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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate selected factors associated with preparing elementary teachers in north Mississippi public schools to work with limited English proficient (LEP) students. The objectives of this research were (a) to determine the awareness of elementary teachers in north Mississippi public schools concerning the legal aspects of teaching limited English proficient students, (b) to ascertain if a need exists to prepare teachers in north Mississippi public schools to work with limited English proficient students, and (c) to identify types of instruction that teachers in north Mississippi public schools would participate in when preparing to work with limited English proficient students.

The subjects in this study were elementary teachers from 17 school districts in north Mississippi public schools with an identified LEP student population. A random sample of 344 elementary teachers was chosen to participate in the study in the spring of 1997.

The instrument used to gather the data for this study was a questionnaire constructed by the researcher. The questions on the questionnaire were categorized according to demographics, the legal aspects of teaching LEP students, the need to prepare teachers to work...
with LEP students, types of instruction for preparing teachers to work with LEP students, and a general question related to teaching LEP students.

The data from the questionnaires were analyzed using the SPSS 6.1 for Windows Student Version (1994) software package. Tables were used to present the data. Statistical analysis involved measuring frequency and percentage of responses.

The following conclusions were reached based on the results of the statistical analysis of the data for this study: (a) teachers in north Mississippi public schools are not aware of the legal mandates that pertain to LEP students; (b) there is a need to prepare teachers in north Mississippi public schools to work with LEP students; and (c) teachers in north Mississippi public schools have preferences concerning the types of instruction they would participate in when preparing to work with LEP students.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

There is a constant influx of limited English proficient students enrolling in the public schools of America. The specific number of limited English proficient students in the United States varies from one source to another but there is agreement that the LEP population is growing (Kreidler, 1986; Lasky 1992; Valentin, 1993). Immigration and the birthrate of non-Caucasian ethnic groups have contributed to the surge of the LEP student population in American schools (Imig, Kostelnik, & Villarruel, 1995). This suggests that there are many students entering schools with the need to learn English as a second language (ESL).

Lasky (1992) asserted that there are not enough teachers prepared to teach limited English proficient students. Oxford-Carpenter, Pol, Lopez, Stupp, Gendell and Peng's study (as cited in Abramson, Garcia, and Pritchard, 1993) stated that over three million limited English proficient students will be in the United States by the year 2000. Many of these students will enter educational institutions to face teachers who are not prepared to work with limited English speaking individuals (Jimenez & Gersten, 1994).
State departments of education and school districts need to recognize their legal responsibility of providing English as a second language instruction to limited English proficient students. This is true even when there is just a small number of limited English proficient children in a school district (Caldwell, Jennings, Lerner, & Richek, 1996).

The struggle which LEP students have encountered in their quest for an education came to the forefront of educational policy making just before World War 1 (WW1). Hakuta and Malakoff (1990) reported that an "English only" policy was implemented by many school districts at that time. A large number of European immigrants, especially Germans, were entering the United States and many Americans felt threatened by their presence. It was not until the advent of World War 2 (WW2) that this attitude began to change. WW1 had brought a prohibition against the use of any language other than English to the schools, but WW2 ushered in an awareness of the need to be proficient in a language other than English and a recognition of the civil rights of ethnic minorities in America (Lessow-Hurley, 1996).

Shortly after WW2, the Supreme Court rendered the Brown v. Board of Education Court decision which assured ethnic minorities the same opportunity for an education as mainstream American students (Lessow-Hurley, 1996). The federal government became involved in the struggle
for equality by ethnic minorities because some states were failing to recognize the Constitutional rights of these groups (Jennings, 1992; Phillips, 1983). The struggle for civil rights included the need of limited English proficient students to receive English as a second language and bilingual instruction.

The period from 1954 to 1995 saw a time of great strides in the recognition of the need to provide appropriate instruction to LEP students. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, the Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1974, and the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 have made it easier for LEP students to receive an education which meets their cultural and linguistic needs. These mandates have also made professional development more accessible to teachers preparing to work with LEP students (Anstrom, 1995; Caldwell et al., 1996; Hakuta & Malakoff, 1990; Lessow-Hurley, 1996; Mississippi State Department of Education, 1996; Office of Bilingual and Minority Affairs, February 1995; Office of Bilingual and Minority Affairs, March 1995; Phillips, 1983; United States Department of Education, 1995). However, most LEP children are still taught by teachers who have had no ESL training. Kreidler (1986) stated that only six percent of all teachers have participated in course
work which has prepared them to teach students whose first language is not English.

Kreidler (1987) asserted that teaching English as a second language (TESOL) programs have existed at colleges and universities since the early 1940's and have grown steadily in number since that time. The National Defense Education Act of 1964, which infused federal money into ESL teacher preparation, caused an extensive increase in the availability and number of TESOL programs in the United States.

Recent federal funding has made it easier for preservice and inservice teachers to prepare to teach linguistically diverse students. The new Eisenhower Professional Development program, Title I, and the Bilingual Education Act provide funds for the professional development of ESL teachers. Each of these programs includes the goal of preparing LEP students to meet the same rigorous standards as mainstream American students (U. S. Department of Education, 1995; Mississippi Department of Education, 1996; Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs, 1995).

Standards and goals for inservice and preservice teacher training usually involve the certification process. Certification of teachers is an issue that is managed by state governments (Lessow-Hurley, 1996; Valentin, 1993). The majority of states offer some type of certification in
English as a second language or bilingual instruction (Fleischman, 1995).

The state of Mississippi allows most certified teachers to earn an endorsement in teaching English as a second language. Graduate programs of study in teaching English as a second language are offered by several universities in Mississippi. However, bilingual certification is not offered in Mississippi.

The number of teachers in the state of Mississippi with the ESL endorsement is very low. While there were over 2,700 students classified as LEP in Mississippi public schools during the 1995-1996 school year, there were only six certified English as a second language teachers teaching ESL in Mississippi at the time (Jayne Everett, Mississippi State Department of Education, personal communication, July 3, 1996; Mississippi State Department of Education, 1995). The ratio of English as a second language teachers to limited English proficient students in Mississippi was 1:450 for the 1995-1996 school year.

According to Goodman and Torres-Guzman (1995) and Kreidler (1986), there is a shortage of teachers prepared to work with LEP students throughout the United States. In order to meet the demands of this shortage it has been suggested that teacher education programs include a TESOL class or component in all preservice teachers' course work.
Furthermore, preservice teachers need to become proficient in a foreign language so that they can better understand how the LEP student learns another language (Logan, 1987). Britten (1988) reported that teachers tend to teach the way they were taught. Like other teaching skills, appropriate ESL teaching methodologies need to be modeled for preservice teachers by their college instructors.

Induction year programs are another way to help the beginning teacher make the adjustment from student to instructor. An induction year program is especially needed for teachers of LEP students because of the high rate of attrition for ESL teachers. Induction year programs are cost effective for school districts to implement because they ultimately reduce the staff turnover rate (Gonzales & Sosa, 1993).

Professional development activities keep an experienced teacher abreast of the advances in their field (Bobbit, Choy, Henke, Horn, Lieberman, & Medrich, 1993; Choy, Geis, & Henke, 1996). Inservice training, peer coaching, and the trainer of trainers model are professional development programs which help the experienced teacher prepare to work with LEP students.

In Mississippi, professional development for teachers preparing to work with ESL students is offered by the Bilingual Education/National Origin Desegregation Office of the Mississippi State Department of Education.
Classroom teachers are important links to the new culture in which LEP students find themselves immersed. State departments of education, university teacher education personnel, and local school district administrators should do their part in providing opportunities for teachers to develop and improve their skills in teaching LEP students.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate selected factors associated with preparing elementary teachers to work with limited English proficient students in the public elementary schools of north Mississippi.

Research Questions

The objectives of this research were (a) to determine the awareness of elementary teachers in north Mississippi concerning the legal aspects of teaching LEP students, (b) to ascertain if a need exists to prepare teachers in north Mississippi public schools to work with limited English proficient students; and (c) to identify types of instruction that teachers in north Mississippi public schools would participate in when preparing to work with limited English proficient students. The following questions were explored:
1. Are elementary teachers in north Mississippi public schools aware of the legal aspects of providing instruction for limited English proficient students?

2. Is there a need to prepare elementary teachers in north Mississippi public schools to work with limited English proficient students?

3. Which types of instruction would elementary teachers in north Mississippi prefer to participate in when preparing to work with limited English proficient students?

Definition of Terms

The following terms will be used throughout the study:

1. Bilingual Education Act - The Bilingual Education Act was initially passed by Congress in 1968. The Bilingual Education Act is a policy statement. "Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States, in order to establish equal educational opportunity for all children, to encourage the establishment and operation, where appropriate, of educational programs using bilingual educational practices, techniques, and methods..." (Lessow-Hurley, 1996, p.123). The Bilingual Education Act is also known as Title VII.

2. Elementary school - The place where children in kindergarten through sixth grade attend school.
3. English as a second language - “English as a second language (ESL) also referred to as English for speakers of other languages, is a specialized approach to language instruction designed for those who have a primary language other than English and who are limited in English proficiency” (Carrasquillo, 1994, p. 4).

4. Inservice training - Training provided by the local school district in which one is employed.

5. Limited English proficient (LEP) person - “Nonnative English speakers whose English language proficiencies are sufficiently limited to deny them the ability to learn successfully in classrooms where English is the only medium of instruction” (Olsen, 1989, p. 469).

6. Mainstream teacher - Any teacher of kindergarten through sixth grade who is not a special subject teacher.

7. North Mississippi - The region of Mississippi north of Highway 8, south of the Tennessee boundary, west of the Alabama boundary, and east of the Arkansas boundary.

8. Professional development - A program of preparation which enhances the experienced teacher's repertoire of teaching skills.

9. Preservice teacher - A student who is enrolled in an undergraduate teacher education program.
10. Teaching English as a second language - A field of study in teacher education in which one learns methods of teaching the LEP student.

Limitations

The limitations of this study were as follows:

1. The results of the study may not be generalizable to other regions of the state or nation since the sample was drawn from schools in north Mississippi.

2. Responses to the questionnaire were subjective and may not reflect the respondents' true feelings about the questions being asked.

3. The low response rate of the sample may have biased the study.

Delimitations

This study was limited to 344 classroom teachers from 17 public school districts in north Mississippi during the spring semester of 1997. The researcher limited the study to teachers from school districts with an identified LEP population for the 1995-1996 school year as reported in the Handbook of Educational Services for Limited English Proficient Students (1996) published by the Mississippi State Department of Education.

Significance of the Study

Since there is an apparent need for preparing teachers in north Mississippi to work with LEP students, the results of this study could serve as
a guide to state and local school district administrators in preparing
preservice and inservice teachers to work with LEP students. Personnel
responsible for teacher education programs could also benefit by using
the results of this study for redesigning their instructional programs.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

This study has been organized into five chapters. The first chapter
provides the rationale and theoretical basis for the study and an overview
of the research. The second chapter is a review of the literature related
to the purpose of the study. The third chapter explains the methods and
materials used in the study. The fourth chapter is a presentation of the
analysis of the data that were collected in the study. The fifth chapter is a
summary of the findings of the research study with recommendations for
further research.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose the literature review was to present a rationale and
theoretical basis for the study. The literature review is presented in the
following sections: (a) the legal aspects of English as a second language
instruction, (b) the need for teachers to prepare to work with LEP
students, and (c) the preparation of teachers to work with LEP students.

The United States is a country made up of citizens that have ethnic
roots reaching into every continent of the world. Valentin (1993) stated,
"Modern American culture is a polyglot of the heritages of a vast array of
peoples" (p. 26). The Anglo-Saxon, English heritage has been
predominant in the United States since it became a country in 1776. The
need to learn English has been faced by countless numbers of immigrants
and refugees entering this country for the past two centuries. The struggle
to become part of the mainstream American culture has been felt by
many LEP persons. The education of individuals who are culturally and
linguistically diverse will be enhanced by teachers who are prepared to
teach them.
Legal Aspects of Teaching English as a Second Language

Legal aspects of teaching English as a second language will be examined in the first segment of the literature review. A brief history of the struggle of LEP persons for second language instruction, specific legal mandates related to the instruction of LEP students, and certification requirements for ESL teachers are presented in this section.

The struggle faced by LEP students for special language instruction has been an issue for many years. Lessow-Hurley (1996) stated that instruction in a language other than English was popular in the United States throughout the nineteenth century. However, at the beginning of the twentieth century the attitude toward second language learning began to change. This change was precipitated by the immigration of many Europeans, particularly Germans, into the United States. Many Americans felt threatened by the immigrant population, especially after the beginning of WW1.

A movement to promote “English only” instruction was popular in the United States after the advent of WW1. Many school districts adopted mandates to prevent the teaching of foreign languages (Hakuta & Malakoff, 1990). Ironically, the attitude toward second language instruction and individuals whose native language was not English changed at the beginning of WW2. The importance of individuals
being able to speak a language other than English enhanced the United States' effort to win WW2. One incident where this was apparent involved the use of the Navajo language. The Japanese had been able to interpret and decipher coded messages being sent by the United States. A group of Navajo soldiers were enlisted to send coded messages using their native language. The Navajo code was never understood by the Japanese and this led to victories in the war effort by the United States (Lessow-Hurley, 1996).

Ethnic minorities involved in WW2 found a new sense of pride in being American. They were honored and respected in Europe because of the freedom they had helped win for many individuals. This sense of pride quickly diminished when they returned to the United States where they found a segregated nation with a lack of respect for cultural diversity. Ethnic minorities that were military heroes in WW2 were not allowed the same honors at home as their Anglo-American counterparts, but an awareness had been born in ethnic minorities during WW2 that they were important citizens. This awareness grew and contributed to the landmark Brown v. Board of Education Supreme Court decision in 1954 (Lessow-Hurley, 1996).

The Federal government became involved with the education of ethnic minorities because states were not honoring their rights. It is the
state's responsibility to provide schooling for its citizens. The Constitution
does not call for or reject the creation of systems of public education.
However, when a person's constitutional rights are infringed upon, the
federal government can step in to correct any injustices. The First
Amendment, which provides for free speech, religion and assembly, and
the Fourteenth Amendment, which calls for the equal treatment of all
persons, are two mandates the federal government relies upon when
rendering judgments concerning the right of an individual to an
education (Jennings, 1992; Phillips, 1983).

School segregation on the basis of ethnic identity was practiced in the
United States until the Brown case. Wang (1976) reported that the Brown
v. Board of Education Supreme Court decision called for the end of
segregation. Separate but equal school facilities for ethnic minorities was
found unconstitutional. The Brown resolution overturned Plessy v.
Ferguson, the Supreme Court ruling that had made separate but equal
the law of the land in the late 1800's. Brown v. Board of Education laid
the groundwork for subsequent legislation that would allow ethnic
minorities the same opportunity for a quality education as mainstream

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, which included Title VI, was implemented
to help speed the desegregation of schools that had been mandated by
the Supreme Court in the Brown ruling. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act was a federal mandate that all individuals be treated equally in regard to employment and educational opportunities. Title VI allowed the Federal government to withhold funding from school districts that discriminated against ethnic minorities (Lessow-Hurley, 1996; Mississippi State Department of Education, 1996).

Phillips (1983) explained that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), created by Congress in the Johnson administration during the 1960's, was the most far reaching federal government intervention program for education in the history of the United States. ESEA provided large sums of money for educational programs through Title grants. Title I was part of ESEA. Title I was designed to correct the inequities that many economically disadvantaged persons and ethnic minorities had endured in their quest for an education (Anstrom, 1995).

The Bilingual Education Act, Title VII, of ESEA first became a law in 1968—several years after ESEA was established. The Bilingual Education Act brought credibility to existing programs for LEP students, provided money for teacher training, and funded research in the area of second language learning (Hakuta & Malakoff, 1990; Mississippi State Department of Education, 1996).
Title I and Title VII have gone through numerous revisions during the past thirty years. The last major change to these programs took place in 1994 with the passage of the Improving America's School Act (IASA). The IASA reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that was initiated in 1965. The programs offered under IASA were coordinated to offer maximum benefits to students. The improvements in the programs were tied to Goals 2000. Goals 2000 are national education goals that all children should attain by the year 2000 (Anstrom, 1995; U. S. Department of Education, 1995).

The new Title I law makes it easier for limited English proficient students to receive educational help. It also provides funds for programs to prepare teachers to teach LEP students (Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Affairs, March 1995; U. S. Department of Education, 1995).

The Bilingual Education Act, Title VII, was improved with the passage of the IASA in 1994. Title VII provides funds to help linguistically and culturally diverse students meet the same academic standards of excellence that mainstream American students are expected to meet by the year 2000. The professional development of teachers is also encouraged by Title VII (Caldwell et al., 1996; Office of Bilingual and Minority Affairs, February 1995).
The Lau v. Nichols Supreme Court decision of 1974 has had a major impact on the education of LEP students in the United States. This court case was brought by Chinese Americans in San Francisco. Wang (1976) reported on the Supreme Court’s ruling against the San Francisco Unified School District. The school district had violated the civil rights of Chinese students by not providing them an adequate education. The school district believed that the Chinese students were getting the same quality of education as English speaking students. However, the school district felt they were justified in this belief because Chinese students had access to all of the instructional programs and materials offered to English speaking students. But the justices of the Supreme Court ruled unanimously that the Chinese students were not getting an equal and adequate education compared to the English speaking students since they could not understand what was being taught.

