A study of bilingual education programs and policies in private and parochial schools in the United States was undertaken to determine whether these schools were using their potential for development of instructional techniques. Bilingual education programs were broadly defined to include transitional, maintenance, or other programs in English and/or native languages for children of minority language backgrounds not proficient in English. Also included were non-English language programs for children who may or may not be proficient in English. The process included (1) a review of the literature, convening of an advisory committee, and preparation of a descriptive brochure; (2) a search for programs, including nominations from organizations, idea sessions with nonpublic school educators, and follow up monitoring; and (3) site visits to the programs. This process is outlined and findings are presented in the form of site visit profiles, general findings, and specific conclusions. Policy issues discussed include language values, conditions for developing new instructional practices, private schools as a governmental category, private values and public aid, negativism about bilingual education, and integration in private schools. It is concluded that although language training in these schools may reflect the state of the art, it is not influencing important breakthroughs in techniques or methods. The private schools studied appear to attract students as much for the values associated with private schools as for the benefits of the language programs.
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ABSTRACT
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PROJECT TITLE: A STUDY OF BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES IN NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS: George Elford
Protase Woodford
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
PRINCETON, N.J. 08541

PURPOSE:

This project was undertaken in response to the growing importance of nonpublic schools in U.S. education and the evidence of numerous and varied language learning programs offered by these schools. Given the positive environment for learning in private schools and the relative freedom from regulation and bureaucratic supervision enjoyed by principals and teachers, it was assumed that nonpublic schools would be a fertile field for the developments of new techniques and practices in bilingual instruction.

This project was one of a series of studies addressing the research agenda established by the ESEA Title VII, Part C Research Coordinating Committee. At the outset of this project, according to the proposal request, the term "bilingual education programs" was broadly defined to include programs (transitional, maintenance, or otherwise) in English and/or native languages for children from minority language backgrounds who are not proficient in English, as well as programs conducted in non-English languages for children who may or may not be proficient in English.

PROCEDURES:

The activities of the project included: 1) preparatory activities which included the initial review of the literature, the convening of an Advisory Committee, and the preparation of a descriptive brochure; 2) scanning activities which included nominations from organizations, idea-sharing sessions with nonpublic school educators, and follow-up monitoring; 3) site visits; and 4) report preparation.

The questions pursued in the site visits were determined by the variables that were assumed to be of significance in bilingual instruction in nonpublic schools.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The language training in these private schools at best reflects the state of the art but is not the locus of important breakthroughs in techniques or methods. These (full-time) private schools, as a rule, were established and continue to attract patrons as much for the values associated with private or parochial schooling as for the benefits derived from the language program.
With the exception of special language schools like the Ecoles Bilingues and the Washington International School, private schools were not effective in developing genuinely bilingual graduates without strong support from use of the target language at home. Bilingual services offered by nonpublic schools tended to follow patterns related to different categories of schools, such as parochial, Hebrew, and independent schools. In language training, decisions about teaching methods and materials are left to the teachers, who do not have available the kinds of support services available in most public schools. Federal aid for instruction to these private schools was chiefly from Title I and Title IV (Library); there was very limited involvement with Title VII.

The following were the conclusions warranted by the project.

1. The principal contribution of nonpublic schools to bilingual instruction and language learning comes from the value or importance some of these schools assign to language learning—and not from innovative techniques and methods. And (2) Bilingual instruction is an important feature of a few specialized private schools; involvement with bilingual instruction, however, is not a characteristic of most full-time private schools.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

This is a report of a project investigating bilingual education in nonpublic schools. While this project was in progress, another work which touched on bilingual education in nonpublic schools received widespread attention. Hunger of Memory, The Education of Richard Rodriguez (1981) is the autobiography of a LMLEP (Language Minority with Limited English Proficiency) student who began studying English language and literature with "los gringos" at the nearby parish school and later at Stanford, Columbia, Berkeley, and the British Museum.

In one passage, Rodriguez reflected on his experiences in the all-English parish school -

"What I needed to learn in school was that I had the right -- and the obligation -- to speak the public language of los gringos... Without question it would have pleased me to hear my teachers address me in Spanish when I entered the classroom. I would have felt much less afraid. I would have trusted them and responded with ease. But I would have delayed -- for how long postponed? -- having to learn the language of public society..."

Fortunately, my teachers were unsentimental about their responsibility. What they understood was that I needed to speak a public language. So their voices would search me out, asking me questions."(p.19)

This personal account is cited here because it presents the picture that emerged from this project of how most private schools tended to approach the education of students from non-English speaking families.

While Rodriguez's experience is representative, the world of nonpublic schools does offer other experiences. For example, children in a parish school in Nogales, Arizona, begin learning all subjects in Spanish and gradually change to English. In Milwaukee, inner-city students go to a
A private school that has as its mission the maintenance of Spanish along with the teaching of English. At a Washington, D.C. school, students who are as a rule already proficient in English, are instructed entirely in English one day and entirely in French the next day. Private schools stay in existence because they serve particular purposes. For some private schools, these purposes include bilingual instruction. These schools were the subject of the project reported here.

At the outset, the reasons and purposes for this project need to be set forth, the key terms identified, and the project goals described.

1.1 Reasons for the Study Project

This Title VII funded project was undertaken in response to the growing importance of nonpublic schools in U.S. education and the evidence of numerous and varied language learning programs offered by these schools. The National Center for Education Statistics, as cited in N.I.E.'s request for proposals for this project, predicted that "the next ten years will witness a steady growth in nonpublic schools in the United States" (Condition of Education, 1980). As a partial confirmation of this prediction of increased popularity for private schools, the 1982 Gallup poll (Gallup, 1982) on attitudes toward public schools found that 45 percent of parents would prefer private schools, if money was not an issue. In 1982, private school enrollment had risen to 13 percent of the total enrollment. Joshua Fishman's surveys (1972, 1980) of language instruction in nonpublic schools found 400 different nonpublic, bilingual programs among 5,400 nonpublic afternoon, weekend, and summer as well as all-day schools teaching 55 languages. This information led to an assumption that this growing and already highly varied segment of U.S.
education could contribute to the improvement of bilingual instruction in both public and private schools. Given the positive environment for learning in private schools and the relative freedom from regulation and bureaucratic supervision enjoyed by principals and teachers, it was assumed that nonpublic schools would be a fertile field for the developments of new techniques and practices in bilingual instruction. This project examined this assumption in some detail.

This project was one of a series of studies addressing the research agenda established by the ESEA Title VII, Part C Research Coordinating Committee. This agenda centered on three principal concerns:

a. An estimate of the national need for bilingual education

b. The improvement of bilingual educational programs for students

c. The management, operation, and evaluation of ESEA Title VII.

This project addressed principally the second concern, the improvement of bilingual instruction and learning, as a part of a larger set of four studies referred to as the Significant Instructional Features in Bilingual Education Studies. Additional information related to the other two concerns was not, however, considered outside the scope of this project.
1.2 The Definition of Bilingual Education

At the outset of this project, according to the proposal request, the term "bilingual education programs" was broadly defined to include programs in English and/or native languages for children from minority language backgrounds who are not proficient in English, as well as programs conducted in non-English languages for children who may or may not be proficient in English.

The request for proposals proceeded to explain terms as follows:

**Bilingual instructional program:** This includes but is not limited to provision of instruction in academic subjects such as mathematics in the student's first, non-English language while the student is acquiring English fluency through other language instruction. It may include instruction for children either proficient in English or not, conducted in a language other than English where the objective is not development of English proficiency.

**Language minority student:** A student in whose home a non-English language typically is spoken. Such students may include those whose own English is fluent enough to benefit from instruction in academic subjects offered in English, and students whose English proficiency is limited. The latter group of students (limited English proficiency) is the focus of the RFP, but information is requested also on instruction for language minority-non-limited English proficiency students.

**Non-language minority student:** A student in whose home English is the predominant language. Participation in nonpublic schools' bilingual programs for these students is to be included in this study, although it is not the main focus.

Thus, at the outset, the project began with a broad definition of bilingual programs that included programs for non-language minority students.

This broad definition was incorporated in the project brochure (see Appendix A), which was carefully reviewed by the NIE staff. The brochure described bilingual instructional practices as involving "different ways of
taking a student's home language into account when the scope of instruction includes:

1. Teaching English to students whose home language is not English;
2. Conducting instruction in a language other than English for students who are not native speakers of that language but wish to learn it;
3. Helping students develop their home language while learning English.

The brochure then noted that the project would look "at the variety of formal and informal bilingual instructional practices in nonpublic schools that serve a substantial number of students with limited English proficiency (LEP), offer a program in English-as-a-second-language, offer a bilingual education program, or offer innovative programs in foreign language instruction."

The purpose of this broad definition was to avoid restricting at the outset the search for useful, new practices. The brochure definition served as the guiding definition of bilingual instruction for the data collection phase of this project.

More precise definitions, however, have been proposed. One definition of a bilingual education program from an ESEA Title VII evaluation project now in progress (Cardenas, Proper, et al., 1982) stipulated three essential characteristics for such a program:

1) Instruction is given in English and, to the extent necessary to allow children to achieve competency in the English language, in the native language of the children of limited English proficiency;
2) Instruction is given with appreciation for the cultural heritage of the children of limited English proficiency and of other children in the United States; and
3) Instruction is given in all courses or subjects of study to the extent necessary to allow children to progress effectively through the education system.
The definition seems to require that some instruction be provided in the native language of the children "to the extent necessary" for their learning English. From the context it is clear that a bilingual program must serve LEP students. Even though this definition, with a narrow interpretation of the phrase "to the extent necessary," would seem to include English-language immersion programs, this definition is certainly more restrictive than the initial project definition.

In another concurrent NIE project, McLaughlin (1982) defined the subjects of bilingual education as language minority children. He then described the three instructional models that fall within the scope of bilingual education:

1) "Transitional Bilingual Education." By this is meant a model in which the subject matter is taught (at least in part) in the child's first language until it is thought that the child's English is "good enough" for participation in the regular classroom.

2) "Maintenance Bilingual Education." In this model the ultimate goal is a bilingual individual fluent in both the first and the second language. Instead of phasing out instruction in the first language, as in transitional bilingual education, instruction is continued in the first language, although the use of the first language may change from serving as a medium of instruction to being taught as a subject.

3) "Immersion. In this model all instruction is given in the child's second language. Children in immersion programs are separated from native speakers of the second language so that they do not suffer by comparison. The child's first language is gradually phased in and is maintained through special instruction."

McLaughlin identified three other instructional models, which he described as outside the purview of bilingual education. The "enrichment model" provides language majority children with instruction in a prestige language such as French or German. While these programs may be bilingual in one sense, for Title VII purposes, these programs are not considered
bilingual because the students are, as a rule, already proficient in English. The "submersion model" places language minority students in all English classrooms on a sink or swim basis, with or without a "pull-out" program in English as a Second Language (ESL).

As will be noted in this report, these three instructional models, enrichment, submersion, and ESL programs, tended to characterize the private sector offerings in bilingual instruction. While ESL programs can be one component in a bilingual program, the ESL programs offered in nonpublic schools are not, as a rule, offered as a component of a bilingual program but as special programs for foreign students. Bilingual programs that meet McLaughlin's more restrictive definitions of bilingual education proved difficult to find in the private sector. In this project, Title VII programs in private schools were not considered private school programs because the staff, programs, and materials were provided by the local public schools.

In an evaluation design for the Montgomery County, (Md) Public Schools, Daniel Ulibarri (1981) advanced a definition of bilingual instruction that centered on the array of services offered to students which included alternative ESOL, in which special content courses for LEP students are taught in English, itinerant ESOL, transitional bilingual education, cluster schools, and tutorial programs. According to this definition, a bilingual program is one that includes one or more of these services to LMLEP students in any combination. An expanded version of this definition will be employed in this report (see 4.3 General Findings). This approach to defining bilingual instruction proved to be the most useful for the purpose of this project.
1.3 Overview of Project Goals

Stated in broad terms, the purpose of this project was to identify the ways in which nonpublic schools serve the language learning needs of American youth. More specifically, the project had the following purposes:

1) To identify the range of nonpublic school bilingual instructional programs by describing the principal types of programs offered.

2) To identify apparently effective practices in nonpublic schools that hold promise for wide use in both public and other nonpublic schools.

3) To encourage nonpublic school efforts in bilingual instruction.

This last goal describes a deliberately planned by-product of the project.
2.0 RELATED LITERATURE

The literature provides a continuous, well-documented history of non-public schooling, as well as a great deal of sometimes conflicting information about bilingual programs, instructional practices, and curricular materials. Between these two bodies of literature, however, lies a chasm of silence regarding bilingual educational practices in nonpublic schools. The works by Fishman and his associates (Fishman and Markman, 1980) constitute the major bridge between these two separate streams of historical, evaluative, analytical, and research literature.

2.1 Types of Bilingual Programs

Data available do not allow us to generalize about the exact numbers and types of bilingual programs available in nonpublic schools, since even the major surveys undertaken by Fishman and his associates reported response rates just above ten percent. Fishman and Markham (1980) have postulated that for bilingual educational programs, "... the language and ethnicity link is vital and eternal." They cited the Jewish Parochial schools which have perpetuated Yiddish and extended the knowledge of Hebrew, the Mennonite and other Protestant sectarian schools which have continued the use of German dialects, and the Byzantine Church which has kept Greek culture alive in many of our great cities. They also described the Chinese and Japanese language schools on the mainland and in Hawaii, and the Ukrainian, Estonian and other Slavic ethnic groups who have maintained their ethnic identity by establishing separate schools. The premise of this present project harks back to Fishman's 1978 postulate which suggested that ethnicity, religion, and language form a tripod that has provided the foundation for the stable and meaningful bilingual programs found among nonpublic schools.
In discussing ethnographic research contributions to bicultural/bilingual education at the Georgetown University Roundtable, Carden and her associates (1980) described two nonpublic English as Second language (ESL) programs: the first in the primary grades at Kamehameha school in Hawaii, the second at St. Mary's high school in southwestern Alaska. In reading the description of the two programs, a number of effective instructional program characteristics were mentioned. The KEEP project is based at Kamehameha, a K-12 school serving over a thousand students. The reading comprehension program described by Au and Jordan (in press) was based on an overlapping turns reading class structure similar to overlapping speech patterns of Polynesian conversations. The talk story approach of discussion was found to be accompanied by dramatically increased reading achievement. This approach to beginning reading may well have application for public school reading programs designed to serve pupils from other cultures with strong oral traditions. It would certainly be possible to design a replication study among other language/culture groups enrolled in public schools. And if the KEEP results were confirmed, dissemination of the new reading instructional method could be encouraged. Because of the importance of this project as an example of what nonpublic schools can contribute, a report on this project is included as Appendix F. Both the KEEP project and the Kamehameha Schools are "private" in a qualified sense. Funding comes from a trust established by the Hawaiian royal family, descendants of King Kamehameha.

St. Mary's in Alaska was also reported as having notable success in terms of language achievement, and high rates of college entrance. The factors described as being related to the effectiveness of the St. Mary's program would appear to be less amenable to application in public school settings.
The scale of operations and the living facilities would be impractical for public schools. In addition, teachers at St. Mary's were described as being young, spirited volunteers who devote twenty-four hours a day to their young charges. These teachers provided for their pupils emotional as well as intellectual sustenance in a quasi-familial setting. Broad applications of such a model in public schools would probably be very difficult to achieve. Such schools were too far away to be considered economically sound candidates for site visits, given the scale of this project.

2.2 Factors Which Shape Nonpublic Instruction

The literature does describe a number of factors which tend to shape instruction in nonpublic schools.

2.2.1 The differences between a "private" and "public" institution.

Carlson (1964) has analyzed the differences between schools and other institutions based on their relationship to the community. Carlson has contrasted "domesticated" institutions, which are "kept" by public law and government funds and "wild" institutions such as nonpublic schools that must win support year by year. Erickson, MacDonald, and Manley-Casimer (1979) identified differences between public and independent schools in British Columbia that fitted Carlson's typology. Differences between public and independent schools were found on measures of student commitment, institutional jeopardy, school effectiveness (assessed by parents), teacher commitment (as judged separately by teachers, parents, and students), social cohesion, school responsiveness to parents, sense of special mission, parent commitment, school justice, and student enthusiasm for work. With the introduction of public funding of private schools in 1978, a second administration of the same measures showed declines in school responsiveness to
parents, teacher commitment, social cohesion, need for parental involvement, and parental perceptions of school effectiveness. Students showed less enthusiasm for school work, a less clear perception of being treated fairly and belief that the school was in some way "special." These studies show how the shift from the "private" toward the "public" domain can affect important elements in the instructional process.

2.2.2 Parent and Student Aspirations

The reasons parents chose nonpublic schools vary with socioeconomic circumstances and with the type of school selected. In general, parents sent students to elite independent schools for predominantly academic reasons—in particular, for the quality of these schools' preparation for college (Baird, 1977). Inner city parents tended to select Catholic and other nonpublic schools likewise for academic reasons, related to upward mobility, preparation for higher education and discipline. Parents in middle-class suburban areas, however, tended to select church-related nonpublic schools chiefly for religious reasons (Gratiot, 1979, Ford, 1979, Kamin and Erickson, 1981). Those parents in the South who selected comparatively new, fundamentalist Christian schools did so predominantly for religious reasons that were linked to distrust both of the public schools and the contemporary values in American society (Nevin and Bills, 1976, Turner, 1979). Coleman (1980), Jencks (1979), and Rosen (1969), among others, have shown that parents have a very substantial influence on the achievement of their children, not only by their own skills, knowledge, and capabilities, but by motivating their offsprings' learning behavior. A comparative study of inner city public and Catholic school students by Levine, Lachowicz, and Tangeman (1972) attributed
the relatively higher academic achievement in the Catholic schools to the more supportive home environments of the parochial school students. A study comparing Catholic and public high schools by Morrison and Hodgkins (1970) defined "effectiveness" as the proportion of former 10th grade students who went on to any form of post-secondary education. Controlling for the number of drop-outs, the capability of the student body, the social class context, and the community setting, Catholic high schools were found to be considerably more "effective" than public high schools. The finding simply confirms that the families of nonpublic school students tend to be motivated toward higher education and, in lower middle class families, to social mobility through education. This pattern was confirmed more recently for Hispanic students by Greeley (1980) in the NORC study of public and private high schools.

Specific studies related to nonpublic schools in bilingual education have focused on the aspirations of nonpublic school families. Carter and Segura (1980) reported that, based on comments by informants, Roman Catholic schools in the southwest enrolled Mexican/American families of upwardly mobile or middle-class families. A study by Lampe (1979) in San Antonio showed that eighth-grade Chicanos in parochial schools, unlike their public school counterparts, reflected attitudes and values similar to those of Anglo students. Carter and Segura refer to the "agrinado," the "angloized Mexican American," who tend to achieve and react in ways similar to other middle-class children.

Cogan (1979) studied the school choice behavior of parents in British Columbia. Parents in this study had a choice between private and public schools and, within the latter, between English and French programs. Passive choice parents and a high proportion of low SES parents reported concern
about the proximity—and accessibility of schools. Active choice and high
middle SES parents showed greater concern about the availability of a parti-
cular program—in this case, French.

The literature without exception underscored the advantages enjoyed by
private schools based on higher levels of parent and student aspirations.

2.2.3 School Principals and Administrators

Historically, nonpublic schools have been known for their great head-
masters. In fiction and in biographies, the individualistic, sometimes even
idiosyncratic educational notions of men of vision have been celebrated.
Their work left indelible imprints upon the character and influence of their
schools. Kraushaar (1972) has attributed the importance of the role of
nonpublic school principals—and headmasters—to the absence of a powerful
central administration and the elaborate bureaucratic procedure associated
with public school systems.

The differences between the management systems and principals’ roles of
nonpublic and public schools deserve close scrutiny in the context of the
proposed study. Abramowitz and Stackhouse (1980) reported that in comparison
to their public school counterparts, private school heads have substantial
authority and can select staff to promote the school’s purpose. Staff
participation in decision-making is greater, however, and staff meetings are
more frequent. This same study reported private schools as showing a
marked congruence between the principals’ goals and the perceived goals of
the parents and a high level of principal satisfaction. Kraushaar (1972) re-
ported that the heads of nonpublic schools surveyed responded that they spent
more time working with students than with any other function. Tikunoff (1981)
reported that effective principals of bilingual programs exerted strong
leadership, allowed maximum autonomy for teachers, knew which classrooms were doing well or poorly, and set and implemented consistent disciplinary procedures. None of these characteristics are at variance with the qualities described by Kraushaar, who suggested additional criteria for evaluating principal performance. He listed, in addition to the universally acknowledged criterion of strong and loyal graduates, maintaining the reputation of the school, attracting and holding a strong faculty, being successful in introducing innovations without loss of beloved tradition(s); maintaining the trust of trustees, parents and alumnae, keeping up school morale, as well as demonstrating the more tangible accomplishments of augmented enrollment numbers, buildings, prestige, and financial support.

2.2.4 Nonpublic School Teachers

In staffing their classrooms, nonpublic elementary schools, as a rule, were not limited by state certification requirements. Only 13 states required private school teachers to be certified (O'Malley, 1979). In Catholic elementary schools in 1972 (NCEA/Ganley, 1979) approximately one fourth of the lay teachers who made up 70 percent of the total staff, had less than a BA degree. Compared with public school teachers, however, teachers at the elite schools studied by Baird (1977) were described as working longer hours, earning lower salaries, having more experience, and having more training in their subject matter than in education courses. These teachers also chose to be in private schools for academic reasons, such as freedom to design and teach courses as they wish, lower student/teacher ratios, and regard for the quality of students and other teachers.
Nevin and Bills (1976) found that teachers in the new Christian schools were poorly paid and generally less qualified than their public school counterparts. These teachers did, however, share the parents' values. As noted above, Erickson, in his studies in western Canada, found that differences in teacher commitment between public and private (Catholic) schools were eroded with the introduction of direct public funding, even though these funds were expended chiefly for substantial increases in faculty salaries (Erickson and Nault, 1980).

2.2.5 Materials and Equipment in Nonpublic Schools

Beattie, in his survey of Cleveland area ethnic heritage schools, found a dearth of appropriate teaching and supplementary materials. The lack of even a modest arsenal of audiovisual equipment was considered a major problem of the nonpublic bilingual educator respondents. While Federal programs such as Title I have provided significant help for some nonpublic schools, Vitullo-Martin (1977) estimated that less than half the nonpublic school students who are entitled to Title I services actually received them and that these students received only a fraction of the services they should. Vitullo-Martin suggested a professional ombudsman for nonpublic schools not subject to public officials. In addition a number of cultural/ethnic organizations have also produced special teaching materials or collected sources of materials for the mini-language minorities (Reilly et al., 1981).

2.2.6 Nonpublic School Students

As noted above, differences have been found between public and nonpublic school students in terms of their aspiration levels and attitudes toward various aspects of schooling (Greeley, 1980, Erickson, 1981). Nault (1979) has identified differences among nonpublic school students between
those who chose the school themselves and those for whom the parents chose the school. "Self-affiliated" students evidenced a higher degree of commitment to extracurricular participation and academic achievement. Kottkamp (1979) replicated this study within a public school that offered several schools within a school.

2.3 Research in Bilingual Education

Despite the proliferation of bilingual education programs across the country since 1968, it was not until recently that research issues were given a "line-item" in the budget process. Troike (1978) noted that less than 0.1 percent of the total appropriation for bilingual education had been allocated for research. In response to the need for research, Congress mandated the Secretary of Education to "develop a national research program for bilingual education." The result of this directive was the formulation of the Bilingual Education Part C Research Agenda in the Department of Education. In an update of the research agenda (Forum 1982) the studies fall into three main categories: (1) improvement in the delivery of services; (2) improvement in Title VII program management and operations; and (3) assessment of national needs for bilingual programs. This section will review several Part C studies as well as other relevant studies.

2.3.1 Effectiveness of Bilingual Education

One of the underlying questions in the studies which fall in this category is to determine what "effectiveness" actually means with regard to bilingual programs. The only large-scale Federal effort to address this question was the study begun in 1974 by the American Institutes for Research under contract with the U.S. Office of Education (Danoff, 1978).
The general design of the Impact Study was one of contrasting the performance of two groups of students: those enrolled in Title VII Spanish/English bilingual projects and comparable students not enrolled in such projects. Students from grades 2 through 6 were pre-tested in Fall 1975 and post-tested in Spring 1976; in addition, a sample of students initially tested in grades 2 and 3 were retested in Fall 1976. The Title VII sample was drawn from 38 projects in 117 schools with approximately 5,300 students. The non-Title VII control group consisted of approximately 2,400 students from 50 schools. A wide range of classroom data was collected including project characteristics and instructional processes. The Impact Study findings indicated that:

1. "In English Language Arts, participation in the ESEA Title VII project did not appear to produce gains in student achievement over and above what would be expected had students been assigned to a traditional classroom. In fact, in several grades the non-Title VII students made slightly greater gains in English Language Arts instruction."

2. "In mathematics, students participating in the ESEA Title VII project had gains in achievement approximately equal to those of non-Title VII students."

3. "For Title VII Hispanic students, post-test achievement in Spanish reading exceeded that measured in pre-test."

4. "Participation in a Title VII project did not affect attitudes toward school-related activities."

(Executive Summary, USOE/OPPE March 1978)

Despite the heavy criticism of this study (Cardenas, 1978; Gray, 1978; O'Malley, 1978), it provided valuable information about the intricacies of conducting evaluative research in bilingual settings. For example, the case studies indicated the wide diversity of students and projects across the country. Recent large-scale evaluations of bilingual programs conducted by the state education agencies have provided insight into program variation within and between states. Egan and Goldsmith (1981) described the Colorado
State evaluation which began in 1974. The purpose of the data collected by the State's Department of Education was to examine student academic performance while participating in a bilingual program. The study showed that a significant number of students who participated in the bilingual program either maintained or significantly increased school achievement. In addition, attendance rates for participating students were significantly higher than nonparticipating students. Similar findings were indicated in the studies from New York (1982) and New Jersey (1982).

These positive findings do not overshadow the lack of conclusive evaluation studies on the effectiveness of transitional bilingual education (TBE). Baker and de Kanter (1981) conducted an extensive review of the literature in this field. Of the over 300 documents reviewed, they contended that only 28 both addressed the question of effectiveness and met minimal methodological standards. Program effectiveness was defined as student performance in English and mathematics. The study compared the findings of the 28 studies with those from alternative instructional approaches, e.g., English as a second language (ESL), structured immersion. The findings of the 28 studies were aggregated according to whether the effects of TBE were positive, no different, or negative in comparison to the other approaches.

The results from this study indicated:

- In teaching a second language (i.e., English), only 10 of 30 findings reported any positive effects of TBE in comparison to submersion in the ordinary classroom.

- In teaching mathematics, only 2 of 14 findings reported any positive effects of TBE in comparison to the ordinary classroom.

- ESL and TBE programs were equally effective, although only a few such comparisons were reported.

- Studies of structured immersion, while very few in number, showed promising results.
Baker and de Kanter qualified these results by noting that simple tabulations fail to distinguish among studies with differing information bases. The study's methodology, referred to as the "voting method," has been questioned in terms of methodological rigor (Glass, McGaw, and Smith, 1981). One of the primary problems with this approach is that the aggregation of mixed results from diverse studies not only produces an imprecise analysis, but also obscures issues which are relevant to the issue under study.

2.3.2 Instructional Features in Bilingual Settings

Until recently, much of the research on bilingual instructional practices was conducted outside of the United States (Tucker, 1977). Much of the seminal work has been conducted in Canada and developing nations, i.e., Nigeria and the Phillipines.

