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#### Abstract

The reference publication contains national statistics on the limited-English-proficient (LEP) student population in the United States and the educational programs that serve them. Information is drawn from national darabases of federally-funded educational programs in 1992-93. Summary data, with narrative, are offered on: the number of LEP students by state; trends in enrollment from 1991-92 to 1992-93; student language background; enrollment numbers and percentages by grade level; federal programs that serve this population; the number and percentage of LEP students served by each program type; the kinds of instructional services available to LEP students, with percentages; and federally-authorized teacher training programs designed to build teacher capacity to serve this population. (MSE).
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## Foreword

Welcome to the first edition of the Digest of Education Statistics for Limited English Proficient Students. The purpose of this publication is to provide a reference containing national statistics on the limited English proficient (LEP) student population and on the educational programs that serve them, using the most current available data.

The information provided in this digest is drawn from databases of Title VII state and local grant programs funded in 1992-93 by the U.S. Depaniment of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA). These databases were developed by the Special Issues Analysis Center, a technical support center to OBEMLA. Also included are data from the Descriptive Study of Services for LEP Students (Fleischman and Hopstock, 1993), a national study of limited English proficient students in public schools grades K-12, conducted in 1991-92.

This publication includes information on the numbers of LEP students, characteristics of LEP students, Federal, State, and local programs serving LEP students, and the types of instructional services provided to LEP students.

## I. Introduction

Over the past decade, there has been a large and growing number of students in the United States who speak a language other than English and who bring different cultural heritages to their classrooms. Many of these students enter school with little or no English proficiency. There is an important need to better understand this population in order to determine appropriate and effective methods for including these students within challenging instructional environments. A first step is to have a basic understanding of the numbers of such students and their backgrounds, and of the programs that serve them. This digest provides summary data for that purpose.

## II. How are limited English proficient students identified?

Children from language backgrounds other than English bring to their schools not only linguistic, but also cultural resources. However, these students need assistance if they do not yet have the full proficiency in English needed for success in school.

There is no federally mandated definition of limited English proficiency. Therefore, different definitions of limited English proficient students are frequently used by indiv.dual states or local education agencies.

The process for determinir., if a student is limited English proficient can be district- or school-based. For the 1991-92 academic schooi year, district-defined criteria were used in 70 percent of districts while schooldefined criteria were used in 18 percent of districts. Combinations of the district- and school-defined criteria were used in 12 percent of districts. ${ }^{1}$

Typically, schools and districts use more than one type of data to determine whether a student is limited English proficient. Districts and schools in the 1991-92 Descriptive Study of Services for LEP Students reported that the most commonly used criteria were oral proficiency tests in English ( 83 percent of districts), home language surveys ( 77 percent of districts), teacher judgment ( 69 percent of districts), and achievement tests in English ( 52 percent of districts).

## III. How many limited English proficient students are there?

Limited English proficient students are a large and growing population in the United States. The following sections describe the numbers and the trends of enrollment for limited English proficient students.

## Number of Limited English Proficient Students

States reported a total enrollment of 2,558,487 limited English proficient students for the 1992-93 academic school year. ${ }^{2}$ In addition, the U.S. territories reported a total LEP student enrollment of 177,465, for a total of approximately 2.7 million LEP students identified in 1992-93 within U.S. states and territories (See Table 1). These are actually underestimates of the number of limited English proficient students enrolled, since data were not reported for three states (Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia) and one territory (Guam). Table 2 presents data on the number of LEP students by state. As shown in the table, California had the largest number of limited English proficient students. There were $1,152,000$ LEP students in California, which is approximately 42 percent of all limited English proficient students in the United States and its territories. Texas ( 345,000 LEP students) and New York ( 195,000 LEP students) had the next largest numbers of limited English proficient students reported. The distribution of limited English proficient students across the states and territories is shown in Figure 1. As shown in the figure, the greatest numbers of limited English proficient students are in the West and Southwest.