The Equal Educational Opportunity Act (EEOA) was passed in 1974, the same year as the Lau Supreme Court ruling. The EEOA strengthened the Lau decision. The EEOA stated that “no state shall deny equal educational opportunity to an individual on account of his or her race, color, sex, or national origin, by the failure by an educational agency to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by its students in its instructional programs” (Mississippi
State Department of Education, 1996, p. 9). One interpretation of this ruling is that a child's civil rights are violated if the child is discriminated against because of their inability to speak English. States are required to offer instruction that meets the needs of LEP students. They are free to choose the types of programs to implement to meet the instructional needs of LEP students, but they must provide some kind of educational program. Lessow-Hurley (1996) asserted the following:

In other words, children may not sit in classrooms where they cannot understand what is going on. Affirmative steps must be taken to ensure that all children have a meaningful educational experience. As articulated in the case law, in order to properly serve students who are limited English proficient, districts must:

- develop a program based on a sound theoretical rationale
- provide trained teachers and sufficient material resources to implement the program
- develop an evaluation system for the program and refine the program in accordance with information from the evaluation. (p. 126)

Programs for LEP children are more numerous today than they have ever been, but many children are still not getting the help they need.
There are some school districts with high concentrations of one ethnic group. These school districts are required to provide bilingual services for this ethnic group. When a school district has children from various language groups, instruction in English must be offered (Caldwell et al., 1996). Laws and Supreme Court cases have established the rights of LEP children to receive English language instruction, but sometimes it takes an outcry from parents or the public to assure that the educational needs of LEP students are met (Grosse & Wagner, 1994; Wang, 1976).

Certification for English as a second language or bilingual instruction is managed by state governments (Lessow-Hurley, 1996; Valentin, 1993). The book, Requirements for Certification of Teachers, Counselors, Librarians, and Administrators for Elementary Schools by Tryneski (1996) lists the names and addresses of offices which handle the issuance of a license or certificate to teach in each state.

Fleischman (1995) indicated that 32 states have bilingual education certificates or endorsements and 41 states offer the ESL certificate or endorsement. Kreidler (1987) stated that TESOL programs are usually offered at the graduate level, although some undergraduate programs exist. This situation accounts for the reason many states offer an endorsement in ESL. Certified teachers can return to school to take courses which will help them work with LEP students. They can add an
endorsement to their already existing teaching certificate when the required number of courses is completed. The ESL endorsement is offered in the state of Mississippi, but the bilingual endorsement is not (Fleischman, 1995; Mississippi State Department of Education, 1996).

The Mississippi State Department of Education lists the minimum competencies that must be included in a university or college's program of study in TESOL in order for a teacher to obtain the ESL endorsement. These competencies include language principles, language acquisition, methodology, and cross-cultural awareness (Appendix A). "ESL programs which meet the competencies specified by the State Department of Education are offered at several colleges or universities in the state (Mississippi State Department of Education, 1996, p. 29)." The ESL endorsement allows a teacher to teach English as a second language in kindergarten through twelfth grade.

Several universities in Mississippi give teachers the opportunity to add the ESL endorsement to their teaching certificates. The University of Mississippi (Appendix B), The University of Southern Mississippi (Appendix C), and Mississippi State University (Appendix D) offer programs of study in TESOL (The University of Mississippi, 1997; The University of Southern Mississippi, 1993; Mississippi State University, 1992). Jackson State University
(Shirley Reed, secretary in English Department, personal communication, June 3, 1997), Delta State University, (Dr. Cronin Hines, director of student teaching, personal communication, February 1, 1997), Alcorn State University (Paul Broome, director of English department, June 3, 1997, personal communication), and Mississippi University for Women (Dr. Mary Mize, director of student teaching, June 3, 1997, personal communication) do not offer a program of study in TESOL. Dr. Mary Mize at Mississippi University for Women stated that the possibility of adding the TESOL curriculum has been proposed but not yet implemented there. The University of Mississippi is the only university in the state of Mississippi to offer a Doctor of Philosophy degree with an emphasis in TESOL. The following table (see Table 1) explains the availability of TESOL programs at several of the major universities in Mississippi.

**The Need for Teachers to be Prepared to Work with LEP Students**

The need for teachers to be prepared to work with LEP students is the topic for this portion of the literature review. Demographics related to LEP students and ESL teachers, an overview of the TESOL profession, funding sources for the professional development of teachers, and facts related specifically to the need to prepare teachers to work with LEP students will be examined in this section.
TABLE 1

AVAILABILITY OF TESOL PROGRAMS IN MISSISSIPPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Add-on Endorsement in TESOL</th>
<th>Master's Degree Program in TESOL</th>
<th>Doctor of Philosophy Degree in TESOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University of Mississippi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Southern Mississippi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta State University</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson State University</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi University for Women</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dale (1986) stated that most schools in the United States have had the responsibility of educating LEP students. Some believe the LEP student population in the United States to be as high as seven million and others project it to be as low as one million (Anstrom, 1996). Kreidler (1986) reported approximately three and one-half million students were limited English proficient in the late 1980's. Choy, Geis, and Henke (1996) asserted that the number of ESL students attending public schools in the United States in the 1993-1994 school year was 5% of the total student population. This lack of agreement concerning the number of LEP students in American public schools is common. However, one fact that has been agreed upon is that the LEP population in the United States is increasing (Brooks & Kaufman, 1996; Kreidler, 1986; Lasky, 1992; Paria, 1994; Rennie, 1993).

The lack of agreement about the number of LEP students in the United States can be linked to the need for a standard definition of what constitutes limited English proficiency and to the methods used to count LEP students (Anstrom, 1996; Lasky, 1992; Olsen, 1989). Each state that applies for federal funds must identify its total LEP population. A state that chooses not to apply for federal funds does not have to report the number of LEP students enrolled in their schools (Olsen, 1989). Scoring below a certain level on a standardized test, teacher observation,
parental input, and other methods are used to identify an LEP child. Identification methods and criteria vary from school district to school district and from state to state. This causes a discrepancy in the number of persons reported as LEP.

The census is used by some researchers to determine the LEP population in the United States. Anstrom (1996) noted that the identification of an LEP student is based on only two questions on the census form. The person being asked the census questions may not understand what they are being asked. This can influence LEP population estimates.

It is clear that immigration is causing America to become more multicultural. Over 13 million immigrants have entered the United States in the last 40 years. The birth rate of immigrants is typically higher than that of the majority Caucasian population of the United States. Immigration has caused a large increase in the number of individuals classified as LEP (Imig, Kostelnik, & Villarruel, 1995).

The Asian American ethnic group is growing faster than any other ethnic group in the United States, even faster than the Hispanics. The total number of Hispanics is much higher than the Asians, but the Asian rate of growth far exceeds that of the Hispanics. The immigration policy of the United States has been favorable to Asian immigration since
The Immigration Act of 1965. Immigration accounts for the enormous increase in the Asian American population in America (Hsia & Hirano-Nakanishi, 1989).

The increase of the LEP student population has affected almost every school district in the United States (Dale, 1986). Rural as well as urban schools have been influenced by this growth (Parla, 1994). Kreidler (1986) stated that 50% of all public school teachers in the United States have had experience teaching LEP students, but only six percent have had any course work in ESL teaching techniques.

Teachers are being asked to work with ESL students with little or no preparation. Most LEP children are taught by classroom teachers that have not been exposed to strategies that would assist them in teaching English as a second language (Logan, 1987). Only a small number of teachers are presently trained to work with LEP students (Abramson, Garcia, & Pritchard, 1993). There is a need to prepare preservice and inservice teachers to work with students who speak English as a second language. The number of teachers being prepared to teach ESL needs to increase (Lasky, 1992).

The field of teaching English as a second language, as an organized profession, has existed since the early 1940's. The University of Michigan is
recognized as offering the first training for English as a second language teachers. The courses they offered centered around the field of linguistics. TESOL programs grew and were infused with federal funding after the passage of the National Defense Education Act in 1964. Many of the TESOL programs that exist today began in the early 1970's. The number of university programs in TESOL grew from 46 in 1972 to 196 in 1986 (Kreidler, 1987). The influx of LEP students into the United States perpetuates the need to prepare more ESL teachers. This should contribute to the continued growth of TESOL programs at the university level.

Lasky (1992) stated that an English as a second language component needs to be included in the mainstream teacher education programs that currently exist. The preservice teacher needs to be exposed to methods that work with the LEP student. "Therefore, basic credential programs must ensure that teachers coming into the field receive training in language acquisition, teaching ESL, and adapting curriculum to the needs of linguistically diverse students" (Abramson, et. al, 1993, p. 54). The professional development needs of teachers already in the classroom could be met by providing inservice training in ESL techniques (Valentin, 1993).
Several states require all teacher candidates to be prepared to teach LEP students. This situation is especially true in states that have large populations of students whose first language is not English (Abramson, et al., 1993). Some states require professional development and inservice training in ESL for all teachers (Clair, 1995).

Daugherty, McCandless, and Rossi (1996) stated that teachers who live in areas with high numbers of LEP students are more likely to receive ESL training than their peers in other parts of the country where the LEP population is lower. They believe that the level of training teachers receive to work with second language learners is proportionate to the number of LEP students they teach.

The lack of money for TESOL training and development can hinder a teacher from taking course work or participating in professional development activities. The federal government has made it easier for teachers to overcome this obstacle. Funding is available to state departments of education and universities that have an interest in preparing inservice and preservice teachers to work with LEP students. The new Eisenhower Professional Development program, Title I, and the Bilingual Education Act provide funds for teacher education and professional development (U. S. Department of Education, 1995;
The Eisenhower Professional Development program is also known as Title II. The needs of the local school district must be considered when Title II funds are used. Administrators and teachers decide the type of professional development activities that are needed to prepare their school district to meet academic goals established by the state. The type of professional development authorized by Title II must be consistent with the aims of the district and long-term term. Title II also allows universities the opportunity to offer programs of professional development for teachers. The Eisenhower Professional Development program assists schools district and universities in preparing teachers to work with LEP students (U. S. Department of Education, 1995).

As mentioned previously, Title I has gone through many revisions during its 30-year existence. The Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 further refined the objectives of Title I. One of the provisions of the new Title I is to provide professional development for instructors of LEP students. Many school districts employ bilingual aides to work with ESL students. Title I supports the professional development of teacher aides as well as teachers (Anstrom, 1995; U. S. Department of Education, 1995).
The Bilingual Education Act, Title VII, is specifically designed to improve the instruction of LEP students. Title VII provides grants to help schools and teachers work with LEP students. The federal government prints applications for Title VII grants in the Federal Register (Appendix E). Any school district or university can apply for funds to prepare teachers to work with LEP students. The Bilingual Education Act authorized the following:

Title VII authorizes competitive grants to institutions of higher education, states, and districts to upgrade the pre-service and in-service professional development of teachers and other educational personnel. This training will better prepare teachers to teach limited English proficient students to meet the same challenging standards expected of all children. (U. S. Department of Education, 1995, p. 6)

The Eisenhower Professional Development Program, Title I, and the Bilingual Education Act are designed to work together to provide the best education possible to diverse student populations. The emphasis on teacher preparation and development is to help LEP students reach the standards proposed in Goals 2000 (Anstrom, 1995; U. S. Department of Education, 1995).

The state of Mississippi has experienced an increase in its LEP student population. “Mississippi has 82 counties and 153 Public School Districts.”
Currently, limited English proficient (LEP) students are enrolled in 72 of these school districts in approximately two thirds of the state's counties" (Mississippi State Department of Education, 1996, p. 2). The kindergarten through twelfth grade LEP population in Mississippi has risen from 1,291 in the 1985-1986 school year (Olsen, 1989) to 2,777 in the 1995-1996 school year (Mississippi State Department of Education, 1996). This was a 115% increase in the LEP population in a 10-year period.

The five major language groups represented in Mississippi public schools in the 1994-1995 school year were Choctaw, Vietnamese, Spanish, Mandarin, and Korean. A total of 48 languages other than English were reported to be the native languages of Mississippi’s LEP public school population during this time period (Mississippi State Department of Education, 1995).

There were approximately 60 teachers with the ESL endorsement in Mississippi but only six of these were teaching English as a second language in the 1995-1996 school year (Jayne Everett, Mississippi State Department of Education, Statistics Director, personal communication, July 2, 1996; Debra Zischke, Mississippi State Department of Education, personal communication, July 1996). The ratio of ESL teachers teaching English as a second language to the total number of kindergarten through twelfth grade LEP students in Mississippi during the 1995-1996
school year was 1:450. This low ratio of ESL teachers to LEP students indicates a need to prepare more teachers to teach English as a second language in Mississippi.

Preparing Teachers to Work with LEP Students

The LEP student population in the United States is increasing (Brooks & Kaufman, 1996; Kreidler, 1986; Lasky, 1992; Parla, 1994; Rennie, 1993). This trend is projected to continue. There is a need to prepare teachers to work with students who are linguistically and culturally diverse (Parla, 1994). The number of teachers currently prepared to work with LEP students represents a minority of the total teaching population (Goodwin & Torres-Guzman, 1995; Kreidler, 1986). The need to offer all teachers the opportunity to learn how to work with LEP students is apparent.

Types of programs which prepare teachers to work with LEP students are presented in this section of the literature review. Aspects of preservice teacher education and inservice teachers' professional development were examined.

Mainstream teachers usually are not prepared to teach LEP students (Logan 1987) and it is their classroom in which the LEP student is generally placed. Teacher education programs could help to remedy this situation by preparing all preservice teachers to work with LEP students (Lasky, 1992). University and college teacher education programs need to
include a TESOL component in existing courses or add a TESOL course to the program of study for mainstream preservice teachers. The preservice teacher should be encouraged to take course work in a language other than English because this would enhance their understanding of the second language learner. Completing course work in TESOL and a language other than English would help the preservice teacher to develop skills to work with LEP students. These courses need to be a part of the preservice teacher's program of study (Logan, 1987).

Britten (1988) stated that teachers generally teach the way they were taught. Novice teachers will continue to apply methods of teaching in their own classrooms which they have seen modeled in their teacher education programs. Teacher education programs which place value on multiculturalism and diversity tend to produce teachers with these same values.

Anstrom and Galbraith (1995) maintained that ESL and mainstream teachers should work together to meet the needs of LEP students. The State University of New York (SUNY) at Stony Brook teacher education program encouraged collaboration between mainstream and ESL preservice teachers. The preservice teachers were taught to value the needs of LEP students in a class which combined science and ESL. Some of the TESOL and science professors at SUNY at Stony Brook developed an
interdisciplinary course, based on constructivist principles, to prepare preservice teachers to work with LEP students. The TESOL and science students enrolled in this class shared expertise relevant to their particular areas with each other. The TESOL students learned about science and the science students learned ESL teaching techniques. They planned and taught lessons collaboratively. The preservice teachers involved believed they were better prepared to work with LEP students because of this class (Brooks & Kaufman, 1996). The collaborative spirit modeled by the TESOL and science professors in this course will likely be emulated by the preservice teachers involved when they have their own classrooms.

Induction year programs have helped preservice teachers make the transition to their first job as an educator. Induction year programs pair an experienced teacher with a beginning teacher. A mentor/mentee relationship is established (Goodwin & Torres-Guzman, 1995; Choy, Geis, & Henke, 1996). An induction year program is a good investment for school districts because it helps beginning teachers to stay in the teaching profession and lessens staff turnover. Many teachers leave the teaching profession after just a few years. This is especially true for teachers who work with LEP students. Support systems, such as those established with induction year programs, would help novice teachers stay in the classroom (Gonzales & Sosa, 1993).
Experienced teachers can prepare to work with LEP students through professional development activities. Teachers benefit from participation in professional development activities throughout their careers (Bobbit, et al., 1993; Choy et al., 1996). Professional development keeps teachers informed and up to date about what is going on in their field.

Inservice programs offer professional development for experienced teachers. Mendelsohn (1994) noted the following:

Inservice is not merely desirable, but essential. Through good inservice programs, teachers develop the confidence to grapple with problems they are having in their teaching and try to make changes, even though they do not have, and will never have, all the answers.

(pp. 92-93).

Mendelsohn reported that teachers should have input into the type of inservice they need. Teachers should be consulted about what they would like to learn about culturally and linguistically diverse students. Then appropriate professional development should be designed around the needs of the teachers.

Peer coaching is another type of professional development that can strengthen a teacher's understanding of LEP students. An ESL teacher is paired with a mainstream teacher in the peer coaching model. These teachers work with one another in the mutually supportive environment of
the classroom to enhance their skills for teaching LEP students. Peer coaching is long-term and meaningful (Anstrom & Galbraith, 1995).

The trainer of trainers approach is the last type of program for preparing ESL teachers that will be examined in this section of the literature review. Teachers receive training in a particular method or technique and then share their expertise with other teachers in their school when this method is utilized (United States Department of Education, 1994).

The Bay Area Writing (BAWP) project utilized the trainer of trainers model. Gray and Sterling (1997) stated that the BAWP, which began in 1974, was an effort to change the attitude many held toward writing in schools across the United States. There was a lack of understanding about the writing process and of the importance of writing which the BAWP wanted to change. The BAWP also had another goal. They desired to establish meaningful professional development activities for teachers.

The National Writing Project (NWP) was born from the efforts of the BAWP. The NWP utilized the trainer of trainers model. Teachers make the best teachers of other teachers, according to Gray and Sterling (1997). The NWP supports summer institutes where teachers receive extensive preparation in the writing process. These teachers then take the skills
they learn back to the local school district, where they present programs of professional development for their colleagues. The NWP funds the University of Mississippi Writing Project (UMWP). The UMWP provides professional development opportunities for teachers in 17 north Mississippi counties (Progressive Education Workshops, 1997).

Teachers in Mississippi who work with LEP students could benefit from a program of training similar to the model used by the National Writing Project. The National Writing Project funds the Mississippi Writing-Thinking Institute which provides professional development for teachers in the summer and throughout the school year. Teachers who attend the summer institute of the Mississippi Writing-Thinking Institute go back into their school district to teach other teachers how to implement writing into their classroom (Linda Perkes, Mississippi Writing-Thinking Institute, November 25, 1996, personal communication).

