who is the main provider for one or more dependents.
3. Family Member: An individual who is a dependent.
4. Unrelated: An individual who is not a dependent, and who has no dependents.
TABLE VI. FY81 Machine Tool I L&Q Students: Employment Status, Hourly Wage, and Age. (n = 48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER UNEMPLOYED</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER EMPLOYED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 55</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 48)
TABLE VII. FY81 Unemployed Machine Tool I LEP Students: Economic Status and Age. \( n = 30 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME LEVEL</th>
<th>ABOVE $S.I.L.</th>
<th>BELOW $S.I.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Lower Living Standard Income Level as defined by the U.S. Department of Labor.

TABLE VIII. FY81 Unemployed Machine Tool I LEP Students receiving Income Assistance. \( n = 24 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF INCOME ASSISTANCE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ONLY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND CETA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CETA ONLY</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC AID AND CETA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC AID AND ILLINOIS MIGRANT COUNCIL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC AID ONLY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IX. FY81 Secretarial Science LEP students: Age, Sex and Ethnic Background (n=22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HISPANIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICAN AMERICAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUERTO RICAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER HISPANIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- UNDER 18: 4 M, 1 F
- 18-20: 1 M, 2 F
- 21-25: 4 M, 2 F
- 26-35: 1 M, 1 F
- 36-45: 1 M
- 46-55: 1 M
- OVER 55: 1 M

**TOTAL HISPANIC:** 1 M, 9 F
**TOTAL ASIAN:** 3 M, 3 F

1 Two Lao and one Vietnamese
TABLE X. FY81 Secretarial Science LEP Students: Education and Age. (n = 22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>PRIMARY None</th>
<th>PRIMARY 1-3</th>
<th>PRIMARY 4-6</th>
<th>SECONDARY Some H.S.</th>
<th>SECONDARY H.S. Grad.</th>
<th>POST SEC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XI. FY81 Secretarial Science LEP Students: Marital Status, Age, and Family Status. (n = 22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARITAL STATUS</th>
<th>FAMILY STATUS 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARRIED</td>
<td>SINGLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAMILY HEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAMILY MEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNRELATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Department of Labor classifications.
2. Family Head: An individual who is the main provider for one or more dependents.
3. Family Member: An individual who is a dependent.
4. Unrelated: An individual who is not a dependent, and who has no dependents.
TABLE XII. FY81 Secretarial Science LEP Students: Employment Status, Hourly Wage, and Age. (n = 22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNEMPLOYED</th>
<th>EMPLOYED STUDENTS</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER</th>
<th>EMPLOYED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-3.35</td>
<td>3.36-3.99</td>
<td>4.00-4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 55</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the unemployed LEP students, seven were full-time high school students, and five were Public Aid clients.
TABLE XIII. FY81 Unemployed Secretarial Science LEP Students: Economic Status and Age. \((n = 18)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>ABOVE L.L.S.I.L.</th>
<th>BELOW L.L.S.I.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Lower Living Standard Income Level as defined by the U.S. Department of Labor.
TABLE XIV. FY81 LEP students in Waubonsee Community College
English as a Second Language/Adult Basic Education Program
(n = 964)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEXICAN/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICAN-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICAN/</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICAN-</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICAN/</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICAN-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN</td>
<td>OVER 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL HISPANIC</th>
<th>TOTAL ASIAN</th>
<th>TOTAL OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>826</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XV. FY81 Non-LEP Students in "Regular" Machine Tool I: Age and Sex. (n=32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XVI. FY81 Non-LEP Students in "Regular" Machine Tool I: Education and Age. (n = 32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>SOME H.S. GRAD</th>
<th>POST SEC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XVII. FY81 Non-LEP Students in "Regular" Machine Tool I:
Marital Status, Age, and Family Status.
(n = 32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARITAL STATUS</th>
<th>FAMILY STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARRIED</td>
<td>FAM. HEAD 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>MARRIED</th>
<th>SINGLE</th>
<th>FAM. HEAD</th>
<th>FAM. MEMBER</th>
<th>UNREL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Department of Labor classifications.

2. Family Head: An individual who is the main provider for one or more dependents.

3. Family Member: An individual who is a dependent.

4. Unrelated: An individual who is not a dependent, and who has no dependents.
TABLE XVIII. FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students: Previous Vocational Education. (n = 48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOCATIONAL EDUCATION</th>
<th>TOTAL SEMESTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XIX. FY81 Non-LEP Students in Machine Tool I: Previous Vocational Education. (n = 32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOCATIONAL EDUCATION</th>
<th>TOTAL SEMESTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XX. FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students: Vocational Experience in Manufacturing Trades (n = 48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocational Experience</th>
<th>Total Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>LESS THAN 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XXI. FY81 Non-LEP Students in Machine Tool I: Vocational Experience in Manufacturing Trades. (n = 32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocational Experience</th>
<th>Total Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>LESS THAN 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENT STATUS: Tables XXII - XXIII

Status of Students (per course) at Start of Semester and at Follow-Up.

Table XXII: FY81 LEP Students. Starters, Completions, and Withdrawals. (n=82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Starters</th>
<th>Completions</th>
<th>Withdrawals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Machine Tool I</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial Science</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Tool II</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XXIII: Reasons for FY81 Student Withdrawals. (n=28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASONS</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To take a job after being unemployed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Changed Shift</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Working Overtime</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To enter another training program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Moved to another residence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Transportation problems</td>
<td>5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Health problems</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other family problems</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lack of motivation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>29*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One student cited both reasons 6 and 8.
STUDENT STATUS: Status of Students (per course) at Start of Semester and at Follow-Up.

Fall Semester FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students.
Status at Start of Course, August 1980 (n=27)

| EMPLOYED | 8 |
| UNEMPLOYED | 19 |
| HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS | 0 |
| OTHER* | 0 |

Status at End of Course (as of follow-up in March 1981)

| EMPLOYED | 15 |
| Obtained employment | 7 |
| Continued education | 3 |
| LEP Machine Tool II | 2 |
| WCC Vocational courses | 1 |
| UNEMPLOYED | 12 |
| Continued education | 11 |
| LEP Machine Tool II | 10 |
| WCC Vocational courses | 1 |
| Hold** | 12 |

Status as of September 1981 (See also Machine Tool II Status.)

| EMPLOYED | 23 |
| Obtained employment | 15 |
| Continued education | 3 |
| WCC vocational courses | 2 |
| ESL/ABE courses | 1 |

*Persons not in the labor market, such as full-time homemakers.

**Unemployed, in the labor market searching for work (may or may not be continuing education).
### Spring Semester FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students

#### Status at Start of Course, January 1981 (n=21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Students</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Status at End of Course (as of follow-up of August 81)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Students</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Obtained employment** 2

**Continued education** 3

**WCC vocational courses** 2

**ESL/ABE courses** 1

**Hold** 6

***Left geographical area, cannot be contacted for follow-up.***
**Status as of September 1981 (n=21)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPLOYED</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained employment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL/ABE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNEMPLOYED</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCC vocational courses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNKNOWN</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fall Semester FY81 Secretarial Science LEP Students

#### Status at Start of Course, August 1980 (n=11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Students</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status at End of Course**
(As of follow-up in March 1981)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained employment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL/ABE courses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold**</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Students</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued in High School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Status as of September 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained employment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL/ABE courses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Persons not in the labor market, such as full-time homemakers.*

**Unemployed, in the labor market searching for work (may or may not be continuing education).**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued in High School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College mainstreamed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2
Spring Semester FY81 Machine Tool II LEP Students.
Status at Start of Course, January 1981 (n=12)

(All students had completed the Project's Machine Tool I course during the Fall semester.)

| EMPLOYED | 1 |
| UNEMPLOYED | 11 |
| HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS | 0 |
| OTHER* | 0 |

Status at End of course

| EMPLOYED | 3 |
| Obtained employment | 2 |
| Continued education | 2 |
| WCC vocational courses | 2 |
| UNEMPLOYED | 8 |
| Continued education | 7 |
| ESL/ABE courses | 6 |
| Illinois Migrant Council ABE | 1 |
| Hold ** | 8 |
| Went to CETA Job Factory | 6 |
| HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS | 0 |
| OTHER | 0 |
| UNKNOWN*** | 1 |

*Persons not in the labor market, such as full-time homemakers.

** Unemployed, in the labor market searching for work (may or may not be continuing education).

*** Left geographical area, cannot be contacted for follow-up.
### Status as of September 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPLOYED</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained employment</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCC vocational courses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL/ABE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNEMPLOYED</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL/ABE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNKNOWN</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Status of all Machine Tool I* and Secretarial Science LEP Students, as of September 1981. (n=70)

*The 12 Machine Tool II students have not been included here, so as to avoid duplication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPLOYED</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained employment</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCC vocational courses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL/ABE courses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNEMPLOYED</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing education</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCC vocational courses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL/ABE courses</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued education</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued in high school</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCC mainstreamed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNKNOWN</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: Tables XXIV - XL

Introduction

The Project utilized two standard ESL tests to assess its LEP students' English proficiency: (1) The Ilyin Oral Interview to test oral listening and speaking skills; (2) The English-second-language Placement Test (EPT), a written, multiple choice test of grammatical structures (also by D. Ilyin). Both tests were administered to each student before entry into the program and upon completion of the Project's courses. For admittance to both the Machine Tool and the Secretarial Science programs, a minimum score in the 200 Beginning level on the EPT was required, and a minimum score in the 200 Beginning level on the Oral Interview was strongly preferred.

Tables XXIV-XXVI present data on the Machine Tool I students' English proficiency as measured by the Ilyin Oral Interview, and Tables XXVII-XXIX present similar data as measured by the EPT. Tables XXX-XXXII present data on the Secretarial Science students' English proficiency as measured by the Ilyin Oral Interview, and Tables XXXIII-XXXV present similar data as measured by the EPT. Tables XXXVI to XXXIX present similar data on the Machine Tool II students. Although the Project's students were too few in number, especially in its Secretarial Science program, to reach any statistical significance levels, these data give a picture of a group of not atypical LEP students in vocational education that may be of use in the planning and implementation of other projects.

It should be kept in mind that the picture given by the Ilyin Oral Interview and the EPT only shows part of the students' language skills. Both these standard tests are designed to measure proficiencies in ESL for general purposes. For this reason, an important part of the language skills progress made by the Project's LEP students is not reflected in their scores on these
two tests, i.e., their progress in English language skills which are more directly related to their vocational training. Such skills were the focus of the VESL course.

In an attempt to measure at least part of the students' more specifically VESL proficiency, the Curriculum Developer wrote a VESL test of sub-technical vocabulary for the Machine Tool program. This test was field-tested in the spring semester of FY81, and students' scores increased greatly from the pre-test to the post-test. (See Table XL.) This VESL test (slightly revised) and others will be utilized in FY82 on a more formal basis.

Some field-testing of a VESL test was also done for Secretarial Science.

In interpreting the data presented in the following tables, certain general considerations should be kept in mind:

(a) The Machine Tool VESL courses were targeted primarily at the high Beginning and the Intermediate levels; the Secretarial Science VESL courses were targeted primarily at the Intermediate levels.

(b) All the VESL courses worked more on oral listening and speaking skills that on written and reading ones.

(c) All the VESL courses focused on language skills related to the vocational training and job needs, skills that do not always coincide with the general purpose ESL skills measured by the Ilyin Oral Interview and the EPT.

(d) As shown in Table XXIII, the students who did not complete the training programs withdrew motivated by reasons that were not related to language.

With regard to the proficiency levels of the Ilyin Oral Interview and the EPT, it should be noted that both include in their Beginning level a lower 100 level and a higher 200 one, and in their Intermediate level a lower 300 level and higher 400 one. While the Ilyin Oral Interview has only one Advanced level of 500/600, the EPT includes in its Advanced level a lower 500 level and a higher 600 one. A score increase in points on either test, even of several points, does not necessarily mean an increase in level. There are two forms
of the Ilyin Oral Interview, a 50-item one for lower proficiency students (e.g., Beginning and Intermediate levels), and a 30-item one for Advanced students. There are two 50-item EPT forms, A/B/C for the 100-200-300-(400) levels, and G/H for the 400-500-600 ones.
Tables XXIV - XXVI: FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students.
Ilyin Oral Interview.

Table XXIV: FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students.
Ilyin Oral Interview.
Starters, Completions, and Withdrawals per Starting Level. (n = 48)

The Machine Tool I students' starting scores on the Ilyin Oral Interview spanned all three main levels. There were slightly more starters in the Beginning level than in the Intermediate one, and there were slightly fewer starters in the Advanced level than in either of the others. By far the majority of the students started in either the 300 or the 200 level. Proportionately more of the starters in the Intermediate and Beginning levels completed the course that did the Advanced level starters.

Table XXV: FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students.
Ilyin Oral Interview.
Completing Students' Levels at Start, Level Increases, and Levels at Completion. (n = 29)

All the Machine Tool students increased their Ilyin Oral Interview score points from the start to completion of the course. (See the following Table.) More than two-thirds (16 students, or 69.9%) of the 23 students in the Intermediate and Beginning levels also increased one or two levels. At the start, almost the same number of students scored in the Intermediate levels as in the Beginning ones; at completion, more than twice as many students scored in the Intermediate levels as did in the Beginning ones.