## TABLE 1

Number of LEP Students in the United States and Territories*
(Source: 1992-93 State Educational Agency Database)

| States | $2,558,487$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Territories | 177,465 |
| Total | $2,735,952$ |

[^0]
## TABLE 2

## Number of LEP Students by State <br> (Source: 1992-93 State Educational Agency Database)

| State | Number of LEP Students | State | Number of LEP Students |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | 2,332 | New Hampshire | 1,004 |
| Alaska | 13,489 | New Jersey | 49,627 |
| Arizona | 83,643 | New Mexico | 83,771 |
| Arkansas | 3,423 | New York | 194,593 |
| California | 1,151,819 | North Carolina | 8,900 |
| Colorado | 24,876 | North Dakota | 8,652 |
| Connecticut | 17,637 | Ohio | 11,125 |
| Delaware | 1,847 | Oklahoma | 19,714 |
| District of Columbia | 5,132 | Oregon ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 16,359 |
| Florida | 130,131 | Pennsylvania | b |
| Georgia | 10,043 | Rhode Island | 8,350 |
| Hawaii | 11,251 | South Carolina | 1,594 |
| Idaho | 4,616 | South Dakota | 8,197 |
| Illinois | 94,471 | Tennessee | 2,770 |
| Indiana | 5,017 | Texas | 344,915 |
| Iowa | 4,556 | Utah | 24,447 |
| Kansas | 6,900 | Vermont | 723 |
| Kentucky | 1,738 | Virginia | ${ }^{6}$ |
| Louisiana | 5,890 | Washington | 32,858 |
| Maine | 1,820 | West Virginia | b |
| Maryland | 12,719 | Wisconsin | 14,788 |
| Massachusetts | 45,405 | Wyoming | 2,027 |
| Michigan | 37,272 | American Samoa | 13,972 |
| Minnesota | 17,979 | Guam | b |
| Mississippi | 3,222 | Northern Marianas | 9,564 |
| Missouri | 4,365 | Palau | 2,823 |
| Montana | 7,817 | Puerto Rico ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 149,824 |
| Nebraska | 2,623 | Virgin Islands | 1,282 |
| Nevada | 12,040 | Total | 2,735,952 |

- The LEP count in Oregon is for LEP students served and is therefore most likely an undercount of the actual number of LEP students in the state.
b Data were not reported.
- Puerto Rico reports the number of limited Spanish proficient students.




## Trends in Enrollment

The 2,735,952 limited English proficient students reported in the 1992-93 school year for U.S. states and territories represents an increase of over 30C,000 students ( 13 percent) compared to the number reported for the 1991-92 school year. This increase continues the upward trend in the number of limited English proficient students that has been observed over the past several years. This trend is illustrated in Figure 2.

FIGURE 2
Trends in Enrollment of LEP Students:
1985-86 to 1992-93*
(Siturce $1 \times 72.91$ State Fiducational Agency Database)
Number af Nudens:






## School Enro!Iment

Nationally, it is estimated that approximately 28,000 public schools enroll at least one limited English proficient student. ${ }^{3}$ Limited English proficient students are predominately enrolled in public schools. Of the total 2,558,487 limited English proficient students identified in the 199293 academic school year, 98 percent $(2,507,776)$ were enrolled in public schools. ${ }^{4}$

## IV. Who are the limited English proficient students?

Limited English proficient students in the U.S. bring a wide variety of linguistic and cultural backgrounds to their schools. The following sections describe the language backgrounds and gradr levels of LEP students.