The Bilingual Education/National Origin Desegregation Office of the Mississippi State Department of Education (Mississippi State Department of Education, 1996) reported that consultants were available to work with local school districts in providing professional development sessions to prepare teachers to work with LEP students. This office also maintains two libraries of materials to utilize when teaching LEP students. One of the libraries is located in Biloxi and the other in Jackson. Any teacher in
Mississippi can check out materials for an extended period of time to use with their students. The materials can be checked out and returned in the mail.

The increase in the number of LEP students in Mississippi public schools and the lack of teachers prepared to teach them supports the need to offer programs of instruction to preservice and inservice teachers in north Mississippi which would prepare them to work with this population of students. Course work relevant to teaching LEP students should be included in the preservice teachers' programs of study (Logan, 1987). Experienced teachers would benefit from exposure to inservice activities prepared to help them work with LEP students (Mendelsohn, 1994).

Summary of the Literature Review

Factors associated with preparing teachers to work with LEP students were investigated in the literature review. The legal aspects of second language instruction, the need to prepare teachers to work with LEP students, and types of instruction for the preparation of teachers of English as a second language were examined.

The literature revealed the struggle LEP students have endured in their quest for an education. It was discovered that federal mandates had to be initiated to assure LEP individuals access to an education commensurate with that of mainstream American students.
According to the research, the number of LEP students attending public schools in the United States is not proportionate to the number of teachers prepared to teach them. The LEP student population is projected to continue to affect classrooms in urban as well as rural areas of America. There is a need to prepare all teachers, preservice and inservice, to work with LEP students.

Types of instruction for preparing teachers to work with LEP students were also examined. Various instructional practices were found to prepare preservice and inservice teachers to work with LEP students.

The literature review presented a rationale and theoretical basis for the study. Teachers are important links to the new culture in which LEP students find themselves immersed. State departments of education, university teacher education personnel and local school district administrators should do their part in providing opportunities for teachers to develop and improve their skills in teaching LEP students. The input of teachers should be considered when teacher education programs and professional development activities are planned for preservice and inservice teachers preparing to work with LEP students.
The purpose of this study was to investigate selected factors associated with preparing elementary teachers to work with limited English proficient (LEP) students in the public elementary schools of north Mississippi. This chapter will describe the subjects, materials, and procedures used to gather and analyze the data needed for the study. The chapter is presented in three sections: (a) subjects, (b) instrument, and (c) procedures.

Subjects

The subjects for this study were elementary teachers from 17 school districts in north Mississippi public schools with an identified LEP student population as reported on the annual LEP survey conducted by the Mississippi State Department of Education's Project Director for Bilingual Education and National Origin in the spring of 1996 (Mississippi State Department of Education, 1996). The school districts with an LEP population in the spring of 1996 were as follows: Alcorn, Benoit, Calhoun County, Cleveland, Corinth, DeSoto County, Holly Springs, Houston,
Itawamba, Lee County, Nettleton, Oxford, Pontotoc County, Senatobia Municipal, Tishomingo County, Tunica County, and Tupelo.

The population of elementary teachers in the school districts of north Mississippi with a LEP population was 2,047 in the 1996-1997 school year. The population total was determined using the Mississippi Educational Directory (1996) which listed school districts and the schools within the districts and a database report from the Office of Management Information Systems at the Mississippi State Department of Education which listed the names and addresses of all kindergarten through eighth grade teachers in the school districts of north Mississippi.

Each teacher from school districts in north Mississippi with LEP students was included in the population count for this study. A table of random numbers was used to generate the list of teachers for the sample (Borg & Gall, 1989). A random sample of 325 was recommended for a population size of 2,047 (Krejcie & Morgan, n.d.). The researcher adjusted this size upward by 24 subjects. An upward adjustment in the sample size is recommended when survey research is utilized. This adjustment is necessary because some of the sample may choose not to respond to the survey (Balian, 1994). A random sample of 344 elementary teachers was chosen to participate in the study.
Instrument

The instrument used to gather the data for this study was a questionnaire (Appendix F) constructed by the researcher. Most of the questions were in a checklist format. Some open-ended questions were also included. There were five categories of questions on the questionnaire. The five categories of questions were as follows: (a) demographics (see Table 2), (b) legal aspects of teaching LEP students (see Table 3), (c) the need to prepare teachers to work with LEP students (see Table 4), (d) types of instruction for preparing teachers to work with LEP students (see Table 5), and (e) a general question related to teaching LEP students (see Table 6). There were six questions in the demographics category, three in the legal aspects category, eleven in the need to prepare teachers category, three in the type of instruction category, and one in the general questions category.

After the questionnaire had been returned by the teachers participating in the survey, several minor errors were discovered on the questionnaire. The errors were as follows: (a) The numerals for 7 and 8 were not used when numbering the questionnaire; (b) a question mark instead of a period should have been used on question number 11 after the phrase “which of the following groups were represented”; (c) a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONS RELATED TO DEMOGRAPHICS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many years of teaching experience do you have?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the highest degree you have obtained?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was English the first language you learned as a child?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you proficient in a language other than English?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which grade(s) do you teach?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you ever been in a situation where you needed to know a language other than English?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3

**QUESTIONS RELATED TO THE LEGAL ASPECTS OF TEACHING LEP STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you been made aware of the legal mandates that apply to teaching limited English proficient students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you familiar with the Bilingual Education Act which provides money for teacher training and student programs for limited English proficient children?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A teacher who has a standard Mississippi teaching certificate can add an endorsement in teaching English as second language to his or her certificate. This K-12 endorsement can be added by taking from 12 to 15 semester hours of specified course work. Would you be interested in adding this endorsement to your certificate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4
QUESTIONs RELATED TO THE NEED TO PREPARE TEACHERS TO WORK WITH LEP STUDENTS

Do you have any experience teaching limited English proficient children in the classroom?

Yes No

Approximately how many limited English proficient students were in your school district during the 1995-1996 school year?

0 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26 or more

If limited English proficient students were enrolled in your school district during the 1995-1996 school year, which of the following groups were represented. If there were no limited English proficient students in your school district, go to number 12.

___ Choctaw ___ Korean ___ Chinese ___ Mexican ___ Vietnamese
___ Other (please specify)

Approximately how many limited English proficient students are in your school district during the 1996-1997 school year?

0 1-5 6-10 10-15 16-20 20-25 26 or more

If limited English proficient students are enrolled in your school district during the 1996-1997 school year, which of the following groups are represented. If there are no limited English proficient students in your school district, go to number 14.

___ Choctaw ___ Korean ___ Chinese ___ Mexican ___ Vietnamese
___ Other (please specify)

If your school district has limited English proficient students, place a check beside each of the following statements that applies. Go to number 15 if your school district does not have any limited English proficient students.

In my school district, limited English proficient students

___ are taught by a regular classroom teacher
___ are taught by an assistant teacher
___ are taught in the regular classroom setting
___ are taught only in their native language
___ are taught only in English
___ are taught using their native language and English

The number of limited English proficient students in my school district has:

___ Increased during this school year
___ Decreased during this school year
___ Not changed during this school year

If there is an increase, why does this seem to be happening?

The number of limited English proficient students in my school district will probably:

___ Increase during the 1997-1998 school year
___ Decrease during the 1997-1998 school year
___ Not change during the 1997-1998 school year
| Has your education prepared you to teach limited English proficient students? |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Yes | No |

| How do you rate your college education in preparing you to teach limited English proficient students? |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Very satisfactory | Satisfactory | Acceptable |
| Not Satisfactory | Unacceptable |

| What have you done to prepare to teach limited English proficient students? |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. | I have taken an undergraduate college course or courses. |
| Which type(s) of undergraduate course(s) did you take? |
| A course specifically on teaching limited English proficient students |
| A course which contained a component on teaching limited English proficient students |
| b. | I have taken a graduate college course or courses. |
| Which type(s) of graduate course(s) did you take? |
| A course specifically on teaching limited English proficient students |
| A course which contained a component on teaching limited English proficient students. |
| c. | I have completed training sponsored by my local school district and conducted by someone in the local school district. |
| d. | I have completed training sponsored by my local school district and conducted by someone from outside the local school district. |
| e. | I have completed a seminar or workshop conducted at a professional conference. |
| f. | Other (please specify) | |
| g. | I have not had any training related to teaching limited English proficient students. |
TABLE 5

QUESTIONS RELATED TO TYPES OF INSTRUCTION FOR PREPARING TEACHERS TO WORK WITH LEP STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which type of training would you be willing to participate in order to learn how to teach limited English proficient students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ___ An undergraduate college course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ___ A graduate college course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ___ Training sponsored by my local school district and conducted by someone in the local school district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ___ Training sponsored by my local school district and conducted by someone from outside the local school district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. ___ A seminar or workshop conducted at a professional conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ___ Other (please specify) ____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. ___ I am not interested in preparing to work with limited English proficient students at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When would you prefer to attend training sessions to learn how to teach limited English proficient students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___ During the summer ___ During the school year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Other (please specify) ____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where would you prefer to attend training sessions to learn how to teach limited English proficient students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___ My local school district ___ A college or university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Other (please specify) ____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6

GENERAL QUESTION RELATED TO TEACHING LEP STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Briefly respond to the following question. What should be done to prepare teachers to work with limited English proficient students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
question mark instead of a period should have been used on question number 13 after the phrase “which of the following groups are represented”; (d) the numbering of the categories on question 12 should have been consistent with the categories on number 10; and (e) the word “order” should not have been used in question number 20. Also, teachers should have been given an opportunity to respond to question 5 in an open-ended format. The teachers should have been asked to explain what type of situation they had been in when knowledge of another language was necessary.\footnote{A corrected copy of the questionnaire is located in Appendix G.}

Procedures

The questionnaire was pretested the last week of February and the first week of March in 1997. The last week of February a teacher research group, of which the researcher is a member, was given a copy of the questionnaire to critique. Three teachers from this group responded to the questionnaire. Two of these teachers were from school districts in north Mississippi which had an identified LEP population. One was an instructor of English at a community college in north Mississippi. The first week of March two instructors at a university in north Mississippi gave their graduate students, who were teachers in north Mississippi public schools...
with an identified LEP population, the opportunity to respond to the questionnaire. Four teachers fit into this category and responded to the questionnaire. A total of seven teachers in all participated in the pretesting of the questionnaire. Only one teacher wrote that one question was unclear. The researcher rewrote this question. The researcher added several more questions to the questionnaire and refined others to clarify them after attending an international TESOL conference the second week of March. A postcard (Appendix H) was mailed to the school addresses of the sample on March 18. The postcard let the teachers know the type of study that was being conducted and told them to expect a questionnaire in the mail soon.

The questionnaire, a cover letter (Appendix I), and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were sent to the sample on April 7. The number of questionnaires returned by April 22 was 129. Because of the low return rate, the researcher determined that the questionnaire needed to be sent out again. The responses to the questionnaires were anonymous, but some teachers chose to put their names and addresses on the return envelope or on the optional section of the questionnaire. The response rate may have been better if the researcher had coded the questionnaires to determine which subjects had returned the survey.
The second set of questionnaires was sent to teachers who had not identified themselves when the initial questionnaire was returned. The questionnaire, a cover letter (Appendix J), and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were mailed the last week of April. Teachers were asked to disregard the second letter if they had already returned the questionnaire. A total of 72 additional questionnaires were returned in May and June. The total number of questionnaires returned in all was 201. This total represents 62% of the recommended sample size of 325 and 58% of the upward adjusted sample size of 344.

Data Analysis

The data from the questionnaires were analyzed using the SPSS 6.1 for Windows Student Version (1994) software package. Tables were used to present the data. Statistical analysis involved measuring frequency and percentage of responses.
The purpose of this study was to investigate selected factors associated
with preparing elementary teachers to work with limited English proficient
students in the public elementary schools of north Mississippi. The data
collected in the study, the results obtained from the statistical analysis,
and a summary of the findings are presented in chapter four.

A profile of the sample is presented in the first section of this chapter.
Then the data collected and results obtained are presented for each of
the research questions posed for the study. The questions are addressed
in the following order: (a) Are elementary teachers in north Mississippi
public schools aware of the legal aspects of providing instruction to
limited English proficient students?; (b) Is there a need to prepare
elementary teachers in north Mississippi public schools to work with limited
English proficient students?; and (c) Which types of instruction would
elementary teachers in north Mississippi prefer to participate in when
preparing to work with limited English proficient students? The data
collected and results obtained for one general, open-ended question are
also reported. A summary of the findings is included in the last section of this chapter.

**Analysis of Sample Profile Questions**

Six demographic questions were posed on the questionnaire. The sample profile was derived from these questions. A table summarizes the number and percentage of responses for each question.

Question 1 asked, "How many years of teaching experience do you have?" The respondents answered by checking whether they had 0-1, 2-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, or 20 or more years of experience (see Table 7). The respondents reported the following number of years of teaching experience: (a) 13 (6.5%) had 0 to 1 year of teaching experience; (b) 41 (20.4%) had 2-5 years of teaching experience; (c) 25 (12.4%) had 6 to 10 years of teaching experience; (d) 35 (17.4%) had 11-15 years of teaching experience; (e) 30 (14.9%) had 16 to 20 years of teaching experience; and (f) 57 (28.4%) had 20 or more years of teaching experience.

Question 2 asked, "What is the highest degree you have obtained?" The respondents answered by checking whether they had a bachelor's, master's, or specialist's degree (see Table 8). The respondents reported the highest degree they had obtained as follows: (a) 132 (65.7%) had a
### TABLE 7
YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8
HIGHEST DEGREE OBTAINED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bachelor's degree; (b) 65 (32.3%) had a master's degree; and (c) 4 (2.0%) had a specialist's degree. None of the respondents reported having a doctorate.

Question 3 asked, "Was English the first language you learned as a child?" The respondents answered by checking yes or no on the questionnaire (see Table 9). Each of the respondents reported that English was the first language they learned as a child.

Question 4 asked, "Are you proficient in a language other than English?" The respondents answered by checking yes or no on the questionnaire (see Table 10). The number of respondents proficient in a language other than English was 6 (3.0 %). The number of respondents who were not proficient in a language other than English was 195 (97%).

Question 5 asked, "Have you ever been in a situation where you needed to know a language other than English?" The respondents answered by checking yes or no on the questionnaire (see Table 11). The number of respondents who had been in a situation where they needed to know a language other than English was 107 (53.2%). There were 93 (46.3%) of the respondents who had not been in this situation. There was 1 (.5%) of the respondents who did not reply to this question.
### TABLE 9
FIRST LANGUAGE LEARNED AS A CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was English Your First Language?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 10
PROFICIENCY IN A LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency in a Language Other Than English</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 11
SITUATION WHERE KNOWLEDGE OF ANOTHER LANGUAGE WAS NEEDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation where knowledge of another language was needed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 9 asked, "Which grade(s) do you teach?" The respondents answered by checking the grade(s) they taught. The grades listed were kindergarten, first grade, second grade, third grade, fourth grade, fifth grade, sixth grade, or not listed. Respondents who taught more than one grade were reported as multi-grade (see Table 12). The respondents reported the grade(s) they taught as follows: (a) 17 (8.5%) taught kindergarten; (b) 29 (14.4%) taught first grade; (c) 29 (14.4%) taught second grade; (d) 19 (9.5%) taught third grade; (e) 19 (9.5%) taught fourth grade; (f) 14 (7.0%) taught fifth grade; (g) 21 (10.4%) taught sixth grade; and (h) 45 (22.4%) taught more than one grade. There were eight (4.0%) of the respondents who did not report the grade(s) they taught.

Analysis of Research Questions

This section addresses the research questions posed for this study. The questions will be addressed in the following order: (a) Are elementary teachers in north Mississippi public schools aware of the legal aspects of providing instruction to limited English proficient students?; (b) Is there a need to prepare elementary teachers in north Mississippi public schools to work with limited English proficient students?; and (c) Which types of instruction would elementary teachers in north Mississippi prefer to participate in when preparing to work with limited English proficient
### TABLE 12

**GRADES TAUGHT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-grade</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first research question in this study asked, "Are elementary teachers in north Mississippi public schools aware of the legal aspects of providing instruction to limited English proficient students?" Questions 23, 24, and 25 of the questionnaire dealt with the legal aspects of providing instruction to LEP students. The sample's responses to these questions are reported in this section of the data analysis.

Question 23 asked, "Have you been made aware of the legal mandates that apply to teaching limited English proficient students?" The respondents answered by checking yes or no on the questionnaire (see Table 13). The number of respondents who reported they were aware of the legal mandates that apply to teaching LEP children was 48 (23.9%). The number of respondents who were not aware of the legal mandates that apply to teaching LEP children was 146 (72.6%). There were 7 (3.5%) of the respondents who did not respond to this question.

Question 24 asked, "Are you familiar with the Bilingual Education Act which provides money for teacher training and student programs for limited English proficient children?" The respondents answered by checking yes or no on the questionnaire (see Table 14). The number of
TABLE 13

AWARE OF LEGAL MANDATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Mandates</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 14

BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bilingual Education Act</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respondents who were familiar with the Bilingual Education Act was 30 (14.9%). The number of respondents who were not familiar with the Bilingual Education Act was 163 (81.1%). There were 8 (4.0%) of the respondents who did not respond to this question.

Question 25 stated, "A teacher who has a standard Mississippi teaching certificate can add an endorsement in teaching English as a second language to his or her certificate. This K-12 endorsement can be added by taking from 12 to 15 semester hours of specified course work. Would you be interested in adding this endorsement to your certificate?"
The respondents answered by checking yes or no on the questionnaire (see Table 15). The number of respondents who were interested in adding the ESL endorsement to their certificate was 79 (39.3%). There were 115 (57.2%) of the respondents who were not interested in adding the ESL endorsement to their certificate. The number of respondents who did not respond to this question was 7 (3.5%).