Many of these studies are important in that they indicate what types of programs are effective and provide valuable information about the consequences of bilingualism on cognition and the affective domain (MacNamara, J., 1967; Lambert and Gardner, 1972; Lambert and Tucker, 1972). Any generalizing of these findings to the United States must be done with caution. Paulston (1977) and Tucker (1979) underscored the fact that the goals of the U.S. and Canadian programs are notably different. In the U.S. situation, LMLEP students are taught to read in their first language (L1) in an effort to facilitate reading in English (L2). The underlying implication being that students will not lose time academically while learning English. In contrast, the Canadian studies indicated that learning to read in a second language (French) does not harm reading and academic achievement in the native language (English) for middle-class students. Both researchers underscored the difference in student populations and the contextual variables of the program settings.
Until recently, most of the literature on bilingual instructional features was presented in a "cookbook" format, delineating the component parts of program development, administration, and evaluation (Nieves-Squires et al., 1980). In an effort to go beyond this approach, Goodrich (1980 a,b), and Nieves-Squires et al. (1980) detailed a useful design for studying the significant instructional features of bilingual programs. They emphasized the importance of a descriptive component to this type of research which would include data on: (1) the effects of instruction in L1 and L2 on the students' proficiency in both languages; (2) student, teacher, and community attitudes toward L1 and L2; and (3) the consequences of socio-cultural factors on student interaction.

The most recent attempt to examine the significant instructional features of bilingual classrooms is the research underway at the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (FWLERD) and a consortium of eight other educational institutions and agencies. Funded under the Part C Research Agenda, the study was designed in two phases. Part I proposed to identify and describe those features in bilingual instructional settings found to be significant in terms of student performance outcomes. Part II focuses on verification of these features' consequences for LMLEP students in terms of:

(1) Generalizability of features across other settings;

(2) Stability of teacher use of features and consequences for LMLEPs in English language acquisition and academic skills attainment;

(3) Utility of features to improve practice;

(4) Compatibility of Part I findings with those of related research.
A wide variety of qualitative and quantitative data were collected in 58 classrooms, at six sites serving 232 target LMLEP students. The teachers were selected through a nomination process. At each site, teachers were nominated for participation because they were viewed as "successful" bilingual teachers by their colleagues and constituents. No effort was made, however, to verify that the sample of teachers nominated and selected were, indeed, successful (Tikunoff & Valquez-Faria, 1982). In addition, student performance was not determined by achievement testing. Instead, observations using "active teaching" categories were used to make inferences about student success. The basic research related to "active teaching" is summarized in Tikunoff and Vazquez-Faria (1982). They asserted that students who have experienced more direct or active instruction do better on traditional measures of reading and mathematics.

With respect to effective bilingual instruction, Tikunoff et al. (1981) noted three additional skills exhibited by the "successful" teachers:

- Teachers used both $L_1$ and $L_2$ for instruction. The ability to use languages ensures that all children in the classroom will receive instruction in the language in which (they) best communicate.

- Teachers focused some instructional time on English language development, using variations of the bilingual instructional strategies. These strategies were designed to develop English language proficiency while concurrently ensuring that NEP/LEP will have access to regular instruction in the content areas so that they don't fall behind while learning English.

- Of the 58 teachers in the sample, 55 were both bilingual and bicultural. In the other three classrooms, paraprofessionals with these characteristics were present. Preliminary analysis of the descriptions of instruction for teachers in the sample revealed frequent use of behavior which appeared to be culturally relevant and specific for the ethnolinguistic group of NEP/LEP students in a given classroom. Particularly for younger NEP/LEP students, this appeared to be an important presence in the teacher's repertoire of teaching behaviors.
Thus, it can be speculated that effective bilingual instruction can be described not only in terms of (a) the use of bilingual instructional strategies, and (b) the use of effective generic instructional strategies, but in terms of (c) teachers who are bilingual, focus on English language development, and who are bicultural as well.

The preliminary findings of the Significant Instructional Features studies confirmed the conclusion of Ortiz (1980) that:

The two most significant instructional features in bilingual education programs are teacher-pupil interaction and academic learning time. From the data reported upon, it is proposed that other instructional features: educational facilities, appropriate materials, techniques and strategies, classroom management, teacher expectations and attitudes, and learning styles are important but dependent on the positive presence of the two.

2.4 Nonpublic Schools as Consumers of Bilingual Education Research

One significant link between the literature on bilingual education and bilingual instruction in nonpublic schools may well be the impact on private school decision-makers of widely published findings about bilingual education. Private schools must win their clients by demonstrating effectiveness or at least by maintaining the presumption of academic effectiveness. The publication of research findings about a particular approach to language learning, such as TBE, would predictably have immediate impact on the decisions of school administrators. Given the autonomy of the individual private school, programs can quickly come and go. For this reason, the availability of bilingual instruction in private schools could be directly affected by widely publicized research findings on the effectiveness of bilingual education.
3.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

The activities of the project can be grouped into four categories: 1) preparatory activities which included the initial review of the literature, the convening of an Advisory Committee, and the preparation of a descriptive brochure; 2) scanning activities which included nominations from organizations, idea-sharing sessions, and follow-up monitoring; 3) site visits; and 4) report preparation. These activities will be described here. The first step in the project was a detailed meeting with the project officer in which every aspect of the study was reviewed.

3.1 Initial Review of Literature

An initial review of the literature, completed during the first month of the project focused on research on private education related to this project. The companion Part C studies had already provided thorough reviews of the literature on bilingual education which proved useful in planning the site visits for this project.

3.2 The Advisory Committee

An external Advisory Committee made up of experts on nonpublic schools, bilingual education, and second-language research provided direction and counsel at the outset of the study. The committee was made up of nine members selected according to the following criteria:

1) Expertise in bilingual and/or nonpublic education

2) Credibility in the field of bilingual and/or nonpublic education

3) Coverage of major language groups and different types of nonpublic schools.

The members of the advisory committee were:
The Advisory Committee, after lengthy discussion, agreed on the following predictions of what the study was likely to find:

1) The distinctive features of nonpublic bilingual and language learning programs will be institutional features and not classroom practices. Mentioned by way of example were Erickson’s studies (1980, 1981) in Western Canada on the institutional differences between public and private school on such dimensions as institutional jeopardy, responsiveness to parents, parent involvement, and student sense of the school.
as special. The Committee did not expect to find any different classroom techniques or practices in non-public schools.

2) Teacher motivation will contribute to the effectiveness of nonpublic school programs. Committee members saw nonpublic school teachers as having more clearly defined purposes, greater personal dedication or "devotion," a sense of mission (often religious), a greater freedom from constraints (especially from teacher union pressure) and a correspondingly greater sense of autonomy. Teacher expectations for student achievement might be more demanding in nonpublic schools. The committee suggested that the teachers' language proficiency, ethnicity, and ethnic identification be noted in the case studies.

3) Parent commitment to education and to the school should give nonpublic school programs an advantage. Parents in nonpublic schools tend to have a feeling of ownership of their school.

4) The manner in which decisions are made about instructional materials also offer nonpublic schools some advantages. Teachers and principals in nonpublic schools tend to have a greater openness in trying out new materials and greater freedom to change in mid-course if materials don't work. Lack of access to materials encourages teacher inventiveness in creating their own. While nonpublic schools will tend to have less access to materials than public schools, they are freer to select materials without the assistance of curriculum specialists. (They are not tied to possibly irrelevant materials created in a funded project.) The committee urged that attention be given to this question of materials.

5) Given the virtual absence of instructional supervision, nonpublic schools possibly forge types of linkages with colleges, consultants, local public schools, other nonpublic schools, and Title VI resource centers that merit attention. The committee agreed that the principal or headmaster was usually served as the instructional supervisor in the nonpublic school. The ways in which nonpublic schools provided for their inservice training needs are possibly quite varied and noteworthy.

6) Nonpublic schools serve a range of students and communities in terms of SES, despite their middle/upper class image. The project needs to give attention to the impact of SES factors on the programs being described. The staff noted that the idea-sharing sessions are to be held in urban areas where the bilingual population in nonpublic schools include a large number of students from lower income homes.
Along with SES data, other community factors including especially the community's attitudes toward languages should be noted.

7) There are certain programs, for example, language immersion programs, not compatible with federal funding requirements that nonpublic schools have a greater freedom to try. The committee noted that, while this may be true, the problem of finding teachers for these programs was severe.

8) Part-time nonpublic language schools will tend to have a distinctive set of features. These usually religious/ethnic community programs will tend to emphasize reading, have a more focused program, benefit from strong family support, and present teachers who are both role models and community representatives.

3.3 Preparation of Project Brochure

A brochure was prepared for this project and reviewed both by the project officer and the Advisory Committee before its publication. This brochure was used in every contact during the scanning phase (see Appendix A).

3.4 Scanning Activities

The data collection phases of the project began with the scanning effort. Data collection included two major phases, the generating of data from the scanning activities themselves and the generating of data from the visits to sites selected through the scanning effort.

3.4.1 Proposed Multiple Approach to "Scanning"

Two of the essential tasks in this project were: (1) the identification of nonpublic school bilingual programs that apparently "have something to offer" to the field and (2) a more in-depth look at these typical or exemplary programs through-site visits. For the scanning effort required to
identify the schools to be studied in depth, ETS adopted a "multiple source" approach. Schools were identified (a) from a review of the literature, (b) by nominations from nonpublic school and bilingual education groups and agencies, (c) by nomination from the Advisory Committee, and (d) by means of regional idea-sharing sessions.

3.4.2 Nominations from Organizations and Agencies

Nominations to exemplary nonpublic bilingual programs which meet the study criteria were requested from the specific persons, organizations, or agencies as well as from the Advisory Committee. In nominating schools, respondents were asked to identify the basis for the nomination, i.e., what aspect of the program is especially noteworthy.

In mid-November, a letter of inquiry and reply form were sent to all 25 organizations belonging to the Council for American Private Education (CAPE), a list of 67 bilingual education contacts from the "Guide to Resource Organizations for Minority Language Groups" and all (160) of the Catholic diocesan education offices from a list provided by the National Catholic Educational Association (NCEA). From this mailing, the following replies and nominations were received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th>Replies</th>
<th>Nominations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPE*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCEA</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>298**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Educators</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers do not include NCEA which is a CAPE member.

**Number includes 99 from two New York area dioceses but not 103 nominations obtained by follow-up phone calls.
Replies from the November survey along with copies of the Fishman directory list and Greek and Hebrew school directory lists were sent to the project staff of ETS regional office staff. Invitations were sent from these regional offices to schools within easy traveling distance from the meeting location.

The meeting locations were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>1/21</td>
<td>Sheraton Executive Tower Fort Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>Holiday Inn (Newton at Route 128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>2/1</td>
<td>Trinity University (Student Center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1/28</td>
<td>Sheraton Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>1/26</td>
<td>Omni International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>Pasadena Hilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>Berkeley Marriott Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2/10</td>
<td>Holiday Inn (Holland Tunnel Plaza)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>2/23</td>
<td>ETS Office, San Juan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nominated schools were invited to these sessions by a letter of invitation which stated specifically that the sessions were directed to staff from schools serving a sizeable percentage of LEP students and to staff from schools with distinctive bilingual or ESL programs. Thus, by a process of self-selection, the invited participants were limited to those schools meeting the project's criteria.

The invitation list for these idea-sharing sessions was compiled from several sources including the Fishman's (1980) directory of nonpublic schools.
and the nominations submitted by the above named organizations. Using these sources, virtually all nonpublic schools involved with bilingual education and located within 50 miles of one of the conferences were contacted.

Detailed background materials were assembled to assist the ETS field staff in conducting these meetings.

These all-day idea-sharing sessions, while open-ended, followed a planned sequence. The meeting rooms were set up in conference style with an overhead projector and screen. The topics were presented by means of audio/visual displays (on transparencies). At the close of the session, participants were asked to identify exemplary nonpublic schools to be considered for case studies. Despite the small numbers attending, these sessions served their purpose quite effectively. These idea-sharing sessions provided nonpublic school bilingual educators in these locales an opportunity to share information about their own programs with one another as well as with the regionally-based project staff.

The tapes and notes were content analyzed by the study directors. The initial categories for the content-analysis were taken from the Guide notes (see Appendix C). Additional content categories were formulated based on the actual data, compiled from the sessions. A detailed report on these sessions is included in Appendix B.

3.4.3 Follow-up Mailings

The reply card for the idea-sharing sessions identified schools unable to attend but interested in the project. These schools and other nominated schools outside the areas served by the meetings were asked to submit brief descriptions of their programs. To assist them, a guide was prepared outlining what the description should cover (see Appendix C).
The descriptions collected from this mailing and from the idea-sharing sessions were used to compile a descriptive directory of nonpublic schools involved in bilingual instruction which is included as Appendix D. They also provided the list of possible schools from which case studies were selected.

3.5 Design of Site Visits

The site visits of typical and exemplary bilingual programs in nonpublic schools were the principal data collection element in the study. The design of these site visits was based in part on the work completed earlier in this project. Thus, the first step in designing the case studies was the aggregation of data from the scanning activities. The formulation of the research design and the selection of case study sites depended on the information compiled from: a) the Advisory Committee's discussion of draft policy premises, b) the companion studies, c) the literature review, d) the content analyses of the idea-sharing seminars, and e) available information on the schools nominated from all sources.

3.6 Questions to be Investigated

The questions pursued in the site visits were determined by the variables that were assumed to be of significance in bilingual instruction in nonpublic schools. The variables of significance were identified from three sources: a model of the nonpublic school bilingual classroom presented in the proposal, the list of descriptors prepared on the basis of the Advisory Committee's discussion and presented in the projects' Guide for use by schools in describing their bilingual programs, and the major categories and subcategories derived from success indicators in the SBIF study (Tikunoff et al., 1981). Following the outline in the project's "Guide," these three sets
of variables are listed in Table 1 below. Table 1 shows the extensive agreement among these three independent sources.

Table 1: Variables to be Addressed in Site Visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>Proposal Model</th>
<th>SBIF.Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Information</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Total School Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of School</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Community Involvement</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Parents and Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinds of Students</td>
<td>Pupil Behavior</td>
<td>Students Experiences, Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Teacher Background</td>
<td>Teacher Orientations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Bilingual Programs</td>
<td>Classroom Processes/ Teacher Behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective of Bilingual Programs</td>
<td>(Language Program and Content)</td>
<td>(see above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Language of Instruction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of Time</td>
<td>(Time on Task)</td>
<td>(see above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of Instruction</td>
<td>(Instruction Models)</td>
<td>Classroom Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>(Supplemental Material*)</td>
<td>Curriculum/Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Indicators</td>
<td>Pupil Attainment</td>
<td>Students' Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is a list of the key variables investigated in the site visits and the principal questions to be asked related to each.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>PROPOSED QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Information</td>
<td>What type (all-day, half-day, etc.) of school is this? Grade span? Enrollment? Who founded the school? How long has it been in operation? What is the governance structure? How is it funded? Does it receive any government aid? How do key administrators view language learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposes</td>
<td>What attracts people to the school? In rank order, what are the purposes of the school? How does language learning relate to these purposes? How does the school communicate its purpose to its patrons? Is there a consensus about purposes? Is the school perceived by teachers, parents, and students as socially cohesive?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Community</td>
<td>Does the school's supporting community value language learning? Is language learning tied to other important values? In what ways do parents and community members actively support the school? How clearly does the school define for the parents what is expected of them? How dependent is the school on parental contributions? Do parents perceive the school as dependent on them for survival? What are the language use patterns among the parents and supporting community? Do parents see the school as responsive to their concerns as &quot;their&quot; school? Do parents exhibit a more traditional academic orientation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Proposed Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kinds of Students</strong></td>
<td>What is the SES level of the students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the L₁ and L₂ levels of proficiency of incoming students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the educational aspiration level of the students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do students perceive this school as special/more demanding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do students believe their teachers are more committed than teachers in other schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many language groups are represented on the student body?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do all language groups feel as if they “belong” at the school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do students feel that teachers are really fair with them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do language groups interact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Background</strong></td>
<td>What are the L₁ and L₂ levels of proficiency among the staff (teachers, aides, administrators)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How experienced are the teachers in general?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In language learning program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How much training have the teachers had? Are they certified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are teachers recruited? Are they from the local community that supports the school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do teachers perceive the school as having a special mission?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do teachers feel rewarded with the evident success of their students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do teachers favor a very orderly and structured approach to classroom teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do teachers value L₁ and L₂?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is provided for staff development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Proposed Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Programs</td>
<td>What kinds of programs does the school offer? ESL? Transitional? etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How much emphasis is placed on developing L₁ and L₂?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives of the Program</td>
<td>In rank order, which are the important cognitive and affective objectives of the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are objectives set? What kind of consensus is there concerning objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can specific activities be identified with specific objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use</td>
<td>What is the pattern of language use in the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who uses L₁ and L₂? For what purpose? How frequently?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is written and AV material available in both L₁ and L₂?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Time</td>
<td>How much time is devoted to language learning? How is it scheduled?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How long does the program run? One year? Throughout all grades?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Methods</td>
<td>Which method(s) is/are employed? at what levels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are methods followed consistently or switched frequently?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who chooses the method? How prepared is the teacher to use the method?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are interesting &quot;new&quot; methods or techniques in use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>What kinds of materials are used in the program? Who selects them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What access does the school have to available materials?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do teachers devise their own materials?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Proposed Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials (cont.)</strong></td>
<td>Does the school have access to resources in the area for materials and related support services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What kind of linkage has the school established with outside resource providers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success Indicators</strong></td>
<td>What evidence of success is available in terms of test results? Subsequent performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved attitudes toward school (retention)? Evidence of high levels of morale? Higher aspiration level and increased self-confidence? Product evaluation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are students who complete the school's program bilingual?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are students who complete the school's program proficient in English?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific questions were highlighted in certain types of schools based on the judgement of the project staff.

The project staff have analyzed the aggregated information. Based on this analysis, the project staff identified the categories of sites to be visited and the principal questions to be investigated.

### 3.7 Sites Visited

A draft list of sites and questions were reviewed first by the Project Officer and then by the Advisory Committee. Based on this review, the final list of sites and questions was formulated.

Schools were selected in a manner that provided for coverage by the major categories of bilingual and nonpublic schools. These major categories were as follows:
Table 2: Categories of Schools Included in Site Visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Minimum #</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>4 (2)*</td>
<td>Regional distribution was necessary to document the national as opposed to regional contribution of private schools. Border schools presented a special category for study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>4 (2)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>4 (2)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*border schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The majority of schools were parochial; within this group Greek, Hebrew and other language group schools predominated. Independent schools included both ESL programs and special schools emphasizing foreign language. Community ethnic schools included at least two Oriental language schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Ethnic</td>
<td>3 (2)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oriental language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>These three categories were definitely covered. The project covered others as the opportunities allow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual/Bicultural</td>
<td>5 (3)†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>5 (3)†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Most schools were elementary schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrichment programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, a reasonable balance was attempted across all subcategories by region, sponsorship, and program. Schools were selected, however, because of their bilingual practices, not because of other features of the school. Primary and intermediate schools made up the overwhelming majority (three out of four) of the schools visited. This was in keeping with the emphasis of the companion studies of bilingual education. Table 3 lists the 24 schools that were selected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESL or Submersion</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hope Rural School</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Indiantown)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immaculate Conception</td>
<td>Texas*</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rio Grande City)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Mission (LA)</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Veronica (Phil.)</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual/FLES/Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Brendan’s (Miami)</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Michael’s (Levelland)</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Guadalupe (Milw.)</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis (Winooski)</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Heart (Nogales)</td>
<td>Arizona*</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Bilingual Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Redeemer (Phil.)</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Lang. Schl (LA)</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1-12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Schl of S. Jersey</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>K-8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French, Italian, German &amp; Spanish Bilingual Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington International School</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Fr, Sp</td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecole Bilingue (Berkeley)</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecole Bilingue (Camb.)</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Lang. Lutheran (Phil.)</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>K-8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Spring Mont.</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French International</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (Beth.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew, Greek, Armenian Bilingual Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria Hebrew Day Schl</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Peoria)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso Hebrew Day Schl</td>
<td>Texas*</td>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian Maurobian</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soterios Ellenas (Brooklyn)</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew College H.S.</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>9-12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Bilingual Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cloud Indian School</td>
<td>So Dakota</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Ind (Sioux)</td>
<td>K-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.8 Rationale for the Approach Taken

It was necessary that the approach taken in this project match both the goals of the project and the realities of the field to be studied. The more accepted approach would have been to select a random sample of nonpublic schools and to systematically study the bilingual instruction in these schools. This approach, however, would have restricted the number of schools to an insignificant and unworkable number. The subset of nonpublic schools involved with bilingual instruction even broadly defined represented such a small proportion of the total population of nonpublic schools that a random sample would probably miss most of them. Because the chief purpose of the project was to search out interesting programs, sampling did not appear feasible.

The approach taken involved a scanning effort in which nonpublic schools involved with bilingual instruction were named by various organizations and agencies. Three hundred and ninety one schools or some two percent of the nonpublic schools were identified by this process. These schools were contacted for additional information. A number of schools replied that they were not involved with bilingual instruction. The scanning effort thus provided detailed information on some 110 schools or approximately one half of one percent of the nonpublic schools. Most of these schools would have been missed had sampling been used. Neither was sampling used in selecting the site visit schools from the 105 responding schools. Again, the selection was tailored to the chief purpose of the project, the identification of noteworthy programs in a variety of settings. Criteria based on program characteristics, location, and sponsorship, were used in making the selection.
One guiding assumption in this project was that the schools willing to share information about their "bilingual" efforts were most likely to have noteworthy "bilingual" programs.

3.9 Site Visit Procedures

A uniform set of procedures described in a staff working document ("Site Visit Procedures" in Appendix E) was followed for all the site visits. A contact person at the school arranged for the visit and scheduled principals, teachers, parents, and students for meetings with the site visitor. One day at each site proved to be ample time. Table 3 lists the 24 schools visited in May and early June (1982) by the nine-member ETS project field staff.

3.10 Data Collection and Analysis

School publications, written notes, and tapes were provided to the study directors from the field staff who conducted the site visits. A tentative set of findings was prepared on the basis of an initial review of the site visit reports. These findings were circulated for review to the advisory committee and the field staff. A follow-up inquiry looked at the perceived benefits to nonpublic schools of both Title I and Title VII, because the tentative findings suggested such an inquiry to be useful.
4.0 PROJECT FINDINGS

This report of the project's findings will include: a brief profile of each of the site visit programs, a series of general findings, and additional specific information.

4.1 Site Visit Profiles

The following are brief descriptions of the 24 site visit schools listed in Table 3.

4.1.1 Hope Rural School, Indiantown, Fla., is an independent, incorporated school on the grounds of the Holy Cross Catholic Church. The school was founded several years ago in an effort to respond to the needs of the migrant farmworker families in the Indiantown area. The purpose for starting the school was to strengthen the enrollment of migrant students by providing an extended day program and offering non-financial support to the families. Before Hope Rural School was established, many of the agricultural parents were forced to take their children to the fields and groves because the local public school schedule did not coincide with their working hours, and there was no one to see the children off to school nor receive them in the afternoon. Hope Rural School opens at 7:00 AM and the children stay until 4:00 PM receiving breakfast, lunch, and a snack. With this arrangement, the children are able to obtain their education. The average school attendance of a migrant child in the Martin County Public Schools was 80 out of 180 days; the average attendance at Hope Rural in the past two years was 145 out of 180 days.
The school is governed by a board consisting of parents and community people. It is completely independent of the Holy Cross parish and is supported primarily through donations. The federal government does not give money directly to the school, but almost all monies for food are reimbursable. The school is eligible for Title I services.

Many of the children are from Hispanic backgrounds and enter school with limited English proficiency. The parents want their children to learn English rapidly, because the language symbolizes hope for a better life and career opportunity than the parents had.

Hope Rural School, then, is committed to providing the children with a firm educational base and a sense of personal and cultural worth. An ESL program is offered to the limited-English proficiency students. Spanish is used as a bridge to developing English language skills. The children learn to read in English first. Spanish language instruction begins in third grade, once children can function with the basic English skills established in earlier grades.

The school is the center of social life for many of the parents and children. The faculty and staff are aware of this and go out of their way to foster a warm and caring atmosphere. The students love the attention and have a very positive attitude toward the school.

4.1.2 **Immaculate Conception School, Rio Grande City, Tex.**, was founded in 1886 as a girls school. In 1920, the school was taken over by the Sisters of Mercy of St. Louis and became co-educational, serving children in grades kindergarten through eight. In the late 1960s, grades seven and eight were dropped. Presently, the school serves a bilingual community of 182 students.
The school is funded by tuition, fund-raisers held through the Parent/Teacher Organization, donations, and federal funds. Federal funds provide a remedial reading teacher and an aide under Title I and library assistance under Title IV.

Rio Grande City has a Hispanic community with a strong past and tradition. These community members value bilingualism and choose to send their children to the Immaculate Conception School because they feel the bilingual program taught there is superior to that of the area public schools.

The school offers a language program in which Spanish is taught as a second language for one 35- to 40-minute period per day, at which time reading, writing, and vocabulary development are stressed. This program seeks to equip students with the ability to read literature in Spanish for enjoyment, converse and write the language, and appreciate their cultural heritage. At all other times during the school day, English language development is emphasized.

4.1.3 The Dolores Mission School, Los Angeles, Calif., is a Roman Catholic mission school affiliated with the Diocese of Los Angeles. It was founded in 1950 by the Missionary Sisters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary. It is presently governed by a District Supervisor, Principal, and Pastor of the Church. It enrolls 200 students in grades one through six, of whom 90 percent are from Hispanic homes and 5 percent are Vietnamese. Generally, incoming students have limited proficiency in both Spanish and English.

The school is funded by tuition, diocesan subsidy and government aid. Federal funds provide two ESEA Title I teachers on a full-time
basis. A psychologist and nurse are also provided under Title I in conjunction with a local public school. A state subsidy is available for book purchases.

The children who attend the Dolores Mission School are largely from Hispanic homes that value English. Accordingly, the school's language program places its entire emphasis on English language learning through the immersion method. The ESL program uses English exclusively. In addition, English is formally taught one and one-half to two hours per day and informally during all other periods.

None of the teachers on the staff speak Spanish; all speak English. The teachers include two with no degree, four with B.A.s, two with masters, and one with a Montessori degree.

4.1.4 St. Veronica School, Philadelphia, Penn., is a Roman Catholic School founded 120 years ago. The school currently enrolls 565 students and has a waiting list. The students come mainly from first generation Puerto Rican families of lower socio-economic status; approximately 85 percent speak Spanish at home. The school serves members of St. Veronica Church's community as well as a number of non-Catholic students from the local community.

The school is funded by a tuition of $320 per family if a member of the parish and $400 for non-parish members, diocesan subsidy, enthusiastically supported parental fund-raising activities, and federal funds. Federal money provides for six teacher aides, a specialist to work with teachers, an ESL program, and a media center complete with bilingual materials.

At St. Veronica's, it is at present impossible to institute a comprehensive bilingual program, although the administration and teachers
are acutely aware of their responsibility to provide for the variety of needs of the many language minority children enrolled in the school.

In an attempt to meet several needs of its language minority students, the following programs have been implemented:

1. Before coming to St. Veronica's monolingual (Spanish) students spend time, usually one or two years, at the citywide, Title I funded Carino Center until they can function in English.

2. Children experiencing English language difficulties are enrolled for 45 minutes per day in ESL classes provided by Title I services.

3. All children study Spanish as a regular subject of the curriculum to maintain this heritage.

The goal of these three activities is to equip the students with strong oral and written English skills while at the same time providing instruction in their native Spanish language, in an effort to maintain their linguistic and cultural heritage. All subjects are taught in English with the exception of Spanish which is taught two or three hours weekly. Teachers choose methods and techniques from various approaches. As a rule, the teachers develop their own instructional materials. Children are encouraged to develop communication skills through aural/oral activities. At the same time, their teachers encourage the development of comprehension skills.

The teaching staff is composed of the pastor, principal, and 16 classroom teachers. Title I provides additional staff.