## Language Background

As Table 3 shows, the large majority (72.9\%) of limited English proficient students are Spanish-speaking students. Vietnamese is the second most common language group, representing approximately four percent of the limited English proficient student population. There are many language groups being served. For example, students served by Title VII programs represent 198 different language groups. ${ }^{5}$

## TABLE 3

Number of LEP Students in the Twelve Most Common Language Groups*
(Source: LEPs Descriptive Study District Mail Survey)

| Language Groups | Number of <br> LEP Students | Percentage of <br> LEP Students |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Spanish | $\mathbf{1 , 6 8 2 , 5 6 0}$ | 72.9 |
| Vietnamese | 90,922 | 3.9 |
| Hmong | 42,305 | 1.8 |
| Cantonese | 38,693 | 1.7 |
| Cambodian | 37,742 | 1.6 |
| Korean | 36,568 | 1.6 |
| Laotian | 29,838 | 1.3 |
| Navajo | 28,913 | 1.3 |
| Tagalog | 24,516 | 1.1 |
| Russian | 21,903 | 0.9 |
| French Creole | 21,850 | 0.9 |
| Arabic | 20,318 | 0.9 |
| Other | 237,951 | 10.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 , 3 0 7 , 9 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

- The number of respondents to the item was 733 ; this was $98.4 \%$ of those who responded to the survey. The results are werghted to be nationally representative.


## Grade Level Information

Limited English proficient students are primarily found within the elementary grades. As Table 4 indicates, over 60 percent of all limited English proficient students are in kindergarten through grade 5. The number of limited English proficient students decreases from lower to higher grades. For example, 3.3 percent of all limited English proficient students are enrolled in grade 12 as opposed to 12.1 percent enrolled in kindergarten.

| Grade Level | TABLE 4 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number and Percentage of LEP Sturients by Grade Level ${ }^{\text {s }}$ (Source: LEPs Descriptive Study District Mail Survey) |  |  |  |
|  | Number of LEP Students | Percentage of All LEP Students | Total Students in the U.S. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | LEP Students as a Percentage of Total Students |
| Kindergarten | 277,914 | 12.1 | 3,305,619 | 8.4 |
| 1st Grade | 279,257 | 12.1 | 3,554,274 | 7.9 |
| 2nd Grade | 246,979 | 10.7 | 3,359,193 | 7.4 |
| 3rd Grade | 221,936 | 9.6 | 3,333,285 | 6.7 |
| 4th Grade | 197,211 | 8.6 | 3,312,443 | 6.0 |
| 5th Grade | 177,412 | 7.7 | 3,268,381 | 5.4 |
| 6th Grade | 150,421 | 6.5 | 3,238,095 | 4.6 |
| 7th Grade | 134,907 | 5.9 | 3,180,120 | 4.2 |
| 8th Grade | 125,849 | 5.5 | 3,019,826 | 4.2 |
| 9th Grade | 159,208 | 6.9 | 3,310,290 | 4.8 |
| 10th Grade | 137,101 | 5.9 | 2,913,951 | 4.7 |
| 11th Grade | 103,337 | 4.5 | 2,642,554 | 3.9 |
| 12th Grade | 75,423 | 3.3 | 2,390,329 | 3.2 |
| Ungraded | 16,469 | 0.7 | - | - |
| Total | 2,303,425 | 100.0 | 42,000,343 | 5.5 |

The number of respondents to the item was 735 , this was $987 \%$ of those who responded te the siarvey. The results are weighted to be nationally representative
These data are from the National Center for Educatoon Statistics. Pubhe Elementary and Secondary Agsresate Data, by State for Sthool Years 1941.92 and 1990.91. NCFS 93-327.

## V. What programs serve limited English proficient students?

Limited English proficient students may receive services from one or more of federal, state, or local educational progr ns. State and local programs serve the largest number of limited English proficient students.

Among federal programs, there are programs specifically designed to support effective instruction of limited English proficient students, and programs directed toward educationally and/or economically disadvantaged students, many of whom are limited English proficient. These federal programs, and the numbers of limited English proficient students they serve, are described in the sections below. The data that are reported are based on the 1992.93 school year, the most recent year for which data are available on numbers of students served. Several of the federal programs either have been recently reauthorized or will be reauthorized in 1995. Thus, the data reported in this digest represent the program categories authorized in 1992-93 and do not reflect the newly reauthorized programs.