Table XXVI: FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students.
Ilyin Oral Interview.
Completing Students' Score Increases in Points. (n = 29)

All the Machine Tool I students increased their score points on the Ilyin Interview, with the majority showing increases of 1 - 10 points. The students who started in the high Beginning 200 level and low Intermediate 300 level showed the greatest score increases, averaging 15.9 and 14.2 points,
respectively. These average increases represent 15.9% and 14.2% of the maximum possible score of 100 points in the 5-item interview; the average increase of 5.8 points of the Advanced level starting students represents 9.5% of the maximum possible score of 60 points on the 30-item interview given these students.


Table XXVII: FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students. EPT. Starters, Completions, and Withdrawals per Starting Level. (n = 48)

More than half of the 48 Machine Tool I students (28 students, or 58.3%) started at the EPT's 200 level, the minimum required for entrance into the course. Of the 29 completing students, 19 (or 65.5%) started in the 200 level. Comparison of these data with the starters' score levels on the Ilyin Oral Interview (Table XXIV) shows that as a group, the starting Machine Tool I students' general ESL skills were stronger in the oral areas of listening and speaking than in those of reading and written structural recognition measured by the EPT.

Table XXVIII: FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students. EPT. Completing Students' Levels at Start, Level Changes, and Levels at Completion. (n = 29)

The EPT score points of all but 3 of the 29 completing Machine Tool I students increased during the semester (see the following table), and 12 of these 44.4% of the 27 students starting in levels 200 through 500, also increased one or two levels. One student's score did not change, while two others' scores actually decreased 1-3 points, which resulted in a drop from level 200 to level 100. At the start, 19 (or 65.5%) of the 29 students scored in the Beginning (200) level, while at completion, only 12 (or 41.4%)
still scored in that level (200-100).

Table XXIX: FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students.
EPT Completing Students' Score Changes in Points. (n = 29)

Of the 29 Machine Tool I students, 26 increased their point scores on the EPT by 1 - 10 points. Those who started in the 200 level, as well as those starting in the 600 level, increased an average of 4.5 points, or 9.0% of the maximum possible score of 50 points; the 8 students who started in the 300-500 levels increased over twice as much, on the average. One student's score did not change, and two students who started at the lowest point of the 200 level actually decreased 1 - 3 points. A explanation for these albeit small decreases may be found in the possibility that their general ESL foundation was so weak at the start that the course, which was aimed at high beginning to low intermediate and focused on language related to the vocational training and job needs, resulted in confusing these students in the skills measured by the EPT.
As is appropriate for a vocational area in which language is of great importance, more Secretarial Science students started in the Advanced level of the Ilyin Oral Interview than in either of the other levels. The Beginning level had the fewest starters, and they all scored in the higher 200 Beginning level. Most of the completing students started in the two highest levels, i.e., the 500/600 Advanced level or the 400 high Intermediate level.

All the Secretarial Science students increased their Ilyin Oral Interview score points from start to completion of the course. (See the following table.) Four of the five students who started in the Intermediate levels also increased one level.

All the Secretarial Science students increased their point scores on the Ilyin Oral Interview, with nearly all showing increases of 1 - 10 points. The average increases of the Intermediate and Beginning level students' scores represent 11.0% and 4.0%, respectively, of the maximum possible score of 100 points on the 50-item interview. The average increase of the Advanced level students represents 9.7% of the maximum possible score of 60 points on the 30-item interview they were given.
Table XXXII - XXXV: FY81 Secretarial Science LEP Students. English-second-language Placement Test (EPT).

Table XXXIII: FY81 Secretarial Science LEP Students. EPT.
Starters, Completions, and Withdrawals per Starting Level. (n = 22)

The same number of Secretarial Science students (8) started in the two Advanced levels as in the Beginning 200 level. Proportionately fewer students started in the Intermediate levels.

Table XXXIV: FY81 Secretarial Science LEP Students. EPT.
Completing Students' Levels at Start, Level Increases, and Levels at Completion. (n = 13)

All the Secretarial Science students increased their score points, and half of the 12 students in the 200 - 500 levels also increased one level. The Advanced 600 level and the Intermediate 300 level each gained 2 students, the Advanced 500 level and the Intermediate 400 level each gained one.

Table XXXV: FY81 Secretarial Science LEP Students. EPT.
Completing Students' Score Increases in Points. (n = 13)

All the Secretarial Science students increased their point scores, all but one from 1 - 10 points. Those in the Intermediate levels increased the most, an average of 7.8 points, or 15.6% of the maximum possible score of 50 points. The students in the Advanced level and those in the Beginning level had average increases of 4.0% and 8.6%, respectively.
The Machine Tool II students started their course evenly spread out in the Ilyin Oral Interviews' Advanced level, two Intermediate levels, and lowest Beginning level. All the students increased their score points (see the following Table), and 7 of the 9 (or 77.8%) who could have increased a level, did in fact climb 1 or 2 levels. At start 3 students (25%) were in the lowest Beginning 100 level; at completion, all 3 had advanced into the 200 level. Two of the 3 students who started in the low Intermediate 300 level advanced one level, and the other student advanced two levels. At start, 6 students (50%) were in the top two levels, the high Intermediate 400 one and the Advanced 500/600 one. At completion, 9 students (75%) were in these top two levels.

All the FY81 Machine Tool II LEP students increased their score points on the Ilyin Oral Interview, most of them by 1-10 points. The students who started in the 300 level and those who started in the 100 level showed the greatest score increases, averaging 13.7 and 10.3 points respectively, or 13.7% and 10.3% of the maximum possible score of 100 points on their 50-item interview. The 400 level starters averaged 5.3% increases, and the Advanced level starters increased an average of 3.7 points, or 6.2% of maximum possible score of 60 points on their 30-item interview.

Table XXXVIII: FY81 Machine Tool II LEP Students. EPT. Levels at Start, Level Increases, and Levels at Completion. (n=12)

Half of the 12 Machine Tool II LEP students placed in the high Beginning 200 level of the EPT at the start of the course; 4 of these 6 students moved up to the low Intermediate 300 level at completion. Two of the 4 who started in the 300 level moved up 2 levels, to the 500 one. The 500 level starter advanced to the 600 level. All in all, 7 of 11 students (or 63.4%) who could have increased 1-2 levels did in fact do so.

Table XXXIX: FY81 Machine Tool II LEP Students. EPT. Students' Score Changes in Points. (n=12)

Six of the 12 Machine Tool II LEP students increased their score points on the EPT by 1-10 points (out of a maximum possible score of 50), 4 students increased by 11-20 points, and 2 students' scores decreased 1-3 points.
The results of the fall semester demonstrated a need to assess the LEP students' proficiency in the sub-technical vocabulary which is vital in the Machine Tool I course, but is not measured by the general purpose English measured by the Standard ESL tests (Ilyin Oral Interview and EPT.) In order to measure at least part of the students' sub-technical language proficiency, the Project developed the first section of a VESL test: Technical English Test, Section I: Semi-Technical Vocabulary. This test was fieldtested in the spring semester. A copy of the test, plus its full description, rationale and objectives, have been included in Appendix IV.

Section I of the Technical English Test consists of 50 multiple-choice items, each one with a drawing, answer and three distractors of 1-3 words each. Included in the test are basic sub-technical vocabulary items important for the machine tool course (also applicable to a blueprint reading course), vocabulary which LEP students may have learned in the course of their acquisition of English or in general purpose ESL classes. Of the items, 42 represent nouns, and the other 8 are adjectives. Except for #9 (a micrometer) and #26 (revolutions per minute), all the items are sub-technical vocabulary, i.e., words with general use(s) as well as more technical applications in manufacturing trades, especially machine tool technology and blueprint reading. Comprehension of sub-technical vocabulary is vital to explanations and use of the technical terms taught in the vocational course, and most people know these sub-technical words in their native language.

This VESL Test can be administered as a pre-test before the start of the start of the (Machine Tool or Blueprint Reading) vocational and vocational ESL
(VESL) courses, and as a post-test at the end of the courses. This test has proven useful in the Waubonsee project for purposes of student assessment, problem diagnosis and student evaluation.

Table XL presents data on the VESL test scores of the Spring semester Machine Tool I LEP students and the Machine Tool II LEP students. The pre-test results of the Machine Tool I students clearly show that the majority had little knowledge of these sub-technical words. Their post-test scores show great progress. Comparison of the Machine Tool II students' pre-test results with those of the Machine Tool I students shows clearly that the former had mastered most of the sub-technical vocabulary in their fall semester Machine Tool I courses. Even so, their post-test results also show improvement.
Table XXIV: FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students. Ilyin Oral Interview. Starters, Completions, and Withdrawals per Starting Level. (n=48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ilyin Oral Interview Level</th>
<th>Starters per level</th>
<th>Completions per starting level</th>
<th>Withdrawals per starting level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A* 500/600</td>
<td>14 (29.2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I** 400</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Total</td>
<td>16 (33.3)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B*** 200</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Total</td>
<td>18 (37.5)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29 (60.4)</td>
<td>19 (39.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A = Advanced  
** I = Intermediate  
*** B = Beginning

Table XXV: FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students. Ilyin Oral Interview. Completing Students' Levels at Start, Level Increases, and Levels at Completion. (n=29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ilyin Oral Interview Level</th>
<th>Completing students per level at start( %)</th>
<th>Students who increased levels</th>
<th>Students per level at completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 500/600</td>
<td>6 (29.6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 (27.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Total</td>
<td>11 (37.9)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 200</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Total</td>
<td>12 (41.4)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13 (51.7)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Ilyin Oral Interview does not measure level increases of students who start out at its Advanced level.
Table XXVI: FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students.
Ilyin Oral Interview
Completing Students' Score Increases in points. (n=29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ilyin Oral Interview Start Level</th>
<th>Average increase in points</th>
<th>Students whose score increased</th>
<th>1-10 points</th>
<th>11-20 points</th>
<th>21-35 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A** 500/600</td>
<td>5.7*</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 400</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I** Total</td>
<td>13.0**</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 200</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B** Total</td>
<td>11.6**</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A Advanced level students took the 30-item interview, with a maximum score of 60 points.
**Intermediate and Beginning level students took the 50-item interview with a maximum score of 100 points.

Table XXVII: FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students.
English-second-language Placement Test Starters, Completions, and Withdrawals per starting level. (n=48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPT Level</th>
<th>Starters per level</th>
<th>Completions per starting level</th>
<th>Withdrawals per starting level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>600 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500 7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Total</td>
<td>14 (29.2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>400 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Total</td>
<td>6 (12.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>200 28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Total</td>
<td>28 (58.3)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>43 29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XXVIII: FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students
English-second-language Placement Test.
Completing Students' Levels at Start,
Level Changes, and Levels at Completion
(n=29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPT. Start Level at start</th>
<th>Students per level at start (%)</th>
<th>Students who changed levels</th>
<th>Students per level at Completion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>increase +1</td>
<td>decreas. -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>C 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 0 0 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 200</td>
<td>T9</td>
<td>6 1 2 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Total</td>
<td>19 (65.5)</td>
<td>6 1 2 12 (41.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 90 students

Table XXIX: FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students
English-second-language Placement Test.
Completing Students' Score Changes in Points. (n=29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPT. Start Level</th>
<th>Average Increase (points)</th>
<th>Students whose score increased (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-10 pts. 11-20 pts. 20-30 pts. +0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 600</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Total</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 400</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Total</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 200</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15 1 0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Total</td>
<td>19 (65.5)</td>
<td>6 1 2 12 (41.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22 2 2 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XXX: FY81 Secretarial Science LEP Students.  
Ilyin Oral Interview.  
Starters, Completions, and Withdrawals per Starting Level  
(n=22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ilyin Oral Interview Level</th>
<th>Starters per level</th>
<th>Completions per starting level</th>
<th>Withdrawals per starting level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A* 500/600</td>
<td>10 (45.5)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I** 400</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Total</td>
<td>7 (31.8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B*** 200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Total</td>
<td>5 (22.7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13 (59.1)</td>
<td>9 (40.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XXXI: FY81 Secretarial Science LEP Students.  
Ilyin Oral Interview.  
Completing Students' Levels at Start, Level Increases, and Levels at Completion.  
(n=13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ilyin Oral Interview Level</th>
<th>Completing students per level at start</th>
<th>Students who increased 1 level</th>
<th>Students per level at completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 500/600</td>
<td>6 (46.2)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9 (69.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 400</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-300</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Total</td>
<td>5 (38.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 200</td>
<td>2 (15.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Ilyin Oral Interview does not measure level increases of students who start out at its Advanced level.

* A= Advanced  
** I= Intermediate  
*** B= Beginning
Table XXXII: FY81 Secretarial Science LEP Students. Ilyin Oral Interview. Completing Students' Score Increases in Points. \((n=13)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ilyin Oral Interview Start level</th>
<th>Average increase in points</th>
<th>Students whose score increased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-10 points</td>
<td>11-20 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A* 500/600</td>
<td>5.8*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 400</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Total</td>
<td>11.0**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Total</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 200</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Advanced level students took the 30-item interview, with a maximum score of 60 points.