The second research question in this study asked, "Is there a need to prepare elementary teachers in north Mississippi public schools to work with limited English proficient students?" Questions 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 of the questionnaire dealt with the need to prepare elementary teachers in north Mississippi to teach LEP students. The
### TABLE 15

ESL ENDORSEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESL Endorsement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>201</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sample's responses to these questions are reported in this section of the data analysis.

Question 6 asked, "Do you have any experience teaching limited English proficient children in the classroom?" The respondents answered by checking yes or no on the questionnaire (see Table 16). The number of respondents who had experience teaching LEP children was 54 (26.9%). There were 144 (71.6%) of the respondents who did not have any experience teaching LEP students. The number of respondents who did not respond to this question was 3 (1.5%).

Question 10 asked, "Approximately how many limited English proficient students were in your school district during the 1995-1996 school year?" The respondents answered by checking 0, 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25 or 26 or more (see Table 17). The respondents reported the following number of LEP students in their school districts in the 1995-1996 school year: (a) 0 was reported by 38 (18.9%) of the respondents; (b) 1-5 was reported by 75 (37.3%) of the respondents; (c) 6-10 was reported by 33 (16.4%) of the respondents; (d) 11-15 was reported by 12 (6.0%) of the respondents; (e) 16-20 was reported by 9 (4.5%) of the respondents; (f) 21-25 was reported by 1 (.5%) of the respondents; (g) 26 or more was
### TABLE 16

EXPERIENCE TEACHING LEP CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience teaching LEP children</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 17

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS IN THE 1995-1996 SCHOOL YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 or more</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reported by 17 (8.5%) of the respondents; and no response was reported by 16 (8.0%) of the respondents.

Question 11 asked, "If limited English proficient students were enrolled in your school district during the 1995-1996 school year, which of the following groups were represented. If there were no limited English proficient students in your school district, go to number 12. The respondents answered by checking Choctaw, Korean, Chinese, Mexican, Vietnamese and other. Multiethnic was used to code a respondent's answer if more than one ethnic group was checked on the questionnaire and none was used to code respondents who did not report any LEP students in their school district (see Table 18). The respondents reported the following groups of LEP students in their school district during the 1995-1996 school year: (a) Chinese was reported by 3 (1.5%) of the respondents; (b) Mexican was reported by 97 (48.3%) of the respondents; (c) Vietnamese was reported by 1 (.5%) of the respondents; (d) other was reported by 5 (2.5%) of the respondents; (e) multiethnic was reported by 41 (20.4%) of the respondents; (f) none was reported by 54 (26.9%) of the respondents; and (g) Choctaw and Korean was not reported by any of the respondents."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Represented</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choctaw</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiethnic</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 12 asked, "Approximately how many limited English proficient students are in your school district during the 1996-1997 school year?" The respondents answered by checking 0, 1-5, 6-10, 10-15, 16-20, 20-25 or 26 or more (see Table 19). The respondents reported the following number of students in their school districts in the 1996-1997 school year: (a) 0 was reported by 43 (21.4%) of the respondents; (b) 1-5 was reported by 68 (33.8%) of the respondents; (c) 6-10 was reported by 26 (12.9%) of the respondents; (d) 11-15 was reported by 19 (9.5%) of the respondents; (e) 16-20 was reported by 8 (4.0%) of the respondents; (f) 21-25 was reported by 3 (1.5%) of the respondents; (g) 26 or more was reported by 14 (7.0%) of the respondents; and (h) no response was reported by 20 (10.0%) of the respondents.

Question 13 asked, "If limited English proficient students are enrolled in your school district during the 1996-1997 school year, which of the following groups are represented. If there are no limited English proficient students in your school district, go to number 14." The respondents answered by checking Choctaw, Korean, Chinese, Mexican, Vietnamese, and other. Multiethnic was used to code a respondent's answer if more than one ethnic group was checked on the questionnaire and none was used to code respondents who did not report any LEP students in their
TABLE 19

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS IN THE 1996-1997 SCHOOL YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 or more</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
school district (see Table 20). The respondents reported the following
number of LEP students in their school districts in the 1996-1997 school
year: (a) Chinese was reported by 2 (1.0%) of the respondents; (b)
Mexican was reported by 90 (44.8%) of the respondents; (c) other was
reported by 3 (1.5%) of the respondents; (d) multiethnic was reported by
45 (22.4%) of the respondents; (e) none was reported by 61 (30.3%) of the
respondents; and (f) Vietnamese, Choctaw, and Korean was not
reported by any of the respondents.

Question 14 stated, "If your school district has limited English proficient
students, place a check beside each of the following statements that
applies. Go to number 15 if your school district does not have any limited
English proficient students." The respondents answered by checking each
of the following that applied to their situation. In my school district,
limited English proficient students; (a) are taught by a regular classroom
teacher; (b) are taught by an assistant teacher; (c) are taught in the
regular classroom setting; (d) are taught only in their native language;
(e) are taught only in English; and (f) are taught using their native
language and English (see Table 21). The number of teachers responding
to the statements in question 14 were as follows: (a) "In my school district,
### TABLE 20

**GROUPS OF LEP STUDENTS IN THE 1996-1997 SCHOOL YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Represented</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiethnic</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choctaw</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>201</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 21

**WAYS LEP STUDENTS ARE TAUGHT IN NORTH MISSISSIPPI PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEP STUDENTS ARE TAUGHT</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By a regular classroom teacher</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By an assistant teacher</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the regular classroom setting</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only in their native language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only in English</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using their native language and English</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEP students are taught by a regular classroom teacher," was reported by 133 (66.2%) of the respondents; (b) "In my school district, LEP students are taught by an assistant teacher," was reported by 58 (28.9%) of the respondents; (c) "In my school district, LEP students are taught in the regular classroom setting," was reported by 104 (51.7%) of the respondents; (d) "In my school district, LEP students are taught only in their native language," was reported by 1 (.5%) of the respondents; (e) "In my school district, LEP students are taught only in English," was reported by 72 (35.8%) of the respondents; and (f) "In my school district, LEP students are taught in their native language and English," was reported by 47 (23.4%) of the respondents.

Question 15 stated, "The number of LEP students in my school district has_____." The respondents checked one of following phrases to complete the statement posed in question 15: (a) Increased during this school year; (b) decreased during this school year; and (c) not changed during this school year. If there was an increase, the respondents were asked to state why there was an increase (see Table 22). The respondents reported the following changes in their school district’s LEP population for the 1996-1997 school year: (a) An increase was reported by 64 (31.8%) of the respondents; (b) a decrease was reported by 19 (9.5%) of the
TABLE 22

CHANGE IN NUMBER OF LEP STUDENTS DURING 1996-1997 SCHOOL YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not changed</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respondents; (c) the number of respondents that reported their LEP population had not changed was 92 (45.8%) of the respondents; and (d) the number of respondents that did not respond to this question was 26 (12.9%) of the respondents.

There were 64 (31.8%) of the respondents who reported an increase. Only 38 of the teachers reporting an increase responded as to why they thought this was happening. These responses were placed in three categories. The categories were work, immigration, and miscellaneous. There were 27 respondents who stated work was the cause for the increase in the LEP population. The work category included employment in construction reported by 8 respondents, casinos reported by 8 respondents, farming reported by 3 respondents, and employment in general reported by 8 respondents. The immigration category was reported by 8 respondents. The responses of three teachers fit into the miscellaneous category.

Question 16 stated, "The number of LEP students in my school district will probably _____." The respondents checked one of following phrases to complete the statement in question 16: (a) Increase during the 1997-1998 school year; (b) decrease during the 1997-1998 school year; (c) not change during the 1997-1998 school year (see Table 23). The
TABLE 23

CHANGE IN NUMBER OF LEP STUDENTS DURING 1997-1998 SCHOOL YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not change</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respondents reported that they expected the LEP population in their school districts to do the following in the 1997-1998 school year:

(a) An increase was expected by 99 (49.3%) of the respondents; (b) a decrease was expected by 6 (3.0%) of the respondents; and (c) no change was expected by 76 (37.8%) of the respondents. No reply was given to this question by 20 (10.0%) of the respondents.

Question 17 asked, "Has your education prepared you to teach limited English proficient students?" The respondents answered by checking yes or no on the questionnaire (see Table 24). The number of respondents who believed their education had prepared them to work with LEP students was 9 (4.5%). The number of respondents who did not believe their education had prepared them to teach LEP students was 189 (94.0%). No response was given to this question by 3 (1.5%) of the respondents.

Question 18 asked, "How do you rate your college education in preparing you to teach limited English proficient students?" The respondents answered by checking one of the following categories on the questionnaire: (a) Very satisfactory; (b) satisfactory; (c) acceptable, (d) not satisfactory; or (e) unacceptable (see Table 25). The respondents' ratings on how their college education prepared them to work with LEP
**TABLE 24**

EDUCATION TO TEACH LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepared to teach LEP students</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 25**

RATINGS OF COLLEGE EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation to teach LEP students</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfactory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfactory</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
students was as follows: (a) Very satisfactory was reported by 2 (1.0%) of the respondents; (b) satisfactory was reported by 13 (6.5%) of the respondents; (c) acceptable was reported by 13 (6.5%) of the respondents; (d) not satisfactory was reported by 113 (56.2%) of the respondents; (e) unacceptable was reported by 53 (26.4%) of the respondents. No reply was given to this question by 7 (3.5%) of the respondents.

Question 19 asked, “What have you done to prepare to teach limited English proficient students?” The respondents answered by checking each of the following statements that applied to them: (a) I have taken an undergraduate college course or courses; (b) I have taken a graduate college course or courses; (c) I have completed training sponsored by my local school district and conducted by someone in the local school district; (d) I have completed training sponsored by my local school district and conducted by someone from outside the local school district; (e) I have completed a seminar or workshop conducted at a professional conference; (f) other (please specify) _________; and (g) I have not had any training related to teaching limited English proficient students? The statements, “I have taken an undergraduate college course or courses,” and “I have taken a graduate college course or
courses," were further delineated on the questionnaire by asking the respondents to check whether the course work they had taken was specifically on teaching LEP students or if it had a component on teaching LEP students. Some of the respondents checked if their course work was specifically on teaching LEP students or if it had a component on teaching LEP students, but others did not. Some only checked if they had taken an undergraduate or graduate course. The researcher did not report if the course work taken by the respondents was specifically on teaching LEP students or if the course work had a component on teaching LEP students. This was necessary because of the inconsistencies the respondents displayed in marking these statements on the questionnaire (see Table 26). The teachers in the survey had done the following to prepare to work with LEP students: (a) 13 (6.5%) of the respondents had taken an undergraduate college course or courses; (b) 3 (1.5%) had taken a graduate college course or courses; (c) 2 (1.0%) had completed training in the local school district which was conducted by someone in the local school district; (d) 4 (2.0%) had completed training in the local school district which was conducted by someone from outside the local school district; (e) 4 (2.0%) had completed a seminar or workshop at a professional conference; (f) 8 (4.0%) had completed some
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What teachers have done to prepare to teach LEP students</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taken an undergraduate course or courses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken a graduate course or courses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed training in local school district conducted by someone from local school district</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed training in local school district conducted by someone from outside local school district</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a seminar or workshop at a professional conference</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not had any training related to teaching LEP students</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
other type of training to prepare to work with LEP students; and (g) 175 (87.1%) had not participated in any training related to working with LEP students.

The third research question in this study asked, “Which types of instruction would elementary teachers in north Mississippi prefer to participate in when preparing to work with limited English proficient students?” Questions 20, 21, and 22 of the questionnaire dealt with types of instruction elementary teachers in north Mississippi would prefer to participate in when preparing to work with LEP students. The sample’s responses to these questions are reported in this section of the data analysis.

Question 20 asked, “Which type of training would you be willing to participate in to learn how to teach LEP students?” The respondents answered by checking each of the following that applied to them:
(a) An undergraduate college course; (b) a graduate college course; (c) training sponsored by my local school district and conducted by someone in the local school district; (d) training sponsored by my local school district and conducted by someone from outside the local school district; (e) a seminar or workshop conducted at a professional conference; (f) other (please specify) _________; and (g) I am not
interested in preparing to work with limited English proficient students at this time. Types of undergraduate or graduate courses were further delineated on the questionnaire by asking the respondents to check whether they would prefer to take a course specifically on teaching LEP students or a course with a component on teaching LEP students. Some of the respondents checked if their course work would be specifically on teaching LEP students or if it would have a component on teaching LEP students, but others did not. Some only checked if they would like to take an undergraduate or graduate course. The researcher did not report if the course work the respondents preferred to take would be specifically on teaching LEP students or if the course work would have a component on teaching LEP students. This was necessary because of the inconsistencies the respondents displayed in marking these statements on the questionnaire (see Table 27). The preferences of the teachers in the study related to preparing to teach LEP students were as follows: (a) There were 41 (20.4%) of the respondents who wanted to take an undergraduate course; (b) a total of 59 (29.4%) of the respondents wanted to take a graduate course; (c) there were 83 (41.3%) of the respondents who would complete training in the local school district if conducted by someone from inside the school district; (d) a total of 105
### TABLE 27

**HOW TEACHERS PREFER TO PREPARE TO WORK WITH LEP STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How teachers prefer to prepare to work with LEP students</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take an undergraduate college course</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a graduate college course</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete training in the local school district conducted by someone from the local school district</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete training in the local school district conducted by someone from outside the local school district</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete a seminar or workshop at a professional conference</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested in preparing to work with LEP students</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(52.2%) of the respondents would complete training in the local school district if conducted by someone from outside the school district; (e) there were 88 (43.8%) of the respondents who would like to complete a seminar or workshop at a professional conference; (f) only 1 (.5%) of the respondents wanted to do something other than what was listed on the questionnaire; and (g) there were 31 (15.4%) of the respondents who were not interested in preparing to work with LEP students.

Question 21 asked, “When would you prefer to attend training sessions to learn how to teach limited English proficient students?” The respondents answered by marking during the summer, during the school year, or other (please specify) _________. They were asked to choose each of the statements that applied to their situation (see Table 28). The teachers in the study preferred the following times for preparing to work with LEP students: (a) During the school year was chosen by 123 (61.2%) of the respondents; (b) during the summer was chosen by 54 (26.9%) of the respondents; and (c) other was chosen by 9 (4.5%) of the respondents.

Question 22 asked, “Where would you prefer to attend training sessions to learn how to teach limited English proficient students?” The respondents answered by checking one of the following statements:
TABLE 28

PREFERRED TIME FOR TRAINING SESSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When teachers prefer to attend training sessions to prepare to work with LEP students</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the school year</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the summer</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(a) In my school district; (b) a college or university; and (c) other (please specify) ________ (see Table 29). The teachers in the study preferred to attend training sessions to work with LEP students at the following locations: (a) The local school district was chosen by 145 (72.1%) of the respondents; (b) a college or university was chosen by 44 (21.9%) of the respondents; and (c) other locations were suggested by 10 (5.0%) of the respondents.

Analysis of General Question

There was one question in the general question category. Question 26 was an open-ended question. Question 26 stated, "Briefly respond to the following question. What should be done to prepare teachers to work with limited English proficient students?" A total of 134 (66.7%) of the teachers in the survey responded to this open-ended question. Some of the teachers made more than one response. The researcher read and categorized each of the respondents' statements (see Table 30). There were 6 responses that fit in the access to ESL materials category, 2 in the computer related items category, 6 in the monetary assistance category, 77 in the teacher development activities category, 40 in the preservice teacher training category, and 31 in the category labeled other.
**TABLE 29**

WHERE TEACHERS PREFER TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where training is preferred</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local school district</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or university</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 30**

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE TO PREPARE TEACHERS TO WORK WITH LEP STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response categories</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give teachers access to ESL materials</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give teachers access to computer related items</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide monetary assistance to teachers preparing to work with LEP students</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide teacher development activities</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide preservice teacher training</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Findings

A summary of the findings for each category of questions on the questionnaire will be reported in this section. The questions on the questionnaire were placed into the sample profile category, the research questions category, and the general question category. The questions will be examined in this order.

The sample profile category revealed that 60.7% of the respondents to the survey had 11 or more years of teaching experience. It also showed that only 34.3% of the respondents had pursued a graduate degree. All of the respondents reported that English was the first language they learned as a child. Only 3% were proficient in a language other than English. Over half of the respondents, 53.2%, had been in a situation where knowledge of another language was needed. The distribution of teachers across grade levels was concentrated in first and second grade, (28.8%) and at the multi-grade (22.4%) level.

The three questions in the research question category are addressed in the following order: (a) Are elementary teachers in north Mississippi public schools aware of the legal aspects of providing instruction to limited English proficient students?; (b) Is there a need to prepare elementary teachers in north Mississippi public schools to work with limited English
proficient students?; and (c) Which types of instruction would elementary teachers in north Mississippi prefer to participate in when preparing to work with limited English proficient students?

Are elementary teachers in north Mississippi public schools aware of the legal aspects of providing instruction to limited English proficient students? A majority, 72.6% of the respondents, were not aware of the legal mandates related to providing instruction to LEP students. Only 14.9% were aware of the Bilingual Education Act which provides funding for teacher training and development and student programs related to LEP students. Less than half of the respondents, 39.3%, were interested in adding the ESL endorsement to their teaching certificate.

Is there a need to prepare elementary teachers in north Mississippi public schools to work with limited English proficient students? A majority of the respondents, 68.7%, indicated that their school districts had an LEP student population in the 1996-1997 school year. School districts with an LEP population of 11 to 15 or more was reported by 22% of the respondents during this same period. Mexicans represented the largest group of LEP students in the public elementary schools of north Mississippi.

A large number of the respondents, 94%, believed their education had not prepared them to work with LEP students. Over 80% of the
respondents rated their college education as not satisfactory to unacceptable in preparing them to teach LEP students. A total of 175 respondents (87.1%) reported they had not had any training related to teaching LEP students.