4.1.5 St. Brendan's School, Miami, Fla., is a Roman Catholic School affiliated with the Archdiocese of Miami. It serves grades kindergarten through eight and presently enrolls 652 students from predominantly
Cuban middle-class backgrounds. The school is supported through tuition and fund-raising activities in which the parents actively participate.

The majority of the children who enter St. Brendan's speak English. Accordingly, all instruction is given in English with the exception of a Spanish language class for enrichment begun in the third grade and continued through the eighth grade.

4.1.6 St. Michael's School, Levelland, Tex., is a Roman Catholic School affiliated with the Diocese of Amarillo. It was founded in 1962 by volunteers from Regis College (Weston, Mass.) recruited through the Catholic Church Extension Society. The school has been continually staffed by lay volunteers since that time. A volunteer in this case is an especially committed lay person who gives a term of service to the church for a minimum stipend. They are all qualified teachers, certified in the states from which they come, and recruited by Laypersons in the Amarillo Mission Program (LAMP) and Volunteers for Educational and Social Services (VESS).

At present, the school enrolls in grades pre-kindergarten through eight 133 students, 95 percent of whom are Mexican-American. It is funded by a parish subsidy (approximately two-thirds the budget), tuition, donations, and a small trust fund which provides $10,000 per year. Federal funds are received through Title I, Title IV, a lunch program, and special education testing and services.

Many of the Mexican-American students enter the school from bilingual homes. Accordingly, the administration and faculty respect both English and Spanish and believe that children who come from bilingual homes should not be forced to use English at all times. With this idea in mind, an individualized bilingual ESL program was instituted to teach
English on an individualized basis to those children who come to school speaking mostly Spanish. The program also tries to make the children aware of their native language and culture. Spanish is taught as a subject twice a week. The school hopes that the students will value being bilingual.

The children who attend St. Michael's have a positive attitude toward school and feel a strong sense of community. This is, in part, because the faculty makes an effort to reach parents through home visits at least once a year to encourage them to have a say in their children's education. Also, the school sponsors a community activities program which involves students and senior citizens in mutually beneficial activities.

After completing St. Michael's, the children go on to area high schools. Many subsequently choose to attend two-year colleges.

4.1.7 The Bruce Guadalupe Community School, Milwaukee, Wisc., is a former parish school. In 1969, a group of concerned Hispanic parents were instrumental in changing the school to its present status of independent community school. At present, the Bruce Guadalupe School has an enrollment of 86 students, kindergarten through eight, 80 percent of whom are Hispanic. The remaining 20 percent are from European-American, Black-American, or American Indian backgrounds.

The school's operating budget comes from a tuition of $350 per family, donations from individuals and small businesses, parental fundraising efforts, and federal funds which include Title I money and a federal lunch program.
The school community is extremely concerned with preserving the Hispanic language and culture. Accordingly, the primary purpose of the Bruce Guadalupe Community School is to provide quality education in both Spanish and English. The school offers a bilingual program which places equal emphasis on the development of oral and written skills in Spanish and English. ESL is taught to Spanish-speaking students. Spanish as a second language is taught to English-speaking students. Language instruction is conducted between 40 and 90 minutes per day. Children are grouped according to their language ability. It is not uncommon for an older child who is not too proficient in (say) English to be in a class for that particular subject with children a year younger and, conversely, a very proficient child may be instructed with older children.

The methods of instruction varied and were usually chosen by the individual classroom teacher. One social studies class was conducted simultaneously in English and Spanish by a teacher and an aide, during the site visit. Students participated by asking questions and making comments in both languages.

The Bruce Guadalupe School has a 20-member staff which is attracted to the school because they believe they are accomplishing something by helping their students become bilingual, and are indeed a very dedicated staff. In the past few years, the school has been chronically short of funds. In fact, this spring there was a question of whether or not the school would be able to open in the fall of 1982. The teachers, believing so firmly in the need and purpose of the school, opted to do without their June salaries to help the budget crisis.

The students that graduate from Bruce Guadalupe School tend to go on to a Catholic High School.
St. Francis Xavier School, Winooski, Vt., is a Roman Catholic School founded in 1959 as a French parish school. It serves the Roman Catholic community in Winooski and vicinity. Its faculty is all religious and lives in a large convent on school property.

Fifteen years ago, the school was large enough to serve 700 students. At present, due chiefly to population decline, 275 students in grades kindergarten through eight are enrolled and a waiting list is maintained. Funding is obtained through tuition and fees, parish subsidy, home/school funds, fund-raising activities such as Bingo, and federal aid. Title I provides a part-time reading teacher and guidance counselor. Title IV provides funds for library purchases.

The goal of St. Francis Xavier School is to offer its students an excellent secular and religious education. In addition, because the Winooski community values language learning, a French language program has been implemented into the curriculum. This program seeks to develop French language skills and cultural awareness. Bilingualism is not a program goal. The community's parents are particularly pleased with this program; it affords their children an opportunity to speak in French to their grandparents who are predominantly French speaking.

The school faculty and administration value a structured approach to teaching and learning, and this is true of the conduct of the French program. Language instruction is given daily, but the time allotment varies from grade to grade from 10 minutes per day in the first grade, in second through fifth grades 20 minutes per day, and in the sixth through eighth 30 minutes per day. French language is used only during the French class period. English is emphasized in all other facets of the school curriculum. The school has a well-stocked library of English
materials, but has a very limited French library. They find it difficult to find French materials of appropriate levels for this program; materials available from nearby Quebec are often too difficult.

4.1.9 Sacred Heart School, Nogales, Ariz., is a Roman Catholic School affiliated with the Diocese of Tucson. It was founded in 1910 by the Dominican Sisters and run by that order for several years. In 1934, the school was reopened by the Daughters of Mary Immaculate who have taught there ever since. At present, 364 students are enrolled in grades pre-kindergarten through eight. These children comprise a multi-ethnic population: Most are from Hispanic families, with ten percent from Chinese and ten percent from Hindu families.

Sacred Heart School is funded by tuition, parish subsidy, diocesan subsidy, fund-raising activities, and donations. Federal funds provide the school with a Title I resource center which serves 30 students.

The school community values language learning and believes that it is important for its students to learn English while maintaining proficiency in their native language. Accordingly, the language program at Sacred Heart is a blend of a maintenance program and a transitional bilingual education program. There is daily emphasis on developing both Spanish and English, but the concentration on each language varies from grade to grade. Instruction at the pre-kindergarten level is 85 percent Spanish; as the student progresses to kindergarten the emphasis shifts a bit -- Spanish, 50 percent; English, 40 percent. By fourth grade, almost all instruction is conducted in English, with the exception of a half-hour of Spanish instruction daily. Proficiency is developed in both languages.
Further, Sacred Heart School clearly defines its language program objectives. At the primary level, these objectives are: to develop the child's ability to develop original sentences and paragraphs in English and Spanish syntax; to develop the child's word "attack" skills; to develop the child's ability to recognize and use proper punctuation; to motivate the child to read on grade level and independently for content as well as recreation. At the intermediate level, these objectives are: to develop the child's maximum potential in English and Spanish arts; to develop strong verbal self-expression skills; to help the child recognize the interrelation of all subject matter. The children who complete this program are for the most part bilingual.

The school staff is composed of certified and noncertified teachers and volunteers and professionals from the community. The school principal expressed some concerns about staff recruitment because there is no college in the area and the area is not attractive. They mostly attract young teachers looking for a first teaching experience.

The students who graduate from Sacred Heart School go on to area high schools. Some have definite college aspirations.

4.1.10 Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic School, Philadelphia, Penn., is a Roman Catholic school in Center City. It was founded 41 years ago as a mission of St. John's parish, serving Chinese and other Oriental students, both Catholic and non-Catholic, throughout the Metropolitan area. At present, 215 students are enrolled in grades kindergarten through eight, with a waiting list of approximately 50 names.

The school is supported entirely by parish subsidy, a small tuition, and fund-raising activities. It applied for government funds
under Title VII but was turned down allegedly because the children's test scores were too high. Many children receive a government-subsidized free lunch.

The school is highly regarded in the community for its academic excellence and its warm, friendly atmosphere. Many of the Chinese students view the school as a haven from the racial tension and harassment often encountered in the public schools.

Holy Redeemer offers an ESL program to those students who enter the school speaking predominantly Chinese. In the third and fourth grades, Chinese language instruction begins for one period per day. Cantonese, the most common dialect, is taught first. Subsequently, around fifth grade, instruction in Mandarin begins and is continued through eighth grade.

At all levels, a strong English language-arts program is followed. Over 90 percent of the students who attended Holy Redeemer School go on to college.

4.1.11 The Japanese Language School Unified System, Inc., of Los Angeles, Cal., is an independent organization which operates schools that teach Japanese language and culture to predominantly American-born students of Japanese backgrounds.

The first Japanese language schools were founded in California in 1911 but were closed at the outbreak of World War II. When they were re-established in 1948, only 13 students were enrolled. At present, the system includes nine schools (seven elementary, one junior high, one senior high) and enrolls over a thousand students.
The schools are governed by a board of trustees and a principal. They are funded by tuition, donations, investments, and fund-raising activities organized by the finance committee and the parent-teacher organization.

The system employs 75 teachers, many of whom hold degrees from Japanese Universities. Their teaching methods are traditional, structured, and similar to those used in Japan where many of these teachers previously taught.

The Saturday morning program is devoted to language learning skills. The afternoon periods are devoted to cultural electives such as calligraphy, tea ceremony, doll craft, and flower arrangement. Students can choose to study in one or both sessions.

Japanese is taught as a second language through the total immersion method. Japanese is used almost exclusively at all levels, for subjects; English is used only if there is a particularly difficult explanation. The elementary program devotes most of its instructional time to developing oral/aural skills; the junior high program stresses writing and conversational skills; the senior high program offers writing, geography, and Japanese texts and novels. All levels of study are demanding and require many hours of homework on the part of each student.

The faculty develops much of its own instructional materials. They have published their elementary materials in Japan.

By and large, the students who attend these schools are highly motivated. Many view language learning as a tool they will need for their future careers. Others value the knowledge for the ability it affords them in communicating with Japanese-speaking relatives and friends. Most of the students are bilingual upon completion of the course of study.
4.1.12 The Chinese School of South Jersey, Cherry Hill, N.J., is an independent school established in 1968 by several community families interested in preserving their Chinese heritage. At present, the school conducts a part-time language program which meets on Saturday mornings from 10:00 AM to noon. Enrollment consists of 188 children, ages 3 to 15. It is funded by tuition.

The Chinese School of South Jersey seeks to teach and promote Chinese language and culture and offering language programs on two levels. The first is Chinese as a second language in which reading, writing and oral skills are taught to students without using much English. These students have a prior knowledge of Chinese. The second, for the beginning or less proficient student, is a transitional program that uses English as a bridge to teaching Chinese. The audiolingual grammar translation and direct language teaching methods are employed. Materials are a mixture of commercial texts and teacher-prepared notes and dittos.

The cultural component of the program uses games, painting, calligraphy, story-telling, and songs and dances to familiarize the students with their cultural heritage.

4.1.13 Washington International School (WIS), Washington, D.C., is a private school serving pupils from nursery (ages 3) through grade 12. The school was founded in 1966 by Mrs. Dorothy Goodman and Mrs. Cathya Stephenson who continue as director and associate director, respectively. Currently, the school enrolls 550 pupils. WIS is mainly supported by tuition but receives some "bricks and mortar funding" from the Ford Foundation. Also, fund raising is done through annual giving. Tuition ranges from $1,425 in the lower grades to $4,700 in grades 9 through 12.
The purpose in founding the school was broadly to offer a scholarly, worldly curriculum; to set higher educational standards than those of public schools; to provide international education for American and non-American families living temporarily in D.C.; and to develop students' abilities to work in two languages.

The supporting community values this type of education; most students come from families of the international civil service community in the D.C. area. Approximately one out of eight students are inner-city scholarship students. While 80 nationalities are represented in the student body, 50 percent of the students are American.

The language program is all-important beginning in the pre-primary grades. Students from age three through eight (nursery through Junior House 3), alternate language use with days -- one day in English, one in French or Spanish. All subjects are taught. There is some after-school instruction in Japanese and Arabic at extra cost to parents. At this level, the oral/aural method is used, along with audio/visual material and teacher-developed materials. Texts and work books are French, Canadian, or South American.

At the next level, Junior House 4 and 5 (ages 9-10), the students have a good working knowledge of both languages and pursue their studies in both languages. The students work for a half day in English and a half day in Spanish or French. At Middle and Tutorial House levels (ages 11-18) the pupils have intensive instruction in language and literature of both languages, and they study history and geography in French or Spanish. At Middle House level, Latin is also required. A class was observed at the Middle House level, taught completely in Spanish, where the students were learning about ancient China. At Tutorial House (ages 14-17) some students continue Latin or add a third modern language.
The Tutorial House culminates in the International Baccalauriate diploma which provides access to major universities worldwide and sophomore standing in certain U.S. colleges.

The teaching staff has varied, international backgrounds (30 nationalities are represented). A serious effort is made to recruit highly-trained, well-educated staff. They are encouraged to recommend materials; but the overriding principle in selecting materials is that they should be different and, if possible, global in outlook. The Mountbatten Library at the school maybe the only one of its kind anywhere offering a collection of textbooks from all over the world.

4.1.14 Ecole Bilingue, Berkeley, Calif., is a private, non-profit, full-time school serving 149 students in grades pre-kindergarten through five. The student population is racially mixed: 73 percent white, 15 percent black, and 12 percent other. They are from predominantly English-speaking, middle- and upper-middle-class families.

The school, founded in 1977, is governed by a 20-member Board of Trustees who delegate the day-to-day supervision and operation of the school to the director. The director establishes the language learning policy and budget. The Board votes to approve these decisions.

The school is funded by tuition and sophisticated, parent-run, fund-raising activities. The government does not provide assistance.

Ecole Bilingue is strongly geared toward academic excellence and linguistic development. The language program is an equal value bilingual program in which neither French nor English is taught as a
second language; instead, both languages are taught intensively. Initially, the language program is French immersion, in which the entire pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, and half of the first grade is conducted in French. During the second half of the first grade, the children begin to learn English. From that time, the school day is divided in half with all students attending both the American and French sections. French is the only language spoken in the French section, English in the American. Most classes use the direct method. The program followed in the American section is typical of that of an American elementary school. The French program, as taught in France, is used in the French section. The purposes of the program are both oral and written language development and subject matter knowledge.

The faculty is composed of 18 teachers: 13 full-time and the rest are specialists, i.e., physical education, arts, and are hired on a part-time basis. Of the 13 full-time faculty members, 7 come from France through exchange programs. They stay for three years. All are certified with many years of teaching experience. The French teachers tend to approach the classroom in a more structured way than the American teachers. Commercially prepared texts are used as well as teacher-prepared materials such as individualized dittos. All activities emphasize comprehension rather than recall.

Approximately one half of the students go on to the French/American feeder school after fifth grade.

4.1.15 Ecole Bilingue, Cambridge, Mass., is a private, independent, full-time school serving 70 students in grades pre-kindergarten through sixth. They are from predominantly English-speaking, middle- and upper-middle-class homes.
The school was founded 17 years ago by a small group of parents, and incorporated in 1964. It is presently governed by a Board of Directors. Funding is provided through tuition and a small grant from the French Government.

The École Bilingue is strongly geared toward academic excellence and linguistic development. The administration and faculty believe that language learning must be acquired at an early age. The language program is an equal value bilingual program in which neither French nor English is taught as a second language; instead both languages are taught intensively. Initially, the language program is French immersion, in which the entire pre-kindergarten and kindergarten program is provided in French. From age five, the school day is divided in half with all students attending both the American and French sections. French is the only language spoken in the French section; English in the American.

Most classes use the direct method of language instruction. The program followed in the American section is typical of that of an American elementary school. The official French program, as taught in France, is used in the French section. The purposes of the program are both oral and written language development equally in French and English and acquisition of subject matter knowledge.

The French and American faculty members are all certified and are viewed by the parents and administration as committed to their work. They use a combination of commercially prepared texts and their own prepared materials. The materials used in the French sections come directly from France. Recordings are used extensively.

4.1.16 The German Language School of Immanuel Lutheran Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, was founded seven years ago in conjunction with the
Immanuel Lutheran Church which offers services in both German and English. The school is church related but non-sectarian, offering language rather than religious instruction. Classes meet on Saturdays from 8:30 AM to noon. Enrollment consists of 90 students, grades pre-kindergarten through eight.

The school is funded by tuition ($50 per academic year for the first child enrolled with a descending rate for each additional child in the family) and donations from the German Consulate and private sources.

Parents within the church community warmly support this language program which seeks to teach basic skills in German to children with no previous knowledge of the language and to improve skills in reading, grammar and conversation of children from German-speaking families. Fluency is not an aspiration of this program because of its part-time nature. Nevertheless, it is expected that the students who complete the course will have a basic German-language proficiency. English is used as a bridge to the target language. The lower grades are taught a great deal of vocabulary through the audio-lingual method of instruction; the upper grades concentrate on improving conversation and developing cultural awareness. Reading skills are also emphasized through the grammar-translation method.

The German Language School has a small, well-educated, and enthusiastic faculty which views the school as filling a community need by helping to preserve German language and culture. The program uses teacher-prepared materials and commercially-prepared texts which are printed in Germany. In addition, the German Consulate in New York provides monthly filmstrips and tapes.
4.1.17 Spring Bilingual Montessori Academy, Silvery Spring, Md., is an independent, full-time ungraded school serving children ages three through 9 from predominantly middle-class, English-speaking homes. The Academy was founded in 1967 by Mrs. Anna Neri, the Directoress, who still runs the school. The school is supported solely by tuition. Parents help whenever needed, providing transportation, food, etc.; they also serve as volunteer instructors in dance, arts and crafts, and exercise.

Language learning is viewed by Mrs. Neri, the teachers, and the supporting community as a means of promoting children's awareness of different cultures and fostering international attitudes.

The school offers its students a language program in which French, Italian, or Spanish is taught five hours per week. It is an enrichment program, designed to encourage the understanding and appreciation of cultural values and heritage reflected in the second language being taught. The school also offers an ESL program for a small percentage of students from non-English-speaking homes.

The teachers have native fluency in the languages being taught. They have complete freedom in choosing the educational materials they use. Generally, materials are commercially published but some are teacher prepared.

4.1.18 The French International School, Bethesda, Md is a private school, affiliated with the French Ministry of Education, enrolling 865 students. It was founded in 1965 by officials of the French Embassy, Washington, D.C. to prepare students for the French Baccalaureate examination. The school is administered by a non-profit organization whose Board of Directors consists of an equal number of French Embassy offic-
cials and elected parent representatives. The school is supported by tuition. Some grant money from the French government is available to families based on need if one parent is a French national.

The majority of the parents are attracted to the school because it is a French public school and many are French nationals living in the United States for a period of time as Embassy officials and civil servants, World Bank employees, or from the private sector. All of the children speak fluent French. The school's supporting community values language learning and seeks to keep French culture and traditions alive.

The curriculum follows that established by the French Ministry of Education. All subjects, except U.S. History, Art, and Music, are taught in French. Teachers for French subjects are recruited from France and are approved by the Ministry of Education. English teachers are recruited locally to teach Art, Music, and U.S. History, as well as an ESL program. English is taught at the primary level four periods per week, a bit more than it would be in France. At middle levels, 6 hours out of 30 hours of instruction per week are devoted to English. At the high school level, students must add a second modern language or an ancient language to their course of study.

English teachers have much freedom in choosing the materials for their programs. At the primary level, both French and English materials are used; generally American material is used in higher grades. Commercially prepared texts are used in conjunction with teacher-developed materials.

Parents and students have high educational aspirations and are highly motivated.
4.1.19 Peoria Hebrew Day School, Peoria, Ill., founded in 1981, is an independent, community-sponsored Jewish parochial school. At present, it enrolls 35 students in grades kindergarten through eight. The school is governed by a 15-member board of directors and the principal.

The school's main source of funding comes from tuition, which is $1,400 per child. Additional funding comes from the Jewish Federation, which supplies one fourth of the budget, and private donations.

The Peoria Hebrew Day School's main purpose is the development of young students imbued with Torah values, whose general education and training will prepare them to be creative and valuable members of the contemporary American-Jewish community. The school offers an excellent secular and Judaic studies education. Hebrew language learning is an integral portion of the Judaic studies program conducted for two hours daily. Hebrew is not used constantly throughout those two hours. Instead, it is mixed with English and explanations of history, customs, and traditions. Hebrew language teaching methods include audio-lingual and grammar translation.

4.1.20 El Paso Hebrew School, El Paso, Tex., was founded in 1976 by a group of parents who wanted to create a school that would provide a quality education combined with a Judaic studies program. At present, the school enrolls 57 students in grades kindergarten through six. The majority of these students come from English-speaking homes; a few are Israeli and speak Hebrew at home.

The school is funded by tuition, fund-raising activities, aid from the Jewish Federation, and donations. It does not receive any Title I services.
Language learning is integral to the purposes of the El Paso Hebrew School as the administration feels it is the mainstay for the teaching Judaic tradition and culture. The school offers a Judaic studies program conducted for 13 hours per week in which Hebrew language learning plays an important role. This language component teaches Hebrew as it is used in the Bible, prayerbooks, and as a modern language. English is used as a bridge to the target language -- Hebrew. Hebrew words and phrases are introduced on a consonant by consonant, vowel by vowel basis. The teachers find this more effective than the whole word method. The grammar-translation method is also employed. Students are provided with readers and given the opportunity to do translations and develop vocabulary. It is hoped that students who graduate from the school will have learned enough Hebrew to appreciate that it is the prime medium of Jewish expression and be able to use the language for reading and oral communication.

The teaching staff at El Paso Hebrew School is certified in their individual disciplines. No teacher has less than five years of teaching experience. They are recruited locally, as well as through national searches through Jewish organizations. They contribute to a warm atmosphere in which the students feel they learn a great deal.

4.1.21 Armenian Mesrobian School, Pico Rivera, Calif., is one of 20 Armenian schools throughout the nation. This California church-related school was started in 1907 to provide education for refugee families. Religion is taught along with the regular school curriculum; however, it is not the central focus of the school. At present, 416 students are
enrolled in grades kindergarten through twelve. Many come from middle-class, English-speaking homes; about one-fourth come from homes where Armenian is the primary language.

The school is funded by tuition and aid from the parent/teacher association and board of trustee activities. There is some government money available for a part-time ESL teacher.

The supporting community stresses the need for their children to become successful students and to learn to feel at home in both American and Armenian culture. Language learning is viewed as extremely important and as integral to the purposes of the school. Both parents and administrators would like to see the children become truly bilingual.

The language program, then, is a bilingual program which seeks to develop competence in English and Armenian. The immersion method is used for each language taught. Armenian language instruction is conducted one hour daily. The school also offers an ESL program to 20 percent of the student body whose home language is Armenian. Instruction time varies in this program.

The teaching staff has a good deal of flexibility in choosing the materials and teaching techniques they will use in their individual classrooms. The teachers feel this school has a special mission -- a political one -- educating the students to eventually regain their Armenian home land from the Soviets and Turks. The school keeps alive the memory of the Armenian genocide and instills in the students the need to right many of the wrongs committed at that time.

4.1.22 Soterios Ellenes Parochial School, Brooklyn, N.Y., is a Greek Orthodox school affiliated with the Greek Orthodox Church.
At present, 310 students are enrolled in grades kindergarten through eight. Most of these students come from bilingual homes where the first language is English and the second language is Greek. The school is funded by tuition of $1,000 per year per child and church subsidy. No government aid is received.

The parents are extremely interested in bilingual education and serve on a governing board for the school and as classroom resource persons in a volunteer capacity. They are supportive of the school because they feel their children receive an excellent education.

The Soterios Ellenas Parochial School offers a language program in which Greek is taught as a second language. Greek language instruction is conducted one hour per day and Greek cultural instruction is conducted one hour per week. The objective of this program is the development of oral and written language skills which will facilitate the perpetuation of ethnic and religious traditions. The direct method of language instruction is used, aimed at developing listening/speaking proficiency as well as reading and writing skills. Some of the materials used in the program come from Greece (Ministry of Education and Religion); other materials are teacher prepared. The cultural component of the program relies heavily on audiovisual material. A curriculum specialist on the school staff has developed materials tailored to the teaching of Greek to Americans.

The faculty is certified in their respective subject areas, with many holding masters degrees.

4.1.23 Hebrew College High School, Brookline, Mass., is a part-time, after-school program serving some 275 students in grades 9 through 11. Students complete the 82-credit program by taking from 4 to 10 hours per
week in Judaic studies. The students, usually graduates of Hebrew schools, are attracted to the school by their interest in learning about their Jewish heritage, by the recognition given their record at this school in college admissions, and by the social life offered by the school. Until the fall of 1982, all courses had been taught in Hebrew; now only the Hebrew language training is in Hebrew. The switch to English was necessitated by the diminished emphasis on Hebrew in the feeder schools.

While the employment of Israeli teachers, usually at lower salaries, in part overcomes the shortage of American teachers, these teachers have a greater difficulty in relating to the students. The faculty includes 5 full-time and 12 part-time teachers. There is a waiting list for faculty openings.

The school is supported by tuition (15 percent) and by Jewish Community fund raising (25 percent). The parents are active, chiefly in providing the transportation of students from a wide area.

Students are actively recruited by visits to the feeder schools and by special events at the school. One recent event was the student production of "Oklahoma" in Hebrew.

The indicators of success include the use of the Hebrew language in foreign travel, student honors in Temple, the employment of graduates as tutors in Hebrew, the positive experience of graduates in college, and the high incidence of second and third generation students.

Red Cloud Indian School, Pine Ridge, S.D., is a Roman Catholic School affiliated with the Holy Rosary Mission and staffed by the Jesuit Fathers. It is located on the Pine Ridge Reservation, a Sioux community.
The school was founded in 1888 by the Jesuits to bring education and Catholicism to the Sioux.

Red Cloud at present enrolls 228 students in grades pre-kindergarten through eight, from predominantly English-speaking homes. The school charges no tuition; there is a minimal fee for books. It depends rather heavily on donations and government aid for its operating budget. The school has its own fund-raising office which has developed a large array of fund-raising materials and techniques.

Government aid for the school comes from funds the government gives to the county which, in turn, are distributed to Red Cloud. These funds provide three Title I teachers and Title IV library assistance.

The native language of this Sioux community is Lakota. Lakota language and culture are highly prized. There is a community desire among the elders to preserve Lakota which is used with decreasing frequency among the younger generations who prefer English. To address this wish, Red Cloud School instituted a special program in the elementary grades.

The program teaches the usual subjects in English and provides instruction in Lakota language and culture — 30 minutes per day for preschoolers, .5 minutes per day for elementary students, and 40 minutes three days per week for the middle school. The language component consists of oral language development, drill, and grammar translation. Emphasis is placed on basic vocabulary and pronunciation which is taught through tribal legends told in English with Lakota words interwoven. It is hoped that this program will enable the students to form a clear image of their identity as Lakota Sioux and that this image will be a continuing source of pride.

The staff is extremely dedicated, and the children respond well to them. Many of the religious teachers come from around the country and
are recruited through Catholic organizations. The school's administration would like to see more staff come from the local community. At present, only one third does. Although the community is extremely poor due to limited employment opportunities on the reservation, there is a reluctance to move or seek additional educational opportunities. Going to another city or area is often seen as undesirable because the clash of cultures would be worse than the poverty and limited opportunities reservation life affords.

The parents, then, are divided on how they view education. Some favor their children finishing school; others simply do not see the purpose of this. The few students that do go to college to become teachers often do not finish. Instead, they return to the reservation after only a short period of time because the cultural differences cause them too many problems.

4.2 General Findings

This section of the report will present general findings from the site visits under a series of generalizations. These generalizations must be qualified by the small number of schools visited and by the non-random procedures used in selecting these schools.

4.2.1 The language training in these private schools at best reflects the state of the art but is not the locus of important breakthroughs in techniques, methods or materials.