**Intermediate and Beginning level students took the 50-item interview, with a maximum score of 100 points.

Table XXXIII: FY81 Secretarial Science LEP Students. English-second-language Placement Test Starters, Completions and Withdrawals per Starting Level: \((n=22)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPT Level</th>
<th>Starters per level</th>
<th>Completions per starting level</th>
<th>Withdrawals per starting level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Total</td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Total</td>
<td>6 (27.2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 200</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Total</td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XXXIV: FY81 Secretarial Science LEP Students.  
English-second-language Placement Test.  
Completing Students' Levels at Start, 
Level Changes, and Levels at Completion.  
(n=13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPT Level</th>
<th>Students per level at start (%)</th>
<th>Students who increased 1 level</th>
<th>Students per level at completion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Total</td>
<td>4 (30.8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 (38.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Total</td>
<td>5 (38.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 (46.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 200</td>
<td>4 (30.8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XXXV: FY81 Secretarial Science LEP Students.  
English-second-language Placement Test.  
Completing Students' Score Increases in Points (n=13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPT Start Level</th>
<th>Average increase in points (per start level)</th>
<th>Students whose score increased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 600</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 400</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Total</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 200</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XXXVI: FY81 Machine Tool II LEP Students.
Ilyin Oral Interview
Levels at Start, Level Increases, and Levels at Completion.
(n=12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ilyin Oral Interview Level</th>
<th>Students per level at start (%)</th>
<th>Students who increased levels</th>
<th>Students per level at completion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 500/600</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Total</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Ilyin Oral Interview does not measure level increases of students who start out at its Advanced level.*
Table XX.**II: FY81 Machine Tool II LEP Students.
Ilyin Oral Interview.
Students' Score Increases in Points.
(n=12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ilyin Oral Interview Start Level</th>
<th>Average Increase in Points</th>
<th>Students whose score increased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 500/600</td>
<td>3.7*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 400</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Total</td>
<td>9.5**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 200</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B Total</td>
<td>10.3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Advanced level students took the 30-item interview, with a maximum of 60 points.

** Intermediate and Beginning level students took the 50-item interview, with a maximum of 100 points.
Table XXXVIII: FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students. English-second-language Placement Test. Completing Students' Levels at Start, Level Increases, and Levels at Completion. (n=12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPT Level</th>
<th>Students per level at start</th>
<th>Students who increased levels</th>
<th>Students per level at completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Total</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Total</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Total</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XXXIX: FY81 Machine Tool II LEP Students.
English-second-language Placement Test.
Students' Score: Changes in Points.
(n=12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPT Start Level</th>
<th>Average increase in points</th>
<th>Students whose scores changed in points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>increased 1-10 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.8</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 200</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XL. FY81 Machine Tool I (Spring Semester) and Machine Tool II LEP Students.
LEP Project VESL Semi-Technical Vocabulary Test.
Percentages of Students Scoring within Given Ranges of Points Correct in the Pre-Test and Post-Test. (n=24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score ranges in points</th>
<th>% Machine Tool I students ( Completing students only )</th>
<th>% Machine Tool II students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>Post-Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 40-50</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;35-39</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-34</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total below 40</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Maximum possible score of 50 points.

** The lowest score was 12, of a Machine Tool I student on the Pre-Test; this student as well as the other 2 Machine Tool students who scored lower than 29 points on the Pre-Test withdrew before completion of the course. No Machine Tool II student withdrew, nor did any score lower than 36 on the Pre-Test.
MATH PROFICIENCY: Table XLI

Given the importance of basic math skills in all vocational areas, and the fundamental place of fractions, decimals, and measurement in machine tool operation, the Project has always placed a high priority on math. A pre-test and a post-test were developed and administered. Each test consisted of three parts (whole numbers, fractions, decimals) each with 12 computation problems of basic addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division (3 problems per operation). No word problems were given. The results of the pre-test were used for assessment of students' skills and diagnosis of problem areas. Pre-test and post-test results were compared to see progress made. A composite of the results of the Machine Tools students' tests is presented in Table XLI with the shaded areas representing the proportion of the problems that most students solved correctly.

It can be seen that the Machine Tool students began the program with very low math skills, especially those involving fractions and decimals, and division and multiplication. They made considerable progress during their training program, in which the VESL course had to do considerable work on math, with multiplication and division of fractions (both rarely used in Machine Tool Lab I) remaining their weakest areas.

The Secretarial Science students entered the program with somewhat higher skills, especially with whole numbers. Their post-test results showed some progress, but reflected the fact that little attention was able to be given to math in the VESL course, because of the very large amount of language material that needed to be covered.
Table XLI. FY81 Machine Tool I LEP Students.
Composite of Math Pre-Test and Post-Test Results. \((n = 29)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRE-TEST</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole Numbers</td>
<td>Fractions</td>
<td>Decimals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POST-TEST</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole Numbers</td>
<td>Fractions</td>
<td>Decimals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
READING PROFICIENCY

In order to obtain some measure of its students' reading proficiency in English and in their native language, the Project administered English and Spanish parallel versions of the InterAmerican Series of Reading Tests, by Guidance Testing Associates (San Antonio, Texas) to the Hispanic students. The English version only was administered to the non-Hispanic students. Parts I (Comprehension) and III (Vocabulary) of Level 2 (approximately grades 1.5 - 4.0) were given. The tests are in a multiple-choice format of 40 questions in each part; in part I, the students choose from 4 drawings the one referred to in a phrase, sentence or short paragraph, and in part III they choose from 4 words the one suggested by a drawing.

The InterAmerican Series of Reading Tests was chosen for two reasons: (1) it has parallel versions in Spanish and English; and (2) it tests at low, beginning reading levels. Since reading per se was not a major focus of the Project's training program, it was felt that these advantages out-weighed the Series' disadvantages of generally child-oriented content, sometimes middle-class bias, and the unclear character of a couple of the drawings. Level 2 was selected after pilot testing showed that levels 3-5 were too difficult and academically oriented, and that level 1 was too simple to give very usable data on the Project's students. In FY82 the ABLE (Adult Basic Learning Examination) Reading test will also be administered.

On entering the program, most of the Machine Tool students appeared to be reading in English at a level of grades 1.0 - 3.5 as indicated by the comprehension test, and at grades 3.0 - 4.0 as indicated by the vocabulary test. Four students tested above grade 4.0 in both. All the students improved in comprehension an average of 20% from the pre-test to the post-test, with the lowest starting students showing the least improvement. The majority of the
students were reading at grades 3.0 - 4.0 at the end of the course, as shown by their comprehension post-tests.

There was not very much improvement in most cases in vocabulary as measured by this test, and several students' post-test scores on the vocabulary part were slightly lower than their pre-test scores. These results indicate the following: (1) that the students developed skills in comprehending written material during their courses, and probably also a greater familiarity with test-taking; (2) comprehension skills do seem to be transferable from technical content to other kinds of content, while vocabulary skills do not; and (3) the emphasis on specialized vocabulary in the students' vocational and VESL courses does not seem to have helped them in the area of general vocabulary. For information on the students' sub-technical vocabulary development, see the previous discussion of the Project's VESL test (Table XL).

Most of the Secretarial Science students tested above grade 4.0 in the English reading comprehension and vocabulary Level 2 tests, although the Level 3-5 tests were not appropriate for them either.

All but 4 of the Hispanic students scored very much higher on the Spanish reading comprehension test than on the English pre-test, and even those 4 (all in Machine Tool) scored slightly higher in Spanish. All but 2 (again both Machine Tool) students scored very much higher on the Spanish reading vocabulary test than on the English pre-test. (The Spanish test was given only once, in the fifth week of classes.) The Hispanic students can thus be seen as clearly Spanish-dominant in reading, with the exception of the 2-4 Machine Tool students who may have been reading at almost equal levels in both languages.
Conclusions and Recommendations

The foundation of the LEP Project has always been the premise that LEP students can learn the same vocational concepts and skills as native English-speaking students, given the necessary support services and appropriate instructional materials and strategies, both vocational and Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL). From the Project's work in FY81, a number of conclusions may be drawn.

1. The preliminary designing of an effective project will follow these steps:
   (1) make a realistic needs assessment of the LEP community, industry, business, and the institution
   (2) make a realistic resource assessment, especially of the LEP community and the institution
   (3) evaluate the feasibility of alternative kinds of programs and choose the best one(s) for the situation
   (4) allow time and monies for planning, with realistic time lines for staffing and materials development

2. In project goal setting, both a needs assessment and a resource assessment are necessary. However, when it comes to program implementation, it is the extent and the accuracy of the resource assessment that counts most. The needs assessment helps you decide what you want to do, while the resource assessment helps you discover what you can do.

3. After outlining its goals in the planning phase, a project must fill in the details of who, what, when and how. This requires monies for qualified staff members with sufficient time to establish and maintain the necessary operational framework within the institution and the community. There must also be staff members and time to develop the instructional component.

4. In a research and development project such as the Waubonsee LEP Project, the development must come first in order to insure valid and usable research data. During FY81, a number of factors combined in the Project
to make the amount of time necessary to establish the operational framework and fully develop the instructional component much greater than originally planned. The approved revisions in the Project's FY82 Proposal reflect this reality. (See section m, Accomplishments, Objective I.)

5. In vocational content and number of contact hours, special LEP courses should parallel existing "regular" ones as far as possible, although of course VESL courses will continue to be special. Such parallelism is important because vocational content need not and should not be diluted for LEP students although language will need to be adapted/simplified. Parallel LEP courses will permit them to continue after the end of a special project, and will allow the institution to utilize various funding sources to pay instructors' salaries.

6. In terms of adoptability and adaptability of an effective vocational program for LEP students, the two most critical factors, besides operational framework, are:
   a. Support Services
   b. Instructional Materials (vocational and VESL)

These factors work hand in hand to meet the needs of LEP student by utilizing the resources of institutions that provide vocational training.

7. The Support Services component, with its many diverse facets, it vital to recruitment and retention of LEP students, especially adults.

8. The data collected by the Project on its student population point to major differences, e.g., English language skills, general educational background, age and family status, economic status, previous vocational education and experience, between the Waubonsee LEP students and the Waubonsee "regular" vocational students. These differences combine to prevent most LEP adults from successful participation in traditional
vocational programs. An effective program must directly address these differences.

9. The LEP Project has shown that appropriate comprehensive vocational and VESL materials for LEP students can be adapted, written, and/or selected from existing resources.

It is evident that many traditional vocational materials and techniques presuppose high language and academic skills the majority of LEP students do not possess. Even the few existing materials targeted for LEP students are not usable because most of them are designed for the small minority who possess advanced English skills, rather than the majority of LEP students, i.e., those at beginning and low intermediate ESL levels. (See section r, Summations of Evaluation Data Collected.)

Extensive adapting and rewriting of these vocational materials is thus necessary. Both vocational and language expertise must be applied to the development of vocational materials for LEP students. As demonstrated by the Machine Tool instructional materials developed by the Project, the necessary adaptations of organization, format, and layout of concepts, and the necessary language simplification (structures and vocabulary) can be done without diluting the technical content.

10. The high language and academic skills presupposed by traditional vocational textbooks present similar barriers to LEP students and to other special needs students. Like LEP students, many disadvantaged and handicapped students have difficulty in reading and using such traditional textbooks. The Project believes that adapted/developed English vocational materials which are appropriate for LEP students can also be effectively utilized by these other special needs students.

11. The appropriateness of materials depends on:

- language and technical skills necessary for employment in a particular vocational area
- the needs and resources of the student population
- the scope of the vocational training and its VESL support

The extent of materials adaptation necessary will be determined by accurate student assessment, realistic training and employment goals, and the demands of acceptable performance on the job.

12. The Project found that having two semesters of fieldtesting with real LEP students of diverse ethnic and educational backgrounds was extremely valuable in the development of curricula and instructional materials for both Machine Tool and Secretarial Science. The value of time for materials development cannot be overstated: time for planning, initial development, fieldtesting with real students -- preferably with the developer(s) doing some or all of the fieldtesting and teaching -- revisions, and final drafts.

13. In a vocational program aimed at training LEP students for employment in the United States, English should be the main language of instruction, and appropriate English vocational materials are the key to the students' success in training and ultimately on the job. This is equally true for both bilingual and non-bilingual instructional models.

14. Realistic English proficiency entrance requirements must be established for a special project's vocational courses. LEP students need to have certain basic competencies in English in order to profit from vocational training aimed at employability in the U.S. Exactly what constitutes these basic competencies depends on the vocational area and the scope of a particular training program, especially the scope of its VESL component.

15. Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL) courses play a vital role in the success of LEP students in vocational education, especially in the case of students with less than advanced English proficiency. An effective VESL course will be closely coordinated with a particular vocational course.
Due to its specialized nature, VESL should not and cannot replace ESL for general purposes.

16. Since math skills are necessary for training in many vocational areas an LEP program should assess its students' math skills and be prepared to address their needs.

17. In a bilingual instructional model, a program must make decisions about how and how much its instructors and materials will use the students' native language(s). These decisions should be based on such factors as the project's resources, its students' English and native language proficiencies, how many native languages are involved, the vocational area(s) and the availability of qualified bilingual staff and materials in that area.

18. English vocational materials that are appropriate for LEP students should be the basis for any native language materials used in the vocational and/or VESL courses.

19. During the development and implementation of its bilingual instructional model in FY81, the Project found that the use of the LEP students' native language(s) carries with it certain important strengths, particularly the following: (a) potential for insuring student comprehension; (b) potential for helping the vocational instructor to evaluate accurately a student's acquisition of technical knowledge and skills; and (c) bolstering of students' self-confidence.

20. The Project encountered practical difficulties in implementing its bilingual instructional model in FY81, namely the scarcity of qualified bilingual vocational and VESL instructors and the scarcity of appropriate bilingual and/or native-language-only materials.