Which types of instruction would elementary teachers in north Mississippi prefer to participate in when preparing to work with limited English proficient students? The majority of the respondents (52.2%) preferred to complete training in the local school district and to have the training conducted by someone from outside the school district. Many of the respondents (43.8%) also stated that they would like to complete a seminar or workshop at a professional conference. There were 20% of the respondents who preferred to take an undergraduate course and 29% who preferred to take a graduate course related to TESOL.

The majority of the respondents preferred to attend training sessions to prepare to work with LEP students during the school year. Only 1 out of 4 preferred to attend training sessions during the summer. Most of the respondents (72.1%) wanted training sessions to be conducted at their local school district.

There was one question in the general question category of the questionnaire. This open-ended question asked the respondents to briefly
respond to what they thought should be done to prepare teachers to work with limited English proficient students. There were 77 responses (55.4% of the responses) that indicated professional development activities should be provided to prepare experienced teachers to work with LEP students. A total of 40 responses (28.9% of the responses) stated that preservice teachers should be prepared to work with LEP students while in their undergraduate teacher education program.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

A summary of the study will be examined in the first section of this chapter. A discussion of the conclusions based on the results obtained from the study will be reported in the second section of this chapter. The third section will contain recommendations related to the study. Implications drawn from the analysis of collected data will be presented in the last section of this chapter.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate selected factors associated with preparing elementary teachers to work with limited English proficient students in the public elementary schools of north Mississippi. The objectives of this research were (a) to determine the awareness of elementary teachers in north Mississippi concerning the legal aspects of teaching LEP students, (b) to ascertain if a need exists to prepare teachers in north Mississippi public schools to work with limited English proficient students, and (c) to identify types of instruction that teachers in north Mississippi public schools would participate in when preparing to work with limited English proficient students. The following questions were explored:
1. Are elementary teachers in north Mississippi public schools aware of the legal aspects of providing instruction for limited English proficient students?

2. Is there a need to prepare elementary teachers in north Mississippi public schools to work with limited English proficient students?

3. Which types of instruction would elementary teachers in north Mississippi prefer to participate in when preparing to work with limited English proficient students?

Several limitations to the study were apparent. The limitations of the study were as follows: (a) the results of the study may not be generalizable to other regions of the state or nation since the sample was drawn from public elementary schools in north Mississippi; (b) responses to the questionnaire were subjective and may not reflect the respondents' true feelings about the questions being asked; and (c) the low response rate to the survey may have biased the study.

The subjects for this study were elementary teachers from 17 school districts in north Mississippi public schools with an identified LEP student population as reported on the annual LEP survey conducted by the Mississippi State Department of Education’s Project Director for Bilingual Education and National Origin in the spring of 1996 (Mississippi State Department of Education, 1996). A random sample of 344 elementary
teachers was chosen from this population to participate in the study during the spring of 1997.

A questionnaire developed by the researcher was sent to 344 subjects in April to survey topics related to this study. The total number of questionnaires returned to the researcher was 201 (58%).

The data from the questionnaires was analyzed using the SPSS 6.1 for Windows Student Version (1994) software package. Tables were used to present the data. Statistical analysis involved measuring frequency and percentage of responses.

Conclusions

The majority of the respondents in the study were experienced teachers who had not pursued a graduate degree. Although all the respondents stated that English was their first language, the majority had experienced a situation where knowledge of another language was needed. Almost 40% of the teachers responding to the survey were first, second, and third grade teachers.

Are teachers in north Mississippi aware of the legal aspects of providing instruction for limited English proficient students? The survey suggested that most teachers in north Mississippi public schools were unaware of the legal aspects of providing instruction to LEP students. This is partly due to the lack of emphasis placed on legal mandates in teacher education
programs. In general, there is little room in a teacher educator’s program of study for school law issues. This can be traced to the control that state departments of education have over the curriculum offered at public institutions of higher learning. When the state department of education realizes that there is a need to prepare preservice and inservice teachers in Mississippi to work with LEP students, the legal mandates will be more widely recognized.

The survey also indicated that there was a lack of awareness among teachers concerning the availability of funds to prepare them to work with LEP students. The Bilingual Education Act is one of the main sources of money for ESL teacher training and LEP student programs, yet the majority of teachers in north Mississippi were unaware of its existence. The lack of knowledge displayed by the respondents concerning the Bilingual Education Act could be attributed to the lack of communication that exists between principals and teachers in local school districts. School administrators are the ones that usually receive information about funding sources from state departments of education and other sources, but there is a breakdown in the transfer of this information to teachers.

A total of 71% of the respondents to the survey had experience teaching LEP students. Almost half of the respondents in the study, 49.3%, projected that the LEP student population in their school district would
increase during the 1997 to 1998 school year. According to the research reported in the literature review, the LEP student growth trend is expected to continue. Although 1 out of 4 teachers in north Mississippi have had experience working with LEP students, more teachers will work these students in the future.

The majority of teachers in the study were not pleased with their current level of preparedness to teach LEP students, even though they desired to be better prepared to work with this population of students. Teachers are adept at evaluating their own needs in relationship to current and future classroom situations. According to the survey, teachers would take part in professional development activities to prepare to work with LEP students if these activities were offered at the local school district level.

**Recommendations**

The purpose of this study was to investigate selected factors associated with preparing elementary teachers to work with limited English proficient (LEP) students in the public elementary schools of north Mississippi. Since teachers in the study expressed a desire to prepare to work with LEP students, state departments of education and teacher education personnel, and local school district administrators should provide
opportunities for preservice and inservice teacher training.

Recommendations related to this study are as follows:

1. Local school district administrators should help teachers become aware of the legal aspects of providing instruction to LEP students by offering professional development activities in this area.

2. Local school districts administrators should establish procedures to assist teachers in obtaining information on LEP students. The lines of communication between teachers and administrators should be clearly delineated.

3. Local school district administrators should appoint someone to disseminate information on grants and other funding sources directly to teachers. They should provide professional development activities to assist teachers in locating and writing grants to obtain funding for ESL teacher preparation and LEP student instruction.

4. Teacher education personnel should conduct research to compare the achievement of students whose teachers had training to work with LEP students with teachers who did not have any training to work with LEP students.

5. Teacher education programs should integrate a TESOL component into existing course work or offer course work specifically in TESOL to preservice teachers.
6. Teacher education personnel in Mississippi should encourage preservice teachers to complete course work in a foreign language, preferably Spanish, since there is a large number of Spanish speaking students in north Mississippi public schools.

7. Teacher education personnel at the University of Mississippi should expand their TESOL program to the DeSoto Center in northwest Mississippi because of the large number of teachers working with LEP students in that area.

8. The Mississippi State Department of Education should publicize the availability of personnel to conduct professional development activities for inservice teachers.

9. The Mississippi State Department of Education should promote the use of the two libraries of ESL materials they maintain for teachers working with LEP students. One of the libraries is in Jackson and the other is in Biloxi.

10. The Mississippi State Department of Education should open an ESL library in the northern part of Mississippi, preferably at The University of Mississippi, since there are a large number of school districts in that area with LEP students.
11. The Mississippi State Department of Education should implement the trainer of trainers model when preparing teachers to work with LEP students.

12. Teachers should take more responsibility in seeking out sources of funding for their educational pursuits. Resources on writing and obtaining grants are as close as the local library or the Internet.

13. Research on the issue of inclusion, which includes mandates on providing an appropriate education for all children, should be conducted in relation to LEP students.

14. This study should be expanded to include teachers from other areas of Mississippi.

Implications

The factors investigated in this study have yielded information that will help state department and teacher education personnel, and local school district administrators in planning professional development and preservice training programs to prepare teachers in north Mississippi to work with limited English proficient students. Implications related to the study are as follows:
1. Local school district administrators can use the results of this study to plan professional development activities that will prepare teachers to work with LEP students.

2. Mississippi State Department of Education personnel can use the results of this study to plan how to better meet the needs of LEP students in north Mississippi.

3. Teacher education personnel can use the results of this study to plan TESOL instruction for preservice and inservice teachers.

4. Teachers may be more interested in preparing to work with LEP students if they know that funds, such as those provided by the Bilingual Education Act, are available to assist them in their educational pursuits. This study provides information to local school districts pertaining to various government mandates related to funding professional development programs for experienced teachers and training for preservice teachers.

5. This study could serve as a guide to state and local school district administrators in preparing preservice and inservice teachers to work with LEP students. Personnel responsible for teacher education programs could also benefit by using the results of this study for redesigning their instructional programs. Since a majority of the respondents indicated that their teacher education program had not prepared them to work with
LEP students, many children are going to be placed in classrooms where teachers are not prepared to teach them, unless programs to prepare teachers to work with LEP students are implemented in north Mississippi.

The following conclusions were reached based on the results of the study: (a) teachers in north Mississippi public schools are not aware of the legal mandates that pertain to LEP students; (b) there is a need to prepare teachers in north Mississippi public schools to work with LEP students; and (c) teachers in north Mississippi public schools have preferences concerning the types of instruction they would participate in when preparing to work with LEP students.

The above recommendations and implications should assist local school district administrators and state department of education and teacher education personnel in planning programs of instruction for preservice and inservice teachers in north Mississippi. The struggles that many LEP students have encountered when entering schools in north Mississippi will be lessened if teachers are prepared to teach them.
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APPENDIX A

MINIMUM COMPETENCIES FOR ESL ENDORSEMENT

MINIMUM COMPETENCIES FOR ADDING AN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE (ESL) ENDORSEMENT TO A CURRENT TEACHING CERTIFICATE.

I. Language Principles

A. Phonology (sound system)
   1. Determine the phonemic characteristics in a given word (e.g., consonants, blends, vowels, and diphthongs).
   2. Understand the basic concepts of phonology in sentences/phrases (e.g., stress, intonation, juncture, and pitch).
   3. Recognize the relationship of the English sound system to its written alphabet.

B. Structure (grammar)
   1. Comprehend the principles of English morphology (word forms) as they relate to language acquisition.
   2. Understand and analyze English syntax (sentence structure and word order).
   3. Determine principles of syntactic and morphological interference between English and other languages.

C. Language Register (appropriateness)
   1. Differentiate between formal and informal spoken English.
   2. Differentiate between formal and informal written English.
   3. Understand the appropriate use of idioms and slang.

II. Language Acquisition

A. Understand and apply current theories of first and second language acquisition.

B. Match instructional approaches with language learning theories.

C. Compare language acquisition of different age, ethnic, and cultural groups.

D. Differentiate language proficiencies relating to basic interpersonal communicative skills (conversational language) and cognitive academic language skills (textbook language).

III. Methodology

A. Identify the characteristics of English as a second language approaches.

B. Identify, understand, and apply the skills to be taught in the areas of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

C. Develop appropriate curricula for various age groups and English as a second language proficiency levels.

D. Adapt materials and curricula to accommodate cultural and linguistic differences.

IV. Cross-Cultural Awareness

A. Apply ethnolinguistic and cross-cultural knowledge to classroom management techniques.

B. Identify teacher behaviors which indicate sensitivity to cultural and linguistic differences.

C. Identify culture-specific, non-verbal communications such as gestures, facial expressions, and eye contact.

D. Identify specific characteristics of U.S. culture.

E. Compare and contrast features of U.S. culture with those of other cultures.

F. Identify cultural bias in teaching materials.

V. Assessment

A. Design appropriate tests for placement, progress, and achievement of limited English proficient students.

B. Identify suitable English as a second language assessment instruments which assist in complying with legal obligations of districts serving limited English proficient students.

C. Administer various kinds of English as a second language assessment instruments (e.g., oral interviews, compositions, standardized instruments, and tests).

D. Identify cultural bias in assessment instruments.

E. Recognize possible exceptionalities in limited English proficient students (e.g., L/S, SLD, MR, EmH, and G/T).
APPENDIX B

TESOL PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI
Who is eligible?

Other Requirements:

For the MA degree, a Bachelor's degree from an accredited institution. For the Ph.D., a Master's degree in Linguistics, EFL, English, or a Foreign Language. For those with other majors, prerequisites will be required.

GRE scores must be filed with The Graduate School before admission. For the MA degree, a score of 800 is preferred. For the Ph.D., a score of 1000 is preferred. These scores will assure full admission. If scores are lower, but competitive, students will be admitted but they may be required to attain a GPA of 3.3 (on a 4-point scale) on the first nine hours.

For international students, a TOEFL score of 550 or above for full admission (600 or above preferred for the Ph.D.) must be filed in the Graduate School before admission. If the TOEFL is between 523 and 549 English (ETS 100) will be required.

Degree Adviser

Arlene O. Schrade, M.C., TESOL and Ph.D., Foreign Language Education, The Ohio State University

Dr. Schrade, a professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the Ole Miss School of Education, has taught foreign languages, linguistics, methodology, curriculum, and testing for EFL and Spanish in Illinois, Ohio, and Mississippi and written numerous books and articles on foreign language education and Spanish. Dr. Schrade has been active throughout her professional career in state, regional, and national organizations, serving on executive boards as officer and representative.

For More Information

Contact: Dr. Arlene Schrade
School of Education
University, MS 38677
Telephone: (601) 232-7622 or 232-7057
FAX: (601) 232-7149
e-mail: aschrade@olemiss.edu

For additional information concerning admission, tuition, or financial aid, contact:
The Graduate School
University, MS 38677
Telephone: (601) 232-7474
MASTER OF ARTS PROGRAM

The Master of Arts program at The University of Mississippi requires 36 semester hours to include English as a Foreign Language, Advanced Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages, two practica providing supervised on-the-job training in various settings, 12 hours of linguistics, 6 hours of electives in Education, and 6 hours of electives in related fields outside education or more linguistics.

A thesis option exists (6 hours in place of 6 hours of education electives).

A three-hour written comprehensive is required at the end of the program.

Proficiency in a foreign language is also required, with English fulfilling the requisite for international students.

State of Mississippi Certification

To comply with certification for Mississippi, teachers at the AA level, if A level certification is in a foreign language or English, the following courses must be completed:

- Educational Research - EDRS 605
- Curriculum - EDCI 601
- TESOL - EDCI 542
- Methods - EDSE 501
- Practicum - EDRD 520
- History of the English Language - English 505
- Descriptive Grammar - English 501

For A-level add-on endorsement in EFL, the last 5 courses above must be completed.

Linguistics Courses

- Philosophy of Language
- Language and Culture
- Cross-Cultural Psychology
- Descriptive Grammar
- Modern Grammar
- History of the English Language
- Historical Linguistics
- Discourse Pragmatics
- Syntax
- Morphology
- Phonology
- Semantics
- Dialectology
- Sociolinguistics
- Old English
- Linguistics Seminars
- French and Spanish Linguistics
- Artificial Intelligence
- Natural Language Processing

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

The Doctor of Philosophy program at The University of Mississippi requires 60 semester hours beyond the Master's degree, to include Research; Statistics; Curriculum; Educational Psychology; three-hour elective in Education; Foreign Language Methods; Second Language Acquisition; Cross-Cultural Psychology; 9 hours outside Education in Linguistics, writing, or communication theory; a one-semester internship in various settings; and 18 hours of dissertation.

A 12-hour written comprehensive examination is required at the end of the program.

Skills in two or more foreign languages are also required, with English fulfilling a requisite for international students.
APPENDIX C

TESOL PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
Master of Arts in the Teaching of Languages (TESOL Emphasis)
Department of Foreign Languages
The University of Southern Mississippi
Hattiesburg, MS 39406-5038

The Department of Foreign Languages at the University of Southern Mississippi offers a program leading to the Master of Arts in the Teaching of Languages (MAT) with an emphasis in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). The focus of the MAT is on developing and enhancing the knowledge and skills in language, language acquisition, and language instruction that are essential for both effective teaching and successful learning. The MAT is offered year-round, with the option of completing the program through Summer Only registration.

Admission Requirements
Members of all underrepresented groups are strongly encouraged to apply to for admission to the MAT Program. The following materials are reviewed in the admission process:
1. Official scores for the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) or the National Teachers Examinations (NTE) or the Miller Analogies Test (MAT).
2. Official transcripts for all previous undergraduate and graduate studies. Successful applicants in the past have had undergraduate grade point averages over the last two years of undergraduate study that range from 2.75 to 4.0 on a 4.0 scale.
3. For international students whose native language is not English, official scores on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). Successful applicants have had a total TOEFL score of 560 or above, with no section score lower than 54.

See the Academic Requirements section of the Graduate Bulletin for other general requirements. Conditional admission may be considered for applicants whose undergraduate grade point average and/or test scores are marginal but who show promise for success in graduate studies. The requirements for a change to full admission will be stated at the time of acceptance into the program.

General Program Academic Requirements (subject to change)
All students are expected to complete the following requirements:
1. A total of thirty-three (33) hours of graduate level courses with eighteen (18) hours in courses numbered over 600.
2. The courses in the MATL core: FL 561, FL 663, FL 664, FL 665, and FL 694 (See below).
3. The courses specific to the TESOL emphasis: TSL 641 or TSL 692, ENG 501, and a course to be arranged (See below).
4. A language proficiency requirement of 9 hours of conversational foreign language study (or equivalent) with an average of "B" or better for students whose first language is English.
5. A comprehensive examination.
6. A final reflective paper.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS
MATL Core (15 hours)
Methods in Foreign and Second Language Teaching
Applied Linguistics in Foreign and Second Languages
Second Language Acquisition Theory and Practice
Sociocultural & Sociolinguistic Perspectives in Language
Practicum in Foreign and Second Language

TESOL Core (9 hours)
Seminar in TESOL (repeatable to 6 hours) or Special Problems
TSL or FL course to be arranged
Advanced Grammar

A Sampling of Electives
Curriculum Development & Teaching Approaches
in Multicultural Education
History of the English Language
Reading for Different Cultural Groups
The Psychology of Reading
Language and Speech Development
Introduction to Composition Theory

Literature/History/American Studies (one maximum)
AMS 504 Issues in America
ENG 589 Studies in American Literature
HIS 576 History of American Thought II
Research: Its Introduction and & Methodology
Basic Course in Curriculum Development
Special Problems in TESOL

ESL Endorsement Coursework
The following program of study leads to the add-on Endorsement in ESL to current Mississippi teaching certification: FL 561, FL 663, FL 664, CIE 600.