In fairness, the private sector never claimed to make any special contribution to bilingual instructional practice. While the question -- have private schools developed practices the public schools could profitably adapt? -- was a reasonable question, given the extent of private school activity described in the Fishman (1980) report, the answer is "no." Without exception,
these private schools employed the usual methods which included oral, oral-aural, audiolingual, drill, direct method, grammar-translation, and immersion. The grammar-translation method was used heavily in programs where the target language was being taught to English speakers and fluency was not really a goal.

The project's site visits did nevertheless uncover some interesting practices including Montessori pre-school programs in French, Italian, Spanish, and native American (Lakota).

One school, Sacred Heart, Nogales, Arizona, had a transitional bilingual program for LMLEP students. Bilingual teaching was also used at the Bruce Guadalupe School which served LMLEP students. In one activity, observed in a social studies class which was conducted simultaneously in English and Spanish, a teacher would speak in English and an aide would immediately translate into Spanish. Apparently the children responded favorably, relaxing and asking questions and making comments in both languages.

While these nonpublic schools were resourceful in attempting to locate or develop instructional texts and materials, they were not in a position to offer important breakthroughs in this area. All the schools used standard series books, from the usual American publishers, to teach English. Some of the enrichment programs commented on the difficulty in obtaining materials, appropriate to the level of their students. Some received materials from the homeland. For example, the German Language Program at Immanuel Lutheran Church got supplementary A-V materials from the German Consulate in New York. Soterios Ellenas Parochial School received materials from the Greek Ministry of Education. This school also employed a full-time Greek speaking curriculum specialist to develop materials more appropriate for Greek-American students.
Washington International School, as a rule, used foreign language materials from other countries. This school also obtained grant money from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Science Foundation to do research and develop materials. This school also maintains a collection of textbooks from many countries.

In most schools, however, the individual classroom teachers developed their own materials, dittos, etc. Many of the schools had limited funds for book buying. Some, like the Red Cloud Indian School, had Title IV funding. A number of the poorer schools depended on the Title IV funds or the largesse of public school overstocks and out-of-date publications for their materials.

4.2.2 These (full-time) private schools, as a rule, were established and continue to attract patrons as much for the values associated with private or parochial schooling as for the benefits derived from the language program.

In most cases, the private or parochial character of these schools was clearly primary. The language program was an important added attraction. Even in the Bruce Guadalupe School, a former parochial school in Milwaukee in which the bilingual program was featured, the attractiveness associated with its lingering parochial character remained significant.

Over and over when the administrators, faculty, and parents were asked what was attractive about this school, the answers were strikingly similar. The reasons cited for attending Catholic schools were academic standards, religious training, discipline, and language program.

The reasons cited for attending Hebrew Schools were academic excellence, the religious and language program, and discipline.

The reasons for attending other private schools were academic excellence and language learning.
For racial and ethnic minorities, private schools at times served as havens, allowing students the security of being with "their own." This was especially the case with schools serving Chinese and Puerto Rican students. It was noted in passing in one Hebrew School. The very safety and feeling of mutual support provided by the "haven school" translated into an academic advantage. Students could pursue their studies without turmoil or disruption.

In major language/cultural groups, interest and proficiency in the target language seems to be dwindling generation by generation. Distance in time and place from the earlier homeland has contributed to a lessening in the motivation to learn and use the target language. In one school, bilingual parents interviewed in the project avoided using the target language around their children even though the children were studying the language in school. Motivation was also, at times, a serious problem for monolingual English speaking parents sending their children into an immersion program. (At one Ecole Bilingue, a little girl told of having a dream that when she was grown up she would, with delight, force a class of French children to speak only English.) In the Lakota school, the older generation has looked to the school to restore their language which is gradually being lost.

4.2.3 With the exception of special language schools like the Ecoles Bilingues and the Washington International School, private schools were not effective in developing genuinely bilingual graduates -- without strong support from use of the target language at home.

Most of these schools did, however, contribute to the target language development of their students, many of whom were bilingual through family circumstances. A number of schools did not aim to make students truly bilingual, but instead emphasized English with one period per day devoted to the target language. Seldom did these schools attempt by themselves to develop
bilingual proficiency in monolingual students. They did encourage students whose families were actively bilingual.

The German School and the Chinese Language School of South Jersey, because they were only part time, did not have bilingualism as an expectation.

The Hebrew Schools saw language learning as only one component in their Judaic studies programs. While they encouraged their students to be able to communicate effectively orally, the main purpose of the Hebrew program was to enable them to read religious literature and thereby become educated in rites and traditions.

In some schools whose children entered already speaking predominately Spanish -- i.e., Hope Rural, Bruce Guadalupe, and Sacred Heart -- an effort was made to develop both languages. Hope Rural, for example, used both languages, but emphasized English. Spanish was developed only after English reading and speech patterns were established.

4.2.4 Bilingual services offered by nonpublic schools tended to follow patterns related to different categories of schools, such as parochial, Hebrew, and independent schools.

As noted above, one approach to defining bilingual education gives attention to the bilingual instructional services offered by the schools. Ulibarri identified alternative ESOL, itinerant ESOL, transitional bilingual education, cluster schools, and tutorial programs as possible services. In nonpublic schools, the category called cluster schools did not apply because this service involves busing students from several schools in a system to one "cluster school" for one full day program each week. Also, other categories of service were added for purposes of this project. The complete array of activities identified in this project as reported in Table 4 includes the following:
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- All Instruction in English - i.e. an English language immersion or submersion program.

- Itinerant or Pull-out ESL Program in which students receive a minimum of two hours instruction weekly from an ESL teacher.

- Alternative ESL Program in which special content courses in English are provided to students with limited English proficiency.

- Transitional Bilingual Education Program in which content areas are taught bilingually beginning entirely in the native language and ending up entirely in English. Periods of ESL instruction are often included in such a program.

- Tutorial Programs Staffed by Adults which provide LEP students with help in English and/or content areas. (one to one or in small groups)

- Target/Native Language taught as School Subject describes a foreign language course linked to the family language background of the students.

- Foreign Language Immersion Program in which all subjects are taught in the target language in ways that accommodate non-native speakers.

- Bilingual Instruction/One-Half Day or Alternate Day for Each Language involves programs in which the morning courses are all in English and the afternoon courses in the target language (or vice versa) or in which all subjects are taught in the target language one day and in English the next.

Table 4 presents the array of services offered by four categories of site visit schools. Religious, full-time schools is the largest category which includes Roman Catholic (8), Hebrew (3), Greek (1), and Armenian (1) schools. The two community schools, Bruce Guadulape and Hope Rural School are combined with the religious school; these two schools both operated in parish school buildings. The other categories are independent schools and the part-time schools. The latter includes two Asian language schools, one German Lutheran school, and one Hebrew high-school program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>pre-K</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly in English</td>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</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>ESL Pull-Out</td>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</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>Alternative ESL</td>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</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></td>
<td>P</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>T.B.E.</td>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</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>Tutorial-Adult</td>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</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>Target Language</td>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Subject</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>R/C</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>Immersion</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual 1/2 Day</td>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Alternate Day</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</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>
The religious and community schools tended to conduct instruction in virtually all subjects in English while offering the target language as a school subject. These target language classes began either in the primary grades or in Grade 3. Only the three Hebrew schools were different, offering programs with 1/2 day in English and 1/2 day in Hebrew. These religious and community schools also provided ESL pull-out programs in a number of instances.

The independent schools, as a rule, offered immersion and alternate day or 1/2 day programs. Only the Montessori school used English as the medium of instruction all day.

The part-time schools offered immersion programs and instruction in the target language as a school subject.

These patterns of service appeared to match the specific purposes of these different kinds of nonpublic schools. The religious schools had as their primary purpose the academic preparation (in English) of their students, while introducing or reinforcing their language and cultural and religious heritage. The independent schools visited in the project were those which featured foreign language training as one of the primary purposes of the school. For example, at the Washington International School, a monolingual child was considered to be "underprivileged."

4.2.5 In language training, decisions about teaching methods and materials are left to the teachers. As a rule, teachers developed most of their own materials. For most schools, access to materials was a problem. While some curriculum planning was done at the school or, in church-related schools, at the regional level, for the most part, schools and individual teachers had great latitude in shaping their own programs. The teachers themselves varied greatly in their formal preparation for this task.
Across the board there was a scarcity of in-service training and other support services. The Catholic schools had some in-service activity but it was rarely for language learning. Rarely did nonpublic school faculty from any of these schools mix with their public school counterparts for in-service. At times, however, the nonpublic school teachers did participate in public school in-service programs held at the beginning of the academic year. Some schools, like the Rose Cloud Indian School, had their own internal staff development.

The independent and Hebrew schools had well qualified faculties -- many certified with advanced degrees. The schools serving lower income families had, on the whole, faculties with less experience and fewer advanced degrees. These schools tended to offer low salaries that would attract only persons seeking a first teaching experience. These young teachers would stay a year or two and then move on to a better work situation offering more money. One church-related school depended entirely on volunteers.

4.2.6 Federal aid for instruction to these private schools was chiefly from Title I and Title IV (Library). There was little mention of Title VII.

Wherever significant federal instructional support in staff or materials came for LMLEP students, it came through Title I programs conducted through the local public school system rather than through Title VII. Phone interviews were conducted with several state coordinators of government services to nonpublic schools to explore these patterns.

Title I programs were established to assist in the development of basic skills in educationally disadvantaged students. Title VII programs were established to assist LMLEP students in ways that take into account their native language. As a rule, both Title I and Title VII services reach
nonpublic schools through the local public school system. As reported in this project, however, Title I programs tended to be run from a central office in the school district, which allowed greater flexibility in delivering services to nonpublic schools. A 1978 OERMLA survey reported Title VII activities in 114 nonpublic schools or educational agencies of which 85 percent were Catholic, 7 percent Jewish, 2 percent Protestant, and 6 percent unaffiliated. One-third of these programs were in New York. These programs reached some 6200 students or less than two percent of the Hispanic and Asian students in nonpublic schools. (NCEA, Ganley, 1981). Title VII programs were often school-based, which made nonpublic school participation dependent on school-by-school arrangements. Title VII programs also were more specific in their design and requirements, in some cases presupposing state-funded bilingual programs. In these cases, nonpublic schools which had not received the state funds had substantial upfront expenses to become eligible for a Title VII bilingual program.

The chief barrier to Title VII participation seemed to derive from a skeptical attitude among private school educators and parents concerning the effectiveness of a bilingual, as opposed to an immersion or submersion, approach to teaching English.

For these reasons, Title I was the predominant form of government aid for those private schools (usually Catholic schools) that received any assistance at all.

4.3 Specific Findings

The following section reports on specific information describing the site visit schools. Again, these data must be qualified because of the small number of schools and the non-random procedures used in their selection.
4.3.1 Purposes of the Schools

When administrators, faculty and parents were asked -- "What is attractive about this school?" Their answers were strikingly similar. The reasons given are grouped here by type of school.

Religious
- Academic standards
- Religious training
- Discipline
- Belief that this was a better school than the public schools
- Language program
- Friendly, not overwhelming
- Political orientation of school (Armenian)

Independent
- Academic excellence
- Language learning

Part-Time Programs
- Cultural transmission
- Language learning

In some cases, the aspect of the school as a "haven" was mentioned. The parochial or private school was called an "academic haven" or just a "haven." In virtually every case, the respondents perceived their school as offering a superior education compared to the nearby public school.

Students were attracted to the Hope Rural School in Florida, for an additional reason. Most who attended Hope Rural were children of migrant farm workers who worked in the fields from 7:00 AM to dusk. This was the only school in the area that accommodated its hours to their schedule.
4.3.2 Parents/Community

All of the schools visited valued parental involvement. They all have developed a strong communications network with parents which provided information on the goals of the school, planned activities and the progress of the individual children. Most schools encouraged visitations by parents and parental participation in school activities and asked for volunteer help. These schools, as a rule, required parents to attend conferences several times a year in which school goals and the individual's child performances were discussed. In all cases, the school community was perceived as being socially cohesive. Many instances, a "family atmosphere" characterized the school.

All schools sponsored fund raising activities in which the parents actively participated, such as bingo, carnivals, and raffles. Also most schools used parents as volunteers. Some did secretarial work, drove on field trips, or acted as aides. Parents consistently seemed willing to help the school. For many of the poorer schools, the school itself was the community social center.

These schools had developed extensive communication networks. They used newsletters, student handbooks and many other tools to be sure the parents know what is expected of them. Some of the Catholic schools had contracts that parents were required to sign at the beginning of each school year, which described their financial obligations and obligations to volunteer as well as their duties concerning the school dress, homework, and parent/teacher conferences.

Most schools were dependent on parental contributions. Special schools, like Red Cloud Indian School, were dependent on outside contributions. This school had its own public relations group which developed and disseminated promotional materials.
Parents who sent their children to the private, specialized language schools clearly valued language learning as integral to their children's education. At the Red Cloud School the community's valuing of language was mixed along generational lines. Older community members pushed the Lakota language; younger members were not as concerned.

The parents who sent their children to the parochial schools tended to value school discipline. As a rule, they also valued traditional academic orientation -- structured classrooms and traditional methodology. In other schools, the approaches varied. The Ecoles Bilingues were also quite structured -- based in part on the traditional French national curriculum. Parents at El Paso Hebrew School preferred open classrooms and the individualized instruction made possible by small class sizes.

4.3.3 Kinds of Students and Families Served

The site visit schools served a range of socio-economic groups. The kinds of families served by the full-time schools can be identified in a general way by the tuition charged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition over $950</th>
<th>Tuition under $950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Paso Hebrew School</td>
<td>St. Veronica School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria Hebrew Day School</td>
<td>Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecole Bilingue, Cambridge</td>
<td>St. Francis Xavier School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecole Bilingue, Berkeley</td>
<td>Red Cloud Indian School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington International</td>
<td>St. Michael's School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Montessori</td>
<td>St. Brendan's School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soterios Ellenas</td>
<td>Sacred Heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French International School</td>
<td>Immaculate Conception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian-Mesrobian</td>
<td>Bruce Guadalupe Community School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The higher tuition schools serving more affluent families were the independent and the Hebrew schools, along with the Greek school. The lower income schools were Catholic or Armenian.
In most of the schools visited, the parents' and students' aspirations were directed toward higher education. At some schools, particularly the Hebrew Day Schools, mention was made of going on to professional schools.

The Armenian-Mesrobian School was different in one way. Linked with "traditional" educational aspirations were school inspired political aspirations. The school and Armenian community's orientation seemed to be "We are in America until we can return to reclaim our Armenian homeland from Turkey."

In those schools serving low-income students, the educational aspirations were considerably lower. Here the students aspired to graduation from 8th grade and attending a Catholic high school, completing high school and possibly a two year college program, or completing high school and possibly a trade school.

The lowest educational and life aspirations were found at the Red Cloud Indian School. Families on the reservation had no real desire to leave even though there was little employment available. Moving to another area or a city was often seen as undesirable because it led to a clash of cultures that seemed worse than the poverty on the reservation. The parents were divided on the value of education. Some favored the children finishing school; others simply did not see any point in it.

In all schools there was some mixing of students from various language backgrounds. A few schools had three or more language groups represented in the student body. At the Washington International School, a dozen or so languages were represented in the student body which included the children from the diplomatic corps. At no school was there mention of any tension among students from different language backgrounds. One school mentioned a problem with parents. In this school, the Anglo parents had a difficult time working under Chicano parents on school activities. The Anglo's worked much better if they were in charge.
4.3.4 Teacher Recruitment

By and large, in all these schools the teachers were recruited through traditional means -- newspaper advertisements, contacts with local universities, and word of mouth.

The only two schools with remarkable hiring practices were the Ecoles Bilingues and St. Michael's school. The Ecoles Bilingues hired teachers from France through the exchange programs for a period of three years. St. Michael's School was staffed by lay volunteer teachers -- especially committed laypersons who give a term of service to the church for a minimum stipend. These volunteers were all qualified teachers recruited by LAMP (Laypersons in the Amarillo Mission Program) and VESS (Volunteers for Educational and Social Services). All of these teachers were English-dominant but knew Spanish.

4.3.5 Instructional Methods

No schools visited were found to be using new techniques or approaches to language teaching. Techniques and methods were left to the individual teacher to devise. Among the recognized methods most often used in language training are the direct method, the audiolingual method, the grammar-translation method, and the total immersion method. With the direct method, the target language is used exclusively. During the language class, there is an absolute prohibition on use of the native language. This method seeks to develop a high level of listening/speaking proficiency in realistic and language-use situations as well as simultaneous skills in reading and writing. The audiolingual method aims at communicative competence in conversation with native speakers. New material is presented in dialogue form, which is then learned through intensive memorization and repetition. The grammar-translation method develops reading and writing skills in the target language in classes taught primarily in the native language. Explicit grammatical rules
and vocabulary lists are provided. The target language is seldom used in class. In a total "immersion" program all school work, not just language instruction, is carried out exclusively in the target language at a level tailored to readiness of students.

All of these methods were found to be in use among the site visit schools. The grammar translation method often combined with the direct method was used heavily in programs where a second language was being taught to English speakers and fluency was not really a goal, such as part-time programs or the full-time programs at the Hebrew Day Schools. Oral methods seemed to be used most frequently in programs which sought to give non-English proficient children English language skills. Oral methods always formed the first stage of these programs and continued thereafter to play a valuable role.

In the lower grades, oral methods were used most frequently. As the student progressed, written methods were introduced. All programs had an oral and written component, except the Lakota program. Lakota is primarily an oral language; written Lakota has only existed for 20 years.

Generally, the principal and/or the individual teacher choose the teaching method or methods. Teachers seemed to have a good deal of autonomy in this regard. The schools seemed to rely on the teachers' past experience or earlier training in implementing a particular method.

4.3.6 Indications of Success

The high tuition schools reported successful student performance on accepted measures such as test scores and subsequent performance.

The low-tuition schools serving less advantaged families reported successful performance on criteria other than test scores such as parental satisfaction and informal evidence of skill development. Students at these schools, as a rule, continued to score below the national average on standardized tests.
In terms of language proficiency, the results, based on impressionistic comments by school staff, fairly matched the program's expectations which were in many cases modest. Also, the schools seldom employed specific measures of language learning effectiveness for purposes of program evaluation. Parent and student satisfaction, however, remained the important indicators of success in these private schools which depend on consumer satisfaction for their continued support.
5.0 POLICY ISSUES

This section of the report will discuss policy issues that are based on the project's findings. Six policy issues came to the fore in this study.

5.1 Techniques and Valuing of Language

The project, which sought to identify noteworthy practices or teaching techniques in the private sector, found that the value assigned to language learning overshadowed instructional practices or techniques. What distinguished certain private schools and what marked their primary contribution to language learning was the value they assigned to language learning. Private schools have great freedom to choose the values they will highlight in their programs; parents and students, in turn, must freely ratify these values by the investment of their time and resources. In some private schools, language learning was an essential value that provided the raison d'être for the school. In other schools, language learning represented a secondary but significant value. Having chosen to value language learning, these schools simply utilized the methods and practices already available. Any encouragement offered to the private sector in language learning should be based on the value given to language learning, which is reflected in the school's language requirements for both teachers and students.

5.2 Conditions for Developing New Practices

Recently, a new method of teaching English as a second language for foreign-born kindergarten and elementary students, called Lingolinking, was developed by Dr. Linda Ventriglia. This method grew out of a book by Ventriglia, "Conversations of Miguel and Maria," based on 450 conversations with youngsters in a Ford Foundation project, and was developed with a $60,000
post-doctoral grant at Harvard University. The method will be tested at
demonstration sites in Virginia, California, and Florida in the 1982-83
school year. This example underscores the kinds of resources that most
readily enable new methods to be developed. These resources include time,
money, and linkages to educational resources. Only a handful of prestigious
private schools could expect to have access to such resources. Given the
isolation of private school teachers from such resources, their meager
inservice opportunities, their limited salaries and funds for curriculum, and
their crowded schedules, the likelihood that they would be able to develop
new methods or approaches is remote. Certainly individual, creative teachers
in private schools could come up with the germ of a new idea or an individual
practice. While such an idea, if developed, could lead to a new approach,
in most nonpublic schools, the resources needed to develop a new idea simply
do not exist. If the development of new and useful bilingual instructional
practices is anticipated from the private sector, attention must be given to
nonpublic school access to the linkages and resources that tend to make such
developments possible.

5.3 Private Schools as a Governmental Category

For governmental purposes, no distinction has been made between various
types of private schools, despite the clear differences in character, program
and purpose that distinguish subsets of these schools from one another. For
example, a number of laws concerning aid to private schools have been struck
down in federal courts on the basis of the First Amendment doctrine of exces-
sive entanglement between church and state (Lemon v. Kurtzman, 403 U.S. 602
(1971) and Meek v. Pittenger, 421 U.S. 349 (1975)). These cases ignored a
significant segment of private education that has no more church entanglement
than the public schools.
This lumping together of all private schools into one category is an instance where the majority has labelled a minority in an oversimplified manner, much as some people might refer to all Orientals as Chinese. There is, however, a political explanation behind this categorization. It has been politically advantageous for public school supporters to invest all private schools with a religious mantle in a way that prevents direct support to any of these schools on First Amendment grounds. At the same time, it has been politically in the interest of unaffiliated private schools to band together with church-related schools because, by dint of their numbers, the church-related schools have more political influence.

In any consideration of government activity to promote language learning, this lumping together of private schools would prove dysfunctional. The schools that best contribute to language learning are specialized language schools such as the Washington International School and the Ecoles Bilingues. These schools could be eligible for certain types of direct support if this simplified categorization was corrected. The President’s Commission (1979) recommended special regional schools, in many ways like the Washington International School, and direct subsidies to programs to encourage language learning. Direct government assistance to specialized language schools in the private sector would prove feasible if secular private schools were not grouped with denominational schools.

5.4 Private Values and Public Aid

In instances where private schools already assign a significant value to the language program, the provision of federal subsidies to support these programs can have an unsettling effect. For example, if a school’s foreign language program was well established as a highly valued part of the curricu-
lum, the addition of a government subsidy to support this program would appear, at first blush, to be an unmixed blessing — money in the bank. In later budget cycles, however, the program would be linked to the subsidy and eventually become dependent on it (Smith, 1982). A discontinuance of the subsidy might then call into question the program. The current private college crises with student financial aid is an instance of this phenomenon. Private school educators, at least in some quarters, are reluctant to depend on government assistance to support highly-valued activities.

5.5 Negativism About Bilingual Education

Bilingual education is far from universally acclaimed in the private sector. The idea-sharing sessions conducted in this project revealed serious doubts about the worth of bilingual education and concern about the evidence of ineffectiveness in the teaching of English in bilingual programs. The extremely limited involvement of nonpublic schools in Title VII programs is, in part, based on a skepticism about bilingual education. In most nonpublic schools, academic achievement in English is the main business at hand. If, from negative publicity about the effectiveness of bilingual education, these school leaders and their patrons feel that bilingual education is holding the students back from learning English, bilingual education will not be continued. Unlike public schools, private schools have no legal or financial incentive for acclaiming or espousing bilingual education. Bilingual education needs to have its image refurbished by the release of substantive, positive information on its effectiveness before it can be promoted in private schools.
5.6 Private Schools as Havens

The term "haven" bespeaks a place of quiet and safety. In a public policy context, however, the term "haven" takes on a negative connotation as a hiding place or refuge for persons attempting to escape the effects of public policy. "White flight" and "private schools as havens" are companion terms. The role of private schools as havens for minorities has been largely overlooked. Given the government's press to advance racial integration, the role of private schools as havens for racial and ethnic groups seems to run against the tide. This role of private schools, however, merits additional scrutiny. The educational benefits to either group of integrating one lower-income minority group with another lower-income minority group are not at all apparent. Parents in either group at times see such integration as less than advantageous. For example, the families of first generation Chinese immigrants embraced the Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic School in downtown Philadelphia as a haven. The same was true for the Mexican Americans attending Immaculate Conception School in Levelland, Texas and for the Puerto Rican students at St. Veronica's in Philadelphia. These schools, as havens, provided students the chance to go to school with their own group in a setting that was safe and free from harassment. The security and supportive atmosphere was seen as conducive to learning and thus gave these minority students a better chance academically. That certain language minorities have a bona fide need for haven schools deserves more public discussion. Such schools at least merit community affirmation and endorsement without necessarily meriting government support.
6.0 CONCLUSIONS

In addition to the policy implications stated above, two conclusions can be drawn from the findings of the study.

The results of the project's scanning effort indicated that the full-time nonpublic schools involved with bilingual instruction in any form represented a small proportion of nonpublic schools. The schools identified numbered less than two percent of the nonpublic schools; the schools that provided information represented one half of one percent. The investigation of the 24 site visit schools that offered the most promise of bilingual instruction showed that these schools, which indeed valued language learning, did not evidence new or innovative procedures or techniques. The following conclusions, then, seem warranted:

1. The principal contribution of the nonpublic schools to bilingual instruction and language learning is in the value assigned to language learning by the school and its patrons and not in innovative techniques and methods.

2. Bilingual instruction is an important feature of a few specialized private schools; involvement with bilingual instruction is not a characteristic of most full-time private schools.
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tional practices in public schools. The emphasis is on the range of alternative instructional approaches.

WHAT KINDS OF REPORTS WILL COME FROM THIS PROJECT?

In 1978, the Congress mandated that information be collected on exemplary projects and practices in bilingual education. Reports from this project will be transmitted to Congress. Researchers may be interested in the review of the research on non-public school and bilingual education and in the study's final technical report. The report on the idea sharing sessions, the summary report on the study itself, and a practical, non-technical report (possibly in Spanish as well as English) written for teaching staffs in both public and non-public schools may be of interest to a broad audience of educators.

HOW CAN ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROJECT BE OBTAINED?

Please write or call the study's research coordinator, Ihor Vynnytsky, at Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey (609-734-5378).
WHAT ARE BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES?

Bilingual instructional practices involve different ways of taking a student's home language into account when the scope of instruction includes:

1) teaching English to students whose home language is not English,
2) conducting instruction in a language other than English for students who are not native speakers of that language but wish to learn it,
3) helping students develop their home language while learning English.

This project will look at the variety of formal and informal bilingual instructional practices in non-public schools that serve a substantial number of students with limited English proficiency (LEP), offer a program in English as a second language, offer a bilingual education program, or offer innovative programs in foreign language instruction.

WHAT ARE THE PURPOSES OF THIS PROJECT?

As one in a series of concurrent studies of bilingual education mandated by Congress, this project seeks to identify the range of non-public school bilingual programs and to describe effective bilingual practices, especially in non-public schools serving pupils with limited English proficiency. The project will study the instructional practices in those non-public schools that have exemplary bilingual programs. The study will highlight those non-public school practices which can be adopted or modified by public as well as other non-public schools.

HOW WILL THE PROJECT BE CONDUCTED?

First, non-public schools with effective bilingual programs will be identified from a review of journals and newspapers, by nominations from non-public school and bilingual education groups and agencies, by nominations from the study's Advisory Committee, and through a series of regional idea-sharing sessions with non-public school bilingual educators.

Early in 1982, the project staff will conduct these idea sharing sessions in nine cities, Philadelphia, Boston, New York, Chicago, Miami, San Antonio, San Juan, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. Non-public schools in the vicinity that have either an enrollment (K-12) of 200 or more, with a sizable percentage of students with limited English proficiency, or a distinctive bilingual or English-as-a-second-language program, will be invited to attend.

As the project progresses, non-public school bilingual instructional practices that seem to be both effective and exportable to public and other non-public schools should be identified. These practices will be examined in case studies in some 20 to 30 non-public schools -- mostly primary and intermediate schools.

HOW MAY THE PROJECT AFFECT NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

Non-public school educators may benefit directly from the idea sharing sessions in which they will discuss various approaches to bilingual education with their colleagues. They also may benefit from the final study report describing practices that have worked in other non-public schools. Non-public schools, as a whole, should benefit from the recognition given in this study to the contribution of these schools to bilingual education, second language learning, and foreign language instruction.