21. Besides these practical problems, the Project found it necessary to try to minimize the effects of certain potential weaknesses of the use of the students' native language(s), particularly the following:
(a) the possibility that the use of their native language(s) may work against the students' improving their job-related and general purpose English skills

(b) the fact that the more native languages are involved in the multilingual classroom of a "bilingual" model, the less time there is for using English

(c) the double difficulty for students if the new technical vocabulary is taught bilingually

(d) the variety of the students' native language proficiency levels

(e) the students' demands that English be the primary language of instruction.

22. After considerable experimentation with various formats and levels of bilingual Machine Tool materials, the Project found the least effective ones to be bilingual technical glossaries and straight translations of traditional vocational textbooks. (See section m, Accomplishments; Objectives IV and V.) The results of the Project's fieldtesting showed the most effective bilingual Machine Tool materials to be native language supplements to the English vocational materials developed by the Project.
k. Conference/Workshop Summaries

- Conference/Workshop Title: Materials Development Workshop

- Organizer: Jeanne Lopez-Valadez
  Bilingual Vocational Education Project (BVEP)

- Presentation Title: Instructional Materials for LEP Students in Vocational Education: Content, Language Use, Format

- Presentor(s): Michael G. Kelly, Project Director
  Patricia Menges, Curriculum Developer/VESL Instructor

1. Summary of Subject Matter Covered:
The Project Director discussed ways of determining content, language use, and format in the adaptation and/or development of vocational materials for LEP students. The Curriculum Developer discussed the same issues in relation to developing VESL materials.

2. Conference/Workshop Particulars
   a. Place: Northwest Educational Cooperative/BVEP
      Arlington Heights, Illinois
   b. Date: May 22, 1981
   c. Contact Hours of Presentation: 10:30 - 11:15 a.m.
   d. Promotional Brochure for Conference/Workshop: Available from BVEP

3. Participants: + 15 vocational and VESL instructors and administrators

4/5 Conference/Workshop Evaluation: Evaluations were handled by BVEP.

6. Summary of Presentation Strengths/Weaknesses:
The subject matter covered in this presentation was received with considerable interest by the participants, most of whom were high school educators. Unfortunately, there was too little time available within the framework of the workshop as a whole to do any more than outline the basic ideas. It is hoped that future workshops in FY82 will offer the opportunity for fuller treatment of these issues.

7. Materials Developed for Presentation:
The presentation outline that was distributed to the participants is attached. Other materials, too numerous to include in this report, were used to support various points of the presentation.
Instructional Materials for LEP Students in Vocational Education: Content, Language Use, and Format

1. Sample Lesson from the Waubonsee Machine Tool materials.

2. Prerequisites for developing/adapting vocational materials for LEP students.


Michael G. Kelly
Patricia Menges
Waubonsee Community College
Sugar Grove, Illinois
Conference/Workshop Title: Workshop on Multicultural Vocational Education for LEP Students

Organizer: ISBE/DAVTE

Presentation Title: "Adapting Vocational Materials: How Is It Done?"

Presentor(s): Michael G. Kelly, Project Director

1. Summary of Subject Matter Covered
   The first section of this presentation analyzed the need for instructional materials adapted/developed for LEP students in vocational courses, and the importance of a needs assessment and a resource assessment. Certain prerequisites for adapting vocational materials for LEP students were then discussed, as well as various specific methods of actually adapting and/or developing such materials, including setting and writing appropriate student objectives before and during the adaptation process, and the necessary collaboration between vocational and language specialists. Examples of the Waubonsee LEP Project's Machine Tool materials were used to illustrate key points.

2. Conference/Workshop Particulars
   a. Place: Louis Joliet Renaissance Center
      Joliet, Illinois
   b. Date: April 30, 1981
   c. Contact Hours of Presentation: 1:00 - 2:00 p.m.

3. Participants: 15 VESL and vocational instructors and administrators.

4/5 Composite of Completed Conference/Workshop Evaluation Instruments
Evaluation was handled by the conference organizers and results were compiled by Cathy Day of the University of Illinois at Urbana. Several participants signed the Project's mailing list for further information.
6. Summary of Presentation Strengths/Weaknesses:

The participants already directly involved in program implementation and materials development were very interested in the practical application of the strategies outlined in this presentation. Participants expressed the need for an in-depth workshop on this subject.

7. Materials Developed for Presentation:

The presentation outline that was distributed to the participants is attached. Other materials, too numerous to include in this report, were used to support various points of the presentation.
Adaptation of Vocational Education Materials:
How Is It Done?

Michael G. Kelly
Director
LEP Project for Vocational Education
Waubonsee Community College
Sugar Grove, Illinois

(1) Introduction

(2) The Need for Adapted Materials

(3) Needs Assessment and Resource Assessment

(4) Prerequisites for Adapting Vocational Materials for LEP Students

(5) How to Adapt Vocational Materials

(6) Conclusions
Conference/Workshop Title: Workshop on Multicultural Vocational Education for LEP Students.

Organizer: ISBE/BAVTE with Southern Illinois University

Presentation Title: "Development of VESL Materials: Where Do I Start?"

Presentor(s): Patricia Menges, Curriculum Developer/VESL Instructor

Summary of Subject Matter Covered: This presentation began with a look at what VESL is and what it is not, and by reviewing the relationships of VESL and ESL and vocational education. The discussion then turned to a list of questions for the VESL instructor, dealing with: general information about the vocational and VESL courses, technical, language, and other related skills required; assessment of human resources; and assessment of materials resources. Since appropriate vocational materials should be the basis for VESL materials development, three kinds of vocational materials were then briefly examined: traditional, adapted, and bilingual ones. Formats and media for VESL materials and VESL objectives were analyzed, using materials field tested in the Waubonsee LEP Project's Machine Tool courses as examples.

Conference/Workshop Particulars

a. Place: Louis Joliet Renaissance Center

b. Date: April 30, 1981

c. Contact Hours of Presentation: 1:00 - 2:00 p.m.

d. Promotional Brochure for Conference/Workshop: Available from workshop organizers

Participants: 27 VESL, vocational, and ESL instructors and administrators

Composite of Completed Conference/Workshop Evaluation Instruments

Evaluation was handled by conference organizers and results were compiled by Cathy Day of the University of Illinois at Urbana. Nearly all the participants signed the Project's mailing list, expressing interest in further information.
6. Summary of Presentation Strengths:

The level of interest in the topics discussed in this presentation was very high. Participants expressed the need for in-depth treatment of VESL materials and teaching techniques.

7. Materials Developed for Presentation:

The presentation outline that was distributed to the participants is attached. Other materials, too numerous to include in this report, were used to support various points of the presentation.
Development of VESL Materials: Where do I Start?

Patricia A. Menges
Curriculum Developer/
VESL Instructor
Waubonsee Community College
Sugar Grove, Illinois

(1) What VESL is and what VESL is not

(2) V:ESL
Vocational
ESL

(3) Questions for VESL instructor
   (3a) The course: General information
   (3b) Skills required: Technical skills, language skills, other related skills
   (3c) Resource assessment: Human resources
   (3d) Resource assessment: Materials

(4) Vocational Materials
   (4a) "Regular" text
   (4b) Text adapted/developed for LEP students
   (4c) Bilingual materials

(5) VESL Objectives
    VESL Materials

(6) Formats and media for VESL materials
Conference/Workshop Title: First Midwest Regional TESOL/BE Conference and 9th Annual State Convention: A Toast to TESOL

Organizer: TESOL/BE Association (National) and Illinois TESOL/BE Association

Presentation Title: "Current Illinois Projects Concerned with LEP Students in Vocational Education" (panel presentation)

Presentor(s): Michael G. Kelly, Project Director
Patricia Menges, Curriculum Developer/VESL Instructor
(Panelists with staff members of other LEP Projects)

1. Summary of Subject Matter Covered: Staff members of each project gave an overview of their project, and showed samples of the materials being developed and/or technical assistance provided.

2. Conference/Workshop Particulars:
   a. Place: University of Illinois
      Urbana, Illinois
   b. Date: April 4, 1981
   c. Contact Hours of Presentation: 3:30 - 4:30 p.m.
   d. Promotional Brochure for Conference/Workshop: Available from conference organizers

3. Participants: 20+ vocational and VESL instructors and administrators

4/5 Composite of Completed Conference/Workshop Evaluation Instruments
   Evaluation was handled by conference organizers
   Several participants signed the Project's mailing list for further information.

6. Summary of Presentation Strengths/Weaknesses:
   As a general information session by a panel, the presentation was a success.

7. Materials Developed for Presentation:
   (N/A: Panel Presentation)
Conference/Workshop Title: First Midwest Regional TESOL/BE Conference and 9th Annual State Convention: A Toast to TESOL

Organizer: TESOL/BE Association (National) and Illinois TESOL/BE Association

Presentation Title: "Putting the V in VESL"

Presenter(s): Patricia Menges, Curriculum Developer/VESL Instructor
               Michael G. Kelly, Project Director

1. Summary of Subject Matter Covered
   After a brief look at the need for vocational education aimed at LEP adults, this presentation turned to the relationships between vocational education and ESL, between it and VESL, and between VESL and ESL. Then considerable attention was given to the inappropriateness for LEP students of traditional vocational textbooks, methods of adapting and/or developing vocational materials used by the Waubonsee LEP Project, simplifying syntactic structure, types of VESL materials based on vocational materials, Technical Vocabulary Lists and their possible uses in the VESL courses, and conclusions about "Putting the V in VESL." Samples of the Waubonsee LEP Project's Machine Tool vocational and VESL materials were included among the handouts.

2. Conference/Workshop Particulars
   a. Place: University of Illinois
      Urbana, Illinois
   b. Date: April 3, 1981
   c. Contact Hours of Presentation: 9:30 - 11:30 a.m.
   d. Promotional Brochure for Conference/Workshop: Available from Conference Organizer

3. Participants: 25 vocational, VESL and ESL instructors and administrators

4/5 Composite of Completed Conference/Workshop Evaluation Instruments

   Evaluation was handled by conference organizers. Nearly all the participants signed the Project's mailing list, expressing interest in further information.
6. Summary of Presentation Strengths/Weaknesses:

The information presented generated great interest in and discussion about the Project's materials and LEP students in vocational education. Many of these participants attended the workshop on Multicultural Vocational Education for LEP students sponsored by DAVTE 3 weeks later.

7. Materials Developed for Presentation:

The presentation outline that was distributed to the participants is attached. Other materials, too numerous to include in this report, were used to support various points of the presentation.
PUTTING THE V IN VESL

(1) Vocational Education for LEP Adults: Why?

A Good Job

Marketable Technical Skills

English Language Skills

(2) The Waubonsee Project

Budget
Needs Assessment
Resource Assessment

Project Design
Model
Materials

Vocational areas:
Machine Tool and Technical English (VESL)
Secretarial Sciences and Business English (VESL)

(3) Vocational Education

(4) ESL.
(5) Vocational Education, ESL, and VESL

Vocational Training for LEP adults
VESL/Technical English

Vocational Education → ESL

(6) $ \quad $ STAFF \quad SCHEDULING \quad MATERIALS \quad RECRUITMENT RETENTION

(7) Curricula and Instructional Materials

(7a) Rationale

(7b) Vocational Materials
- Traditional
- Adapted/Developed for LEP students

(7c) VESL Materials for LEP students

(8) VESL Teaching Strategies and Techniques

(9) Conclusions
Conference/Workshop Title: Illinois ACEA 2nd Annual Conference: Choices '81
Organizer: Illinois Adult and Continuing Education Association
Presentation Title: "Theory and Practice of Vocational Education for LEP Students: A Case Study for the 80's"
Presentor(s): Michael G. Kelly, Project Director; Patricia Menges, Curriculum Developer/VESL Instructor

1. Summary of Subject Matter Covered
This presentation focused on the practical considerations and decisions crucial to the various phases of the Waubonsee LEP Project for Vocational Education: I. Initial Concept; II. Planning; III. Implementation; IV. Evaluation. The implications that this Waubonsee LEP Project case study has for other projects with similar goals were discussed and conclusions were drawn about factors that are critical to planning and implementing a successful vocational training program for Limited English Proficiency students. A sample resource assessment form was included as a handout and discussed as an important part of phases I and II.

2. Conference/Workshop Particulars
a. Place: Holiday Inn
Springfield, Illinois
b. Date: March 26, 1981
c. Contact Hours of Presentation: 1:00 - 3:30 p.m.
d. Promotional Brochure for Conference/Workshop: Available from conference organizer

3. Participants: 15 ESL and VESL instructors and administrators

4/5 Composite of Completed Conference/Workshop Evaluation Instruments
Evaluation was handled by conference organizers. Several participants expressed interest in further information about the Project and its materials.
6. Summary of Presentation Strengths/Weaknesses:

The practical focus, especially the Resource Assessment, and the organization of this talk were well presented, and it was very useful for those participants who were directly involved in vocational education for LEP students. Some of the participants were not involved in this field and would have preferred something more basic and general.

7. Materials Developed for Presentation:

The presentation outline that was distributed to the participants is attached. Other materials, too numerous to include in this report, were used to support various points of the presentation.
Vocational Education for LEP Adults: Why?