For further information, contact Dr. Bill Powell at the address above or at (tel) 601/266-4864 or (fax) 601/266-4853. Other primary MATL emphasis areas are in Spanish and French. Dual language programs of study can also be arranged.
APPENDIX D

TESOL PROGRAM AT MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY
EMPHASIS IN TESOL

Department of English, Mississippi State University

The emphasis in English requires 12 hours of coursework in Teaching English as a Second Language. The course work is offered through the Department of English at Mississippi State University. Undergraduate and graduate students in English, English Education and Foreign Languages are eligible to apply provided they have met all prerequisites for the courses and satisfied the requirements of the Department of English.

SAMPLE PROGRAM

Note: This is effective for all students commencing their emphasis in TESOL as of Fall 1992.

FALL:

* EN4403/6403 Introduction to Linguistics (3)
* EN4463/6463 Second Language Acquisition (3)
EN4453/6453 TESOL Course Design and Testing (3)

SPRING:

* EN4433/6433 Teaching of English as a Second Language (3)
* EN4423/6423 Applied Transformational English Grammar (3)

* = core courses for emphasis in TESOL

Note: EN4453/6453 may be substituted for one of the core courses only for Fall 1992.

ELECTIVES: The following courses will not substitute for the core courses for a TESOL emphasis. However, students wishing to take more courses in linguistics can choose from the following:

EN4633/6633 Sociolinguistics (3)
EN4623/6623 Language and Culture (3)
EN8583 Seminar in Stylistics (3)

(2) Certification in TESOL for the state of Mississippi

Students in English, English Education and Foreign Languages who hold a Class A Standard Teaching Certificate can be certified in TESOL provided they have passed EN4403/6403, EN4423/6423, EN4433/6433 and EN4463/6463.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION/QUESTIONS, CONTACT:

Dr. Paula W. Sunderman
Dept. of English, Room 317-D Lee Hall
Mississippi State University
Phone: 325-3644
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This notice invites applications for funding under the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) for Program Enhancement Projects (PEPs). These grants will support the implementation of high quality alternative instructional programs for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students.

**Eligible Applicants:**  
(1) One or more local educational agencies (LEAs); or  
(2) One or more LEAs in collaboration with an institution of higher education or a State educational agency, or  
(3) A community-based organization, or  
(4) A community development organization, or  
(5) A State educational agency, or  
(6) A local educational agency.

**Purpose:**  
To provide local educational agencies with an opportunity to develop and implement high quality alternative instructional programs for LEP students.

**Deadline for Transmittal of Applications:** March 14, 1997.

**Deadline for Intergovernmental Review:** May 13, 1997.

**Available Funds:** $10.8 million.

**Estimated Range of Awards:** $100,000-$150,000

**Estimated Average Size of Awards:** $125,000

To the extent practicable, this notice contains all of the information required by applicable laws and instructions precedent to apply for an award under this program.

The statutory authority for this program and the application requirements and application competition are set out in sections 7107 and 7110 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001, which establishes the Improving American Schools Act of 1986 (PL 99-419).

**Program Goal:**  
This program provides grants to local educational agencies that will develop and implement high quality alternative instructional programs for LEP students to improve the educational performance of LEP students.

**Eligible Applicants:**  
(1) One or more local educational agencies (LEAs); or  
(2) One or more LEAs in collaboration with an institution of higher education or a State educational agency, or  
(3) A community-based organization, or  
(4) A community development organization, or  
(5) A State educational agency, or  
(6) A local educational agency.

**Eligible Uses of Funds:**  
- Development of high quality alternative instructional programs.
- Implementation of high quality alternative instructional programs.
- Evaluation of the impact of high quality alternative instructional programs.

**Application Process:**  
Applications must be submitted to the State educational agency, which will then select applicants to receive funding. The State educational agency will review applications to determine eligibility and award amounts.

**Eligibility Requirements:**  
- The applicant must be a State educational agency or a local educational agency.
- The project must be conducted within the State.
- The project must be conducted at the local level.
- The project must be conducted at the school level.

**Deadline for Application Submission:** Applications must be submitted by March 14, 1997.

**Application Requirements:**  
- The application must contain specific information, including the proposed project, the objectives, and the methods of evaluation.
- The application must be submitted in the format specified by the State educational agency.

**Evaluation Criteria:**  
- The application will be evaluated based on criteria such as the project's potential impact on student achievement, the quality of the instruction provided, and the effectiveness of the evaluation methods used.

**Funding Opportunities:**  
- The BEA provides funding for programs designed to improve the educational performance of LEP students.
- The funding is available to LEAs, institutions of higher education, community-based organizations, and community development organizations.

**Contact Information:**  
For more information, contact the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20202-5544, or call 1-800-414-7432 (TDD) or 1-800-859-2129 (voice).

**Program Period:** 24 months.

**Applicable Regulations:**  
- The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR Parts 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, and 85.

**Description of Program:**  
The BEA provides funding for programs designed to improve the educational performance of LEP students. These programs may include alternative instructional programs, professional development, and evaluation of the effectiveness of these programs.

**Evaluation Criteria:**  
- The application will be evaluated based on criteria such as the project's potential impact on student achievement, the quality of the instruction provided, and the effectiveness of the evaluation methods used.

**Funding Opportunities:**  
- The BEA provides funding for programs designed to improve the educational performance of LEP students.
- The funding is available to LEAs, institutions of higher education, community-based organizations, and community development organizations.

**Contact Information:**  
For more information, contact the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20202-5544, or call 1-800-414-7432 (TDD) or 1-800-859-2129 (voice).

**Program Period:** 24 months.

**Applicable Regulations:**  
- The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR Parts 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, and 85.

**Description of Program:**  
The BEA provides funding for programs designed to improve the educational performance of LEP students. These programs may include alternative instructional programs, professional development, and evaluation of the effectiveness of these programs.

**Evaluation Criteria:**  
- The application will be evaluated based on criteria such as the project's potential impact on student achievement, the quality of the instruction provided, and the effectiveness of the evaluation methods used.

**Funding Opportunities:**  
- The BEA provides funding for programs designed to improve the educational performance of LEP students.
- The funding is available to LEAs, institutions of higher education, community-based organizations, and community development organizations.

**Contact Information:**  
For more information, contact the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20202-5544, or call 1-800-414-7432 (TDD) or 1-800-859-2129 (voice).
1. Proficiency in English and another language: (3 points)

The Secretary reviews each application to determine the extent to which the project will achieve for the development of bilingual proficiency in English and another language for participating students.

2. The qualifications of the principal or other key personnel: (3 points)

The qualifications of the principal or other key personnel shall be used to evaluate the project.

3. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

4. The qualifications of related personnel: (3 points)

The qualifications of related personnel are to be evaluated.

5. The work of the principal and other key personnel: (3 points)

The work of the principal and other key personnel are to be evaluated.

6. The work of the project director: (3 points)

The work of the project director is to be evaluated.

7. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

8. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

9. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

10. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

11. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

12. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

13. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

14. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

15. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

16. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

17. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

18. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

19. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

20. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

21. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

22. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

23. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

24. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

25. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

26. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

27. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

28. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

29. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

30. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

31. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

32. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

33. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

34. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

35. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

36. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

37. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

38. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

39. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

40. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

41. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

42. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

43. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

44. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

45. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

46. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

47. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

48. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

49. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

50. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

51. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

52. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

53. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

54. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

55. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

56. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

57. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

58. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

59. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

60. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

61. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

62. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

63. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

64. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

65. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

66. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

67. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

68. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

69. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

70. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

71. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

72. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

73. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

74. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

75. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

76. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

77. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

78. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

79. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

80. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

81. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

82. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

83. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

84. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

85. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

86. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

87. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

88. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

89. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

90. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

91. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

92. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

93. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

94. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

95. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

96. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

97. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

98. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

99. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.

100. The qualifications of the project director: (3 points)

The qualifications of the project director are to be evaluated.
In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number of this information collection is OMB No. 1865-0528. In accordance with this number, the time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 30 minutes per respondent, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate described above, or suggestions for improving this form, please write to Washington, D.C., 20020. There are no financial or personnel penalties for not responding to this collection. This information will be used to determine whether or not an application received and may only be used to fund a grant award if received by the appropriate deadline.
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Applicants are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number of this information collection is OMB No. 1865-0528. In accordance with this number, the time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 30 minutes per respondent, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate described above, or suggestions for improving this form, please write to Washington, D.C., 20020. There are no financial or personnel penalties for not responding to this collection. This information will be used to determine whether or not an application received and may only be used to fund a grant award if received by the appropriate deadline.

Notice to All Applicants

Thank you for your interest in this program. The purpose of this statement is to inform you about a new provision in the Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) that applies to applicants for new grant awards under Department programs. This provision is Section 427 of GEPA, enacted as part of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1992 (Pub. L. 102-28)

In Whom Does This Provision Apply?

Section 427 of GEPA applies to all applicants for new discretionary grant awards under Department programs. All applications for new awards must include information in their applications to address this new provision in order to receive funding under this program.

Budget

The budget narrative must support the goals and objectives of the proposed project. It must be directly applicable to the instructional design and all other project components.

Final Application Preparation

The information above will be used to verify that all items are addressed. Prepare one original with an original signature, and include these additional copies. Do not use elaborate bindings or covers. The application package must be submitted to the Office of Grants and Policy, and postmarked within 30 days of the deadline.

Notice to All Applicants

Thank you for your interest in this program. The purpose of this statement is to inform you about a new provision in the Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) that applies to applicants for new grant awards under Department programs. This provision is Section 427 of GEPA, enacted as part of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1992 (Pub. L. 102-28)

In Whom Does This Provision Apply?

Section 427 of GEPA applies to all applicants for new discretionary grant awards under Department programs. All applications for new awards must include information in their applications to address this new provision in order to receive funding under this program.

Budget

The budget narrative must support the goals and objectives of the proposed project. It must be directly applicable to the instructional design and all other project components.

Final Application Preparation

The information above will be used to verify that all items are addressed. Prepare one original with an original signature, and include these additional copies. Do not use elaborate bindings or covers. The application package must be submitted to the Office of Grants and Policy, and postmarked within 30 days of the deadline.

Notice to All Applicants

Thank you for your interest in this program. The purpose of this statement is to inform you about a new provision in the Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) that applies to applicants for new grant awards under Department programs. This provision is Section 427 of GEPA, enacted as part of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1992 (Pub. L. 102-28)

In Whom Does This Provision Apply?

Section 427 of GEPA applies to all applicants for new discretionary grant awards under Department programs. All applications for new awards must include information in their applications to address this new provision in order to receive funding under this program.

Budget

The budget narrative must support the goals and objectives of the proposed project. It must be directly applicable to the instructional design and all other project components.

Final Application Preparation

The information above will be used to verify that all items are addressed. Prepare one original with an original signature, and include these additional copies. Do not use elaborate bindings or covers. The application package must be submitted to the Office of Grants and Policy, and postmarked within 30 days of the deadline.

Notice to All Applicants

Thank you for your interest in this program. The purpose of this statement is to inform you about a new provision in the Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) that applies to applicants for new grant awards under Department programs. This provision is Section 427 of GEPA, enacted as part of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1992 (Pub. L. 102-28)

In Whom Does This Provision Apply?
provides to take to ensure equitable access and participation in its federally assisted program. This includes students, teachers, and other program administrators in developing the disabled, students with special needs.

In section 127, Section 127 for applying, an applicant may use the Federal Government to establish criteria for eligibility. The applicant that proposes to develop new instructional materials for classroom use might describe how it will make the materials available on audio tape or in braille for students who are blind.

Q: An applicant that proposes to serve alternative education programs for severely handicapped students who are severely handicapped may be more likely than less to enroll in the course. How it meets the criteria for "independent" of these methods to conduct outreach efforts to encourage their enrollment.

We recognize that many applications may already be implementing effective solutions to ensure equity of access and participation in their grant programs. We appreciate your cooperation in responding to the requirements of this program.

Program Enhancement Grants

Q: Are preschool programs for English proficient (LEP) students eligible for funding under the Program Enhancement Grant? A: Preschool early childhood programs for limited English proficient (LEP) students are eligible for funding under the Program Enhancement Grant. Also, programs that serve adults are eligible for funding if the program is specifically designed as a family education program with parent outreach and training activities that will assist parents to become active participants in the education of their children (Section 7113(d)(1)(A)(i)(I) and (II)).

All applicants must demonstrate how they plan to enhance "existing bilingual education or special alternative instructional programs." The statute provides specific definitions for bilingual education program, a special alternative instructional program, and a family education program that must be included in the applicant's application. The requirements for applying under the Program Enhancement Grant are set out in 34 CFR 73.1 et seq. to 73.120.

Q: What should be included in the narrative of the application for the Program Enhancement Grants? A: The narrative of the application should include a description of the project, including the goals, objectives, and activities. The narrative should also include a description of how the project will be evaluated and how the results will be disseminated.

Q: Is there a requirement that the application for the Program Enhancement Grant be submitted by a LEA? A: There is no requirement that the application be submitted by a LEA. The application must be submitted by the applicant, which could be a single school, school district, or other entity.

Q: What is the purpose of the Program Enhancement Grant? A: The Program Enhancement Grant is intended to provide resources to support the development and implementation of bilingual education programs and other forms of instruction for English learners. The grant is available to local education agencies (LEAs) and other eligible applicants.

Q: What is the time period for which the Program Enhancement Grant will be awarded? A: The Program Enhancement Grant will be awarded for a period of three years.

Q: What is the maximum amount of the Program Enhancement Grant? A: The maximum amount of the Program Enhancement Grant is $500,000.
Is there a requirement that the applicant must consult with the private schools in designing its application?

A. Yes. The statutory authority for this program requires applicants to take account, in designing the applications, of the needs of students with limited English proficiency enrolled in nonpublic private elementary and secondary schools in the area served by the approved project.

Consultation by the applicant with appropriate private school officials is part of the requirement.

The full requirement is set out at Section 10, 520.5 of the regulations, and should be carefully reviewed by all applicants. The Department, before it will approve an application to the program, shall determine that this requirement has been met. For that reason, applicants should address this requirement in their application and must include documentation of their efforts to consult with provision's requirement to consult with private school officials.
APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

1. TYPE OF INSTITUTION: 
   - Construction
   - Non-Construction

2. DATE SUBMITTED

3. DATE RECEIVED BY STATE

4. DATE RECEIVED BY FEDERAL AGENCY

5. APPLICANT INFORMATION

   a. Legal Name

   b. Organization Name

   c. Address (City, State, and Zip Code)

   d. Name and telephone number of the person to be contacted on matters involving this application (give area code)

6. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (EIN)

7. TYPE OF APPLICATION

   - New
   - Continuation
   - Revision
   - Increase Award
   - Decrease Award
   - Decrease Duration
   - Other

8. CATALOG OF FEDERAL DEEP RELATIVE ASSISTANCE NUMBERS

   - 8 4 2 9 9 P

9. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

   - Bilingual Education: Program Enhance Project

10. PROJECT INFORMATION

    a. Start Date
    b. Closing Date

11. IS APPLICANT SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER (YES/NO)

    a. YES, THIS APPLICATION WAS MADE AVAILABLE TO THE STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER 13372 PROCESS FOR REVIEW ON:

    b. NO.

12. IS PROGRAM COVERED BY E.O. 13372

13. IS PROGRAM COVERED BY STATE FOR REVIEW

14. IS APPLICANTElIGIBLE FOR ANY FEDERAL BANC?

    a. Yes
    b. No

15. IS APPLICANT ELIGIBLE FOR ANY FEDERAL BANC?

    a. Yes
    b. No

16. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this application is true and correct. The recipient has been duly authorized by the governing body of the applicant and the applicant will comply with the attached assurances if the assistance is awarded

   a. Name of Authorized Representative
   b. Title
   c. Telephone Number

   Authorized for Local Reproduction
INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE "424"

This is a standard form used by applicants as a required facesheet for preapplications and applications submitted for Federal assistance. It will be used by Federal agencies to obtain applicant certification that States which have established a review and comment procedure in response to Executive Order 12372 and have selected the program to be included in their process, have been given an opportunity to review the applicant's submission.

Item:  Entry:  Item:  Entry:

1. Self-explanatory.

2. Date application submitted to Federal agency (or State if applicable) & applicant's control number (if applicable).

3. State use only (if applicable).

4. If this application is to continue or revise an existing award, enter present Federal identifier number. If for a new project, leave blank.

5. Legal name of applicant, name of primary organizational unit which will undertake the assistance activity, complete address of the applicant, and name and telephone number of the person to contact on matters related to this application.

6. Enter Employer Identification Number (EIN) as assigned by the Internal Revenue Service.

7. Enter the appropriate letter in the space provided.

8. Check appropriate box and enter appropriate letter(s) in the space(s) provided:
   — "New" means a new assistance award.
   — "Continuation" means an extension for an additional funding/budget period for a project with a projected completion date.
   — "Revision" means any change in the Federal Government's financial obligation or contingent liability from an existing obligation.

9. Name of Federal agency from which assistance is being requested with this application.

10. Use the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number and title of the program under which assistance is requested.

11. Enter a brief descriptive title of the project. If more than one program is involved, you should append an explanation on a separate sheet. If appropriate (e.g., construction or real property projects), attach a map showing project location. For preapplications, use a separate sheet to provide a summary description of this project.