HOW MAY THE PROJECT AFFECT PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

Public school bilingual educators may benefit from learning about instructional practices that have worked effectively in non-public schools and might be used in other schools. In describing these non-public school practices, however, the study will be sensitive to any conditions that tend to give some non-public schools an advantage over some public schools.

IS THIS PROJECT A BILINGUAL VERSION OF THE RECENT COLEMAN STUDY COMPARING PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

No. The Coleman study attempted directly to compare the effectiveness of public and private schools for different populations. This study will collect new data on instructional practices used in private schools and, if appropriate, will use existing data to see how these might differ from instruc-
Summary Report (First Draft) of Idea-Sharing Sessions

The idea-sharing sessions were designed to serve the interests of the participants while contributing to the scanning phase of the project. Judging from the response of the participants, these sessions were indeed seen as quite helpful as a stimulus to their work in bilingual instruction. These sessions also served the interests of the project by identifying the questions and concerns of a broadly representative group of nonpublic school education. This brief report will describe the participants, the questions and concerns they discussed and the "hypotheses" suggested by these discussions.

Table 1 below describes the participants at each location by the type of school they represented. While the Catholic schools were represented by the largest number, their numbers were concentrated in five of the sessions. (For a complete list of participants, see Appendix A.) Participants were asked to complete a directory entry or description of their program using the "Guide for Describing Bilingual Instruction in Nonpublic Schools" prepared by the project staff. The use of this approach obviated the need to collect information during these sessions about what each school was doing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hebrew School</th>
<th>Catholic School</th>
<th>Ind./Other School</th>
<th>Other Ed. Agency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York/Phil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 below reports in content categories the questions and issues raised by the participants in these open-ended discussions. In each session, a number of questions were proposed by the participants, and then a smaller number, selected as "priority questions," were discussed in more detail. As shown in Table 2, the interest of the participants centered chiefly on instruction, with an emphasis on methods and procedures. Government-related issues came next in importance, followed by concerns about parent and community issues. Priority questions were distributed proportionately across the categories.

Table 2
Participant Questions by Content Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Categories</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
<th>Priority Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Methods</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Techniques</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Problems</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing/Assessment</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives/Effects</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aides</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Difference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government Programs</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community/Parents</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes &amp; Values</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Barrier Problems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By way of an overview, the following list by content categories presents in abbreviated form the specific questions or issues raised. Priority questions are marked with an asterisk.

Instruction

Methods and Procedures

**Location**  **General Methods**

- Use of language camps recommended.

  *2.9 - Inquiry on introducing new language to preschoolers.

  2.2 - Question of effectiveness of oral vs. written instruction.

  *3.2 - Question of coordinating use of two languages in instruction.

  *3.3, 4.7, 6.15 - Which method most effective for ESL (pullout, bilin\-ual immersion).

  *3.4 - How to match methodology with student needs.

  *5.4 - How to use immersion without loss of home language/culture.

  *6.4, 6.17 - Inquiries on elementary school methodology.

  6.10 - Recommend audio/visual method with teacher aides up to grade 4.

  6.13 - Inquiry on secondary school methods.

  7.3 - Inquiry on second language acquisition processes.

  7.12 - Inquiry about curriculum design.

  7.8 - Questions about teaching methods in general.

  7.16 - Questions about early vs. later immersion.

  7.17 - Questions about acquisition vs. learning of a second language.

**Special Techniques**

  *1.1 - Recommended use of "sensitivity group" in language instruction.

  1.6 - Recommended use of diaries and journals to stimulate ESL writing.

  4.1 - Discussion of successful learning activities.

  3.10 - Questions about use of peer tutoring.

**1 = Boston, 2 = Miami, 3 = Berkeley, 4 = Chicago, 5 = Los Angeles, 6 = Puerto Rico, 7 = New York.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Special Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Learning disabled students in a second language program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Assimilating English-speaking students in bilingual program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>How to avoid &quot;watering down&quot; English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>How to assist non-Spanish-speaking students returning to Puerto Rico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Participation of mainstream students in language learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Special Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Inquiry on longitudinal studies on various methodologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Inquiry on influence of first language on acquisition of second language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Inquiry on research in bilingual learning theory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Materials

Testing and Measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Special Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Inquiry on placement tests in languages other than Spanish or English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Question about standardized tests and other types of assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Inquiry about aptitude tests for non-English speaking students which do not require a test specialist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Screening for bilingual programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Assessment of L1 and L2 proficiency at grades 8 and 12.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Special Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>Inquiry on where to find bilingual materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>Inquiry on the quality of primary grade texts and the possibility of developing them locally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Recommend publishers take note of need for high interest/low readability materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Discussion of successful materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Inquiry about quality of primary grade texts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectives and Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Should not all schools be bilingual?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Should all teach the student's first language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Question: Do students need to be taught &quot;perfect English?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>Recommend setting goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>Questions about the goals of the bilingual program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effects

| 6.7      | Question whether bilingualism results in failure to master either language. |
| 6.11     | Recommend evaluating attainment in relation to goals. |
| 3.6      | Question whether early bilingualism causes confusion or cognitive impairment. |
| 3.8      | Question about whether there are indeed "balanced bilinguals." |
| 2.9      | Question about psychological problems involved with being bilingual. |

Staff

Teachers

| 3.18     | Inquiry about impact of language attitudes between student/teachers on learning. |
| 3.15     | Question on how to foster acculturation between students and teachers addressed. |
| 3.16     | Question about how to facilitate teacher joint planning. |
| 3.1      | Questions whether bilingual teacher more effective than a monolingual teacher in the target language. |
| 7.9      | Question about teacher preparation. |
| 7.11     | Question about the validity of teacher certification requirements. |
| 7.10     | Question about teacher/staff sensitivity to language/cultural differences. |
| 2.4      | How to locate/use new materials for teacher training. |
| 5.10     | How to get recognition of language and cultural competence of bilingual teachers. |
| 6.19     | How to motivate teachers to teach languages. |
Location  Aides

2.2  - Question whether in-service training always necessary.

Administration

2.13  - Administrator's role in encouraging bilingual instruction.

6.14*  - Question whether the administrators know the goals of the program.

4.9  - Inquire about need for network of nonpublic bilingual educators.

Private School Differences

1.7  - Observation that private schools do better with smaller classes and more homework.

1.9  - Observation that effective private school teachers tend to use structured approach and well planned presentations.

Government Programs

Policy Issues

1.12*  - Question on the inequitable use of government funds to maintain certain ethnic communities but not others.

3.21  - Inquiry about how the government can foster bilingual instruction.

3.13  - Inquiry about the predicted national trend in bilingual education.

5.14  - Question the reasons why foreign language training has been neglected in federal bilingual policy?

5.1  - Inquire how to "mesh" public and nonpublic school language training effort.

7.5  - Question the need for bilingual education in the U.S.

7.6  - Inquiry on the reasons we should not have bilingual education.

7.14*  - Question on role of learning a second language in American society.

Funding

2.1, 3.17  - Inquiry for other sources of funding for nonpublic school programs besides tuition.

5.2, 7.7  - Inquiry for funding for a language lab.

3.22  - Inquiry about a voucher system in support of nonpublic schools.

5.11  - Inquiry about accountability and regulation linked to government funds.
Title VII

1.4 - Complaint that Title VII programs which encourage students to remain in their subculture without learning English create significant social problems.

5.9 - Inquiry about inclusion of nonpublic school students in 1980 mandated identification of LEP students.

5.12 - Comment that federal funds cover only aides and materials.

5.17 - Inquiry about the use of by-pass amendment in 1978 bilingual art.

Community/Parents

Parent Education

2.6 - How to train parents who do not speak the target language to become aides.

4.2 - How to educate parents in their role in the educational process.

5.5 - Inquiry about programs for parent and community education.

5.6 - How to disseminate information on the bilingual program.

7.1 - Question about parent participation.

Attitudes and Values

1.5 - Comment that family values on learning English are critical.

3.9 - Inquiry about psychological problems associated with being bilingual.

1.11 - Comment that U.S. leaders not seen as bilingual (e.g., H. Kissinger never heard talking German).

3.14 - Inquiry on how cultural differences among parents, students and teachers are dealt with.

4.6 - Inquiry about environmental factors effecting second language acquisition.

6.1 - Student fear about learning English a problem.

6.5, 6.12 - Language learning (English) complicated by socio-cultural and political identity issues.

6.16 - Comment on difficulty in motivating children who do not speak English at home.

6.8 - Comment on need to clarify the relationship between bilingual education and bilingual preparation.

6.20 - Comment on difficulty in explaining the importance of English.
Location | Language Barrier Problems
--- | ---
2.14 | - Problems in communicating with non-English-speaking parents on the progress of their children.
3.11 | *Inquiry about ways to help monolingual parents reinforce bilingual instruction.*
5.7 | - Comment on effects of sociological factors (language use outside of school) on school success.
7.4 | - Question about the impact of school on home language.

In addition to the questions proposed by the participants, the project staff introduced questions as time permitted. One such question asked about the advantages and disadvantages that private schools experienced in language teaching because they were private schools. The replies from two sessions are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Support</td>
<td>Finances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom for faculty</td>
<td>Greater teacher workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small student/teacher ratio</td>
<td>Anti-bilingual education attitude in community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better discipline</td>
<td>Pressure from community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective admissions</td>
<td>Low priority on part of administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of materials</td>
<td>Lack of adequate discussion of language issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on values/morals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A second question dealt with the ways in which the government should encourage nonpublic schools in meeting the language needs of their students. The suggestions included the following:

1. Financial support
2. Guidelines for programs
3. Information dissemination
4. Minimum standards for students
5. Including languages in graduation requirements
6. Teacher training for both public and nonpublic school teachers
7. Precluding nonpublic schools in needs assessments and program planning
8. Tuition tax credits or voucher systems
9. Text book support
10. Tax credits for nonpublic school teachers
11. Increase federal government support for education

The other staff question dealt with nominations of nonpublic schools that merit attention in this study project.

Suggested "Hypotheses"

From the content and pattern of these open-ended discussions, several "hypotheses" can be formulated for possible inclusion in the case study segment of the project. These hypotheses are as follows:

1. Because those private schools involved with bilingual instruction are acting on the basis of free choice and not any legal mandates, they are especially affected by negative appraisals of the effects of bilingual education. The questions dealing with the reasons for bilingual education and the possible negative effects of these programs suggested this hypothesis.

2. English language proficiency, linked to upward mobility, is clearly one valued outcome of attendance at the mainstream private or parochial school. The focus on ESL and immersion programs underscored this proposition both for mainland and Puerto Rican schools.
3. For teachers active in bilingual instruction in mainstream private schools, vigorous work with parents and administrators is necessary to maintain continued support of the program. From the array of questions and comments, there is some evidence that bilingual programs are "controversial" -- unlike mathematics and reading (English). Because value consensus is the basis for private school action, these programs must depend on continuous "parent education."

4. Because bilingual programs are "add-on" programs in mainstream private schools, bilingual program staff are especially concerned about obtaining external (usually government) funds to support their program. Funds for bilingual or foreign language instruction seem to be assigned a low priority in the expenditure of private school tuition revenues given that these programs fall outside the principal focus of the school. Against a background of nonpublic-school interest in government support that appears to be pervasive, the bilingual staff have their own special concerns.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia E. Lugo</td>
<td>Sister Maria de Guadalupe Diaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sacred Heart High School</td>
<td>Academia Santa Teresita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Paul Dirks</td>
<td>Maria Geswaldo de Rosado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colegio San Jose</td>
<td>Academic San Jose High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Guide for Describing Bilingual Instruction in Nonpublic Schools

Introduction

To inform the Congress on the ways in which nonpublic schools provide for the language learning needs of a varied segment of American youth, an annotated directory is being prepared describing specific nonpublic schools and their bilingual programs. This directory, which will be illustrative rather than comprehensive, will document the variety and scope of the nonpublic schools' contribution to bilingual instruction. As broadly defined in this project, bilingual instruction involves different ways of taking a student's home language into account when the scope of instruction includes:

1. teaching English to students whose home language is not English,
2. conducting instruction in a language other than English for students who are not native speakers of that language but wish to learn it,
3. helping students develop their home language while learning English.

Your school has been identified for possible inclusion in this report to Congress. If your school is involved with bilingual instruction as defined above, you are asked to take a few minutes to describe your school and its bilingual program in a three or four paragraph entry for the directory.

This guide has been prepared to assist in preparing your school's entry. It is designed to help but not to hinder. Indeed, certain distinctive features of your program may be more important than those mentioned here. The bracketed numbers in this guide refer to the attached worksheet, which is also provided only to assist you. Should time not permit your completing your entry, your notes on the worksheet can be submitted. Entries compiled from worksheets will be submitted to the sending school for review prior to
publication. If your school has a brochure or other descriptive materials already prepared, these could be submitted as your entry. Please send any submissions to Educational Testing Service, 111 Washington Street, Brookline, Massachusetts, 02146.

What Might be Included in an Entry

In addition to the name of the school, its location, enrollment, age/grade span, and calendar (i.e., all day, weekend, summer, etc.), basic information about the school might include the school's affiliation (independent, Church related, community based, etc.) and locale (urban, inner-city, etc.).

Nonpublic schools are not created by law but by the shared purposes of their parents and students. These purposes vary from school to school. Some schools may serve both religious and general educational purposes; some may serve purposes of academic enrichment especially in the area of language development. Some may serve ethnic or cultural purposes linked to the sponsoring community.

The involvement of parents and the sponsoring community especially parents interested in bilingual instruction -- can take varied forms. These parents might serve on a governing or advisory board, as classroom aides or resource persons, or in other volunteer capacities. The general attitude toward bilingual instruction on the part of a nonpublic school's supporting community may range from warmly supportive to somewhat negative.

The kinds of students served by nonpublic schools vary greatly. Nonpublic school, at times, serve lower income families both within and outside of the inner city. Some serve more affluent families interested in educational excellence. The language background of nonpublic school students
students can likewise be varied. In some schools, many students are from homes where English is seldom, if ever, spoken. Some come from genuinely bilingual families. Some schools have a significant number of foreign students. The mix of students in the school and entry levels of these students in terms both of English speaking and reading and home language speaking and reading tend to be critical elements in any bilingual program.

The background and language facility of the teachers and other staff working with the students in language learning are clearly important. Free from the constraints of teacher certification requirements, private schools use not only experienced teachers but also parents and other community resource persons. Many bilingual programs are staffed by representatives of the ethnic community whose native language is the home language of the children. Other programs provide some training in the home language of the children to regular classroom teachers. Please describe the teachers in your bilingual program.

Bilingual programs tend to be identified in certain accepted categories. English as a second language (ESL) programs teach oral and literacy skills to non English speakers without necessarily using the home language. Transitional programs use the home language to teach English. Maintenance programs develop English language skills while maintaining proficiency in the home language. Bilingual or equal value programs place the same emphasis on the development of both the home language and English. In some bilingual or multi-lingual schools specializing in foreign language training, the predominant home language might be English.
The objectives of bilingual programs(7) likewise vary. They can include language development, both oral and written, the imparting of subject matter knowledge, the development of global or cultural awareness, the fostering of ethnic identity and pride, the development of a positive self concept and the appreciation of cultural diversity. Developing social competence and day to day coping skills are important objectives in some programs.

Language use is, of course, a critical element in a bilingual program. (8) The uses of the home language can include no use (i.e., use is forbidden), use as a bridge to the target language, use in an oral and/or literary maintenance program, and use in a program that seeks to develop and enrich oral and literacy skills in both languages in ways that include the study of literature and advanced writing. The extent of home language use in class and outside of class, the people who use the language (teachers, parent-aides, etc.), the quality of printed material on hand in the home language, and the times when the language is used (e.g., in language arts class, in subject matter classes) tend to be useful descriptors of a bilingual program.

The ways in which instructional time(9) is allocated to bilingual instruction are important. Some programs run for only a few weeks or months; some run for one or two years; others are continuous. The amount of class time given to instruction in the target language and the home language as well as the scheduling of that time are important. Language training can, for example, take place for 15 minutes each day, for one entire morning each week, or for two or three full days each month.
While there are other recognized methods, the methods most often used in language training are the direct method, the audiolingual method, the grammar-translation method, and the total immersion method. With the direct method, the target language is used exclusively. During the language class there is an absolute prohibition on use of the native language. This method seeks to develop a high level of listening/speaking proficiency in realistic and language-use situations as well as simultaneous skills in reading and writing. The audiolingual method aims at communicative competence in conversation with native speakers. New material is presented in dialogue form, which is then learned through intensive memorization and repetition. The grammar-translation method develops reading and writing skills in the target language in classes taught primarily in the native language. Explicit grammatical rules and vocabulary lists are provided. The target language is seldom used in class. In a total "immersion" program all school work, not just language instruction, is carried out exclusively in the target language.

The materials used in the bilingual program might prove noteworthy. These could range from teacher prepared materials to commercial publications, from dittoed pages to AV materials. The persons selecting or developing the material and the extent of the school's access to materials also could be noteworthy.

For bilingual programs, success indicators can vary from improved attitudes toward school to measurable improvement in language skills and subject matter knowledge. Success could be viewed solely in terms of competence in English (the target language) or in terms of the development of both the native and target languages. Success could be seen in terms of short-term change or year by year progress. Success could be seen in academic, linguistic and/or affective terms. Factual evidence should be linked to success indicators where possible.
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Sacred Heart School
333 Arroyo Boulevard
Nogales, Arizona 85621

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, Diocese of Tucson
Population served: pre-K-8
Enrollment: 364 students
Languages: English, Spanish
Time Allocation: Spanish as a language is taught one-half hour per day.
English is taught one to one-and-one-half hours per day.

The language program at Sacred Heart School is a blend of a maintenance program and a bilingual program. There is daily emphasis on developing both Spanish and English, but the concentration on each language varies from grade to grade. For example, instruction at the pre-K level is 85% Spanish; as the student progresses to Kindergarten, the emphasis shifts a bit — Spanish 60%, English 40%. By fourth grade, almost all instruction is conducted in English, with the exception of a half-hour of Spanish instruction daily. Proficiency is developed in both languages.

Navajo Evangelical Lutheran Mission School
Rock Point, Arizona

Affiliation: Lutheran
Population served: 1-6
Enrollment: 43 students
Languages: English, Navajo
Time Allocation: ESL instruction is provided one-half hour each day per student.

At the Navajo Evangelical Lutheran Mission School, the administration and faculty believe the goal of bilingual education is to prepare limited English-proficient students as quickly as possible to compete successfully with their English-proficient peers. Accordingly, the school emphasizes general education with ESL instruction and Navajo literacy training. Instruction in ESL is provided one-half hour each day per student, primarily through the audiolingual method. Students are encouraged to use English in their classes, but if explanation is difficult, the child is allowed to explain in the mother tongue. Curriculum includes standard published texts and materials from the Albuquerque Native American Development Center.
Ecole Bilingue
1009 Heinz Street
Berkeley, CA 94710

Affiliation: Independent
Population served: pre-K - 5
Enrollment: 149 students
Languages: English, French
Time Allocation: French is stressed in lower grades with English being taught one hour per day. French and English taught on an equal basis in higher grades.

The administration and faculty of Ecole Bilingue believe that language learning must be acquired at an early age. Neither French nor English is taught as a second language, instead both languages are intensely taught. Initially, the language program is French immersion, in which the entire pre-K and kindergarten program and part of the first grade program is provided in French. Students learn to read first in French, then English. By the time the students reach higher grades, instruction is in French and English on an equal basis. It is expected that the children will attain academic excellence in both languages.

Dolores Mission School
170 So. Gless Street
Los Angeles, CA 90033

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, Los Angeles Archdiocese
Population served: 1 - 6
Enrollment: 200 students
Languages: English
Time Allocation: ESL program, using English exclusively. English is formally taught one and one-half to two hours per day; and informally during all other subjects.

The children who attend the Dolores Mission School are largely from Hispanic homes that value English. The school's language program places its entire emphasis on English language learning through the immersion method.
Herzel School
1039 S. LaCienega Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA

Affiliation: Hebrew
Population served: 7-9
Enrollment: 95 students
Languages: English, Hebrew

Time Allocation: All students are taught Hebrew as part of curriculum. ESL program for limited English proficiency students from Russia, Iran, Israel, Germany and South America. Class meets two mornings per week for 50 minutes. Additional help is available for newly-arrived students.

The Herzl School is a conservative, Jewish, Junior High School that affords its students the opportunity of obtaining a secular education concurrent with Judaic studies. Hebrew language is part of the curriculum for all students. In addition, an ESL language program is provided for limited English proficiency students. The ESL students are immersed in English to force them to speak and use the language daily. The use of the native language is discouraged during classes except for clarification. The goals of this program are: English language development, both oral and written; developing a positive self-image through success in school; and developing social skills through interaction with classmates.

San Antonio de Padua School
1500 E. Bridge St.
Los Angeles, CA

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K-8
Enrollment: 330 students
Languages: English, Spanish

Time Allocation: Children hear both English and Spanish all day, (approximately six hours per day).

The students who attend San Antonio de Padua School come from Hispanic families. Half of the children in the lower grades enter speaking only Spanish. Appreciating this, the school seeks to provide a course of study to enable each child to become as well rounded and secure as possible in both English and Spanish. Spanish is learned first by the Spanish dominant students, and they are expected to make the transition into English by means of the Bilingual program. This transition usually comes by the end of the second or third grade. The method of instruction is total immersion for all children. However, the reading program differs a bit: Spanish dominant children follow a reading program in Spanish; English dominant children learn to read in English. Individual classroom teachers develop their own reading and math aids.
Immaculate Conception School
830 Green Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K-8
Languages: English
Time Allocation: Formal Spanish class in 8th grade
ESPA Reading Program as needed.

Immaculate Conception School does not offer a bilingual program. English language is stressed for all students. Spanish is taught as a subject, in a formal class setting for eighth graders. Although ninety percent of the school community is Hispanic, it supports the school's primary emphasis on English language instruction.

1218 So. Menlo Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90006

Affiliation: Independent
Population served: ages 5 - 19
Enrollment: 1,000 students
Languages: English, Japanese
Time Allocation: Japanese language instruction 4 hours per week on elementary level, 3 hour per week on Jr. & Sr. high level.

At the Japanese Language School, Japanese is taught as a second language since the first language of the students is English. The primary objective of the program is language development, both oral-aural and written. In addition, cultural awareness is stressed. The textbook materials for the elementary level have been written by the school's own teachers and published in Japan.
Our Lady Queen of the Angels Middle School
725 North Hill St.
Los Angeles, California
90012

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, Archdiocese of Los Angeles
Population served: 7-8
Enrollment: 200 students
Language(s): English
Time Allocation: English language assistance depends on the needs of the individual student.

Our Lady Queen of the Angels Middle School favors English language instruction through the total immersion method. There is no formal bilingual program. Nevertheless, limited English-speaking students are able to receive assistance in specific subject areas from teachers of their choice.

St. Emydius Catholic School
Lynwood, California

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: 1-8
Enrollment: 400+ students
Language(s): English
Time Allocation: Total instructional time is conducted in English. Low achievers get additional English instruction 45 minutes each day in a "pull-out" tutoring class.

At St. Emydius Catholic School there is no formal bilingual program. Students are expected to master English language skills to assure success in high school and subsequently, the work force.
Monterey Park United Methodist Language School  
Monterey Park, CA  
Affiliation: First United Methodist church  
Population served: ages 6 - 14  
Enrollment: 140 students  
Language(s): Japanese  
Time Allocation: part-time Japanese language program, meets Saturdays, 9:00 AM to 12:00 noon and 1:00 to 4:00 PM.

The Monterey Park United Methodist Language School teaches Japanese language to children whose predominant language is English. English is used approximately one third of the instructional time as a bridge to Japanese. Oral and written language skills are taught. Materials include commercial texts, teacher-prepared materials, and materials borrowed or purchased from the Japanese Consulate.

The Adat Ari El Day School  
5540 Laurel Canyon Boulevard  
North Hollywood, CA 91607  
Affiliation: Hebrew, Temple Adat Ari El  
Population served: K - 6  
Enrollment: 135 students  
Languages: English, Hebrew  
Time Allocation: Mornings are devoted to general studies. Afternoons are devoted to Hebrew language, culture, and religious studies.

The Adat Ari El Day School provides a dual curriculum of general and Judaic studies. The Judaic studies component offers the students Hebrew language instruction, as well as cultural and religious knowledge.
Emek Hebrew Academy
12732 Chandler Blvd.
North Hollywood, CA 91607

Affiliation: Hebrew
Population served: pre-K - 10
Enrollment: 450 students
Languages: English, Hebrew
Time Allocation: Hebrew language instruction one and one-half hours per day

Emek Hebrew Academy offers a language program designed to give predominantly English-speaking students Hebrew language competence. English is used as a bridge to Hebrew, with emphasis being placed on oral and written language development. Other program goals include: fostering Jewish identity and instruction on Orthodox religious customs and practices.

Our Lady of Guadalupe Elementary School
530 North Juanita Avenue
Oxnard, California 93030

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, Archdiocese of Los Angeles
Population served: 1-8
Enrollment: 335 students
Language(s): English
Time Allocation: All instruction is in English

Our Lady of Guadalupe Elementary School does not offer a bilingual program. All instruction is in English.
Our Lady of the Rosary School
14813 Paramount Boulevard
Paramount, California

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, Daughters of Mary and Joseph
Population served: 1-8
Enrollment: 362 students
Language(s): English, Spanish
Time Allocation: "Pull-out" time for reading and English language development. Spanish class offered in the sixth grade for enrichment.

At Our Lady of the Rosary School, the administration, faculty, and parents believe that the students will function better at school if only English language development is stressed. Accordingly, the school does not provide bilingual instruction. Instead, extra help is provided for non-English proficient students through the Title I Project in "pullout" sessions. Spanish is taught in the sixth grade for enrichment.

St. Philip the Apostle School
Pasadena, California

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, Archdiocese of Los Angeles
Enrollment: 300 students
Language(s): English

St. Philip the Apostle School does not offer a formal bilingual program. Nevertheless, there is a multicultural component included in its Title I Program. The component's objective is to expose the students to the many cultures and celebrations of this multi-ethnic school community.
Armenian Mesrobian School
Pico Rivera, CA

Affiliation: Private, Church-related
Population served: K - 12
Enrollment: 416 students
Languages: English, Armenian
Time Allocation: One hour per day is allotted for native language instruction.

The Armenian Mesrobian School offers a bilingual program which seeks to develop competence in English and Armenian. The goals of this program include: development of oral and written language skills and cultural awareness.

Korean Language School of Sacramento
5770 Carlson Drive
Sacramento, California 95819

Affiliation: Private
Population served: K-12
Enrollment: 80 students
Language(s): English, Korean
Time Allocation: Part-time language program meeting on Sundays, 2:00 - 4:30 PM.

The Korean Language School of Sacramento offers Korean/American children cultural and academic enrichment through the development of Korean language skills. The program stresses both oral and literary language development. Ninety percent of the instruction is provided in Korean.
Ecole Bilingue
French-American Bilingual School
Woods Hall
55 Laguna Street
San Francisco, CA  94102
(415) 626-8564

Affiliation:  Private, Independent
Population served:  K-12
Enrollment:  410

Languages:  English, French
Three years or IBS level: Arabic, Chinese, Russian, Spanish

Time Allocation:  French is stressed in lower grades; English is taught only one hour per day. French and English brought on equal basis in higher grades.

The purpose of the French American Bilingual School is to provide their students with a bilingual education and to prepare them for entrance into universities throughout the world. All of the courses are taught in English and French. It is expected that the students will achieve fluency and academic excellence in both languages. The method of instruction is total immersion.

St. Gabriel School
2550 41st Avenue
San Francisco, CA  94116

Affiliation:  Roman Catholic
Population served:  K - 8
Language(s):  English

Time Allocation:  ESL "pull-out" class held daily for 30 minutes per session. Students who participate in this special class do so through the middle grades.