(1a) A Good Job

- Marketable Technical Skills
- English Language Skills

Vocational Training

- Technical English (VESL)

Vocational Education

- ESL/Bilingual Programs

(1b) Theoretical Basis
- needs assessment
- something special to offer
- resource assessment
- models and their evolution

(2) Phase I. Initial Concept
(2a) Community initiative
(2b) Waubonsee Community College
(2c) Advisory Council

(3) Phase II. Planning
(3a) Funding
(3b) Planning Grant
(3c) Decisions

Budget
Needs Assessment
Resource Assessment

Project Design
Model
Materials

(3d) Vocational areas:
  Machine Tool and Technical English (VESL)
  Secretarial Sciences and Business English (VESL)

(4) Phase III Implementation

(4a)

(5) Phase IV Evaluation

(6) Conclusions
(6a) Community commitment
(6b) Needs assessment
(6c) Institutional commitment
(6d) Resource assessment
(6e) Instructional materials
(6f) BE REALISTIC AND PRACTICAL
- Conference/Workshop Title: IVA Conference

- Organizer: Illinois Vocational Association

- Presentation Title: "Overview of LEP vocational education programs in Illinois" (Panel Presentation)

- Presentor(s): Michael G. Kelly, Project Director (Panelist with Directors of other Projects)

1. Summary of Subject Matter Covered Each Project Director briefly described his/her project.

2. Conference/Workshop Particulars
   a. Place: Northwest Educational Cooperative
      Arlington Heights, Illinois
   b. Date: February 27, 1981
   c. Contact Hours Presentation: 3:00 - 4:30 p.m.
   d. Promotional Brochure for Conference/Workshop; Available from Conference Organizer

3. Participants: 5 vocational education administrators

4/5 Composite of Completed Conference/Workshop Evaluation Instruments
   Evaluation was handled by conference organizers.

6. Summary of Presentation Strengths/Weaknesses:
   Scheduling conflicts hindered attendance; however, several contacts were established by the informal presentation/dialogue.

7. Materials Developed for Presentation
   (K/A: Panel Presentation)
Conference/Workshop Title: Illinois TESOL/BE Spring Conference

Organizer: Illinois TESOL/BE Association

Presentation Title: "Bridging the Gap between Vocational Education and ESL/BE Programs"

Presentor(s): Michael G. Kelly, Project Director

1. Summary of Subject Matter Covered: This presentation touched on issues connected with: the relationship of VESL to ESL and to vocational education; differences in expertise necessary for VESL, ESL, or vocational instructors; coordination between language instructors and vocational instructors; making technical content accessible to LEP students; adapting traditional vocational textbooks; classroom vs. shop talk; and attitudes.

2. Conference/Workshop Particulars
   a. Place: Northern University
      Chicago, Illinois
   b. Date: February 21, 1981
   c. Contact Hours of Presentation: 10:45 - 11:45 a.m.
   d. Promotional Brochure for Conference/Workshop
      Available from Conference Organizer

3. Participants: 13 ESL/BE Instructors and Administrators

4. Composite of Completed Conference/Workshop Evaluation Instruments
   Evaluation was handled by Conference organizers. In addition, the Project Director distributed his own evaluation form. The results are presented in composite form below.
6. Summary of Presentation Strengths/Weaknesses:

The presentation established the need for coordination between language and vocational instructors in developing vocational programs and materials for LEP students. Participants wanted more information on language teaching materials and techniques.

7. Materials Developed for Presentation:

The presentation outline that was distributed to the participants is attached. Other materials, too numerous to include in this report, were used to support various points of the presentation.
COMPOSITE EVALUATION FORM

USE THIS SCALE TO RATE THIS SESSION:

Mark the space you feel is appropriate for each statement. (Use the same scale.)

I. This session was beneficial to my area of work.
   poor _____ 2 2 7 2 excellent
   This session was beneficial to my area of work.
   poor 1 3 3 5 1 excellent

II. This session was well organized.
    poor _____ 2 5 5 1 excellent
    This session was well organized.
    poor _____ 2 5 5 1 excellent

III. This session was presented in an interesting manner.
     poor _____ 1 5 6 1 excellent
     This session was presented in an interesting manner.
     poor 1 5 6 1 excellent

IV. This session stimulated new insights in my field.
    poor _____ 2 3 5 3 excellent
    This session stimulated new insights in my field.
    poor 2 3 5 3 excellent

Comments:  Succeeded in creating awareness.
            Not enough time.
            A lot of questions and not many answers.
            This session will enable me to evaluate my vocational-
            students' performance better and to help them with problems.
            Very good.
            Gave realistic view
            Not enough information

Suggestions for future workshop:

   Continuation of this session.
   More information about VESL and Vocational education
Bridging the Gap Between ESL/Bilingual Education and Vocational Education

(1) Questionnaire

(2) What is the relationship of VESL to ESL instruction and to vocational instruction?

(3) What would you do if?
   - as an ESL instructor, you get a VESL class for welding.
   - as a welding instructor, you get several LEP students of different language background.

(4) Coordination between language instructors and vocational instructors.

(5) How do you make technical content, technical skills, and technical materials accessible to LEP students?
   - as a vocational instructor
   - as a VESL instructor

(6) How would you teach these words?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Subtechnical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>electrode</td>
<td>correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current</td>
<td>sizzling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arc</td>
<td>shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voltage</td>
<td>pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>produce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>melt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7) How would you teach the structures in these excerpts?

(8) The Classroom vs. the Shop

(9) Attitudes

(10) Summary

Michael G. Kelly
Waubonsee Community College
Sugar Grove, Illinois
February 21, 1981
w. Materials Developed

The development of extensive instructional materials for Machine Tool has been a major focus of the LEP Project. In FY81, the Project developed, fieldtested, and revised two drafts of these materials. In FY82, they will be finalized as Machine Shop Fundamentals: Part I and Part II (Student textbooks, Native language supplements in Spanish, Lao, and Vietnamese, Student workbook, Instructor's manual). Machine Shop Fundamentals Part I and Part II will be disseminated in the Spring of FY82.
s. Statement of Impact

The intended impacts outlined in the FY81 Proposal have been achieved to a high degree. The three major areas of impact have been: program development and implementation; adaptation and development of instructional materials; and improved access of LEP persons to vocational training and support services.

The successful development and implementation of the Project's vocational training program for LEP students has proven the feasibility of such programs to administrators, vocational instructors, and ESL and VESL instructors at Waubonsee Community College and at other institutions, and to staff members of social service agencies and state offices. At the same time, the Project's FY81 program development and implementation have identified effective strategies and certain key problem areas. The means of reaching the target audiences have included local in-service workshops and personal contacts, formal presentations at statewide professional conferences, and visits to the Project by staff of other programs. In the future, the Project will continue to reach its target audiences through these means, as well as through the dissemination of this Final Report, which discusses in detail the problems faced by the Project and the program components, strategies, and instructional materials and methods that were found to be essential to effective vocational training for LEP students. This data will continue to assist other institutions in planning, implementing, and evaluating their programs.

The impact of the curricula and instructional materials -- especially the comprehensive Machine Tool materials -- which were developed/adapted, fieldtested and revised by the Project in FY81 is already evident, although the materials will not be finalized for dissemination by DAVTE until spring of FY82. The response to the conference and workshop presentations given by the Project staff in FY81 was very positive, and several other programs indicated considerable
interest in the Project's Machine Tool and Secretarial Science curricula and materials. Some programs expressed an immediate need for these materials, in particular the Machine Tool ones. This led the Project to include in its FY82 Proposal an intensive pre-service workshop in August 1981 for a limited number of programs wanting to use the drafts of the materials in their fall semester classes.

The LEP Project is the result of a community-based initiative coupled with the consistent active support of Waubonsee Community College. Since its inception, the Project has served as an important link between the LEP community and Waubonsee's regular college programs, its ESL/ABE program, social service agencies, state offices, industry and business, in the vital areas of vocational training and support services. In establishing and maintaining these linkages, the Project's Information and Referral System provided necessary support services to over 340 LEP persons, and referred the majority of them to ESL/ABE courses, regular Waubonsee courses, and/or to the Project's own vocational and VESL courses, according to their needs, interests, and (language) skills. After completing the Project's courses, 9 LEP students were able to mainstream into regular college courses for further training. Twenty-two obtained jobs.

In addition to providing LEP students with entry-level technical skills, the Project has clearly helped LEP persons to better utilize the services and resources of Waubonsee by making them more aware of these services and resources and by offering needed individual counseling and encouragement. The college has increased its already strong support of the Project for FY82, and preliminary discussion about FY83 has been initiated.
PART THREE
1. Paid Participants in Activity

Full-time

(1) Michael G. Kelly
249 North Walnut Street
Hinckley, IL 60520

(2) Project Director
(3) Waubonsee Community College
(4) See Staff Resumes in Appendix I

(1) Patricia Menges
5544 Lyman
Downers Grove, IL 60516

(2) Curriculum Developer/ESL Instructor
(3) Waubonsee Community College
(4) See Staff Resumes in Appendix I

(1) Kebir Marti-Lambert
412 South Broadway Street
Aurora, IL 60505

(2) Information and Referral Person/Bilingual Counselor
(3) Waubonsee Community College
(4) See Staff Resumes in Appendix I

(1) Mary Diaz
1440 Westwood Drive, Apt: 42
Aurora, IL 60506

(2) Secretary
(3) Waubonsee Community College
(4) See Staff Resumes in Appendix I
Part-time Staff (Paid by Project)

(1) Michael G. Kelly  
(see above)

(2) Vocational English as a Second Language Instructor in Machine Tool (part-time, over and above full-time duties as Project Director)

(3) Waubonsee Community College

(4) See above

(1) Homer Guerrero, Jr.  
540 South La Salle Street  
Aurora, IL 60505

(2) Vocational English as a Second Language Instructor for Machine Tool II

(3) Waubonsee Community College

(4) Taught English, Spanish, and Electronics.  
Worked as a Resident Counselor

Attended St. Mary's University  
Southern Illinois University  
Northern Illinois University,  
and Chicago City College  

Bilingual/Bicultural  

Mr. Guerrero resigned because of health problems.

(1) Kebir Marti-Lambert  
(see above)

(2) Vocational English as a Second Language Instructor for Machine Tool II (part-time, over and above full-time duties as Information and Referral Person/Counselor).

(3) Waubonsee Community College

(4) See above
Florencio Moreno  
519 Pierce Street  
Aurora, IL 60505

Bilingual Tutor

Waubonsee Community College

Enrolled in Waubonsee Community College  
Associate in Applied Science Degree Program  
Graduated from Aurora East High School, 1980  
Bilingual/Bicultural

Part-time Staff (Paid with Local Contributions)

Kenreth E. Shibata  
321 John Street  
North Aurora, IL 60542

Executive Vice President  
(5% time for LEP Project)

Waubonsee Community College

Dean of Instruction (WCC), 8 years  
Executive Vice President, 3 years

BA, Kearney State College, 1950  
ME, University of Nebraska, 1965  
MEd, University of Nebraska, 1965

Leland R. Thompson  
Route 1, Box 106 L  
Sugar Grove, IL 60554

Dean of Social/Economic Sciences and Technologies  
LEP Project Administrator (5% time)

Waubonsee Community College

Assistant Dean of Instruction,  
Occupational Education (WCC), 10 years  
Dean of Social/Economic Sciences and Technologies, 3 years

BS, Northern Illinois University, 1958  
MS, Northern Illinois University, 1962
Daniel J. Griffin  
713 Marion  
Joliet, IL 60436  

Director of Research and Development  
(5% time for LEP Project)  

Waubonsee Community College  

Village Administrator, Village of New Lenox, 3 years  
Grant Coordinator, City of Joliet, 2 years  
Director of Research and Development (WCC), 1 year  

BA, Lewis University, 1970  
MA, Purdue University, 1973  
MS, Governors State University, 1975  

Enrique Torres, Jr.  
134 Neil Road  
Sugar Grove, IL 60554  

Vocational Instructor in Machine Tool  

Waubonsee Community College  

Assembly Foreman, Caterpillar Company, 2 1/2 years  
Training Instructor/Machine Operator, Caterpillar Company, 10 years  
Bilingual/Bicultural  
San Benito High School  

Mauro González  
350 North Jefferson Avenue  
Aurora, IL 60505  

Vocational Instructor in Machine Tool  

Waubonsee Community College  

Halington High School, 1961  
Halington, Texas  
Machine Operator, Caterpillar Company, 7 years  
Aurora, IL  
Self-Employed, 9 years  
Gonzalez Used Cars  
Aurora, IL  
Bilingual/Bicultural
(1) Guadalupe A. Lambert
804 Superior Street
Aurora, IL 60505

(2) Vocational Instructor in Secretarial Science

(3) Waubonsee Community College

(4) Secretarial experience, 7 1/2 years
Bilingual teaching experience, 2 years
Bilingual/Bicultural
High School Business Diploma

(1) Kathy A. Johnson
350 North Lincoln Way
North Aurora, IL 60542

(2) Vocational English as a Second Language Instructor in Secretarial Science

(3) Waubonsee Community College

(4) ESL/ABE/GED Instructor at various institutions, including Waubonsee Community College, 6 years part-time.

Curriculum and materials development,
East High School, Aurora, 2 years
Several presentations at in-service ESL workshops
Office experience.