12. List only the largest political entities affected (e.g., State, counties, cities).


14. List the applicant's Congressional District and any District(s) affected by the program or project.

15. Amount requested or to be contributed during the first funding/budget period by each contributor. Value of in-kind contributions should be included on appropriate lines as applicable. If the action will result in a dollar change to an existing award, indicate only the amount of the change. For decreases, enclose the amounts in parentheses. If both basic and supplemental amounts are included, show breakdown on an attached sheet. For multiple program funding, use totals and show breakdown using same categories as item 15.

16. Applicants should contact the State Single Point of Contact (SPOC) for Federal Executive Order 12372 to determine whether the application is subject to the State intergovernmental review process.

17. This question applies to the applicant organization, not the person who signs as the authorized representative. Categories of debt include delinquent audit disallowances, loans and taxes.

18. To be signed by the authorized representative of the applicant. A copy of the governing body's authorization for you to sign this application as official representative must be on file in the applicant's office. (Certain Federal agencies may require that this authorization be submitted as part of the application.)
# GROUP APPLICATION CERTIFICATION

**NOTE:** This form must be completed by eligible parties applying as a group for a grant. This form must be accompanied by a group agreement that details the activities that each member of the group plans to perform under the grant.

(24 CFR 76.1251(a-b))

To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this application are true and correct. I agree to be bound by every statement and information made in this application.

**Authorized Representative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taped Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date Signed</th>
<th>Telephone Number (including Area Code)</th>
<th>Name of Institution/Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

BUDGET INFORMATION

NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

SECTION A  BUDGET SUMMARY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Project Year 1 (a)</th>
<th>Project Year 2 (b)</th>
<th>Project Year 3 (c)</th>
<th>Project Year 4 (d)</th>
<th>Project Year 5 (e)</th>
<th>Total (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contractual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indirect Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Training Stipends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicants requesting funding for any one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Project Year 1 (a)</th>
<th>Project Year 2 (b)</th>
<th>Project Year 3 (c)</th>
<th>Project Year 4 (d)</th>
<th>Project Year 5 (e)</th>
<th>Total (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contractual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Direct Costs (Sums 1-8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indirect Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Training Stipends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Total Costs (Sums 9-11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION C - OTHER BUDGET INFORMATION** (see instructions)
INSTRUCTIONS FOR ED FORM NO. 524

General Instructions

This form is used to apply to individual U.S. Department of Education discretionary grant programs. Unless directed otherwise, provide the same budget information for each year of the multi-year funding request. Pay attention to applicable program specific instructions, if attached.

Section A - Budget Summary

U.S. Department of Education Funds

All applicants must complete Section A and provide a breakdown by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-11.

Lines 1-11, columns (a)-(e): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Lines 1-11, column (f): Show the multi-year total for each budget category. If funding is requested for only one project year, leave this column blank.

Line 12, columns (a)-(e): Show the total budget request for each project year for which funding is requested.

Line 12, column (f): Show the total amount requested for all project years. If funding is requested for only one year, leave this space blank.

Section B - Budget Summary

Non-Federal Funds

If you are required to provide or volunteer to provide matching funds or other non-Federal resources to the project, these should be shown for each applicable budget category on lines 1-11 of Section B.

Lines 1-11, columns (a)-(e): For each project year for which matching funds or other contributions are provided, show the total contribution for each applicable budget category.

Lines 1-11, column (f): Show the multi-year total for each budget category. If non-Federal contributions are provided for only one year, leave this column blank.

Line 12, columns (a)-(e): Show the total matching or other contribution for each project year.

Line 12, column (f): Show the total amount to be contributed for all years of the multi-year project. If non-Federal contributions are provided for only one year, leave this space blank.

Section C - Other Budget Information

Pay attention to applicable program specific instructions, if attached.

1. Provide an itemized budget breakdown, by project year, for each budget category listed in Sections A and B.

2. If applicable to this program, enter the type of indirect rate (provisional, predetermined, final or fixed) that will be in effect during the funding period. In addition, enter the estimated amount of the base on which the rate is applied, and the total indirect expense.

3. If applicable to this program, provide the rate and base on which fringe benefits are calculated.

4. Provide other explanations or comments you deem necessary.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to vary from 15 to 22 hours per response, with an average of 17.5 hours, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, Information Management and Compliance Division, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651, and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 1875-0102, Washington, D.C. 20503.
# STUDENT DATA

Name of Local Educational Agency

SECTION A - PROGRAM ENHANCEMENT GRANT

1. Total number of Limited English proficient (LEP) students in the school district

2. Total number of students in the school district

3. Percentage of LEP students (line 1 divided by line 2) %

SECTION B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of project school</th>
<th>Language grouped to be served</th>
<th>Graduated to be served</th>
<th>Number of students to be served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students to be served</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


PROJECT DOCUMENTATION

NOTE: Submit the appropriate documents and information as specified below for the following programs:

PROGRAM ENHANCEMENT PROJECT

SECTION A

A copy of applicant’s transmittal letter requesting the appropriate State educational agency to comment on the application. This requirement does not apply to schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. (See 34 CFR 75.155 and 75.156 below.)

§75.155 Review procedure if State may comment on applications: Purpose of §§75.156-75.158. If the authorizing statute for a program requires that a specific State agency be given an opportunity to comment on each application, the State and the applicant shall use the procedures in §§75.156-75.158 for that purpose.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1221e-3(a)(1))

Cross-Reference: See 34 CFR part 70 (Intergovernmental Review of Department of Education Programs and Activities) for the regulations implementing the application review procedures that States may use under E.O. 12372. (In addition to the requirement in §75.155 for review by the State educational agency, the application is subject to review by State Executive Order 12372 process. Applicants must complete item 16 of the application face sheet (Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance) by either (a) specifying the data when the application was made available to the State Single Point of Contact for review or (b) indicating that the program has not been selected by the State for review.)

§75.156 When an applicant under §75.155 must submit its application to the State: proof of submission.
(a) Each applicant under a program covered by §75.155 shall submit a copy of its application to the State on or before the deadline date for submitting its application to the Department.
(b) The applicant shall attach to its application a copy of its letter that requests the State to comment on the application.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1221e-3(a)(1))
Evidence of compliance with the Federal requirements for participation of students enrolled in nonprofit private schools. (See section 7116(h)(2) of Public Law 103-382 and 34 CFR 75.119, 75.652, and 76.656 below.)

Sec. 7116. Applications. "(2) in designing the program for which application is made, the needs of children in nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools have been taken into account through consultation with appropriate private school officials and, consistent with the number of such children enrolled in such schools in the area to be served whose educational needs are of the type and whose language and grade levels are of a similar type to those which the program is intended to address, after consultation with appropriate private school officials, provision has been made for the participation of such children on a basis comparable to that provided for public school children."

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 7426(h)(2))

§75.119 Information needed if private schools participate.
If a program requires the applicant to provide an opportunity for participation of students enrolled in private schools, the application must include the information required of subgrantees under 34 CFR 76.656.

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 1880-0513)
(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1221e-3(a)(1))

§76.652 Consultation with representatives of private school students.
(a) An applicant for a subgrant shall consult with appropriate representatives of students enrolled in private schools during all phases of the development and design of the project covered by the application, including consideration of:
(1) Which children will receive benefits under the project;
(2) How the children's needs will be identified;
(3) What benefits will be provided;
(4) How the benefits will be provided; and
(5) How the project will be evaluated.
(b) A subgrantee shall consult with appropriate representatives of students enrolled in private schools before the subgrantee makes any decision that affects the opportunities of those students to participate in the project.
(c) The applicant or subgrantee shall give the appropriate representatives a genuine opportunity to express their views regarding each matter subject to the consultation requirements in this section.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1221e-3(a)(1))

§76.636 Information in an application for a subgrant.

An applicant for a subgrant shall include the following information in its application:

(a) A description of how the applicant will meet the Federal requirements for participation of students enrolled in private schools.

(b) The number of students enrolled in private schools who have been identified as eligible to benefit under the program.

(c) The number of students enrolled in private schools who will receive benefits under the program.

(d) The basis the applicant used to select the students.

(e) The manner and extent to which the applicant complied with §76.652 (consultation).

(f) The places and times that the students will receive benefits under the program.

(g) The differences, if any, between the program benefits the applicant will provide to public and private school students, and the reasons for the differences.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1221e-3(a)(1))

SECTION C

Check the appropriate box below:

- There are no eligible nonprofit private schools in the proposed service delivery area that wish to participate in the project. ☐

- One or more eligible nonprofit private schools in the proposed service delivery area wish to participate in the project and are listed on the enclosed Student Data form. ☐

- There are no eligible nonprofit private schools in the proposed service delivery area. ☐
Certification of Agreement

NOTE: This form must be included in an application from a community-based organization or an institution of higher education for the following program:

Section 7112 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as amended specifies that a community-based organization or an institution of higher education, to be an eligible applicant, must have its application "approved by the (appropriate) local educational agency to develop and implement early childhood education or family education programs or to conduct an instructional program which supplements the educational services provided by a local educational agency." (20 U.S.C. 7422(c)(3))

In order to comply with this statutory requirement, an application from a community-based organization or an institution of higher education must include the following signed certification.

As the duly authorized representative of the local educational agency (LEA) named below, I certify that this application has been approved by the LEA named below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorized Representative</th>
<th>Name of Local Educational Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signature</strong></td>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typed Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date Signed</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAM ASSURANCES

NOTE: The authorizing statute requires applicants under certain programs to provide assurances. These assurances are specified below under the relevant programs. If your application pertains to any of these programs, this form must be completed.

- As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant, in regard to the program relevant to this application:

  - Program Enhancement Grants

  - Will not reduce the level of State and local funds that the applicant expends for bilingual education or special alternative instructional programs if the applicant is awarded a grant under this program.
  - Will employ in the proposed project teachers who are proficient in English, including written and oral communication skills.

[Authority: 20 U.S.C. 7426(g)(1)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorized Representative</th>
<th>Applicant Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typed Name</td>
<td>Date Signed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSURANCES — NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Note: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project costs) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application.

2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States, and if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.

3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.

4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.

5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§ 4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the nineteen statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM’s Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. Part 900, Subpart F).

6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. §§ 2000a-2000d) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§ 1681-1683, and 1686-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. § 794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicap; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§ 6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§ 523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1932 (42 U.S.C. §§ 200 dd-3 and 295 ee-3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. § 3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statutes) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.

8. Will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§ 1501-1508 and 7324-7329) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.
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10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 108 of the
Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234), which requires recipients in a special flood hazard
area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable
construction and acquisition is $10,000 or more.

11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a)
institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive
Order 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of
wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO
11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program
developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§ 1451 et seq.); (f)
compliance of Federal actions to State (Clear Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the
Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. § 7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources
of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, (P.L. 93-523); and (h)
protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, (P.L.
93-205)

protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.

13. Will assist the awarding agency in ensuring compliance with Section 106 of the National
Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16
U.S.C. 470), EO 11593 (identification and
protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of
1974 (16 U.S.C. 469a-1 et seq.).

14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research,
development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.

15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C.
2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for
research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.

16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§ 4801 et seq.) which
prohibits the use of lead based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence
structures.

17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the

18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations
and policies governing this program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>DATE SUBMITTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING LOBBYING, DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS, AND DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS

Applicants should refer to the regulations cited below to determine the certification to which they are required to attest. Applicants should pay or wait the instructions for certification indicated in the regulations before completing this form. Signature of this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 34 CFR Part 82, "New Restrictions on Lobbying," and 34 CFR Part 65, "Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants)." The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of Education determines to award the covered transaction, grant, or cooperative agreement.

1. LOBBYING

As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the U.S. Code, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 82, for persons entering into a grant or cooperative agreement over $100,000, as defined at 34 CFR Part 82, Sections 82.105 and 82.110, the applicant certifies that:

(a) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any Federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal grant or cooperative agreement;

(b) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall comply and submit Standard Form - LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions;

(c) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subgrants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all subawardees shall certify and disclose accordingly.

2. DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS

As required by Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, for prospective contractors in primary covered transactions, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.105 and 85.110 –

A. The applicant certifies that it and its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, or proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency;

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commerce fraud statutes; theft, forgery, bribery, defamation, or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State, or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (b) of this certification; and

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application had one or more public transactions (Federal, State, or local) terminated for cause or default;

B. Where the applicant is unable to certify any of the statements in this certification, he or she shall attach an explanation to this application.

3. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE

(GRANTEES OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALS)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.620 and 85.610 –

A. The applicant certifies that it will or will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:

(a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantees workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

(b) Establishing an on-going drug-free awareness program to inform employees about:

(1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;

(2) The grantees policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;

(3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs;

(4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;

(c) Making it a requirement that each employee be engaged in the performance of the grant as given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);

(d) Notifying the employees in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will:

(1) Abide by the terms of the statement;

(2) Notify the employer in writing of its or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction;

(e) Notifying the agency in writing, within 10 calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. Employers or convicted employees must provide notices, including position titles, to: Director, Grants and Contracts Service, U.S. Departure of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. (Room 3124), GSA Regional Office.
Building No. 31, Washington, DC 20220-4571. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant.

5. Taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (A)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted:

1. Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, or

2. Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency.

3. Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

B. The grantee may insert in the space provided below the name(s) of the person(s) for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant:

Place of Performance (Street address, city, county, state, zip code)

Check [ ] if there are workplaces on file that are not identified here.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF APPLICANT</th>
<th>PR/AWARD NUMBER AND/OR PROJECT NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Certification Regarding Determined Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion - Covered Transactions

This certification is required by the Federal Government regulations governing the exclusion of and disqualification of contractors.

Certification

1. By signature and submission of this proposal, the prospective lower tier participant certifies that he/she is not currently involved in a determined covered transaction, or has not been involved in a determined covered transaction within the past year. If the participant has been involved in a determined covered transaction, he/she certifies that he/she has been excluded from participation in this contract and is not involved in any other determined covered transactions.

2. In the event the prospective lower tier participant is found to be involved in a determined covered transaction, the participant shall be disqualified from participation in this contract.

NAME OF APPLICANT

PR AWARD NUMBER AND/OR PROJECT NAME

PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

SIGNATURE

DATE
**DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES**

Complete this form in accordance with section 31 U.S.C. 1357 (See reverse for public disclosure)

1. Type of Federal Action:
   - a. Contract
   - b. Grant
   - c. Cooperative Agreement
   - d. Other

2. Amount of Federal Action:

3. Date of Expenditure:

4. Material Change on:
   - a. Contract
   - b. Grant
   - c. Cooperative Agreement
   - d. Other

5. Name of Client or Contractor:

6. Address of Client or Contractor:

7. Congressional District, if known:

8. Federal Department/Agency:

9. Federal Action Number, if applicable:

10. Amount of Payments (check all that apply):

11. Form of Payment (check one or more):
   - a. cash
   - b. check
   - c. credit card
   - d. wire transfer
   - e. other:

12. Total Description of Services Performed or to be Performed and Details of Services, including professional expertise or specialty:

13. Type of Payment (check all that apply):

14. Description of Compensation for Payment Indicated in Item 14:

15. Signature:

16. Date:

Authorized for Local Reproduction (amended Form 144)
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF SF LLL, DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

This disclosure form shall be completed by the reporting entity, whether subordinate or prime Federal contractor, the person or receipt of a covered Federal action, or a material change to a previous filing pursuant to 31 U.S.C. section 1352. The filing of a form is required for each payment or agreement to make payment to any lobbying entity for influencing or attempting to influence an official or employee of any agency, a member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Federal Government, or to any individual who, if a member of Congress or its staff, would have been subject to the form's requirements. The above conditions shall be met in order to determine if the form is required. Compare all items that apply for both the initial filing and material change report. Refer to the implementing guidance published by the Office of Management and Budget for additional information.

1. Identify the type of covered Federal action for which lobbying activity is and/or has been secured to influence the outcome of a covered Federal action.

2. Identify the status of the covered Federal action.

3. Identify the appropriate classification of the report. If this is a follow-up report caused by a material change to the information previously reported, enter the year and quarter in which the change occurred. Enter the date of the report or other information on the change.

4. Enter the full name, address, city, state, and zip code of the reporting entity. Include Congressional District, if known. Check the appropriate classification of the reporting entity that designates if it is or expects to be, a prime or subaward recipient, identify the tier of the subawardee, e.g., the first subawardee of the prime or the 1st tier. Subawardees include but are not limited to subcontractors, subgrants, and contract awards under grants.

5. If the organization filing the report in item 4 checks "Subawardee," then enter the full name, address, city, state and zip code of the prime Federal recipient, include Congressional District, if known.

6. Enter the name of the agency Federal agency making the award or loan commitment, include at least one organizational level below agency name, if known. For example, Department of Transportation, United States Coast Guard.

7. Enter the program name or description for the covered Federal action (Item 1). If known enter the full Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for grants, cooperative agreements, loans, and loan commitments.

8. Enter the most appropriate Federal meiner number for the covered Federal action identified in item 1, e.g., Request for Proposal (RFP) number, invitation for bid (IFB) number, grant announcement number; the contract, grant, or loan award number; or the coordination/proposal control number assigned by the Federal agency. Include prefixes, e.g., "RFP-DE 90-001."

9. For a covered Federal action where there has been an award or loan commitment by the Federal agency, enter the Federal amount of the award or loan commitment for the prime entity identified in item 4 or 5.

10. (a) Enter the full name, address, city, state, and zip code of the lobbying entity registrant under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 engaged by the reporting entity identified in item 4 to influence the covered Federal action.

(b) Enter the full names of the individuals performing services, and include full address if different from 10(a). Enter Last Name, First Name, and Middle Initial (MI).