The students who attend St. Gabriel School come from bilingual families from a variety of ethnic backgrounds. The school offers ESL classes designed to develop strong English oral and written skills, a positive self concept, and an appreciation of cultural diversity. Instruction is entirely oral for the younger children. Older students receive both oral and written instruction.
Chinese School
718 S. Azusa Avenue
West Covina, CA 91791
(213) 336-3454

Affiliation: San Gabriel Valley Chinese Cultural Association
Enrollment: 110 students
Languages: English, Chinese

Time Allocation: part-time Chinese language program, Saturdays, 9:00 AM to 12:00 noon. Program is divided into three instructional sections:

- Reading and language arts - 80 minutes
- Culture - 40 minutes
- Martial Arts (P.E.) - 40 minutes

The Chinese School offers its students a part-time language program designed to develop, through the audio-lingual method, oral and written Chinese language skills and cultural awareness.

German-American School Association
of Southern California, Inc.
227 East Las Tunas Dr.
San Gabriel, CA 91775

Affiliation: Independent
Population served: ages 4 - 16
Language(s): German

Time Allocation: part-time German language program, Saturdays, 9:00 AM to 12:00 noon.

The German-American School Association operates fifteen schools throughout Southern California which conduct part-time German language programs. These programs stress the development of oral and written skills and an appreciation of cultural awareness and diversity. German is used exclusively during the school session.
Annunciation School
Denver, Colorado

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K-8
Enrollment: 178 students
Languages: English, Spanish
Time Allocation: Students are taught language by bilingual teacher on a one-to-one basis, 30-60 minutes per week.

The purpose of Annunciation School is to provide quality education in a Christian atmosphere to inner-city, lower-income children. The teachers work with the students in two ways: developing a good self-concept by stressing the gifts and talents of each student, and developing their oral and written English language skills to enable them to function well in society.

Cathedral of St. Joseph
809 Asylum Ave.
Hartford, CT

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K-8
Enrollment: 250 Students
Languages: English, Spanish, Chinese
Time Allocation: TESOL program students receive individual instruction in English 30-40 minutes per day.

At the Cathedral of St. Joseph School, the TESOL language program is used with students who enter school speaking no English or limited English. Native languages are used as a bridge to English both by the TESOL teacher and the students and teachers in the regular classrooms. The method of instruction is individualized with great emphasis placed on developing vocabulary, word analysis, language mechanics, bi-cultural enrichment and basic study skills.
St. Augustine School
20 Clifford St.
Hartford, CT 06714

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, church related school
Population served: K-8
Enrollment: 490 students
Language(s): English

Time Allocation: ESL instruction three times per week. Students are dropped from this program when they are capable of doing work in regular classroom.

St. Augustine School offers an ESL program to students whose native language is not English. The program does not provide instruction in the students' native language. English language development is stressed in all areas.

Washington International School
2735 Olive Street, NW
Washington, DC 20007

7425 MacArthur Blvd.
Cabin John, MD 20810

3100 Macomb Street, NW
Washington, DC 20008

Affiliation: Independent
Population served: Pre-K - 12
Enrollment: 550 students
Languages: English, French, Spanish

Time Allocation: Alternating daily schedule between English and French or Spanish

The Washington International School offers an international education for resident Washingtonians and non-American families living temporarily in Washington. The school seeks to develop its students' ability to study in two languages. An ESL program is offered along with a bilingual program which alternates language instruction on a daily basis. For example, primary students alternate days of English instruction in all subjects with French or Spanish instruction in all. Fourth and fifth grades alternate mornings and afternoons between the two languages. Older students have intensive instruction in language and literature of both languages and study history and geography in French or Spanish. Textbooks are selected from many countries and supplemented with teacher prepared materials. Research is conducted by the school with outside support from the National Endowment for the Humanities and National Science Foundation.
Saint Mark's Episcopal School
1750 East Oakland Park Blvd.
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33304

Affiliation: Episcopal
Population served: Pre-K - 9
Enrollment: 330 students
Languages: English, Spanish

Time Allocation: For students in the English immersion program, instruction is continuous. For all other students, a daily Spanish class is held beginning in pre-K.

Saint Mark's Episcopal School offers a bilingual program, designed to teach non-English speaking students to speak English fluently, and English speaking students to speak Spanish fluently. The conduct of the program is two fold: for those students whose first language is not English, the immersion method in small classes with a teacher and an aide is used; for all others, a daily Spanish class is held in methods appropriate to age level. These methods include Spanish speaking tables in the dining room, excursions to Spanish speaking stores and restaurants, and a cultural course in the eighth grade which features a nine-day stay in Mexico.

Immaculate Conception
125 W 45th St.
Hialeah, Florida

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population Served: K-8
Enrollment: 1,265 students
Languages: Spanish, English

Time Allocation: Spanish classes, grades 5 and 6 for 60 minutes per week, and grades 7 and 8 for 90 minutes per week

This school serves lower and middle income families, including some non-English speaking families. LEP students in kindergarten and primary grades receive assistance from an ESL program and summer programs. All instruction in the school is in English, except for Spanish classes. These classes, which make use of trained parent volunteers, are designed to help Spanish speaking students read and write Spanish.
Hope Rural School
15927 SW 150th Street
Indiantown, FL 33456

Affiliation: Independent incorporated school on the grounds of the Holy Cross Catholic Church.
Population served: K - 4
Enrollment: 60 students
Time Allocation: School hours are 7:00 AM - 4:00 PM to accommodate parents work schedules. English language instruction is continuous.

The Hope Rural School seeks to provide the children of migrant/farm workers with a firm educational base and a sense of personal and cultural worth. The parents favor their children learning English. Accordingly, a strong ESL program is offered. Spanish is used as a bridge to developing English language skills. The children learn to read in English first. Spanish language instruction begins in third grade once basic English patterns have been established.

St. Brendan's School
8755 S.W. 32nd Street
Miami, FL 33165

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, Archdiocese of Miami
Population served: K - 8
Enrollment: 652 students
Languages: English, Spanish
Time Allocation: Spanish language instruction begins in third grade.

At St. Brendan’s school, all instruction is in English with the exception of a Spanish language class for enrichment begun in third grade and continued through eighth grade.

Lehrman Day School
Miami Beach, Florida

Affiliation: Hebrew
Population served: pre-K - 6
Enrollment: 264 students
Languages: English, Hebrew
Time Allocation: Hebrew studies - two hours per day. ESL for students new to this country - one-and-one half hours of individualized instruction per week.

Lehrman Day School offers two language programs: a very small ESL program for a small percentage of students who are new to this country; a Hebrew language program in which all students participate. Hebrew is taught to enrich oral and literacy skills to facilitate the study of literature, advanced writing, and the history and traditions of the Jewish people. Many of the students visit Israel and speak Hebrew with native speakers by the eighth grade. ESL students speak and read English in the span of a marking period.
St. Joseph's School
8625 Byron Avenue
Miami Beach, FL 33141

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, Theatine Sisters
Population served: 1 - 8
Enrollment: 182 students
Languages: English, Spanish

Time Allocation: Spanish is taught as a formal class for 7th and 8th graders twice weekly. Special ESL classes for foreign-born students.

St. Joseph's School offers two language programs. The first is an enrichment program in which all students in the seventh and eighth grades have formal classes in Spanish twice weekly. These are regularly scheduled and taught by a teacher whose native language is Spanish. Oral and written skills and the cultural heritage of the Spanish-speaking people are emphasized.

The second program is offered to incoming students from foreign countries. The instruction is English immersion. The children are put into regular classrooms and very often are helped on a one-to-one basis by other students who share the same linguistic background. In addition, each of these children attends special ESL classes until such time as he or she can gain a reasonable command of spoken and written English.

Akiba Schecter Jewish Day School
Chicago, IL

Affiliation: Hebrew, Jewish Board of Education
Population served: grades 1 - 8
Language: English, Hebrew

Time Allocation: Hebrew/Judaica program one-half of the school day.

Akiba Schecter Jewish Day School seeks to provide its students with a high quality English curriculum and a Hebrew/Judaica program. The Hebrew/Judaica program is conducted for one-half of the school day from grades one through eight. The students learn Hebrew as a second language and the history of Judaism. It is expected the students will become fluent in Hebrew for religious purposes and for reading Jewish and Israeli literature.
Latvian School of Chicago, Inc.
Montrose Avenue
Chicago, IL

Affiliation: Independent
Population served: ages 4 - 17
Enrollment: 160 students
Language(s): Latvian
Time Allocation: Part-time Latvian language program -- meets four hours per Saturday.

The Latvian School of Chicago offers a part-time program designed to teach Latvian language through the total immersion method. In doing so, the school seeks to preserve its students' cultural heritage and foster ethnic identity and pride.

Pedagoginis Lituanistikos Institutas
Lithuanian Institute of Education, Inc.
5620 South Claremont Ave.
Chicago, IL 60636

Affiliation:
Population served: High School Seniors, College Freshmen and Sophomores
Language(s): Lithuanian
Time Allocation: Part-time Lithuanian language program meeting on Saturdays for six hours per session.

The Lithuanian Institute offers a language program designed to prepare its students to teach Lithuanian in Lithuanian Schools. The Institute publishes its own texts and materials.
Morris P. Zaransky - Meyer Katzman
Consolidated Hebrew High School
2828 W. Pratt Boulevard
Chicago, IL 60645

Affiliation: Hebrew, Associated Talmud Torahs
Population served: High School students
Languages: English, Hebrew
Time Allocation: Hebrew classes meet twice a week, one hour per session.

The Morris P. Zaransky - Meyer Katzman Consolidated Hebrew High School serves Jewish students through its seven branches within Chicago and its suburbs. The school offers classes in Hebrew language and Jewish subjects. The language program teaches Hebrew to students whose native language is English. The courses aim to teach conversational and textual skills. English is used to convey concepts and to overcome gaps in discussions. Standard text books are used together with audio/visual software and oral-aural methods.

Sabra School
72 E. 11th Street
Chicago, IL 60605

Affiliation: Board of Jewish Education (BJE) of Metropolitan Chicago
Population served: ages 6 - 17
Language(s): Hebrew
Time Allocation: Part-time Hebrew language program -- meets Saturdays 9:00 AM to 12:00 noon.

The children who attend the Sabra School are from homes in which at least one parent is Israeli. They already have Hebrew language skills which this program seeks to maintain and further develop. All instruction is in Hebrew.

St. Therese of Jesus School
255 North Farnsworth
Aurora, Illinois 60505

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K-6
Enrollment: 140-150 students
Languages: English, Spanish
Time Allocation: Spanish classes for 40 minutes per week

About one half of the students are Spanish speaking; many are from homes where English is not spoken. Informal ESL is offered in the kindergarten and primary grades with assistance from parent volunteers. Two teachers have some ability to speak Spanish. To maintain Spanish language skills, 20 minute classes in Spanish reading are offered twice a week in grades four through six.
St. Anthony School
11530 S. Prairie Ave.
Chicago, IL 60628

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, church related school
Population served: K-8
Enrollment: 325 students
Languages: English, Spanish

Time Allocation: ESL classes are held daily: primary students - 25 minutes per day, Intermediate & J.H.S. - 60 minutes per day. Children return for ESL instruction each year until it is felt they no longer need this special class and can function in a regular classroom.

Many of the children who attend St. Anthony's School are recent immigrants from Mexico whose home language is Spanish. The school conducts an ESL program in which the home language is used for beginning language students. As English proficiency develops, emphasis is placed on presenting increased instruction in English. The program seeks to develop daily English skills to enable students to survive in a regular classroom. The school attempts to motivate its students to pursue education beyond elementary school.

St. Matthias School
Chicago, IL

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, Archdiocese of Chicago
Population served: K-8
Enrollment: 355 students
Languages: Only English is used in school, although student population speaks twenty-three different languages.

Time Allocation: English is used during the entire school day. For those students who require additional help, special tutoring is provided in English, 20 minutes to one-and one half hours per day.

At St. Matthias' School the students are a multi-ethnic group representing twenty-three different languages. All of these native languages are highly respected and there is much encouragement to maintain them at home and after school. Nevertheless, during school all effort is centered on becoming proficient in English. English, then, is used throughout the entire school day in an effort to develop strong speaking, reading and writing skills.
Peoria Hebrew Day School
3616 N. Sheridan
Peoria, IL  61604

Affiliation: Hebrew, Community sponsored

Population served:  K-8

Enrollment:  35 students

Language(s):  Hebrew

Time Allocation:  Two hours per day of Hebrew studies.

The Peoria Hebrew Day School is an independent, community sponsored, Jewish parochial school. The school offers a Hebrew language program to students whose primary and home language is English. The program aims to develop a fluency in Hebrew both conversational and with text.

Congregation Bnai Emunala
9131 Niles Center Road
Skokie, IL  60076

Affiliation: Hebrew, Synagogue related, Board of Jewish Education

Population served: ages 8 to 13

Enrollment:  200 students

Languages:  English, Hebrew

Time Allocation:  Part-time program, six hours per week.

Congregation Bnai Emunala’s language program teaches Hebrew as a second language to students whose home language is English. Oral and written skills are stressed to enable the students to read selected bible passages in Hebrew and chant prayers. All teachers are certified. High school students are used as tutors.
Bnai Jacob Synagogue Religious School
2340 S. Fairfield Avenue
Fort Wayne, Indiana 46807

Affiliation: Hebrew
Languages: English, Hebrew
Time Allocation: Part-time program three days per week (total of six hours)

The purpose of this part-time program is to teach Hebrew language to English speaking students while fostering religious and cultural development. The method of instruction is oral-aural, reading and writing. English is used as a bridge to Hebrew.

The Academy of Mount St. Scholastica
1034 Green Street
Atchison, Kansas 66002
(913) 367-1334

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, Benedictine Sisters
Population served: ages 14 - 18
Language(s): English
Time Allocation: English as a Foreign Language Program,

The Academy of Mount St. Scholastica offers an English as a Foreign Language Program which is designed to help non-English speaking students acquire a working ability in English language. These international students study English within the framework of a secondary school which accommodates American students. This special English program stresses the basic skills of reading, grammar, composition, verbal ability, and study skills.
Our Lady of Guadalupe School
210 North Branner
Topeka, Kansas 66616

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K-8
Enrollment: 164 students
Languages: English, Spanish
Time Allocation: Language Instruction 30-45 minutes per day

The students who attend Our Lady of Guadalupe School come from a bilingual community. Appreciating this, the school uses Spanish as a bridge to aid students in developing English language skills. Oral and written skills are taught through the audiolingual and grammar-translation methods. The staff is aided in these teaching objectives by senior citizen volunteers working through the AYUDA program.

Rayne Catholic Elementary School
407 S. Polk Street
Rayne, LA

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K-8
Languages: English, French
Time Allocation: Formal French class held two or three days per week.

At Rayne Catholic Elementary School, English is used for all instruction, with the exception of a French language class which is offered two or three days per week for enrichment.
French International School
9600 Forest Street
Bethesda, Maryland

Affiliation: French Ministry of Education
Population served: K - 12
Enrollment: 865 students
Languages: French, English
Time Allocation: English instruction six hours per week.

The French International School follows the program established by the French Ministry of Education; the overall purpose is the preparation of students for the Baccalaureat examination. All courses are taught in French with the exception of American history, English language, and music. In beginning English language classes, French materials are often used; in more advanced English classes, American materials are used.

Washington International School
2735 Olive Street, NW
Washington, DC 20007

7425 MacArthur Blvd.
Cabin John, MD 20810

3100 Macomb Street, NW
Washington, DC 20008

Affiliation: Independent
Population served: Pre-K - 12
Enrollment: 550 students
Languages: English, French, Spanish
Time Allocation: Alternating daily schedule between English and French or Spanish

The Washington International School offers an international education for resident Washingtonians and non-American families living temporarily in Washington. The school seeks to develop its students' ability to study in two languages. An ESL program is offered along with a bilingual program which alternates language instruction on a daily basis. For example, primary students alternate days of English instruction in all subjects with French or Spanish instruction in all. Fourth and fifth grades alternate mornings and afternoons between the two languages. Older students have intensive instruction in language and literature of both languages and study history and geography in French or Spanish. Textbooks are selected from many countries and supplemented with teacher prepared materials. Research is conducted by the school with outside support from the National Endowment for the Humanities and National Science Foundation.
German School Washington, D.C.
8617 Chateau Drive
Potomac, MD  20854

Affiliation:  German School Society
Population served:  K-13
Languages:  English, German
Time Allocation:  Instruction is predominately in German.

The German School offers a curriculum which is basically that of German schools. The majority of the students within each class is German speaking and most instruction is in German.

Charles E. Smith Jewish Day School
1901 East Jefferson Street
Rockville, Maryland  20852

Affiliation:  Hebrew
Population served:  K - 12
Enrollment:  800 students
Languages:  English, Hebrew
Time Allocation:  Hebrew language instruction takes place for 11-3/4 hours per week in the lower school (k-6), 13 hours per week in the upper school (7-12).
ESOL program for Russian, Iranian, and Israeli students -- three hours per week.

The Charles E. Smith Jewish Day School offers two language programs. The first, in Judaic studies, is an integral part of the school curriculum, comprising 40 percent of the school day, in which all students participate. Hebrew language, cultural identification, text explication, and religious rites and rituals are taught.

The second language program is English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) for those students whose native language is not English. The program consists of activities supplementary to regular classroom activities. It is geared toward mainstreaming non-native speakers into regular classroom as rapidly as possible. The direct method of instruction is used and generally the students can function in the mainstream after a year or two.
Spring Bilingual Montessori Academy
2010 Linden Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20906

Affiliation: Independent
Population served: ages 3 - 9
Languages: English, French, Italian, Spanish
Time Allocation: Language instruction one hour per school day.

The Spring Bilingual Montessori Academy offers its students a language program in which French, Italian, or Spanish is taught five hours per week. It is an enrichment program designed to encourage the understanding and

Hebrew College High School
Brookline, MA 02146

Affiliation: Hebrew
Population served: 9-11
Enrollment: 275 students
Language: Hebrew
Time Allocation: part-time Hebrew language instruction, 4-10 hours per week.

At the Hebrew College High School all instruction is in Hebrew. Students attempt to develop Hebrew language skills and an understanding of their Jewish heritage.
Saint Mary’s School
Harvard Street
Brookline, MA 02146

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K-8
Enrollment: 286
Language(s): English

Time Allocation: ESL instruction is conducted 30-45 minutes, three times per week.

At Saint Mary’s School the English as a second language children come from a variety of countries. English is not spoken at home. The ESL program provides a variety of language experiences. These range from survival skills to oral and written language development. The aim is to equip the students so they can deal with subject matter courses. There is more emphasis on subject matter in the upper grades. Cultural awareness and pride in one’s background are not the main emphasis of the program, but they are woven into the format.

Ecole Bilingue
145 Brattle Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 661-5787

Affiliation: Private, Independent
Population served: pre K – 6
Enrollment: 70 students
Languages: English, French

Time Allocation: French is stressed in lower grades with English being taught one hour per day. French and English taught on an equal basis in higher grades.

The administration and faculty of Ecole Bilingue believe that language learning must be acquired at an early age. Neither French nor English is taught as a second language, instead both languages are taught intensely. Initially, the language program is French Immersion, in which the entire pre-K and Kindergarten program is provided in French. From age five, the school day is divided in half, with all students attending both the American and French sections. French is the only language spoken in the French section; English in the American. Most classes use the direct method. The program followed in the American section is typical of that of an American elementary school. The official French program, as taught in France, is used in the French section. The purposes of the program are both oral and written language development and subject matter knowledge.
Eaglebrook School
Deerfield, MA 01342

Affiliation: Independent, boarding school
Population served: grades 6 - 9
Enrollment: 246
Languages: English, French, German, Spanish

Time Allocation: ESL classes are offered to 10% of the students, 37-39 minutes per day. French, German and Spanish classes are available on three levels.

The Eaglebrook School offers its students two types of language programs. The first, teaches French, German or Spanish skills to students whose native language is English. The second program, is ESL which is offered to 10% of the students whose native languages are not English. The ESL class is held for one academic period per day and uses the total immersion method of instruction. As English proficiency develops, students are "graduated" out of the ESL class to function successfully in their regular classrooms.

Macduffie School
Springfield, Massachusetts

Affiliation: Independent
Population served: 7-12
Enrollment: 300 students
Language(s): English

Time Allocation: ESL classes are offered daily, 45 minutes per session.

Macduffie School conducts an ESL program for its foreign students. The school seeks to develop excellent language skills which will prepare these students to attend American colleges and universities.
Worcester Academy
Worcester, MA

Affiliation: Independent
Enrollment: 360 students
Population served: 7 - post graduate (High School)
Language(s): English
Time Allocation: Daily during regular academic year
Summers:
Institute for English as a Foreign Language

Worcester Academy specializes in college preparation. The English as a Foreign Language Program taught during the regular academic year and the summer, is devoted exclusively to the purpose of improving the ability of the foreign student to speak, read and write English. Instruction is offered on several levels. Each student's abilities are tested at the beginning of the program to assure proper placement.

International Institute of Metropolitan St. Louis
4484 West Pine Boulevard
St. Louis, MO 63108
(314) 535-4890

Affiliation: American Council for Nationalities Services
Population served: 12 years of age - adults
Language(s): English
Time Allocation: ESL classes are held every morning (9 am - 12:00)
Monday - Friday. Evenings (6:00 - 9:00), 4 days per week.

Funding: Tuition for refugee students is paid through a government grant (morning program). The evening program is supported by the City of St. Louis Adult Basic Education program. There is no charge to the student.

The majority of the students who attend the International Institute are refugees from South East Asia, Cuba, and Spanish America. English is rarely, if ever, used at home by these students. The main purpose of the language program is to provide systematic instruction in ESL in order to equip them with verbal skills to join the American work force. The main goal is to teach the students to understand and respond to spoken English. To supplement these goals, training is also given in writing and reading. Instruction is audio-visual and modified audio-lingual. Standard audio-lingual texts are used. In addition, many teachers use their own collection of written activities.
At St. Charles Mission School, the administration and faculty are dedicated to preserving the culture and heritage of the Crow people by preserving their language. The language program has two significant features: (1) culture, language and heritage are incorporated into the curriculum and (2) the bilingual staff is available to teach concepts, lessons, or provide remediation. Crow language instruction is restricted to oral usage. None of the bilingual staff are literate in Crow and very few written materials are available on the reservation.

NOTE: Crow has been a written language for only twenty years.

The Sacred Heart School encourages its multi-ethnic student population to develop English proficiency. The students are mainstreamed into regular classrooms and are required to speak English at all times. To further aid their English language development, they receive special ESL classes two times per week. The school finds these methods effective; students are able to successfully participate in content subject areas in six months.
### St. Columba School
25 Pennsylvania Avenue
Newark, NJ 07114

**Affiliation:** Roman Catholic  
**Population served:** K-8  
**Enrollment:** 281 students  
**Languages:** English, Spanish  
**Time Allocation:** Grades 7-8 have Spanish classes three times per week.

This school, located in a blighted inner-city area, serves mostly (77 percent) Puerto Rican families in which many of the parents have had no formal education. The main emphasis is on teaching basic skills including English. Students at grade 7 and 8 who are on level in English take part in Title I and New Jersey Chapter 192 pull-out classes in Spanish, in which parents are sometimes involved. The local Spanish newspapers have proved to be a useful tool. The effectiveness of the school is demonstrated by the success of its graduates in high school and college.

### St. Michael's School
182 Broadway
Newark, New Jersey

**Affiliation:** Roman Catholic  
**Population served:** K-8  
**Enrollment:** 551 students  
**Languages:** Spanish, French, English  
**Time Allocation:** ESL for 35 minutes once a week

The program reported here is an ESL program funded by New Jersey (NJ 192-193) for non-public schools. This program serves NEP or LEP students in the early grades in small (3-5 member) groups, who work with vocabulary, grammar, reading, writing, role playing, and reading-readiness skills.
Chinese School of South Jersey
P.O. Box 2024
Cherry Hill, New Jersey 08034

Affiliation: Independent
Population Served: three to fifteen year olds
Enrollment: 188 students
Languages: English, Chinese
Time Allocation: part-time program, Saturday mornings, 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM.

The Chinese School of South Jersey seeks to teach and promote Chinese language and culture. It offers language programs on two levels. The first, is Chinese as a second language in which reading, writing and oral skills are taught to students without using much English. The second, is a transitional program that uses English to teach Chinese. The audiolingual, grammar translation and direct methods are employed. Materials are a mixture of commercial texts and teacher prepared notes and dittos.

Holy Rosary School
Elizabeth, New Jersey

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: Elementary
Enrollment: 179 students
Languages: English, Spanish
Time Allocation: ESL instruction varies according to the needs of the individual student. Range: 90-225 minutes per week.

Holy Rosary School offers an ESL program staffed by a certified ESL teacher and an aide supplied through the ESEA Title I Basic Skills Program. This program uses the direct method to develop oral and written English language skills. All instruction is in English. Students use their native language only if they are having difficulty in expressing themselves in English.
Holy Trinity Elementary School
Hackensack, New Jersey

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: Elementary
Language(s): English

Time Allocation: Students without English skills are in ESL classes two and one half hours per day.

Holy Trinity Elementary School offers its non-English speaking students ESL programs funded by the state of New Jersey. The programs aim at developing oral and written language skills, and imparting knowledge of subject matter similar to the curriculum of English proficient students. Classroom teachers employ the audiolingual and direct methods of instruction. They are aided by bilingual students from the Youth Career Exploration Project, who provide one to one and group instruction for non-English speaking students until they have mastered the basics of the language.

Holy Cross School
15 South 4th Street
Harrison, New Jersey

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, Sisters of Charity
Population served: Elementary
Languages: English, Spanish

Time Allocation: ESL classes are held three days per week. One day each for English, reading and speech. Spanish classes are held six days a week. The Saturday session is held for two hours. A summer program is also provided.

Holy Cross School offers its students an ESL Transitional program, as well as, daily Spanish classes. Spanish, the students home language is used as a bridge to help in the development of English skills. Parents serve as classroom aides by helping poorer students in various subject areas.
St. John the Baptist School
3044 Kennedy Boulevard
Jersey City, N.J. 07306

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K-8
Language(s): English, Spanish
Time Allocation: ESL classes are held one hour per week, usually in two half-hour sessions.

St. John the Baptist School offers its non-English proficiency students ESL instruction under New Jersey Laws 192-193. The program stresses the development of oral and written skills, while encouraging the development of a positive self image. The ESL teacher is fluent in Spanish and uses this language when necessary to provide a bridge to English.

Our Lady of Good Counsel School
Newark, NJ

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K-8
Enrollment: 647 students
Language(s): English
Time Allocation: ESL classes are conducted four days per week. Each session lasts 30 minutes.

Our Lady of Good Counsel School offers its non-English speaking students ESL instruction through a state funded program. The children are encouraged to speak English at all times as all classes are conducted in English. The home language, Spanish, is used only when English is not understood at all.
New Jersey Korean School
New Brunswick, N.J.

Affiliation: private
Population served: ages 4-15, also adults
Languages: English, Korean
Time Allocation: Part-time program, classes are held on Saturdays for two hours per session.

The New Jersey Korean School offers its students a maintenance bilingual program in which English and Korean are taught. Cultural awareness is also stressed.

Frisch School
Paramus, New Jersey

Affiliation: Hebrew
Population served: 9-12
Languages: English, Hebrew
Time Allocation: Hebrew language is taught as a component of the Judaic studies program. ESL classes are offered to students with a language handicap, two hours per week.