BA Archeology

Consultants

(1) Carolyn M. Carter
22 North Fordham Avenue
Aurora, IL 60506

(2) Consultant, Graphic Artist

(3) Waubonsee Community College

(4) Assistant Art Director
Harry Schneiderman Inc., 6 years

Graphic Artist, Channel 60,
WLXT T.V., 4 years

Graphic Artist, Waubonsee Community College, 10 years

Chicago Academy of Fine Arts
Commercial Art Program
(1) Ann Dermody
(2) Consultant Secretarial Science Curriculum
(3) Waubonsee Community College
(4) Secretarial Science Instructor/Supervisor, 13 years
   BS, Secretarial Science Education

(1) Kathy A. Johnson
   (see above)
(2) Consultant Business English VESL Curriculum
(3) Waubonsee Community College
(4) VESL Instructor, LEP Project, Waubonsee Community College, 1 year
   Pre-Vocational ESL Instructor, Kane County CETA
   and Waubonsee Adult Education, 1/2 year
   (see above for other qualifications)

(1) Guadalupe A. Lambert
   (see above)
(2) Consultant Secretarial Science Curriculum
(3) Waubonsee Community College
(4) See above

(1) P. Ouankeo
   451 Weston Avenue
   Aurora, IL 60505
(2) Consultant, English-Lao Translator
(3) Waubonsee Community College
(4) English-Lao Translator/Interpreter for Laos-Philippine Operation Brotherhood, 2 years
   Police Officer, liason to United States Embassy, 14 years
   High School Diploma from Laos
   Agricultural College in Chiangmai, Thailand, 3 years
   Intensive English at Lao-American Association in Vientiane, Laos, 2 years
   Police Intelligence training in Malaysia, 4 months
English as a Second Language courses and Machine Tool Laboratory I and II at Waubonsee Community College.

(1) Martha Price  
Route 2 Box 18 E  
Plano, IL 60545

(2) Consultant Secretarial Science Curricula and Materials

(3) Waubonsee Community College

(4) Coordinator/Instructor Secretarial and Office Careers Program, Waubonsee Community College, 14 years

High School Business Teacher, 1 year  
BS, Business, Illinois State University at Normal  
MS, Business Education, Northern Illinois University  
Additional graduate work, Northern Illinois University

(1) Alfredo J. Rodriguez  
206 East Arrowhead Street  
North Aurora, IL 60542

(2) Consultant, Graphic Artist

(3) Waubonsee Community College

(4) Commercial Artist, Supervisor, Director,  
National Institute of Combustibles, Alcohol and Portland, 17 years  
Specialized courses, University of Uruguay, 8 years

(1) Lee Scheidenhelm  
36W 943 Treetop  
St. Charles, IL 60174

(2) Consultant Machine Tool Materials

(3) Waubonsee Community College

(4) BA, Illinois State University, 1968  
MA, Colorado State College, 1971  
Amboy High School 1968-1971  
Amboy, IL  
Machine Tool Technology Instructor 1971-Present  
Waubonsee Community College
(1) Sang Ly Tsan  
1179 East Wilson Street, Apt. 201  
Batavia, IL

(2) Consultant, English-Vietnamese Translator

(3) Waubonsee Community College

(4) English-Vietnamese Translator/Interpreter
in Vietnamese Army, 7 years
Machine operator, 2 years
G.E.D. graduate (United States)
High School Diploma from Vietnam
Machine Tool Laboratory I and II and Welding at Waubonsee Community College
q. Resource Persons

/ / BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Maria Rivera
Eastgate Apts., Apt. #3
991 Aurora Avenue
Aurora, IL 60505

Ms. Irene Carr
College of Continuing Education
Community Services Office
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115

Francisco Herrera
1273 Johnston Drive
Aurora, IL 60504

Ms. Christine Delgado
1239 California Avenue
Aurora, IL 60506

Bob Galvan
229 Williams
Aurora, IL 60506

Jose Martinez
School District #129
80 South River Street
Aurora, IL 60506

Rodrigo D'Escoto
26 South Stolp Street
Aurora, IL 60505

Dr. Kenneth E. Shibata
c/o WCC

Jesse Guerra
1151 Almond Drive
Aurora, IL 60505

Mr. Lee Thompson
c/o WCC

Homero Basaldua, Director
El Centro Pan Americano
52 North Broadway Street
Aurora, IL 60506

Alberto Meza
c/o WCC

CONSULTANTS TO THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

E. Jeanne Lopez-Valadez, Project Director
Bilingual Vocational Education Project
500 South Dwyer Avenue
Arlington Heights, IL 60005

Richard Healy
c/o WCC North Campus

Ms. Barbara Neisendorf
c/o WCC

David Oatman
c/o WCC North Campus

Dr. Edward H. Fauth
c/o WCC

Carol Viola
c/o WCC

Mr. Stanley Groh
c/o WCC

James Vojtisak
c/o WCC
Staff Development

In addition to giving presentations at the Illinois Adult and Continuing Education Association Conference and the Midwest TESOL/BE Regional Conference (see section k, Conference/Workshop Summaries), Michael G. Kelly and Patricia A. Menges attended various sessions at these professional meetings.

Publicity

An article outlining Dr. Kenneth Shibata's presentation to the Waubonsee Board of Trustees about the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Program and the Board's subsequent approval of the Program appeared in the Beacon News in July, 1980.

The Fall 1980 publication of The Network News focused on vocational education programs and limited English proficiency students in Illinois and vocational education programs serving LEP students. Descriptions of the LEP Program at Waubonsee and other projects are included.

A description of the LEP Program is part of the Annual Report ... January 1981 of the Latino Community Services Office of the College of Continuing Education at Northern Illinois University.

In the June, 1981 issue of TESOL SHORTS & BILINGUAL BRIEFS there is an article about the LEP Project at Waubonsee Community College.

The LEP Project also wrote and printed English and Spanish brochures, and posters describing the Project. These brochures were used for recruitment of students and the dissemination of information about the Project. (See Appendix III for copies of the articles and the brochures)

Visits to the Project

September 5, 1980
Betty Heron, ESL Director
Prairie State College

Diane Herron, ESL Teacher
Prairie State College

September 18, 1980
Sang Sui Tsan, Director
Indochinese Refugee Project
Rock Valley College
Rockford, IL 61102
December 3, 1980
Kate Geyer, Director
Vocational Educational Readiness
W.C.C. East Campus
441 North Farnsworth Avenue
Aurora, IL 60505

December 15, 1980
Jeanne Lopez-Valadez, Director
Bilingual Vocational Education Project
500 South Dwyer Avenue
Arlington Heights, IL 60005

Hermalinda Ortega, Director
Illinois Migrant Council
41 West New York Street
Aurora, IL 60505

April 8, 1981
Sue Adamowski, Director
Adult Basic Education and
Assistant to the Dean
Sarah Binganan, Advisor Continuing Education
Ellen Kuhn, Assistant Development
Triton College
200 Fifth Avenue
River Grove, IL 60171
1. **Resource Listing**

**The Bilingual Publications Co.**

- Prácticas de taller mecánico I
- Prácticas de taller mecánico II
- Diccionario técnico de electro mecánico
- Correspondencia de los negocios:
  - Método objetivo para secretariado
  - bilingüe inglés-español
- Obtenga la máxima utilidad de su torno
- Obtenga la máxima utilidad de su taladro de banco

**Delmar Publishers**

- Basic Mathematics Simplified
- Practical Problems in Mathematics for Machinists

**Development Associates, Inc.**


**Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.**

- The Secretary's Handbook

**Institute of Modern Languages**

- Orientation in Business English: Secretarial Series

**Janus Book Publishers**

- Job Application Languages: A Survival Vocabulary

**Libros McGraw-Hill**

- Business Vocabulary and Spelling Text and Workbook

**Longman, Inc.**

- Tense Drills
- Writing English Language Tests
- Understanding Technical English
  - Book 1
  - Book 2
- General Science Mathematics
- Teacher's Notes to Mathematics
National Textbook Co.

Guía de correspondencia española
A Practical Guide to Social and Commercial Correspondence

Newbury House Publishers

Adaptation in Language Teaching

New Jersey Voc/Tech., Curriculum Laboratory

Precision Inspection Manual I
Precision Inspection Manual II

South-Western Publishing Co.

Introductory Typewriting (Third Edition)
Punctuation
Basic Letter and Memo Writing
Manual de referencia para la oficina
Reference Manual for the Office
Correspondencia Comercial: Fondo y Forma
Practical Correspondence for College
Typewriting Timed Writing w/Selected Drills

State Department of Vocational and Technical Education

Machine Shop - Teacher

University Press of America

Learning to Type as a Second Language

Vocational Technical Curriculum Laboratory
Rutgers State University

About Business
Typing: What Matters is How

Regents Publishing Co., Inc.

Business English
APPENDIX I: STAFF RESUMES
Appendix I has been removed to preserve confidentiality of personal information.
APPENDIX II: INFORMATION AND REFERRAL SYSTEM
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY PROGRAM
INFORMATION REFERRAL SYSTEM

ENTER
INTERVIEW
ASSESSMENT
COUNSELING

OCCUPATIONAL SERVICES
Illinois Job Service
CETA
Business and Industry

SOCIAL SERVICES
El Centro Pan Americano
Kane County Department of Public Aid
Aurora Township
Illinois Migrant Council
The Salvation Army
Wayside Cross Rescue Mission
Marie Wilkinson Child Development Center
State of Illinois - Unemployment Office

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
Waubonsee Community College
East Campus
Waubonsee Community College
District 131 Community School
Elgin Community College
INFORMATION AND REFERRAL SYSTEM

The LEP Program at Waubonsee Community College recognizes the importance and value of support services for its clients and students. This is especially true for LEP students who may not be aware of existing services and/or may not be able to utilize existing services because of linguistic/cultural barriers. A certain level of economic and personal stability must be established and maintained in one's daily life if one is to successfully complete a new endeavor. This Information and Referral System divides existing agencies and resources in the Aurora area into three categories: occupational, educational, and social services.

OCCUPATIONAL SERVICES

Illinois Job Service
323 West Galena Blvd.
Aurora, IL 60506

Business and Industry

Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA)
323 West Galena Blvd.
Aurora, IL 60506

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

Waubonsie Community College
East Campus
441 North Farnsworth-Avenue
Aurora, IL 60606

LEP Program
Vocational Education
Post-Secondary Education
Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA)
Kane County - Aurora Office
30 South Stolp Avenue
Aurora, IL 60506
897-0436

Elgin Community College
Spartan Drive
Elgin, IL
697-1700

District 131 Community School
779 5th Street
Aurora, IL 60505
851-8230

SOCIAL SERVICES

El Centro Pan Americano
52 North Broadway
Aurora, IL 60506
892-2224

Kane County Department of Public Aid
361 Old Indian Trail Road
Aurora, IL 60507
859-3500

Aurora Township
15 Water Street
Aurora, IL 60505
897-8777

Illinois Migrant Council
41 East New York Street
Aurora, IL 60505
859-8015

Department of Rehabilitation Services
1700 North Farnsworth Avenue
Aurora, IL 60506
851-7275

Education
Training

Bilingual Access Program
Vocational Education
Post-Secondary Education

English as a Second Language
Adult Basic Education
G.E.D. Preparation

Translation
Labor Relations
Advocacy
Consumer Protection
Counseling

Food Stamps
Financial Assistance
Health/Medical

Emergency Food
Emergency Financial Assistance

Emergency Financial Assistance
Emergency Food

Vocational Rehabilitation
Specialized Counseling
Health/Medical
The Salvation Army  
437 East Galena Blvd.  
Aurora, IL  60506  
897-7284

Wayside Cross Rescue Mission  
215 East New York Street  
Aurora, IL  60505  
892-4239

Marie Wilkinson Child Development Center  
1144 East Galena Blvd.  
Aurora, IL  60505  
851-7772

Unemployment Compensation  
221 Spruce Street  
Aurora, IL  60506  
897-3818

Kane County Information prints a directory of additional services and agencies available in Kane County.  
A copy can be obtained at the Waubonsee Community College East Campus.
The key to the Information and Referral System is the Information and Referral Person/Bilingual Counselor. This person must be accessible to the LEP population and vice-versa. In addition he/she must be bilingual/bicultural. At initial contact with the client, the Information and Referral Person/Bilingual Counselor holds an informal interview. The informal interview establishes a report between the counselor and client and begins the assessment and counseling process. Clients interested in the LEP Program are given an oral and written English proficiency test. A minimum English proficiency level is required to enter in the program. Depending on the individual's needs, abilities, interest, etc., he/she is referred to the appropriate agency or institution. The Information and Referral Person/Bilingual Counselor make follow-ups on his/her referrals.

The Information and Referral Person/Bilingual Counselor provide an orientation to the LEP Program. He/she meets at least monthly with students in the program in order to discuss progress, plans, problems, etc. Students receive on-going counseling and follow-up services.

While no Information referral system cannot list all the service agencies which are available, the ones listed here are the major occupational, educational, and social service providers for LEP clients. The first purpose of the Information and Referral System is to identify agencies which provide services to LEP students. Secondly, the system informs agencies and institutions about the LEP Program and its support services component. Lastly, the Information and Referral System coordinates information and referrals among existing agencies and resources.
APPENDIX III: PUBLICITY
**SPRING SCHEDULE 1981**

**MACHINE TOOL-LAB I and TECHNICAL ENGLISH**

10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.
Monday through Friday

5:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.
Monday through Wednesday

8:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.
Saturday

Waubonsee Community College
Rt. 47 at Harter Road
Sugar Grove, IL 60554

SECRETARIAL SCIENCES and BUSINESS ENGLISH

10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.
Monday through Friday

5:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.
Tuesday through Friday

Waubonsee Community College
East Campus
441 N. Farnsworth Avenue
Aurora, IL 60505

**COST**

Machine Tool $45.00
Secretarial Sciences $45.00
Technical English NO COST
Business English NO COST

All classes begin January 12, 1981

FOR MORE INFORMATION CALL:

Marti Lambert 851-5707
or 808-2442
THE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY PROGRAM

Everyone wants a good job. But to be able to compete successfully in a highly developed industrialized society like that of the United States today, technical skills and experience are vital. Many people whose native language is not English find that language presents a major obstacle to their participation in technical training programs.