11. Enter the amount of compensation paid or reasonably expected to be paid by the reporting entity item 15 in the lobbying entity's form, the compensation paid or reasonably expected to be paid by the reporting entity for the purpose of payment has been made (e.g., will be made later). Check all boxes that apply. If this is a material change report, enter the cumulative amount of payment made or planned to be made.

12. Check the appropriate checkbox for each item that applies. If other specify nature.

13. Check the appropriate checkbox for each item that applies. If other specify nature.

14. Provide a specific and detailed description of the services that the lobbyist has performed, or will be expected to perform, and the detail of any services rendered. Include all preparatory and related activity, not just time spent in actual contact with Federal officials. Identify the Federal official(s) contacted or the official(s) employees, or Members and staff who were contacted.

15. Check the box to indicate a SF LLL Form A-Complete Statement is attached.

16. The certifying official shall sign and date the form, print his/her name, title, and telephone number.

Public regarding burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 30 minutes per response. Including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0044), Washington, D.C. 20503.
APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRE
A Survey of Factors Related to Preparing Teachers to Teach Limited English Proficient Children

University of Mississippi Department of Curriculum and Instruction Spring 1997

Limited English proficient students are “Nonnative English speakers whose English language proficiencies are sufficiently limited to deny them the ability to learn successfully in classrooms where English is the only medium of instruction” (Olsen, 1989).


Please place a check beside each of the following that applies to you.

1. How many years of teaching experience do you have?
   ___ 0-1 ___ 2-5 ___ 6-10 ___ 11-15 ___ 16-20 ___ 20 or more

2. What is the highest degree you have obtained?
   ___ Bachelor ___ Master ___ Specialist ___ Doctorate

3. Was English the first language you learned as a child?
   ___ Yes ___ No

4. Are you proficient in a language other than English?
   ___ Yes ___ No

5. Have you ever been in a situation where you needed to know a language other than English?
   ___ Yes ___ No

6. Do you have any experience teaching limited English proficient children in the classroom?
   ___ Yes ___ No

9. Which grade(s) do you teach?
   ___ Kindergarten ___ First Grade ___ Second Grade ___ Third Grade
   ___ Fourth Grade ___ Fifth Grade ___ Sixth Grade ___ Grade Not Listed

10. Approximately how many limited English proficient students were in your school district during the 1995-1996 school year?
    ___ 0 ___ 1-5 ___ 6-10 ___ 11-15 ___ 16-20 ___ 21-25 ___ 26 or more
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11. If limited English proficient students were enrolled in your school district during the 1995-1996 school year, which of the following groups were represented. If there were no limited English proficient students in your school district, go to number 12.

___ Choctaw  ___ Korean  ___ Chinese  ___ Mexican  ___ Vietnamese
___ Other (please specify)  __________  __________  __________  __________

12. Approximately how many limited English proficient students are in your school district during the 1995-1996 school year?

___ 0   ___ 1-5   ___ 6-10   ___ 10-15   ___ 16-20   ___ 20-25   ___ 26 or more

13. If limited English proficient students are enrolled in your school district during the 1996-1997 school year, which of the following groups are represented. If there are no limited English proficient students in your school district, go to number 14.

___ Choctaw  ___ Korean  ___ Chinese  ___ Mexican  ___ Vietnamese
___ Other (please specify)  __________  __________  __________  __________

14. If your school district has limited English proficient students, place a check beside each of the following statements that applies. Go to number 15 if your school district does not have any limited English proficient students.

In my school district, limited English proficient students ________.
___ are taught by a regular classroom teacher
___ are taught by an assistant teacher
___ are taught in the regular classroom setting
___ are taught only in their native language
___ are taught only in English
___ are taught using their native language and English

15. The number of limited English proficient students in my school district has:

___ Increased during this school year
___ Decreased during this school year
___ Not changed during this school year

If there is an increase, why does this seem to be happening? ________________

16. The number of limited English proficient students in my school district will probably:

___ Increase during the 1997-1998 school year
___ Decrease during the 1997-1998 school year
___ Not change during the 1997-1998 school year

17. Has your education prepared you to teach limited English proficient students?
___ Yes  ___ No

18. How do you rate your college education in preparing you to teach limited English proficient students?
___ Very satisfactory  ___ Satisfactory  ___ Acceptable
___ Not Satisfactory  ___ Unacceptable
A Survey of Factors Related to Teaching Limited English Proficient Children

19. What have you done to prepare to teach limited English proficient students?
   a. ___ I have taken an undergraduate college course or courses.
      Which type(s) of undergraduate course(s) did you take?
      ___ A course specifically on teaching limited English proficient students
      ___ A course which contained a component on teaching limited English proficient students
   b. ___ I have taken a graduate college course or courses.
      Which type(s) of graduate course(s) did you take?
      ___ A course specifically on teaching limited English proficient students
      ___ A course which contained a component on teaching limited English proficient students
   c. ___ I have completed training sponsored by my local school district and conducted by someone in the local school district.
   d. ___ I have completed training sponsored by my local school district and conducted by someone from outside the local school district.
   e. ___ I have completed a seminar or workshop conducted at a professional conference.
   f. ___ Other (please specify) ______________________________________
   g. ___ I have not had any training related to teaching limited English proficient students.

20. Which type of training would you be willing to participate in order to learn how to teach limited English proficient students?
   a. ___ An undergraduate college course
      Which type of undergraduate course would you prefer to take?
      ___ A course specifically on teaching limited English proficient students
      ___ A course which contains a component on teaching limited English proficient students
   b. ___ A graduate college course
      Which type of graduate course would you prefer to take?
      ___ A course specifically on teaching limited English proficient students
      ___ A course which contains a component on teaching limited English proficient students
   c. ___ Training sponsored by my local school district and conducted by someone in the local school district
   d. ___ Training sponsored by my local school district and conducted by someone from outside the local school district
   e. ___ A seminar or workshop conducted at a professional conference
A Survey of Factors Related to Teaching Limited English Proficient Children

f. ___ Other (please specify) ____________________________________________________

g. ___ I am not interested in preparing to work with limited English proficient students at this time.

21. When would you prefer to attend training sessions to learn how to teach limited English proficient students?
   ___ During the summer ___ During the school year
   ___ Other (please specify) ____________________________________________________

22. Where would you prefer to attend training sessions to learn how to teach limited English proficient students?
   ___ My local school district ___ A college or university
   ___ Other (please specify) ____________________________________________________

23. Have you been made aware of the legal mandates that apply to teaching limited English proficient students?
   ___ Yes ___ No

24. Are you familiar with the Bilingual Education Act which provides money for teacher training and student programs for limited English proficient children?
   ___ Yes ___ No

25. A teacher who has a standard Mississippi teaching certificate can add an endorsement in teaching English as a second language to his or her certificate. This K-12 endorsement can be added by taking from 12 to 15 semester hours of specified course work. Would you be interested in adding this endorsement to your certificate?
   ___ Yes ___ No

26. Briefly respond to the following question. What should be done to prepare teachers to work with limited English proficient students?

Mail the survey to Connie McDonald. For your convenience a self-addressed stamped envelope was enclosed with the survey.

Mail address and telephone number:
University of Mississippi
School of Education
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
University, MS 38677
(601) 232-7100

Home address and telephone number:
2538 Casilla Road
Scobey, MS 38953-9509
(601) 226-6599

Optional Please fill out the following information if you would like a copy of the survey results.

Name ________________________________ ________________________________

Address ________________________________ ________________________________

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE SURVEY

© Connie McDonald, University of Mississippi, 1997
APPENDIX G

CORRECTED COPY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE
Limited English proficient students are "Nonnative English speakers whose English language proficiencies are sufficiently limited to deny them the ability to learn successfully in classrooms where English is the only medium of instruction" (Olsen, 1989).


Please place a check beside each of the following that applies to you.

1. How many years of teaching experience do you have?
   - 0-1
   - 2-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-15
   - 16-20
   - 21 or more

2. What is the highest degree you have obtained?
   - Bachelor
   - Master
   - Specialist
   - Doctorate

3. Was English the first language you learned as a child?
   - Yes
   - No

4. Are you proficient in a language other than English?
   - Yes
   - No

5. Have you ever been in a situation where you needed to know a language other than English?
   - Yes
   - No
   Briefly explain your response ________________________

6. Do you have any experience teaching limited English proficient children in the classroom?
   - Yes
   - No

7. Which grade(s) do you teach?
   - Kindergarten
   - First Grade
   - Second Grade
   - Third Grade
   - Fourth Grade
   - Fifth Grade
   - Sixth Grade
   - Grade Not Listed

8. Approximately how many limited English proficient students were in your school district during the 1995-1996 school year?
   - 0
   - 1-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-15
   - 16-20
   - 21-25
   - 26 or more
9. If limited English proficient students were enrolled in your school district during the 1995-1996 school year, which of the following groups were represented? If there were no limited English proficient students in your school district, go to number 10.

___ Choctaw ___ Korean ___ Chinese ___ Mexican ___ Vietnamese
___ Other (please specify) __________ __________ __________ 

10. Approximately how many limited English proficient students are in your school district during the 1996-1997 school year?

___ 0 ___ 1-5 ___ 6-10 ___ 11-15 ___ 16-20 ___ 21-25 ___ 26 or more

11. If limited English proficient students are enrolled in your school district during the 1996-1997 school year, which of the following groups are represented? If there are no limited English proficient students in your school district, go to number 13.

___ Choctaw ___ Korean ___ Chinese ___ Mexican ___ Vietnamese
___ Other (please specify) __________ __________ __________ 

12. If your school district has limited English proficient students, place a check beside each of the following statements that applies to your situation.

In my school district, limited English proficient students _______.

___ are taught by a regular classroom teacher
___ are taught by an assistant teacher
___ are taught in the regular classroom setting
___ are taught only in their native language
___ are taught only in English
___ are taught using their native language and English

13. The number of limited English proficient students in my school district has:

___ Increased during this school year
___ Decreased during this school year
___ Not changed during this school year
If there is an increase, why does this seem to be happening? __________________________

14. The number of limited English proficient students in my school district will probably:

___ Increase during the 1997-1998 school year
___ Decrease during the 1997-1998 school year
___ Not change during the 1997-1998 school year

15. Has your education prepared you to teach limited English proficient students?

___ Yes ___ No

16. How do you rate your college education in preparing you to teach limited English proficient students?

___ Very satisfactory ___ Satisfactory ___ Acceptable
___ Not Satisfactory ___ Unacceptable
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17. What have you done to prepare to teach limited English proficient students?
   a. ___ I have taken an undergraduate college course or courses.
      Which type(s) of undergraduate course(s) did you take?
      ___ A course specifically on teaching limited English proficient students
      ___ A course which contained a component on teaching limited English proficient students
   
b. ___ I have taken a graduate college course or courses.
      Which type(s) of graduate course(s) did you take?
      ___ A course specifically on teaching limited English proficient students
      ___ A course which contained a component on teaching limited English proficient students.
   
c. ___ I have completed training sponsored by my local school district and conducted by someone in the local school district.
   
d. ___ I have completed training sponsored by my local school district and conducted by someone from outside the local school district.
   
e. ___ I have completed a seminar or workshop conducted at a professional conference.
   
f. ___ Other (please specify) ________________________________
   
g. ___ I have not had any training related to teaching limited English proficient students.

18. Which type of training would you be willing to participate in to learn how to teach limited English proficient students?
   a. ___ An undergraduate college course
      Which type of undergraduate course would you prefer to take?
      ___ A course specifically on teaching limited English proficient students
      ___ A course which contains a component on teaching limited English proficient students
   
b. ___ A graduate college course
      Which type of graduate course would you prefer to take?
      ___ A course specifically on teaching limited English proficient students
      ___ A course which contains a component on teaching limited English proficient students
   
c. ___ Training sponsored by my local school district and conducted by someone in the local school district
   
d. ___ Training sponsored by my local school district and conducted by someone from outside the local school district
   
e. ___ A seminar or workshop conducted at a professional conference
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f. ___ Other (please specify) ____________________________________________ 153

g. ___ I am not interested in preparing to work with limited English proficient students at this time.

19. When would you prefer to attend training sessions to learn how to teach limited English proficient students?
___ During the summer ___ During the school year
___ Other (please specify) ____________________________________________

20. Where would you prefer to attend training sessions to learn how to teach limited English proficient students?
___ My local school district ___ A college or university
___ Other (please specify) ____________________________________________

21. Have you been made aware of the legal mandates that apply to teaching limited English proficient students?
___ Yes ___ No

22. Are you familiar with the Bilingual Education Act which provides money for teacher training and student programs for limited English proficient children?
___ Yes ___ No

23. A teacher who has a standard Mississippi teaching certificate can add an endorsement in teaching English as a second language to his or her certificate. This K-12 endorsement can be added by taking from 12 to 15 semester hours of specified course work. Would you be interested in adding this endorsement to your certificate?
___ Yes ___ No

24. Briefly respond to the following question. What should be done to prepare teachers to work with limited English proficient students?

____________________________________________________________________

Mail the survey to Connie McDonald. For your convenience a self-addressed stamped envelope was enclosed with the survey.

Work address and telephone number: Home address and telephone number:
University of Mississippi 2538 Cascilla Road
School of Education Scoibey, MS 38953-9509
Department of Curriculum and Instruction (601) 226-6599
University, MS 38677
(601) 232-7100

Optional Please fill out the following information if you would like a copy of the survey results.

Name ____________________________

Address ____________________________

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE SURVEY

© Connie McDonald, University of Mississippi, 1997
March 18, 1997

Dear teacher:

A study is being conducted at the University of Mississippi in order to determine ways to better prepare teachers to work with limited English proficient students. A survey is being conducted as part of this research.

You are being given the opportunity to participate in the survey. You will be receiving the survey in about two weeks. It will take about ten minutes to complete the survey. Your input into this study would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Connie McDonald
Instructor
APPENDIX I

COVER LETTER SENT WITH INITIAL MAILING OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE
April 7, 1997

NAME
ADDRESS
ADDRESS2
CITY, MS ZIP

Dear First_NAME:

The attached survey instrument is part of a study being conducted by the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Mississippi. This project is concerned specifically with determining the training needs of teachers who will be or are working with limited English proficient students. The results of the study will provide information to use in designing training for teachers.

Your responses are very important to us because other phases of this research cannot be carried out until we analyze the survey data. Your experience as a classroom teacher will contribute significantly toward solving some of the needs we face in teaching limited English proficient students. It will take approximately 10 minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire. Your responses are anonymous and will be kept confidential.

We would appreciate your completing and returning the enclosed questionnaire by Friday, April 11, 1997. You can return the survey in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope.

This study has been reviewed by the University of Mississippi Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB has determined that this study meets the ethical obligations required by federal law and university standards. If you have any questions, concerns, or reports regarding this study, please contact the IRB at 232-7482.

We will send a copy of the survey results to those who request it. Please contact us if you would like a copy of the results of this survey. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Connie L. McDonald, Ed.S.
Curriculum and Instruction
(601) 232-7100

Sincerely,

Arlene Schrade, Ph.D.
Curriculum and Instruction
(601) 232-7057
COVER LETTER SENT WITH FINAL MAILING OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE
April 25, 1997

Dear teacher:

You recently received a survey from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Mississippi. The questionnaire dealt with issues related to preparing teachers to work with limited English proficient students.

We would appreciate your taking the time to fill out the questionnaire and returning it in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope as soon as possible. Another copy of the questionnaire has been included with this letter for your convenience.

Your responses are very important because other phases of this research cannot be carried out until we complete analysis of the survey data. Your experience as a classroom teacher will contribute significantly toward solving some of the needs we face in the area of preparing teachers to work with limited English proficient students.

It will take approximately 10 minutes to complete the survey. Your responses are anonymous and will be kept confidential.

This study has been reviewed by the University of Mississippi Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB has determined that this study meets the ethical obligations required by federal law and university standards. If you have any questions, concerns, or reports regarding this study, please contact the IRB at 232-7482.

Contact us at the above address or include your name and address on the questionnaire, if you would like a summary of the survey results. Please disregard this letter if you have already sent in the questionnaire. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Connie L. McDonald, Ed.S.
Curriculum and Instruction

Sincerely,

Aine Schrade, Ph. D.
Curriculum and Instruction
APPENDIX K

IRB APPROVAL FORM
December 17, 1996

Ms. Connie L. McDonald  
Dr. Arlene Schrade  
Department of Curriculum and Instruction  
University, Mississippi 38677

Ms. McDonald and Dr. Schrade:

This is to inform you that your application to conduct research with human subjects, A Survey of the Factors Associated with Preparing Teachers to Teach Limited English Proficient Students (protocol 97-058), was reviewed by the Office of Research and has been approved under the Exempt category.

Please be aware that any substantive changes in the methodology of procedures used in this research or the occurrence of any unanticipated problems related to the welfare of any subject should be brought to the attention of the Office of Research at the earliest possible time.

If you should have any questions or comments, please feel free to call me, or Stennis Watson, IRB assistant, at (601) 232-7482.

Thank you for your application. Good luck in your endeavor.

Sincerely,

Diane W. Lindley  
Coordinator, Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research
Connie McDonald was born in 1956 in New Orleans, Louisiana. She is the wife of Steven McDonald.

Connie graduated from Liberty Attendance Center in Liberty, Mississippi in 1974. She received a Bachelor of Science and Master of Education degree from the University of Southern Mississippi and an Educational Specialist degree from Mississippi State University.

Connie taught for over 12 years in various public elementary schools in Mississippi. She also worked one year as a kindergarten teacher in Japan. She worked as a graduate assistant at Mississippi State University while pursuing the Educational Specialist degree. For the last two and one-half years she has worked at the University of Mississippi. While at the University of Mississippi, she worked as a graduate assistant and then an instructor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction in the School of Education.

She is a member of Phi Delta Kappa, Delta Kappa Gamma, The International Reading Association, and TESOL.