## Federal Programs Directed Toward LEP Students: Title VII

Limited English proficient students receive federal support from various programs. Of these, Title VII, or the Bilingual Education Act, is designed to build the capacity of schools and districts to meet the educational needs of limited English proficient students so that these students can meet the same rigorous standards for academic performance expected of all children. Title VII was reauthorized in 1994 as part of the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA). ${ }^{6}$ Programs uperating in 199293, the most recent year for which data on students are available, were funded through the prior legislation, that is, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Under ESEA, Title VII Part A grants provide assistance to local educational agencies and other organizations to support direct educational services to students within six program categories.

The six program categories which are authorized under the prior Title VII (ESEA) legislation are the following:

The Transitional Bilingual Education Program is designed to help limited English proficient students learn English, using the student's native language as needed. This program is also intended to foster multi-cultural learning. Classes may consist of up to 40 percent native English speakers.

The Developmental Bilingual Education Program promotes the development of fluency in both English and a student's native language. Classes should be composed of half limited English proficient students and half native English speakers.

The Special Alternative Instructional Program emphasizes primarily (if not all) instruction in English, with the English instruction structured to be at a level appropriate for the limited English proficient student's level of understanding.

The Special Populations Program provides instruction to preschool, special education, or talented and gifted limited English proficient students.

The Academic Excellence Program facilitates the dissemination of successful instructional methods for limited English proficient students. Academic Excellence programs can be Transitional Bilingual Education, Special Alternative Instructional, or Developmental Bilingual Education progriuns.

The Family English Literacy Program assists limited English proficient adults and out-of-school youths to achieve competence in English.

There are three special funding priorities that have been associated with the Transitional Bilingual Education, Developmental Bilingual Education, and Special Alternative Instructional programs. These are Magnet Middle Schools, Math/Science, and Recent Arrivals priorities.

In FY93, a total of 1,065 projects were funded through Title VII within these six categories. These programs were located in 3,231 schools and served a total of 306,821 students.
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## Other Federal Programs

In addition to Title VII programs, limited English proficient students may be served under several other federally funded programs, most of which are designed to meet the needs of educationally and/or economically disadvantaged students. These programs are described below.

Chapter 1 (reauthorized as Title I) provides educationally disadvantaged students with instructional and support services in school districts with high concentrations of low-income children.

The Migrant Education Program provides instructional and support services to meet the special needs of children of migratory agricultural workers or fishers. This program gives financial assistance to state educational agencies.

Even Start supports family-centered educational programs that aid parents in becoming fully involved in the education of their children, and in helping the children reach their full potential as learners.

The Emergency lmmigrant Education Act Program provides supplementary education services through state and local agencies and helps defray costs for immigrant children enrolled in public and nonpublic schools.

Special Education programs give formula grants to state educational agencies to assist in providing special education and related services to children with disabilities.

Vocational Education programs provide financial assistance in improving vocational programs and in expanding the scope of vocational programs to include traditionally underserved populations.

Table 5 presents the number and percentage of limited English proficient students served by program type.

## TABLE 5

Number and Percentage of LEP Students Served by Program Type^
(Source: 1992-93 State Educational Agency and FY93 Title VII Databases)

| Program | Number of <br> LEP Students | Percentage of All <br> LEP Students |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Title VII Part A Programs ${ }^{\text {c }}$
Transitional Bilingual Education
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Regular } & 145,074 & 5.30\end{array}$
Math/Science Priority 54,327
1.99

Recent Arrivals Priority
12,521
0.46

Developmental Bilingual Education
Regular
5,869
0.21

Magnet Schools Priority
184
0.01

Special Alternative Instructional
Regular
64,424
2.35
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Magnet Scholls Priority } & 167 & 0.01\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Math/Science Priority } & 8,077 & 0.30\end{array}$
Recent Arrivals Priority
8,841
0.32