As part of its effort to meet the community's needs, Waubensee Community College has developed and is currently offering a bilingual program of vocational training which has been specially designed for people of limited English proficiency who want to acquire technical skills and experience.

A limited English proficiency adult is any person whose mother tongue is not English and who does not speak and understand the English language in an instructional setting well enough to benefit from educational and/or vocational classes.

The Waubensee program provides vocational training and English language training in the areas of Machine Tool Technology and Secretarial Sciences. The courses use existing college curricula and adapted instructional materials. Bilingual materials and bilingual instructors are available.

English skills necessary for technical training and for on-the-job performance are stressed.

FALL 1980

During the Fall Semester 1980 40 students enrolled in Machine Tool Lab 1 and Secretarial Sciences courses. These students developed vocational and English language skills for:

- Employment
- Job Upgrading
- Further Training and Education

The students attended 6 hours per week of vocational training and 10 hours per week of technical English language training. The courses were 16 weeks in length.

SUPPORT SERVICES

In addition to instructional services, the students received referral, assessment, counseling, job placement, and follow-up services.
Programa de Educación Técnica Bilingüe

OPERACION DE MAQUINAS INDUSTRIALES E INGLES TECNICO
10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.
Lunes a viernes
5:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.
Lunes a viernes
8:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.
Sábado
Waubonsee Community College
Rt. 47 at Harter Road
Sugar Grove, IL 60554

CLASES DE SECRETARIADO E INGLES DE OFICINA
10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.
Lunes a viernes
5:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.
Martes a viernes
Waubonsee Community College
East Campus
441 No. Farnsworth Avenue
Aurora, Illinois 60505

PRECIO
OPERACION DE MAQUINAS INDUSTRIALES $45.00
CLASES DE SECRETARIADO $45.00
INGLES TECNICO Ningún precio
INGLES DE OFICINA Ningún precio

Todas la clases empiezan el 12 de enero de 1981.
PARA MAS INFORMACION LLAME:
Marti Lambert 851-5707
898-2442
OPERACIÓN DE MAQUINAS INDUSTRIALES

* Lectura de planos azules (Blueprints)
* Lectura de instrumentos de medir de precision
* Operación de las siguientes máquinas industriales:
  * El torno (engine lathe)
  * La fresadora horizontal (Horizontal mill)
  * La fresadora vertical (Vertical mill)
  * El taladro (Drill press)
  * La esmeriladora plana (Surface grinder)

INGLES TECNICO

* Comprender
* Hablar
* Leer
* Escribir
* Inglés práctico para operadores de Máquinas Industriales

INGLES DE OFICINA

* Comprender
* Hablar
* Leer
* Escribir
* Inglés práctico de uso diario en una oficina

PROGRAMA DE EDUCACION TECNICA BILINGUE

Todos deseamos un buen empleo. Pero para poder competir con buen éxito y adquirir un buen trabajo en una sociedad altamente desarrollada como los Estados Unidos, el tener habilidades y experiencia técnicas es absolutamente necesario. A muchas personas su conocimiento del inglés les pone un gran obstáculo para poder entrar en un programa de entrenamiento técnico.

Waubonsee Community College, en su esfuerzo para ser una comunidad desarrollada, ha desarrollado un programa de educación técnica bilingüe especialmente diseñado para satisfacer los requisitos de aquellas personas de inglés limitado que debido al idioma no les es posible ingresar en programas de educación técnica regulares. Corriente el College está ofreciendo estos programas técnicos en las áreas de Operación de Máquinas Industriales y clases de Secretariado.

Waubonsee al diseñar estos programas ha considerado las necesidades especialmente de las personas de inglés limitado y ha incorporado en su diseño dos factores importantes para satisfacer esas necesidades. Uno es la duración del curso que ha sido condensada para que sin afectar la calidad de la instrucción pueda obtener el objetivo del programa en 16 semanas; el otro es el poner, énfasis en un inglés técnico práctico que se ha de usar diariamente en el trabajo.

El objetivo de los cursos es que al completarlos los participantes tengan una oportunidad para obtener empleos y avanzar en su trabajo, si se encuentran empleados, o tengan una base suficiente para continuar sus estudios en el área de su elección.

CLASES DE SECRETARIADO

* Mecanografía
* Procedimiento de oficina
* Archivos
* Uso correcto del teléfono

INGLES DE OFICINA

* Comprender
* Hablar
* Leer
* Escribir
* Inglés práctico de uso diario en una oficina

SEMESTRE DE OTONO 1980

Durante el semestre de otoño de 1980 40 estudiantes se inscribieron en las clases de Operación de Máquinas Industriales y de Secretariado. Estos estudiantes desarrollaron conocimientos vocacionales e inglés práctico para:

* Trabajo
* Avance en el trabajo
* Continuación de su entrenamiento y educación.

Los estudiantes recibieron 6 horas de entrenamiento vocacional por semana y 10 horas de inglés por semana. La duración de los cursos fue de 16 semanas.

Además de los servicios de instrucción los estudiantes recibieron otros servicios así como referencia a otras agencias y programas, evaluación, consejería, y ayuda a obtener empleo.
The Community Services Office is a division of the College of Continuing Education and is responsible for the design of community-serving programs with and for those persons usually not served by institutions of higher education. The Latino Coordinator provides linkages between the university and the community, works closely with the community and its organizations and leaders, and aims toward the kind of community learning that enables the Hispanics to gain control over their environment.

The year of 1980 has been a busy and productive year for Latino community services. Proposal writing, advocacy, direct assistance, community conferences, and adult education activities have all been part of the outreach services provided for the Hispanic community.

"Soy loco por ti América soy loco por ti de amores.
... que tenga como colores
la espuma blanca de latinoamérica
y el cielo como bandera".
The Bilingual/Bicultural Advisory Committee to Waubonsee Community College, initiated by Centro Panamericano, is comprised of a group of community members whose goal has been to advocate and promote educational programming for the Latino population of Aurora. As a member of this committee, Irene has been able to work toward the development of a bilingual vocational education program and has seen this objective become a reality.

With funding from the Division of Adult Vocational and Technical Education, Waubonsee has begun a research and planning project which will train the limited English speaking adult in Machine Tools and Secretarial Sciences. The project's director and staff are contributing innovative and much needed materials to the bilingual vocational training field, and Centro Panamericano is assisting the project by recruiting students for the Vocational Education classes.

Latino Community Services has provided assistance to Universidad Popular in the writing of proposals submitted to private and government funding sources.

Irene has been an active member of a committee formed by Rosemary Bombela, Special Assistant to the Governor for Hispanic Affairs. The committee has been working toward the development of an adult education program and curriculum to serve the needs of the Latino inmates in Stateville and other state prisons.

Rosemary Bombela has also formed a Steering Committee to plan the first Illinois Hispanic Women's Conference to be held in Chicago in October of 1981. As a member of the Steering Committee and the Proposal Committee, the Latino Coordinator has been helping develop the preliminary plans for this conference.

Earlier this year, Latino Community Services submitted a proposal to HEW which is still pending. INTERCUL: A Cross-Cultural Communication Program for Teachers, is a project which proposes to develop and produce a multimedia package of six modules which can be used for in-service training of teachers and others who have special needs to improve their understanding in American culture.
Limited English Proficiency Students

Vocational Education programs in the State of Illinois are trying to meet the needs of all students, including special needs students. There are about 200,000 individuals between the ages of 14 and 24 in Illinois who are limited in English proficiency (oral and/or written). Thus, they need additional services in order to succeed in vocational training. In the long run, these additional services are cost-effective as they provide the basis for a gainfully employed individual in the world of work.

Students with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) have a much higher drop-out rate from secondary school than non-LEP students. Those in post-secondary programs often have the need to work during the day to support family, and lack the educational training necessary to succeed in US post-secondary institutions. Traditional vocational education programs are not equipped to deal with the culturally and linguistically different student. Often both human and material resources are lacking.

In the 1976 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act (Public Law 94-482, Title III), Limited English Proficiency individuals were identified as a national priority population. A set-aside of federal funds at the state level is required by this legislation to address the needs of handicapped, disadvantaged and limited English speaking students. The State of Illinois, Article 14C of the School Code, requires that school districts with attendance centers who have 20 or more LEP students from the same linguistic background provide a program of transitional bilingual education.

While many local districts in Illinois do have bilingual programs, mainly at the elementary level, very few have bilingual vocational programs, or programs with services for LEP students. Only 127 of approximately 750 districts who file 1 and 5 year plans were approved for claiming reimbursement for serving LEP students in vocational education. A review of those approved programs reveals that many districts provide limited services, primarily ESL and tutoring. Additional funding has allowed for the development of some model programs in the state. (Brief descriptions of selected programs are included in this newsletter.)

Funding sources for providing services to LEP students in vocational education exist both at the state and the federal level. The Illinois State Board of Education, Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education administers the P.L. 94-482 set-aside funds, and also has funds for innovative research and developmental programs. The Illinois Community College Board has funds for disadvantaged students and for preparatory courses such as ESL. Federal funds are available through the US Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs and through the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). Indochinese Refugee funds are also available through the Illinois Adult Indochinese Refugee Consor-

Where Are You?

1. Do you know if there are any LEP students in your district?
2. Do you know if there is a program in operation to serve LEP students in your district?
3. Have you planned special services, activities, or programs to meet their needs?
4. Do you know where to go for help in establishing programs to serve LEP students?
5. Are you planning to attend any inservice activities concerning LEP students?
6. Do staff members in your district work together to meet the needs of LEP students?
BILINGUAL ACCESS PROGRAM—ELGIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The Bilingual Access Program is one of three components of an Advanced Institutional Development Program (AIDP) five-year federal grant. It was established to supplement instruction within ten regular ECC programs, including a total of 28 vocational and academic courses. The main goals of the program are to provide regular semester instruction to limited English proficiency adults, bridge the language gap, provide Spanish instructional materials and support, and provide Vocational English as a Second Language unique to each of the selected programs, so that the students possess employable bilingual skills at the end of their programs. The Bilingual Access Instructional Delivery Approach is used only during the first semester of enrollment. Students are expected to have developed technical and English skills by the end of the first semester that are sufficient to enable them to continue in English with additional support outside of class.

Machine Tool Operations, Plastics Technology, Welding, Group Child Care, Culinary Arts, Restaurant Management, Automotive Service Technology, Secretarial Science, Business Programs, and Dental Assisting are the vocational programs to be implemented.

Dr. Arturo Kotesky, Director
Bilingual Access Program
Elgin Community College
1700 Spartan Drive
Elgin, IL 60120
312-697-1000, ext. 319

WAUBONSEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The objective of the Waubonsee Community College Project is to examine and analyze the advantages and disadvantages of two types of instructional models serving Limited English Proficiency students. Analysis will take into account the adoptability and ability of each model, teaching effectiveness, language and vocational skills acquisition, student completion, performance and attitudes. During 1980-81, a bilingual instructional model in vocational education will be implemented and field tested. Support services are to be provided to a minimum of 80 Limited English Proficiency Adults. In-service training is planned for administration, staff and faculty. During 1981-82, the instructional model to be used will be the English Core Language. The same areas will be considered for analysis, and the same vocational areas will be covered—machine tool and secretarial science.

Mike Kelly, Program Director
Waubonsee Community College
Route 47 at Harter Road
Sugar Grove, IL 60554
312-466-4811

TRUMAN COLLEGE

The Truman Bilingual Vocational Center, ProStream, is in its third year of operation. The population are Korean students and Spanish-speaking students, offered in accounting, data entry (including keypunching including blueprint reading). The program provides six semesters of bilingual tutoring and advisement, bilingual guides, intensive English, job counseling and placement, and college credit, courses applying to a Truman certificate and a diploma following successful completion of each semester. The goal of the program is to provide support for students so that they may succeed in regular Truman in vocational areas.

Melaine Stephens
Truman College
1145 W. Wilson Ave.
Chicago, IL 60640
312-878-1700

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

The LEP project at the University of Illinois has objectives for this first year of funding. They include assisting in the improvement of the on-site evaluation relative to LEP services and programming; facilitating in-service, and graduate level instruction related to education for LEP students; studying the identification of assessment processes used by local vocational programs in serving LEP students; and evaluating the adequacy of services provided to LEP youth in CETA/YETP vocational education linkage programs.

The information compiled this year will enable the State Board of Education, local education agencies, and make informed decisions concerning the improvement and services for LEP students. The conferences sponsored by the University of Illinois and the School of Education and Career, Southern Illinois University.

L. Allen Phelps
Cathy Day
University of Illinois
Department of Vocational Education
345 Education
Urbana, Illinois 61801
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The Network News would like to thank Jeanne Lopez-Valadez for preparing the content of the newsletter.
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE . . .

The Northern Regional Chapter of Illinois TESOL/BE is a professional, non-profit organization established for the promotion of scholarship, the dissemination of information, and the strengthening of all levels of instruction and research in teaching limited English and non-English speakers, and in the cooperation with other groups and organizations having similar concerns.