The Frisch School is a college preparatory high school which provides its students with a dual program of secular and religious studies. Hebrew language instruction is a component of the religious studies program. An ESL program is provided for those students with a language handicap. This program seeks to develop strong oral and written communication skills, as well as, practical day-to-day coping skills. The students in this program are encouraged to use English whenever possible. The direct method of instruction is used.
At St. Charles Borromeo School, language instruction involves conducting classes in Spanish for students who are not native speakers but who may need the language for future communication. In this program, English is used as a bridge to learning Spanish through a comparison of the two languages. Program goals include the development of daily conversational skills and an expanded awareness of the Hispanic culture. The method of instruction is primarily oral. Spanish is used during Spanish class as well as in some other classes on a limited basis. Materials are selected from those commercially available; some are developed by individual classroom teachers.

The majority of students who attend Saint Athanasius School are from homes of Spanish background in which English is spoken. The language program aims to develop and enrich oral and literary skills in English and Spanish and to foster ethnic identity and pride. Instruction is a combination of the direct method and grammar-translation method. Most of the teachers prepare materials as no funds are available to purchase published texts.
Cristo Rey School
Box 520
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Affiliation: Roman Catholic


Enrollment: 165 students

Languages: English, Spanish

Time Allocation: Spanish is taught 20-30 minutes per day.

The majority of children who attend Cristo Rey School are from a Spanish-American background; very few speak Spanish at home. The school is not bilingual; Spanish is taught and used only during a formal Spanish class. The object of this Spanish instruction is to enable the students to communicate more easily with non-English speaking grandparents and, to help them gain employment opportunities in later life. Instruction is primarily oral in lower grades; workbook and text books in higher grades.

San Miguel School
403 El Camino Real
Socorro, New Mexico 87801

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, San Miguel Parish

Population served: K, 1, 2, 6, 7, 8

Enrollment: 133 students

Languages: English, Spanish

Time Allocation: Spanish classes taught twice weekly
   Primary classes: 20 minutes per session
   Upper grades: 30 minutes per session

The language program at San Miguel School is a bilingual (or equal value program) with emphasis on the development of both Spanish and English. The program seeks to allow an appreciation of the local culture, to develop a positive self-concept in those of Spanish background and an appreciation of cultural diversity in those of English speaking background. Instruction is meticulously detailed, including grammar, syntax, and spelling.
St. Elizabeth School
612 W 187th St.
New York, New York

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K-8
Enrollment: 634 students
Languages: Spanish, English
Time Allocation: Not specific

This school discontinued its program to teach children to read Spanish. In serving the Spanish speaking families who make up some ninety percent of its parents, the school provides a bilingual kindergarten teacher and Spanish speaking aides to work with small groups of children at other levels in reading and math.

Chinese Service Center Schools
Operating out of Columbia University and Fordham University
New York, New York and Bronx, New York

Affiliation: Independent
Population served: ages 5 to 16
Enrollment: 150 students
Languages: English, Chinese
Time Allocation: part-time Chinese and English language program, meets on Saturdays.

The Chinese Service Center Schools teach ESL to new arrived immigrants and local born Chinese children. The program seeks to develop oral and written competence in both English and Chinese.
Our Lady of Mt. Carmel School
2465 Bathgate Avenue
Bronx, N.Y., 10458

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K-8
Enrollment: 640 students
Language(s): English
Time Allocation: ESL classes vary from 40 to 60 minutes per session, two to five days per week.

Our Lady of Mt. Carmel School offers an ESL program designed to meet the needs of students who come from homes where a language other than English is spoken. It is hoped that the children who participate in this program will be able to perform successfully with peers of the same age and grade level in a classroom where English is the medium of instruction. All instruction is conducted in English.

Soterios Ellenas Parochial School
224 18th Street
Brooklyn, N.Y., 11215

Affiliation: Greek Orthodox, Kimisis Theotokou Greek Orthodox Church
Population served: K-8
Enrollment: 310 students
Languages: English, Greek
Time Allocation: Greek language instruction one hour per day, Greek culture instruction one period per week.

The Soterios Ellenas Parochial School offers a language program in which Greek is taught as a second language. The objective of this program is the development of oral and written language skills which will facilitate the perpetuation of ethnic and religious traditions. Some of the materials used in the program come from Greece (Ministry of Education and Religion); other materials are teacher prepared.
German American School Association
70-01 Fresh Pond Road
Ridgewood, New York 11385

Branches in: Ridgewood, Manhattan, Old Westbury, Yorktown, and White Plains

Affiliation: Independent
Population served: ages 6-18
Enrollment: 1,261 students
Language(s): German
Time Allocation: German classes with two weekly instruction periods of 55 minutes each are held after public school hours.

The German American School Association offers its students a part-time German language program. All instruction is conducted in German with emphasis on speaking, reading and writing.

Cincinnati Hebrew Day School
7855 Dawn Road
Cincinnati, Ohio 45237

Affiliation: Hebrew
Population served: K-8
Enrollment: 140 students
Language(s): English, Hebrew
Time Allocation: Hebrew is taught to all students. An ESL program is provided for Soviet immigrant students one-half of the school day.

In the past five years, the Cincinnati Jewish community has accepted approximately three hundred Soviet Jewish immigrant families for resettlement. The Cincinnati Hebrew Day School has helped in this resettlement by accepting the children into its programs. Many of the children entering did not speak, understand or read English. Some of the older children had studied English for a year or two in Russian schools.

An ESL program, in which all communication and instruction is in English, was developed to teach reading, language, and self-expression. The goal is to integrate the children into regular classrooms on grade level as quickly as possible. Since Hebrew is an important part of the school program, a special Hebrew program was also developed for these students to teach prayers, customs, reading and vocabulary.
St. Michael's School
3146 Scranton Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44109

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, Diocese of Cleveland
Population served: K-8
Enrollment: 250 children
Language(s): English
Time Allocation: Daily ESL instruction, 30-60 minutes per session depending on the needs of the individual student.

At present, St. Michael's ESL program is servicing 48 children in grades K-4. The program emphasizes English language development with a focus on oral communication and reading. Instruction is in English, however, the certified ESL teacher and bilingual staff has the ability to communicate with children and parents in their native language (Spanish).

Immaculate Conception School
926 North Osage Drive
Tulsa, OK 74106

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K-8
Enrollment: 187 students
Language(s): English
Time Allocation: English instruction for foreign students is held three hours per day in small groups (2 to 3 students per group).

The Immaculate Conception School attempts to provide a total education for each child by bringing the academic and religious spheres together. The school serves a multi-ethnic, multi-racial student population. The primary objective of its language program is to have each student attain English fluency which will enable him or her to cope with a standard school curriculum.
Pacific Northwest Bilingual Christian School
1480 Laurel Street
Woodburn, Oregon
Affiliation: Christian
Population served: K-8
Languages: English, Spanish
Time Allocation: Language help is provided until students feel confident in the second language.

The language program at the Pacific Northwest Bilingual Christian School is a bilingual or equal value program with emphasis on the development of both English and Spanish. The teachers use the native language (English or Spanish) as a bridge to the target language (Spanish or English). Help is provided to students until they feel confident in the second language. It is the faculty's experience that some students feel confident after several months, others take a year, perhaps two. Instruction is through immersion. Materials include commercial publications, teacher-prepared materials, and the "Senda" reading program.

Sacred Heart School
4th and Pine Streets
Allentown, PA
Affiliation: Roman Catholic, Sacred Heart Parish
Population served: K-8
Languages: English, Spanish
Time Allocation: Language instruction time varies according to grade level and need.

Sacred Heart School offers both an ESL and Title I program designed to aid their students in language development and self-concept building. The children are encouraged to maintain their native language, while simultaneously developing English proficiency. Most of the instructional materials are prepared by the teachers.
Forman Hebrew Day School
Foxcroft and York Roads
Elkins Park, PA 19117

Affiliation: Hebrew, Solomon Schechter Day School
Population served: K-6
Enrollment: 139 students
Languages: English, Hebrew
Time Allocation: Two and one-half hours per day are devoted to Judaic studies, including Hebrew language.

The Forman Hebrew Day School offers a dual curriculum in general and Judaic studies. The Judaic studies component offers students the opportunity to learn Hebrew and use it to the degree possible during the Judaic studies portion of the day. Emphasis is placed on first, developing Hebrew reading and writing skills, later, speech.

Congregation Shaare Shamayim
Philadelphia, PA

Affiliation: Hebrew
Population served: 1-7
Languages: Hebrew, English
Time Allocation: 2 hours a day, 3 days per week

The part time program offers 6 hours per week of instruction in oral and written Hebrew, covering Judaic cultural and religious traditions and ideals. Both the direct method and the grammar translation method are used in teaching Hebrew to students, most of whom are English-speaking.

Reform Congregation Keneseth Israel Religious School
Elkins Park, PA

Affiliation: Hebrew, Reform Congregation Keneseth Israel
Population served: 4-7
Enrollment: 300 students
Languages: English, Hebrew
Time Allocation: part-time program, two days per week after public school day

The purpose of this religious school is to teach rudiments of the Hebrew language and prepare students for Bar and Bat Mitzvah. English is spoken in class; Hebrew is emphasized as a tool for reading prayer books, rather than a spoken language. The grammar-translation method is used.
German Language School of Immanuel Lutheran Church
Southampton & Worthington Roads
Philadelphia, PA

Affiliation: Church related
Population: ages 4-15
Languages: English, German

Time Allocation: Part-time German language program meeting on Saturdays from 9:30 - 12:00, September through May.

The German Language School of Immanuel Lutheran Church offers a part-time language program. It is designed to teach basic German skills to children with no previous knowledge of the language, and to improve skills in reading, grammar and conversation of children from German speaking families. English is used as a bridge to the target language, German. The lower grades use the audio-lingual method of instruction; the upper grades use grammar-translation. The program uses teacher prepared materials and commercially prepared texts which are printed in Germany. In addition, the German Consulate in New York provides monthly filmstrips and tapes.

Saint Veronica School
33521 N. Sixth Street
Philadelphia, PA 19140

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: PK-8
Enrollment: 560 students
Languages: English, Spanish

Time allocation: Varies according to which language program the student is enrolled in.

To meet the needs of these multi-ethnic students, St. Veronica School offers three types of language programs:

1) Monolingual (Spanish) students spend time at the Carlo Center until they can function in English.

2) Children experiencing difficulty with English are enrolled in ESOL classes provided by Title I.

3) All children in the school study Spanish as a regular subject.
German Language School
Of Reading Liederkranz
Liederkranz Clubhouse
814-36 Chestnut St.
Reading, PA

Affiliation: Liederkranz Club
Population served: ages 6-12, also adults
Languages: English, German
Time Allocation: Language instruction - one hour per week.

The German Language School offers a language program designed to develop, primarily oral, German language skills and to foster ethnic identity and an understanding of German culture.

Red Cloud Indian School
Pine Ridge, South Dakota
57770

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, Holy Rosary Mission
Jesuit Fathers of Wisconsin Province
Population served: pre K - 8
Enrollment: 228 students
Languages: English, Lakota
Time Allocation: Lakota language and cultural instruction, 30 minutes per day for pre-schoolers, 45 minutes per day for elementary, 40 minutes, 3 days per week for middle school.

The Red Cloud Indian School is located on the Pine Ridge Reservation, a Sioux community, whose native language is Lakota. Lakota language and culture are highly prized. There is a community desire to preserve Lakota which is used with decreasing frequency among the younger generations. To address this wish, Red Cloud instituted an equal value bilingual program in the elementary grades.

The program teaches the usual subjects in English, and provides instruction in the Lakota language and culture. The language component consist of grammar-translation and drill. Emphasis is placed on basic vocabulary and pronunciation which is taught through legends told in English with Lakota words interwoven. It is hoped that this program will enable the students to form a clear image of their identity as a Lakota Sioux and that this image will be a continuing source of pride.
El Paso Hebrew School
22' E. Cliff Drive
El Paso, Texas 79902

Affiliation: Hebrew
Population served: K-6
Enrollment: 57 students
Languages: English, Hebrew
Time Allocation: Hebrew language is closely intertwined with the 13+ hours devoted to Judaic studies.

Language learning is integral to the purposes of the El Paso Hebrew School as the administration feels it is the mainstay for teaching Judaic tradition and culture. The school offers a Hebrew language program which teaches Hebrew as it is used in the Bible, prayerbooks and as a modern language.

English is used as a bridge to the target language, Hebrew. The grammar translation method is also employed: students are provided with readers and given the opportunity to do translations and develop vocabulary. It is hoped that students leaving the school will have learned enough Hebrew to appreciate that it is the prime medium of Jewish expression, and be able to use the language for reading and oral communication.

Beth Yeshurun Day School
4225 Beechnut Boulevard
Houston, Texas 77096

Affiliation: Hebrew
Population served: 1-6
Enrollment: 360 students
Languages: English, Hebrew
Time Allocation: Two hours per day are spent on the study of Hebrew, Jewish customs, and traditions.

The Beth Yeshurun Day School seeks to provide its students with an excellent program of general education in conjunction with a strong program of Judaic studies. Hebrew language instruction is a component of the Judaic studies program.
St. Michael's School  
319 East Washington Street  
Levelland, Texas 79336  

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, Diocese of Amarillo  
Population served: Pre K-8  
Enrollment: 133 students  
Languages: English, French, Spanish, American sign language  

Time Allocation: ESL program on an individualized basis. Spanish is taught as a subject, twice per week. French is taught to 13 and 14 year olds. American sign language is incorporated into curriculum.

At St. Michael's, the administration and faculty highly respect both English and Spanish and believe that children who come from bilingual homes should not be forced to use English at all times. With this idea in mind, a bilingual program was instituted which is individualized and ESL in nature. It is designed to teach English to those children who come to school speaking only Spanish. The program also tries to make the children aware of their native language and culture. Spanish is taught as a subject twice a week. It is hoped that students will value being multi-lingual.

St. Patrick School  
2116 Lowry  
Lufkin, Texas 75901  

Affiliation: Roman Catholic  
Population served: K-8  
Languages: English, Spanish  

Time Allocation: ESL classes are held daily, 45 minutes per session.

St. Patrick's currently has twenty-five students enrolled whose home language is Spanish. They are given daily ESL classes in which Spanish is used as a bridge toward English. After two years, these students are mainstreamed into regular classrooms where language development is continued.
Immaculate Conception School
305 North Britton Ave.
Rio Grande City, Texas 78582

Affiliation: Roman Catholic, Sisters of Mercy
Population served: Grades 1 - 6
Enrollment: 182 students
Languages: English, Spanish
Time Allocation: One period per day is devoted to Spanish instruction.

The Immaculate Conception School offers a language program in which Spanish is taught as a second language. It is integrated into the curriculum for one period per day, at which time, reading, writing and vocabulary development are stressed. At all other times during the school day English language development is emphasized.

St. Joseph School
Burlington, VT.

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K-8
Enrollment: 175 Students
Languages: English, French
Time Allocation: French instruction one hour per week.

St. Joseph School offers its 7th and 8th grade students a French language program designed to prepare them for high school language course work. This enrichment program is conducted one hour per week and includes oral and written language development.
St. Francis Xavier School
Winooski, VT

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K-6
Enrollment: 270 students
Languages: English, French

Time Allocation: French language is taught for enrichment.
- 1st grade: 10 minutes per day
- 2 - 5: 20 minutes per day
- 6 - 8: 30 minutes per day

St. Francis Xavier School offers its students a French language program aimed at developing language skills and preserving cultural heritage and awareness. The community's parents are particularly pleased with this program; it affords their children an opportunity to speak in French to their grandparents who are predominantly French-speaking.

St. Joseph School
Yakima, Washington

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
- 1981-1982 joined with Yakima School District #17 as a member of a Bilingual Basic Project

Languages: English, Spanish

Time Allocation: Daily Instruction in bilingual resource room

St. Joseph School provides its limited English proficiency students a bilingual multicultural program of instruction in a bilingual resource room. The program seeks to develop English language proficiency while simultaneously developing Spanish language skills. The school tries to develop a positive self-concept among its students and an appreciation of their cultural heritage.
Bruce Guadalupe Community School
825 N. Van Buren
Milwaukee, WI 53201

Affiliation: Independent
Population served: K-8
Enrollment: 86 students
Languages: English, Spanish
Time Allocation: ESL is taught to Spanish-speaking students. Spanish as a second language is taught to English speaking students. Instruction is given between 40-80 minutes per day.

The primary purpose of the Bruce Guadalupe Community School is to provide quality education in both Spanish and English to Hispanic students. The school offers a bilingual program which places equal emphasis on the development of oral and written skills in Spanish and English skills. The method of instruction varies and is usually chosen by the individual classroom teacher. One aspect worth mentioning is the method of instruction used in social studies classes. They are conducted simultaneously in English and Spanish; students participate by asking questions in both languages.

Academia San Jose High School
Calle A #32
Villa Caparra
Guaynabo, P.R. 00657

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: 9 - 12
Languages: English, Spanish
Time Allocation: A formal English class is held 55 minutes per day. All other subjects are taught in English.

English is taught as a first language at the Academia San Jose High School. The students are taught to express themselves correctly in an English atmosphere and to prepare for college. Most students go on to college in the United States.
Academia San Jose Elementary  
Villa Caparra M-215  
Guaynabo, P.R. 00657  

Affiliation: Roman Catholic  
Population served: K - 8  
Enrollment: 1,000 students  
Languages: English, Spanish  
Time Allocation: Language instruction is conducted 50-60 minutes daily  

Academia San Jose Elementary seeks to develop in its students an ability to communicate and receive meaningful instruction in English. The school offers a two level bilingual program:  

1. English as a first language which is oriented to the needs of second language students  
2. An advanced group in which English is taught in all subjects by seventh grade  

At all levels grammar, reading comprehension, and oral skills are taught. Intensity varies, depending on ability and grade level of the students.  

Academia Maria Reina  
College Park, Rio Piedras  
Puerto Rico  

Affiliation: Roman Catholic  
Population served: 7-12  
Enrollment: 378  
Languages: English, Spanish  

This college preparatory school uses English as the first language. All textbooks are in English but all subjects are taught in Spanish. The school is owned by a board of parents and conducted by the sisters of St. Joseph.
Colegio Sagrados Corazones
Guaynabo
Puerto Rico

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population Served: K-12
Enrollment: 885 students
Time Allocation: Elementary level has 6 classes per week for 45 minutes each, and the secondary level has 7 classes per week that average 60 minutes each.

This college preparatory school serving middle income families offers instruction in Spanish, with English taught as a second language. In elementary classes, the math texts are in English; in high school, the science and math texts are in English. The attention given to English increases from a conversational class in kindergarten to a more intensive schedule of classes from grade 9 through 12. Effectiveness is shown by student test scores and increased interest in reading books in English, as shown in library records.

Colegio Nuestra Senora de Belin
Caparro Heights
Puerto Rico

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population Served: K-12
Enrollment: 1,100 students
Languages: Spanish, English
Time Allocation: English class for 50 minutes per day

While the school serves students from K-12, only the 9-12 program is described here. This pre-college program serving lower to upper middle income families, is conducted almost entirely in Spanish with textbooks in English. Only English classes are taught in English. The school has three English teachers, one a native speaker and two who are bilingual speakers. The school demonstrates its success by its ability to place students in U.S. and Puerto Rican colleges and universities.
Colegio San Antonio Abad
Humacao, P.R. 00926

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: 7 - 12
Languages: English, Spanish
Time Allocation: ESL is taught 45 minutes per day

Colegio San Antonio Abad is a college preparatory school. It offers its students an ESL program designed to develop oral and written language skills which will enable them to continue their studies in the U.S.A. or Puerto Rico.

Colegio San Antonio
Rio Piedras, P.R. 00926

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K - 12
Languages: English, Spanish
Time Allocation: A formal English class is held 45 minutes per day.

The Colegio San Antonio is a college preparatory school. Most of the classes are taught in Spanish; some (Social Studies and Math) use English textbooks. English is taught in a formal language class, with emphasis on developing strong communication skills. Fifty percent of the graduating students enter colleges in the United States.

Colegio San Jose
Rio Piedras, P.R.

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: Boys, 7-12
Enrollment: 620 students
Languages: English, Spanish
Time Allocation: A formal English class is held one period per day.

At Colegio San Jose, a high priority is placed on preparing for post-high school studies. Spanish is taught as the primary language, English as second language. Nevertheless, the English program is broad, seeking to develop reading, writing, and speaking skills to such a degree that students can use English to pursue higher education.
Colegio San Luis Rey  
Calle 43 SE Final  
Repto Metropolitano  
Rio Piedros, P.R.  

Affiliation: Roman Catholic  
Population served: Pre K - 8  
Languages: English, Spanish  
Time Allocation: ESL taught in all grades, Pre-K and K - 30 minutes per day; upper grades - 50 minutes per day. Additional time is spent in resource center.  

The students who attend Colegio San Luis Rey are from middle and upper class homes where the ability to speak English is highly valued. Appreciating this, the school offers an English language program beginning at the pre-K level and continuing throughout the eighth grade. English is taught as a second language through formal classes and a Resource Room. Oral skills are stressed at the pre-K and Kindergarten levels. Reading and writing skills are introduced in the upper grades.

Santa Teresita  
Naranjito  
Puerto Rico  

Affiliation: Roman Catholic  
Population served: 7-12  
Enrollment: 150 students  
Languages: Spanish, English  
Time Allocation: 50 minutes per day -- English class  

This school serves students from middle and lower-income families coming largely from public schools in rural areas. The dedicated but often inexperienced teaching staff offers instruction in English using the "English for Today" series. Students returning from the states are given special assistance with the all-Spanish curriculum. The school attempts to give the students both a facility in English and an openness to the English-speaking culture.
University of Sacred Heart School
Box 12383 Lozía Station
San Juan, P.R. 00914

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K-12
Languages: English, Spanish
Time Allocation: On the elementary level English is taught fifty-five minutes per day. On the secondary level, two hours per day, three days per week.

At the University of Sacred Heart School, English is taught as a second language. There is a formal English class in which grammar is emphasized through literature. All other subjects are taught in Spanish.

Angeles Custodios
Rio Piedras
Puerto Rico

Affiliation: Roman Catholic
Population served: K-12
Enrollment: 600 students
Languages: English, Spanish
Time Allocation: 45 minutes per day - English

At present, Angeles Custodios is trying to develop a good bilingual program. Instruction is given mostly in Spanish. English classes are held for 45 minutes each day. The school serves middle and lower income families with religious and lay teachers including 8 Title I teachers. The current focus is on developing the English curriculum.
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Site Visit Procedures

A Working Document

The following notes have been prepared to assist you, the project field staff, in conducting the site visits. Because the kinds of schools being visited are varied, the procedures recommended here are meant to serve as a general guide to be adapted to each school according to the judgment of the field staff. While specific questions are presented, these notes are not to be read as a structured interview guide. Reference materials are included here for your background reading.

Procedures to be Followed in Advance of the Visit

A letter has been sent to each site by the project director (see attachment A) to the principal or contact person in advance of your initial phone contact. In this initial contact, you should review the information submitted by the school ("Now, let me see, your school has ...") and then set a date for the site visit.

Attachment B presents a follow-up letter you should send the school after the date has been set. It asks the principal to notify several parents (6) and board members (3) of your visit and/or phone contact with them. It also informs the principal of your interest in looking at the following documents -- where possible:

- press clippings about the school
- book lists
- curriculum guides
- student, faculty, and parent handbooks
- parent organization meetings, schedules, and minutes
- minutes of board or governance committee meetings
• aptitude and achievement test scores
• enrollment statistics
• descriptive brochures
• newsletters to parents

Where possible, obtain copies of the documents to take with you, assuming all xeroxing costs.

Procedures to be Followed During the Visit

You should arrange your travel to enable you to be on hand at the opening of the school day. Arrange for a meeting with the principal first. Obtain all available documents during this meeting. Visit with teachers and students during recess, lunch, or after school. Meet with the parents and board members in person or by phone after school or in the early evening. Make notes on the available documents as time permits throughout the day. Observe a few classes briefly (say three 1/2-hour visits) to sample patterns in language use.

The questions to be asked are presented below for each category of respondents, e.g., principal, teacher, student, etc. The overlap is deliberate. (See the Proposal, B-21, Quality Control.) Information should be verified where possible by cross-checking with several sources. Again, it must be noted that the following questions are general guides for your assistance and not a formal interview schedule. While you are encouraged to explore interesting leads, be sure that all of the following questions are asked in some form.

You might tape your meeting with the principal. If that is awkward, take rough notes which you can then dictate into a tape recorder after the interview. This procedure is recommended for all other interviews. You need to set up your own response recording forms.
Questions for the Principal

First of all, ask the principal for the documents listed above -- provided these are available and not considered confidential.

Ask for a brief history(2)* of the school -- when it was founded? By whom? What were the reasons for starting the school? Are the purposes the same today as then? If it is not mentioned, ask about the role of language learning in the founding of the school.

Ask about the governance structure. (2) Is there a board or sponsoring body? How much authority does the principal have? In what areas? Are language group representatives involved in the governance structure?

Ask about the funding of the school(3) Inquire about the availability of annual reports with financial data. What sources of income other than tuition and fees are available? Does the school receive government aid -- in money or services? Does the school benefit at all from local public school resources?

Review briefly the information submitted earlier on the school. Then ask the principal's views(4) on the importance of (bilingual) language learning. Push to get some clear view of its status. Is it a peripheral program or is it integral to the purposes of the school?

What attracts people to the school? (5) How do most people, e.g., teachers, parents, rate the purposes of the school? How does language learning relate to these purposes? (6) (Reference documents: brochures, newsletters.) How does the principal communicate the school's purposes to present and prospective patrons? (7) Is there generally agreement about all parties on what the school is "all about?" Does the school community work well together? (8) (See Erickson on social cohesion, p. 134.)

*Numbers keyed to list of numbered questions in earlier working paper.
Do the parents seem interested in the bilingual instructional activities? How does this interest or lack of interest show itself? If interested, — what is the basis for the interest? With what community values is bilingual instruction associated? What are the language use patterns in the community? In general, do the parents support the school? See Erickson (p. 131-134) for helpful follow-up questions. How dependent is the school on parental support apart from tuition and fees? See Erickson on the concept of jeopardy (p. 115-119). Do the parents see the school as dependent on them for survival? Does the school expect certain things from the parents? If so, how does the school communicate to the parents what is expected of them? To what extent do the parents see the school as "their school" -- responsive to their concerns? See Erickson (p. 124-125) for some helpful questions. In general, do the parents favor a highly structured approach to classroom teaching or a more flexible, open classroom approach? How, concerning the students, what kinds of families do they come from -- in terms of income, occupation of parents, stability within the home, mobility? What languages are spoken at home? What are the L1 and L2 levels of proficiency of students as they enter school? What are the educational goals of their families? How many language groups are represented in the student body? How do these groups interact? Do the students see this school as special? more demanding? (See Erickson, p. 156-157.)
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About teachers' backgrounds, ask what are the L₁ and L₂ levels of proficiency among the staff (teachers, aides, administrators)? How much training have the teachers had? How experienced are the teachers in general? in language learning programs? (Are resumes available?) How are teachers recruited? Are they from the local community that supports the school? Do teachers perceive the school as having a special mission (see Erickson, p. 128)? Do teachers feel rewarded with the evident success of their students (see Erickson, p. 138-139)? Do teachers favor a very orderly and structured approach to classroom teaching? How do teachers value L₁ and L₂? What is provided for staff development?

About the bilingual programs, ask what kind of program the school offers -- ESL? Transitional? etc. How much emphasis is placed on developing L₁ and L₂? In rank order, which are the important cognitive and affective objectives of the program? How are objectives set? What kind of consensus is there concerning objectives? Can specific activities be identified with specific objectives? What is the pattern of language use in the program? Who uses L₁ and L₂ for what purpose? How frequently? Is written and AV material available in both L₁ and L₂? How much time is devoted to language learning? How is it scheduled? How long does the program run? One year? Throughout all grades? Which method(s) is/are employed? at what levels? (See the Woodford paper included here.) Are methods followed consistently or switched frequently? Who chooses the method? How prepared is the teacher to use the method? Are interesting "new" methods or techniques in use?
What kinds of materials are used in the program? Who selects them? (49)

What access does the school have to available materials? (50) Do teachers devise their own materials? (51) Does the school have access to resources in the area for materials and related support services? (52) What kind of linkage has the school established with outside resource providers? (53)

For the bilingual programs, what evidence of success is available in terms of test results? Subsequent performance? Improved attitudes toward school (retention)? Evidence of high levels of morale? Higher aspiration level and increased self-confidence? (54) (Review test scores to record score gains) Are students who complete the school's program bilingual? (55) Are students who complete the school's program proficient in English? (56)
Questions for Teachers

If at all possible, meet with at least three teachers -- individually where schedules permit or, as a last resort, in a group session.