Special Populations
7,337
0.27

Overall
306,821
11.21

Other Federal Programs
Chapter 1
715,349
26.15

Migrant Education $\quad 226,653 \quad 8.28$
Even Start 8,570
0.31

Emergency Immigrant Education $\quad 705,825 \quad 25.80$
Special Education 165,187
6.04

Vocational Education $\quad .72,341 \quad 2.64$
State and Local Programs
2,081,077
76.06

- The data on Title VII Part A Programs are from the FY93 Title VII Application Database. The remaining data in this table are from the 1992-93 State Educational Agency Database.
r The overall percent L.EP is greater than 100 percent because LEP students may be served by more than one program.
- The Academic Excellence and Family English Literacy programs were not included in this table because they do not directly serve students.


## VI. What types of instructional serviccs do limited English proficient students receive?

There are no Federal requirements or mandates regarding the specific methodologies to be used in providing instruction to limited English proficient students. The Federal role has been to support the building of local capacity. In fact, Federal funds that support the development of instructional programs for limited English proficient students serve only a small proportion (about 10 percent) of the total population of limited English proficient students. Thus, decisions about the most appropriate instructional approaches are made by individual States and/or local educational agencies.

State policies and legislation regarding requirements for special instructional services for limited English proficient students vary greatly across the country. Some states have no regulations; others require the use of special instruction in English language arts or instruction in content areas using the students' native language. Although some states require or at least encourage particular types of services, how these requirements are implemented at the local level varies substantially. The final decisions about the instructional services to be provided are often shaped by a number of factors, such as the number of limited English proficient students enrolled in the school or district, the language backgrounds of the students, and the resources available locally for serving those language groups.

For these reasons, schools employ a variety of approaches and models inproviding instruction to their limited English proficient students. Table 6 presents the percentage of limited English proficient students by type of service as defined in the Descriptive Study of Services for Limited English Proficient Students (Fleischman and Hopstock, 1993). As shown in the table, the largest percentage ( 33.7 percent) of limited English proficient students receive intensive services with significant native language use. Many of these students are elementary grade level students, who are about twice as likely as high school students to receive this type of service. The second largest percentage (17.4 percent) of limited English proficient students receive some special services with instruction all in English.

## TABLE 6

## Services Received by LEP Students <br> (Source: LEPs Descriptive Study School Mail Survey)

## Type of Service

Percentage of

No special services 1.9
Services not specific to LEP students (e.g., Chapter 1 services) 1.3
Some special services ${ }^{\text {a }}$, instruction all in English ${ }^{\text {c }} \quad 17.4$
Some special services ${ }^{\wedge}$, some native language use ${ }^{d} \quad 6.4$
Some special services ${ }^{\wedge}$, significant native language use $\quad 2.8$
Intensive servicesb, instruction all in English ${ }^{\text {c }}$
Intensive servicesb, some native language use ${ }^{\text {d }} \quad 14.4$
Intensive services ${ }^{\text {b }}$, significant native language use ${ }^{\text {e }}$
Unknown 9.0

- Some special services = bilingual aide, Chapter 1 bilingual resource teacher, or ESL services (less than 10 hours)
- Intensive services $=$ multiple period ESL or specially desigried content instruction
- All English $=$ less than 2 percent rative language use
- Some rative language use = less than 50 percent in any one major content area, and less than 25 percent overall in math, science, and social studies
- Significant native language use = more than 50 percent in any one major content area, at least 25 percent overall in math, science, and social studies

There are large numbers of public school teachers in the United States who teach at least one limited English proficient student in grades K-í2. Most of these teachers are not specialists; they teach classes containing mostly English proficient students along with some limited English proficient students. In 1991-92, an estimated 364,485 teachers had at least one limited English proficient student in their class(es).?

The purpose of Federal Title VII funding has been to build the capacity of teachers and other school staff to serve limited English proficient students. The prior Title VII Part C (ESEA) authorized grants within four training assistance programs, three of which directly prepare educational personnel who are currently working with or will work with limited English proficient students. In FY93, a total of 162 projects were funded within these categories.