FROM THE EDITOR . . .

For most of you, June represents the end of another school year and the start of an all-too-brief summer hiatus. For others, June is simply another month in an all-too-brief calendar year when year-end reports are due, proposals are being hastily drafted and sent to Springfield and Washington, and little rest is on the schedule.

This issue of Shorts & Briefs is the first issue of Volume 2. We have successfully completed our first year of publication and are beginning our second with continued hope that our economy and our profession will both hit new peaks. In this issue we are highlighting several summer conferences and institutes for those of you with inquiring minds. On Pages 2 you will find a brief description of the channels open to some of you who wish to pursue Certification in ESL in Illinois.

Most important, our June issue contains a call for Conference presentations for the Annual Conference to be held this year on November 7 in Chicago. We are especially interested in hearing from those of you in our membership who may never have led a conference session before but feel you have an idea you would like to share with your colleagues in a more formal way. If you have ever thought of presenting but are too timid to do so at a state or national conference, why not try your hand first at a regional conference? The theme this year is Classroom, Culture, and Communication. You will receive another reminder of this call in the August Shorts & Briefs.

I hope to have more to report next month. Illinois TESOL/BE held its annual May luncheon and business meeting, May 18 at Joe's Restaurant in Chicago. I had the privilege of welcoming the newly elected officers: John Boyd as First Vice-President, Margo Costello as Second Vice-President, and members-at-large Ann Boyd, Lucy Groce, Vicky Ganther, Bob Alexander, Elise Hamayon, and Margie Burns. Congratulations to these new executive committee members of Illinois TESOL/BE!

Richard A. Green
Editor
DeKalb, Illinois

MIDWEST REGIONAL . . .

The First Midwest Regional TESOL Conference is now history. Nearly 600 educators in ESL and Bilingual Education gathered in Champaign, April 3-4, for the two day event to hear from four nationally known speakers who delivered major addresses, and from a host of over 70 other professionals from throughout the Midwest who lead workshops and demonstrations, and who made paper presentations on a variety of topics from practical hints for improving pronunciation to discussions of current issues and research in the field of TESOL.

From all points of view the conference was a great success. Nine Midwest affiliates, including Illinois TESOL/BE were well represented among the many presenters as well as those in attendance at concurrent sessions. Twenty-six publishers exhibited materials of interest to the broad field of TESOL throughout the two days.

Next year's regional will be hosted by Indiana TESOL in Indianapolis in early April. This will be welcomed in view of the national conference in Hawaii May 1982. Illinois TESOL/BE will hold its 10th Annual State Conference in Chicago in late February. Make your plans to attend both events now!

VESL AT WAUQUESTEE . . .

Everyone wants a good job. But to be able to compete successfully in a highly developed industrialized society like that of the United States today, technical skills and experiences are vital. Many people whose native language is not English find that language presents a major obstacle to their participation in technical training programs.

As part of its effort to meet the community's needs, Wauquestee Community College in Sugar Grove has developed and is currently offering a bilingual program of vocational training which has been specially designed for people of limited English proficiency who want to acquire technical skills and experience.

A limited English proficiency adult is any person whose mother tongue is not English and who does not speak and understand the English language in an instructional setting well enough to benefit from educational and/or vocational classes.

The Wauquestee program provides vocational training and English language training in the areas of Machine Tool Technology and Secretarial Sciences. The courses use existing materials. Bilingual materials and bilingual instructors are available.

English skills necessary for technical training and for on-the-job performance are stressed. Courses are generally 16 weeks in length. The students attend 6 hours per week of vocational training and 10 hours per week of technical English language training.

In addition to instructional services, the students receive referral, assessment, counseling, job placement, and follow-up services. A few of the courses offered at Wauquestee include Machine Tool Lab, Secretarial Sciences and Business English.

For more information call Martin Lambert at (312) 831-5707 or 898-2442.
3rd ANNUAL CONFERENCE
DISTRICT U-46, ELGIN HIGH SCHOOL
Elgin, Illinois

November 7, 1981

CALL FOR CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

We are interested in proposals from all members - classroom teachers, teacher trainers, curriculum designers, material developers, evaluators, researchers... We encourage educators, linguists, to submit proposals. The theme of this year's conference is Classroom, Culture and Communication.

A special feature of this year's conference will be an Audio-Visual Fair.

We are asking for proposals for the NIC Conference in three different categories. For clarification, brief definitions of each have been prepared. Each session will be 45 minutes in length.

Paper
A paper tells about something you are doing or have done in relation to theory and/or practice; often this information is accompanied by the use of audio-visual aids and/or handouts.

The description should be a summarized version of the conceptual content of the paper (central idea, issue, or purpose - details of description, procedures, evidence, or argument - summary, conclusions, applications, or implications.) Proposals selected for the conference should not have the conceptual content changed substantially after acceptance.

Demonstration
A demonstration "shows how" you do something. Techniques used in teaching, testing, or gathering research data often lend themselves well to this kind of presentation.

The description should include a brief statement of your rationale and a description of what you will demonstrate and how (i.e., video demonstration plus narration, audience participation as "students" or "subjects," etc.)

Workshop
A workshop provides participants with the opportunity to have "hands-on" experiences in developing methods and materials, analyzing research data, or solving research/teaching problems. In a workshop there is very little lecturing by the leader(s); rather the emphasis is on the participants DOING.

Procedures

Before September 1, 1981, send the following items to the address below:

I. A copy of your 100 word typewritten description with title.
   Prepare the description as you would wish it to appear in the program.
   Note: A. On the top of the page, indicate whether it is a proposal for a paper, a demonstration, or a workshop.
   B. On the same page, indicate the primary audience(s) for whom your presentation is intended.

II. Include a copy on a separate sheet which contains:
   A. A 75-150 word bio-data statement including: name, title, affiliation, mailing address, and telephone number.
   B. A list of all equipment that you will require (from simple blackboard to more complex equipment.)
   C. If the number of participants that you will accept is limited, please indicate maximum acceptable.
   D. If a special seating arrangement is desired, please specify.

Send to: Gloria Johnston, Bilingual Coordinator, District U-46, 360 DuPage Street, Elgin, Illinois 60120
APPENDIX IV: VOCATIONAL ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE (VESL) TEST:
SECTION I
Limited English Proficiency Program for Vocational Education

MACHINE SHOP FUNDAMENTALS

TECHNICAL ENGLISH TEST

SECTION I. SEMI-TECHNICAL VOCABULARY

Description and Rationale

Section I of the Technical English Test consists of 50 multiple-choice items, each one with a drawing, answer and three distractors of 1-3 words each. The student writes the letter of the best word(s) for the drawing in the blank beside the item number. Of the items, 42 represent nouns, and the other 8 are adjectives. Except for #9 (a micrometer) and #26 (revolutions per minute), all the items are semi-technical vocabulary, i.e., words with general use(s) as well as more technical applications in manufacturing trades, especially machine tool technology and blueprint reading.

The items can be classified under the following topic headings, and were chosen on the basis of field-testing at Waubonsee during Fall 1981:

- basic hand tools (17 items: #1-10, 18)
- basic fasteners (4 items: #11-14)
- basic machine parts (7 items: #19-25)
- shapes (5 items: #27-30, 41)
- kinds of lines (7 items: #31-34, 36-38)
- dimensions (9 items: #40, 43-50)
- miscellaneous (7 items: #15, 16, 26, 35, 39, 42)

The test does not pretend to be a comprehensive one, but to help fill the gap between English as a Second Language (ESL) Tests and traditional vocational instructional materials. An attempt has been made to include in the test basic semi-technical vocabulary important for the machine tool course (also applicable to a blueprint reading course), vocabulary which LEP students may have learned in the course of their acquisition of English or in general purpose ESL classes. Final revisions of 4 or 5 of the drawings in this draft of Section I are now in process, and two other test sections on semi-technical vocabulary (especially verbs) are being developed.

Section I of the Technical English Test can be administered as a pre-test before the start of the (Machine Tool or Blueprint Reading) vocational and vocational ESL (VESL) courses, midway through the courses, and/or as a post-test at the end of the courses. This test has proven useful in the Waubonsee project for purposes of student assessment, problem diagnosis and student evaluation.
Objectives

Administered as a pre-test, the objectives of Section I of the Technical English Test are:
(1) to assess LEP students' knowledge of English semi-technical vocabulary in the topic area covered by the test (see description above)
(2) to diagnose semi-technical topic areas and specific vocabulary items in which students need particular attention

Administered midway through the vocational and VESL courses, the objectives of Section I of the Technical English Test are:
(1) to evaluate students' progress
(2) to identify persistent areas of difficulty

Administered as a post-test, the objectives of Section I of the Technical English Test are:
(1) to evaluate students' progress
(2) to evaluate teaching effectiveness
TECHNICAL ENGLISH TEST

SECTION I

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Look at the picture.

2. Read the 4 words.

3. Choose the best word for the picture. There is only 1 correct word for each picture.

4. Write the letter of the correct word in the blank space beside the number of the picture.

EXAMPLES:

1. B. a pencil
   A. a pen
   C. a book
   D. a letter

2. B. a store
   A. a house
   C. a street
   D. a church
1. A. a saw 
   B. a screwdriver 
   C. a wrench 
   D. a hammer 

2. A. a saw 
   B. a screwdriver 
   C. a wrench 
   D. a hammer 

3. A. a saw 
   B. a screwdriver 
   C. a wrench 
   D. a drill 

4. A. a chisel 
   B. a screwdriver 
   C. a wrench 
   D. a hammer 

5. A. a micrometer 
   B. a drill 
   C. a screwdriver 
   D. a vise 

6. A. a clamp 
   B. a vise 
   C. a wrench 
   D. a drill
7. A. a drill
   B. a ruler
   C. a knife
   D. a vise

8. A. a drill
   B. a ruler
   C. a gage
   D. a vise

9. A. a ruler
   B. a micrometer
   C. a vise
   D. a clamp

10. A. a drill
    B. a gage
    C. a chisel
    D. a vise

11. A. a nut
    B. a bolt
    C. a nail
    D. a screw
12. A. a bolt  
B. a nail  
C. a nut  
D. a screw

13. A. a bolt  
B. a screw  
C. a nut  
D. a nail

14. A. a bolt  
B. a nail  
C. a nut  
D. a slot

15. A. a slot  
B. a hole  
C. a curve  
D. a dent

16. A. even  
B. dented  
C. smooth  
D. broken

17. A. a groove  
B. a hole  
C. a dent  
D. a slot
18. A. fasteners  
    B. gears  
    C. tools  
    D. parts

19. A. washers  
    B. gears  
    C. dials  
    D. handwheels

20. A. tools  
    B. parts  
    C. gears  
    D. fasteners

21. A. gears  
    B. clocks  
    C. handwheels  
    D. dials

22. A. buttons  
    B. dials  
    C. handwheels  
    D. gears
23. A. levers  
   B. handles  
   C. switches  
   D. knobs

24. A. levers  
   B. knobs  
   C. switches  
   D. handwheels

25. A. handles  
   B. switches  
   C. levers  
   D. knobs

26. A. range per mile  
   B. revolutions per minute  
   C. rate per millimeter  
   D. rotations per million

27. A. a circle  
   B. a rectangle  
   C. a square  
   D. a triangle

28. A. an angle  
   B. a rectangle  
   C. a square  
   D. a triangle
29. A. an angle  
B. a square  
C. a cylinder  
D. a circle

30. A. an angle  
B. a rectangle  
C. a cylinder  
D. a circle

31. A. an angle  
B. a square  
C. a rectangle  
D. a triangle

32. A. a curved line  
B. a horizontal line  
C. a bent line  
D. a vertical line

33. A. a straight line  
B. a curved line  
C. a parallel line  
D. a bent line

34. A. a vertical line  
B. a horizontal line  
C. a curved line  
D. a bent line
35. A map
   B. a blueprint
   C. a chart
   D. a scale

36. A. a vertical line
    B. a horizontal line
    C. a curved line
    D. a bent line

37. A. diagonal lines
    B. horizontal lines
    C. parallel lines
    D. perpendicular lines

38. A. perpendicular lines
    B. parallel lines
    C. diagonal lines
    D. vertical lines
39. A. dimensions  
   B. symbols  
   C. positions  
   D. devices

40. A. shapes  
   B. positions  
   C. devices  
   D. dimensions

41. A. sizes  
   B. positions  
   C. shapes  
   D. dimensions

42. A. up and down  
   B. clockwise  
   C. counter-clockwise  
   D. sideways

43. A. radius  
   B. center  
   C. circumference  
   D. edge

44. A. width  
   B. height  
   C. diameter  
   D. length
45. A. diameter  
   B. circumference  
   C. center  
   D. radius

46. A. width  
   B. depth  
   C. length  
   D. height

47. A. height  
   B. diameter  
   C. depth  
   D. length

48. A. radius  
   B. diameter  
   C. width  
   D. circumference

49. A. height  
   B. width  
   C. depth  
   D. length

50. A. radius  
   B. circumference  
   C. diameter  
   D. width
45. A. diameter  
   B. circumference  
   C. center  
   D. radius

46. A. width  
   B. depth  
   C. length  
   D. height

47. A. height  
   B. diameter  
   C. depth  
   D. length

48. A. radius  
   B. diameter  
   C. width  
   D. circumference

49. A. height  
   B. width  
   C. depth  
   D. length

50. A. radius  
   B. circumference  
   C. diameter  
   D. width