Ask about the support given to language learning and bilingual instruction.(4)

Ask about their views on what attracts parents and students to the school(5) and whether bilingual instruction contributes to this attractiveness.(6) How do they rank the various purposes of the schools?(5) Ask about how well the school community works together (see Erickson, p. 134-135, on social cohesion and p. 136-138 on teacher commitment).(8) To what extent does the school's supporting community value language learning? Is language learning associated with important community values?(5) Ask whether they see parents favoring a more structured or a more open approach to classroom instruction,(16) Which do they themselves favor?(32)

Ask about the students. What is the SES level of the students?(17) What are the L1 and L2 levels of proficiency of incoming students?(18) What is the educational aspiration level of the students?(15) How many language groups are represented on the student body?(22) Do all language groups seem to feel as if they "belong" at the school?(23) How do language groups interact?(25)

Then ask the teachers about their backgrounds. What are their L1 and L2 levels of proficiency?(26) How experienced are they in general? in language learning programs?(27) How much training have the teachers had?(28) How were they recruited? Are they from the local community that supports the school?(29) Do they perceive the school as having a special mission (see Erickson as above)?(30) Do they feel rewarded with the evident success of their students (see Erickson as above)?(31)
How do they value $L_1$ and $L_2$? What is provided for staff development?

On the bilingual programs, the questions are the same as those asked of the principal. What kinds of programs do the school offer? ESL? Transitional? etc. (See pages 5 and 6 preceding.)
Questions for Parents/Board members

Parents and board members will be contacted either at school, if they stop by, or by phone after school or in the early evening.

First, thank the parents and board members for their willingness to be interviewed. (For board members only -- ask them to describe their role in the governance of the school.) What kinds of decisions do they make, if any? Are they decision making or advisory only groups?

Ask the parents and board members what attracts people to the school? In rank order, what are the purposes of the school? How does language learning relate to these purposes? How does the school communicate its benefits to its patrons? Do teachers, parents, and students work well together (see Erickson as above)? Does the school’s supporting community value language learning? Is language learning tied to other important values? In what ways do parents and community members actively support the school? How clearly does the school let parents know what is expected of them? How dependent is the school on parental contributions (see Erickson on jeopardy as above)? Do parents see the school as dependent on them for survival? What are the language use patterns among the parents and supporting community? Do parents see the school as responsive to their concerns as "their" school? Do the parents favor a more structured, orderly approach or a more flexible, open approach to classroom instruction?

Ask the parents and board members about their educational aspirations for these children. In their view, do students seem to see this school as special -- more demanding? Do students seem to feel their teachers
Questions for Students

Please use your own judgment about talking to students. In elementary school, clearly you should talk with the older students. In every case, talk with students who appear to belong to a language minority.

Ask the students what is special about this school. Is this school "harder" than the public school? Is the language program a part of what is special? Do students and teachers get along with each other here? Is there a real school spirit? Do the teachers seem more "committed" (see Erickson, p. 144-147)? Do they seem fair?

What languages do the students and their families speak at home? In the neighborhood? Do students from different language groups seem to feel they "belong" at this school? How do these different groups of students get along?

Ask the language minority students whether the principal and any teachers or aides use the students' native language? If so, find out in what circumstances this is likely to happen. Do the teachers encourage students to use their native language and consider skill in that (target) language an asset? How much time, if any, is spent in class in learning the target language?

Inquire and observe how proficient the students are both in English and the target language.
are more committed than teachers in other schools? (21) Do teachers give the impression that they perceive the school as having a special mission? (30) Do students feel that teachers are really fair with them? (24) Do all language groups seem to feel as if they "belong" at the school? (23)

Procedures to be Followed after the Visit

After the visit, be sure to send a personal thank-you note to the principal or contact person at the school. Dictate your notes from the visit on a tape cassette (not a dictaphone tape) and send them to the Boston office. Do not take the time to have your notes typed. We can work from your tape. Please give as much information as you can about each question. Also, please send along any documents you collect.
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INTRODUCTION

The Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP) is a research and development project designed to find ways of improving the school performance of educationally 'at-risk' Hawaiian children and using these results to help public schools better serve this population. A central question that the KEEP project poses is one that concerns every community in a society as diverse as ours: Whose responsibility is it to build bridges between the culture of a community and the culture of the school? Is it chiefly the young child's responsibility to adjust to the new and different demands encountered upon entering the public school? KEEP is important as an example of a deliberate attempt to take account of the cultural background and abilities developed in the community, and to design an instructional program which is both culturally congruent with community practices and manageable in the public schools.

In January 1981, as a team of six people, we had the opportunity to observe KEEP at first hand. The study team was deliberately diverse: an educational psychologist, a sociolinguist, a psychologist, an educational linguist, an educational administrator and a foundation program officer. Four of the group had been public school teachers; one
member was Hispanic, one Black; all had been involved in research, development and training in the education of children from minority cultures. We did not agree about every aspect of the program, but there was consensus that what we had seen was sufficiently important that a report should be prepared for wider dissemination. The project is now known only to a small group of educators and social scientists; a report could make it known to more people and help others to think about the implications of KEEP's work for other children.

We found at KEEP a sustained effort—maintained over a decade and still going—to find out how to increase the chances of school success for the children of a community where educational success is not noteworthy. The modifications the project is making are not radical; rather, they involve subtle alterations in traditional roles and procedures and in the instructional emphases in the teaching of the critical school skill of literacy. KEEP is more specific than many other programs—not necessarily more prescriptive—about which teaching practices are important for children's learning.

It is not clear how much KEEP's progress can be attributed to practices in the educational program that are specific to Hawaiian children and how much to instructional elements that, properly adapted, might work equally well with other populations. Individual elements of the program can be found in operation in a number of mainland schools. In the spirit of the project, our interest is not to try to single out one or the other feature that best explains the program's success, but to encourage discussion.
of the different components that, in some combination, seem to comprise
the necessary and sufficient ingredients for effective instruction.
Unacceptably low levels of educational performance still confront many
schools in the United States. To learn about the Kamehameha Early
Education Project is to learn as much about its unwillingness to settle
for low achievement and about the spirit of inquiry that animates its
work as it is to learn about specific program components. We hope this
account will help others to share in some measure in the analysis of a
venture that has challenged, questioned and pushed our own beliefs
and assumptions.

This report has 6 main sections. The first narrates the historical
background on the multidisciplinary research that has led to the present
program, and reports the various comparisons KEEP has made in evaluating
its program and the results they have obtained so far. Second is a brief
description of a typical morning in a KEEP classroom, which sets the stage
for more extended discussion of two program components: the direct
instruction of comprehension and the social organization of the classroom.
The third section, on direct instruction in comprehension, discusses in
some detail the reading program that has evolved at KEEP, explores alternative
explanations for its success, and ends with a report of a test we asked the
staff to administer to a few KEEP laboratory school students. The fourth
section, on the social organization of the classroom, suggests new meanings
for the term "social" in teaching and learning, and includes discussions of
the complex relationships between ethnographic research and educational
innovation. In the fifth section, the laboratory teachers' roles in KEEP's
development are described, followed by a picture of the training processes that evolved, moving from training in the laboratory school to the training now underway in cooperating public schools. The sixth and last section, the conclusion, pulls together some of the themes highlighted in the report, and includes a brief discussion of the costs of KEEP, a subject not discussed on our trip.*

*Because so many of the documents about KEEP are not widely available, readers may be especially interested in the Spring, 1981 issue of Educational Perspectives, devoted entirely to KEEP, with contributions from KEEP researchers and one outside commentator, Isabelle Beck. See Appendix A for the Table of Contents of that issue, and information on how to obtain it.
HISTORY AND RESEARCH BACKGROUND

History

The population of the Hawaiian Islands today is highly diverse. Changes in the basis of the census classifications make it difficult to be exact about changes in the population membership. Depending on how data are collected, approximately 20% is estimated to be of Hawaiian or part Hawaiian ancestry or to identify themselves as ethnically Hawaiian. Once primarily an agricultural and fishing people, the native Hawaiian communities have experienced social and economic dislocation in the process of adapting to the demands of a modern industrial and business oriented society. Conflict between the traditional and modern ways of living is particularly manifest in those areas that are heavily ethnic Hawaiian. Some have adapted themselves easier than others; and, as in other communities in transition, the children of the families adhering closest to the traditional ways are likely to experience the greatest discontinuities when they move into the culture of the school. For children of these families, transition can be abrupt. How the school responds to the differences children bring to school can be of paramount importance in the child's willingness to participate in classroom activities.

It was an awareness of the crucial nature of the gap between the home and the dominant culture that first led social scientists and educators to undertake investigations of community life among the Hawaiian ancestry families. Begun in the mid 1960's, these interdisciplinary community studies looked at modes of teaching and learning in the home and in the school and used this information to frame initial questions about discrepancies between styles of
learning in the home and educational performance in school. The starting assumptions of these studies were that the Hawaiian-ancestry families were bi-cultural, that their cultural differences were not deficits but preferred differences in life style and modes of behavior, and that bi-culturalism did not have to be a barrier to participation in modern society. Rather, understanding of the differences might offer insights into ways of creating school environments in which children could learn to participate in the larger society. The school could learn to modify its practices in ways that would enable the children to become successful learners of school tasks, just as they were successful learners of home and community tasks.

By 1970 the Hawaiian community was showing an increasing concern over the poor academic achievement of children from low income homes. Since the 1880's a small percentage of native Hawaiian children had been educated at the Kamehameha Schools, a non-public educational program established by a Trust of the last descendant of the Kamehameha dynasty of Hawaiian monarchs, Bernice Pauahi Bishop. These schools had selected their students from among the most advantaged; and it is now time, said the community, that the Trust (the Bishop estate) turn its attention to the more disadvantaged children, most of whom attend public schools. Building on the findings of the earlier community studies, in 1971 the Trust created the Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP) as a research and development project aimed at finding ways of improving the school performance of the educationally at-risk Hawaiian children and using the results to help the public schools better serve this population.

KEEP's main task was to uncover the reasons for the widespread failure
in learning to read and, based on that understanding, to develop an instructional program in which children could be more successful. Systematic observations of learning behavior in the community and in the school, starting with kindergarten in 1972, focused on the child's interactions with adults and other children. As in earlier studies, the research team was multidisciplinary: it involved anthropologists, psychologists, linguists, educational researchers and teachers. It was collaborative and interactive; observations fed into the design of experiments and in turn those findings fed back into new hypotheses and new questions. The orientation of the KEEP team was problem-solving: a systematic search for clues to understanding what goes wrong and an openness to examining why something worked when it did, a reiterative process that Frederick Erickson (1977) has since referred to as "analytic detective work."

The very practical goal of the research project led in 1973 to the opening in Honolulu of an experimental laboratory school, known as Ka Na'i Pono,* purposely designed to facilitate the coordination of research and its applications to classroom design. The intake population - kindergarten through third grade - was planned so that 75% of the children would be from an urban area where many Hawaiian children are "at risk".** Three fourths of the families were receiving financial assistance; few youths complete high school and fewer (about 5%-7%) attend college -- a picture not unlike that of other disadvantaged minority communities in mainland USA.

* The name "Ka Na'i Pono" means "to strive for excellence." It was given to the school through a traditional practice - it came in a dream to a Hawaiian elder. ** In recent statewide testing, the modal fourth grade scores in schools with high Hawaiian and other Polynesian enrollments are in the tenth percentile. KEEP estimates that some 35,000 children compose the ethnic Hawaiian at-risk public school population.
From the beginning, the research team was determined to find solutions that could work in the public schools. The search for practical alternatives was aided by participation in the research team of the teachers in the laboratory school and by locating the research space on the school site. Data collection was furthered by construction in the laboratory school building of an observational deck with audio and video equipment so that any interaction between teachers and children could be both directly observed and captured on tape. Conditions at the laboratory school otherwise conformed to those in the public school: pupil-teacher ratio, classroom size, resources and school calendar resembled public school conditions.*

Beginning in 1973 and over a period of four years of explorations, experimentation, design, reformulation, try out and revision, an educational program was developed and tested on successive classes of children enrolled in the laboratory school, and the results were compared with those of children of comparable backgrounds attending nearby public schools. By 1977 KEEP felt it had succeeded in identifying the essential features of an appropriate instructional program, one that was both culturally congruent with community practices and manageable in the public school. Data from the experimental groups were showing improvements in pupil performance, confirming the judgements of the staff as to the necessary and sufficient components of an effective reading and language arts program. Meanwhile, the staff had begun to explore the interest of public schools in communities with significant numbers of Hawaiian children; and strategies for moving the program into public school

*Because the reading/language arts teachers in the lab school are active collaborators in curriculum design and research they are in the classroom only in the mornings; other teachers carry out the rest of the primary curriculum in the afternoon.
field sites were formulated. Staff training was redesigned for a public school operation, and in 1978-79 the first public school field site began operation. As of the time of our visit, there were two public school sites, and three more were planned. The goal is state-wide dissemination through the seven districts that make up the public school system of the Islands, concentrating first on schools with 25% or more Hawaiian ancestry children where the achievement level is below the 40th percentile.

Research background

The research activities that contributed to the development of the KEEP program divide into roughly four phases: first, the basic ethnographic and linguistic studies that sought to understand and describe community culture, language and ways of learning and to consider their influence on the children's educational performance; second, the introduction of variations into the school program, observation of their effects on learning, experiments with potentially significant features and assessment of their results; third, transposition of the most promising features into a stable set of classroom practices and design of systems to ensure consistent application by teachers. A fourth stage, overlapping with the third and still underway, is the work of learning how to transfer the resulting program to public school contexts. Phases necessarily transcended the whole sequence of program development: some elements changed or took different forms as new data were collected and fed back from classroom observations. Thus, it
would be misleading to imply that this was a highly sequential and linear development. Although the ethnographic research came first, data from the community continued to inform subsequent inquiry and served as an important resource in helping the staff to interpret children's responses to classroom practices.

The ethnographic studies covered a five year period, concentrated on a community over 50% Hawaiian, and involved all day naturalistic observations in a small number of homes and interviews with parents. The focus was mothers and young children, family socialization patterns and relationships among children. In addition to the informal observations, direct observations were made of mothers' styles of teaching in a variety of games and learning tasks designed by the researchers. To supplement the data from the one community, interviews were conducted with a random sample of 100 households, parents and adolescents. From these investigations researchers learned that many Hawaiian children grow up in an environment of sibling caretaking and sibling work-groups; they have household tasks that they do cooperatively; interaction between mother and children is not characterized by extensive or elaborate verbal instructions. Children learn by observing the activities of older children, and they perform industriously and responsibly with a minimum of supervision. (Gallimore & Howard, 1968)

An early question that preoccupied the research team was whether linguistic differences in the native Hawaiian population - variation along a Hawaiian creole to standard English continuum - could explain some part of school failure, and whether standard English should be directly taught. Samples of children's speech were tape recorded by mothers in the home, supplemented by formal interviews with children, at home and in school.
Studies were conducted of children's responses on a variety of linguistic measures and of speech behavior in peer groups; and a study was made of the effects of direct instruction in standard English. Much was learned, but the linguistic research turned up no clear evidence that being bilinguial was a barrier to understanding or responding to school instruction. The overall conclusion was that speaking Hawaiian Creole is not a cause of school underachievement (Gallimore, 1977; Gallimore & Tharp, 1976; Speidel, 1981). Thus the research and development team would have to look beyond the forms of language for the roots of school learning problems.

Parallel with the ethnographic and linguistic studies in the Hawaiian communities, the research team studied the behavior of Hawaiian children in the regular public school classrooms and the nature of the instruction they received. Observations were made of the level of children's engagement in classroom activities, and the type of social interactions between children and teachers and among the children. The children were observed to be inattentive, uninvolved, frequently restless or aggressive and hostile. Several years of observation, some directly focused on teachers' efforts to control classrooms, seemed to support a prevailing stereotype of Hawaiian children as lazy, unmotivated, lacking in the abilities necessary for school work. The contrast between this classroom description and the industrious and helping behaviors the researchers had observed in the community constituted both a continuing stimulus for efforts to alter the classroom environment, and a guide for the staff in experimenting with new classroom structures and curriculum practices that would engage the natural abilities of the Hawaiian children.

The KEEP laboratory school setting provided the control over the instructional program necessary for the second and third phases of the
project -- experimentation with trial and error adjustments of elements in the classroom, and evaluation of their effects. Laboratory school teachers were selected who would not only have patience with ongoing investigations but who would also participate with the researchers in observing children's responses in class and who were willing to examine the effects of their own teaching styles. The practitioners' intimate practical knowledge enabled them to offer valued feedback to the research and development staff. Cooperation between researchers and teachers was greatly facilitated by the researchers' respect for classroom experience and their sympathetic evaluation of the teachers' reactions and suggestions.

The initial research task was to introduce variations into the social organization and curriculum, observe them in action, and document the conditions in which children would participate more readily in the classroom. Over time a number of potential new elements were tried out, and those that survived the practical realities of the school were retained, later to become candidates for the program design. Theory was sometimes a determiner of what was tried and at other times a resource in explaining the effects. Some changes were predictable from the ethnographic research; in other cases, the ethnographic data base helped to suggest reasons for the results obtained; in still others, explanations only came to light later on, after the staff had had ample opportunities to reflect on the whole course of events.

In introducing variations into classroom structures and curricula, KESB sought to learn how to organize an environment that would capture the Hawaiian child's attention and engage his abilities in school learning. How could the industriousness, learning abilities and work orientation the children displayed at home be applied to school work? How could out-of-school cooperation and self-regulation be made to function in the educational program?
If the children were displaying to the researchers age-appropriate verbal and cognitive abilities outside of school, what would it take to get them to apply those abilities in learning to read and meet the achievement expectations of the school? KEEP's answers assume that what had to change were the adult teaching styles that somehow conflicted with or prevented manifestation of the child's natural modes of learning. Thus, while the goal was to improve the child's school performance, the unit of project attention was not the learner but the teacher. Unlike many compensatory education programs that provide added services directly to children, KEEP saw its function as changing the adult-made structures that might be producing the observed low levels of child engagement.

Student industriousness became the first area of classroom experimentation because it represented an area in which successful program effects might lead to improvement of Hawaiian children's educational achievement with minimal alteration in the public schools. KEEP's initial research orientation was drawn directly from psychological learning theory and educational behavior analysis -- the application of learning theory techniques to the investigation and manipulation of children's and teacher's behavior in the classroom. Children's motivation was operationalized to mean the frequency of on-task behavior. Two techniques for increasing school motivation were implemented simultaneously: training the teaching staff in the use of behavior management techniques, especially positive social reinforcements of desirable student behaviors; and establishing a small group organization of classroom activities that permitted children more self-direction and self-management in their classroom work.

The first formal evaluation of these changes in classroom control and organization was conducted in 1976 with the reading curriculum then in
use -- a phonics or code-oriented basal reading series. The KEEP classrooms were clearly different from the public schools; According to Tharp (personal communication, 1/81) KEEP teachers use up to five times more praise than comparison public school teachers, and employ so little punishment that it cannot be reliably counted. The KEEP kindergarten and first-grade children's on-task rate increased (to about 90% of the time) relative to control-group public school children (about 65% of time). The use of behavioral management techniques was also associated with gains in WPPSI general intelligence test scores among children: children who previously scored in the subnormal verbal IQ range scored in the normal verbal IQ range after a one-year exposure to KEEP. However, examination of the effects of teacher management techniques on gains in students' reading achievement test scores (Gates-MacGinitie test), failed to show any positive effects. KEEP children's reading scores remained at or below the 15th percentile -- a pattern essentially the same as for public school children of Hawaiian background (Gallimore and Tharp, 1974; Tharp and Gallimore, 1976).

When, despite improvements in classroom management and increases in on-task behavior, reading scores continued to be low, the reading curriculum itself came under examination. It was suspected that the highly sequential small-step organization of the formal phonics reading curriculum required too much rule learning and adult verbal direction and lacked meaning for the children. And so the KEEP staff searched for "available alternatives that would have certain features: a small-group orientation, a focus on higher-order cognitive operations, and a psycholinguistic emphasis, including a lot of child language production." A program developed at the University of Arizona and in use at the Flowing Wells demonstration site in Tucson became the basis of KEEP's new comprehension-based reading program,
modified at KEEP in the light of the ethnographic studies and their own previous classroom research. "For example, we insisted that reading instruction must be small group, and not one-on-one tutorial, as was the Arizona proclivity" (R. Tharp, personal communication, 9/81).

The shift to a comprehension or meaning-emphasis approach to reading proved fortuitous in unanticipated ways. The children themselves showed the way by the pattern of their participation in small group story discussions, a pattern the KEEP staff subsequently analysed (with the help of independent sociolinguistic research by Watson 1975 and Watson-Gegeo & Boggs 1977) as related to an indigenous Hawaiian speech event called "talk story". The result is an explicit formulation of a bicultural classroom and the linking role of the teacher in helping children to apply their everyday experiences and knowledge to the content of school texts.

The process that KEEP went through in designing and trying out components of the new reading program has been described by Tharp (Tharp, 1981; Tharp & Gallimore, 1979). First written as an after-the-fact analysis of KEEP's evolutionary ad hoc processes, the formalized model has, according to Tharp, guided KEEP's work since 1977.

By 1977 the project had identified at least the potential features of a workable program that would be culturally compatible with community practices and more likely to engage the children in school learning than the traditional school reading programs. The initial try outs of the program were encouraging (after one year, test scores in one class went from the 23rd percentile to the 69th). But it took four years of successive trial and error, design and redesign and continuing evaluation, to establish
the essential features of the new curriculum and learn how to maintain them as stable elements of the KEEP school program.

The researchers and developers produced a diagnostic-prescriptive reading skills system, called the Kamehameha Reading Objectives System (Kros-Crowell et al, 1981 - see description in Appendix B) which includes a set of graded behavioral goals and a record system for keeping track of the progress of individual students. They also devised a quality control system for monitoring teaching practices. Together, these systems provide tools for formative evaluation of the program in operation and for feedback of information to teachers. With such records, data can guide the improvement of teaching and can also serve functions of public accountability.

Learning to implement and sustain the program in the classroom is hard work; it requires re-direction of teacher time and focus as well as re-arrangement of room organizations and use of new management tools. Accordingly, teacher training is itself approached as a research and development problem, and considerable investment is being made in studying the training process as KEEP extends its program into the public schools. A continuing question for the research and training groups is the degree of concentrated on-site support necessary for teachers to gain and maintain control over the program's essential features.

Program Evaluation

While KEEP is an educational program undergoing continued evolution,
the present instructional and organization design has reached the stage of stability where impact on learning can be evaluated. In contrast to formative research that produces information guiding the improvement of program elements, the term "program evaluation" is used at KEEP to refer to summative evaluation of the overall effects of the full program on student achievement. A deliberate decision was taken to use standardized tests as the primary outcome measure in order to evaluate the program in terms familiar to educational decision makers.

Three separate comparisons of reading achievement are available. First, comparisons were made of the test score performance of children who had been receiving the phonics-oriented basal reading program, children undergoing KEEP's transition from phonics to comprehension during their primary years, and cohorts of children who received only the new program emphasizing direct instruction in comprehension in small group learning centers. On standardized norm-referenced achievement tests, performance was significantly better for primary grade cohorts instructed after introduction of the comprehension approach, compared with those who experienced the phonics-oriented reading curriculum or part-phonics, part-comprehension.

Whether the small learning centers made a specific contribution to the outcomes, apart from the reading curriculum itself, is not clear. In the staff's view, the effects of individual features can be studied, but their independent contributions to the overall results cannot be evaluated because "they always occur in interaction with others". KEEP's view is that the learning center organization and reading program are interdependent elements: in this setting, at least, the centers are necessary to free the
teacher for direct teaching of comprehension while simultaneously encouraging peer group management of independent work.

KEEP also has made two comparisons of the effectiveness of the experimental program and the regular public school curriculum. These comparisons have taken two forms: first, comparisons of the achievement of KEEP laboratory school children with similarly selected children in a sampling of regular public schools; second, comparisons of children's performance in the KEEP-style program in its first year of implementation in two public schools with that of children in the regular program in the same schools.

Cohorts of children in grades one through three who received the KEEP program were compared with classes in public schools in the same area serving the same high risk disadvantaged population. Both groups were volunteers to the study. On a combination of Gates and Metropolitan tests, in the first year the experimental program was tried, 1976-77, first grade KEEP children scored at the 73rd mean percentile compared with a 30th percentile score for the public school controls. Similar differences were obtained during 77-78 at the second grade level, when the experimental group scored at the 61st percentile compared with the control public school score at the 27th percentile. 1978-79 scores, while not sustained at these initially very high levels, continue to show scores in favor of the KEEP groups at each grade level (Klein, 1981; Tharp, in press):

1978-79 Reading Test Scores (in percentiles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>KEEP</th>
<th>Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade One</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Two</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Three</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A number of factors might account for these differences. KEEP points to the specific features and elements of the program which, in combination, distinguish it from regular public school practices.*

Also contributing to the very early differences in outcome might be factors that inhere in experimental sites; for example test taking conditions, or the attention and recognition invariably given to teachers and children in special settings.

The second evaluation in public school settings was planned to test the sturdiness of the program in two different public schools and to find out how the features work when subject to local adaptations. The two schools were in rural and semi-rural communities where there are heavy concentrations of Hawaiian ancestry children. Children were assigned randomly, with two first grade classes using the KEEP program and two serving as controls. At the time of our visit, data was available for the first year of public school implementation, 1978-79. Although it is too soon to assess the durability over time of the cumulative effects on children, the first reports released in 1980 showed KEEP-taught children significantly exceeding controls on two standard measures of reading.

*Besides direct instruction of comprehension in small group learning centers, they include the consistent use of contingency reinforcement techniques, diagnostic prescriptive instruction with continuous feedback of data on student progress, a quality control system which monitors implementation of specific teaching practices, and the teacher training required to maintain the necessary classroom practices. Not mentioned but of possible consequence is the early start the KEEP program gives to reading in the kindergarten.
achievement (Tharp, 1981).

Moreover, data obtained in quality control monitoring of teaching behaviors (Au & Hao, in press) are currently being related to data from KEEP's own criterion referenced tests on a teacher-by-teacher basis. Results obtained to date indicate that public school teachers in the KEEP program do change their behaviors during small group instruction in desired ways, and that improvements in pupil performance accompany these changes (Au, personal communication, 9/81).

While these data in themselves are not sufficient grounds from which to draw firm conclusions about the program's comparative effectiveness, they are a step towards discovering the type of monitoring and support of teachers that is necessary to obtain steady improvements in student achievement. Subsequent reports of evaluations at these and other public school sites should contribute to understanding the level of public school effort that can be maintained and the outcomes that can be expected over time.

Unlike most mainland programs that limit their evaluations to reports of outcome measures, KEEP continues to explore the processes that contribute to the outcomes. It thereby may add important new dimensions to the methodologies of educational evaluation, and simultaneously help others to interpret the implications of KEEP's work for improving the education of children from ethnically diverse low income populations in other parts of the United States.

A TYPICAL MORNING IN THE KEEP LABORATORY SCHOOL FIRST GRADE

The following description is a composite of our observations in January and the narration of the film, "Coming Home to School".*

*Coming Home to School" (produced by R. Tharp, C. Jordan, L. Baird & L. Loganbill, 1980) is available from KEEP in both 16 mm and video cassette media.