The four categories of training programs authorized by the prior Title VII (ESEA) legislation are: ${ }^{8}$

> The Educational Personnel Training Program provides financial assistance to meet the need for additional or better trained educational personnel preparing to work with limited English proficient students.
> The Short-Term Training Program improves the skills of educational personnel and parents participating in programs for lim:ied English proficient students.

The Bilingual Education Fellowship Program awards fellowships to full-time students for advanced study of bilingual education.

> The Training, Development, and Improvement Program promotes reform, innovation, and improvement in graduate education curricula, the structure of the academic profession, and the recruitment and retention of higher education and graduate school faculties in bilingual education.

As shown in Table 7, the largest numbers of participants are served within the Educational Personnel Training (Regular) Program (9,758 participants). Short-Term Training programs served the second largest number of participants (4,784 participants)

## TABLE 7

Number of Participants Served by Title VII Part C Programs*(Source: FY93 Title VII Application Database and OBEMLA Program Records)Number ofProgram TypeParticipants
Educational Personnel Training
Regular ..... 9,758
Math/Science Priority ..... 1,670
Bilingual Education Fellowship ..... 394
Short-Term Training ..... 4,784
Total ..... 16,606

- Tie data for the Bilingual Education Fellowship program are from OBEMLA program records. The remaining data are from the FY93 Title VII Application Database. Data on participants are not provided in applications for the Training, Development, and Improvement Program.


## Endnotes

${ }^{1}$ Data are from Fleischman, H.L. and Hopstock, P.J. (1993). Descriptive Study of Services to Limited English Proficient Students. Washington, DC: Development Associates, Inc.
${ }^{2}$ Data are from Henderson, A., Donly, B., and Strang, W. (1994). Summary of the Bilingual Education State Educational Agency Program Survey of States' Limited English Proficient Persons and Available Educational Services 1992-93. Special Issues Analysis Center. Arlington, VA: Development Associates, Inc.
${ }^{3}$ Data are from Fleischman, H.L. and Hopstock, P.J. (1993). Descriptive Study of Services to Limited English Proficient Students. Washington, DC: Development Associates, Inc.
4 Data are from Henderson, A., Donly, B., and Strang, W. (1994). Summary of the Bilingual Education State Educational Agency Program Survey of States' Limited English Proficient Persons and Available Educational Services 1992-93. Special Issues Analysis Center. Arlington, VA: Development Associates, Inc.
${ }^{5}$ Date are from the FY93 Title VII Application Database. Special Issues Analysis Center. Arlington, VA: Development Associates, Inc.

- Under the reauthorized Title VII (IASA) legislation, program categories supporting services for students at the district and school level are: Program Development and Implementation Grants, Program Enhancement Projects, Comprehensive School Grants, and Systemwide Improvement Grants.
${ }^{7}$ Data are from Fleischman, H.L. and Hopstock, P.J. (1993). Descripttve Study of Services to ${ }^{-}$ Limited English Proficient Students. Washington, DC: Development Associates, Inc.
8 Under the reauthorized Title VII (IASA) legislation, program categories supporting professional development are: Training for All Teachers Program, Bilingual Education Teachers and Personnel Grants, Bilingual Education Career Ladder Program, and Graduate Fellowships in Bilingual Education Program.


## For adilitional information and statistics please contact:

## National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education

1118 22nd Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
Phone: 202-467-0867
Fax: $\quad$ 800-531-9347 or 202-467-4283
E-mail askncbe@ncbe.gwu.edu
Http: www.ncbe.gwu.edu

Office of Educational Research and Improvement

555 New Jersey Avenue, NW Room 602<br>Washington, DC 20208<br>Phone: 800-424-1616 or 202-219-2050<br>Fax: 202-219-1466<br>E-mail: Library@inet.ed.gov<br>Http: www.ed.gov




[^0]:    Data were not reported for Pennsylvana, Virginaa, West Virginia, and Guam.

