

Texas Dual Language Program Cost Analysis



A Report
developed for the

Texas Education Agency
and
The Texas Senate Education Committee

Dr. Rafael Lara-Alecio
a-lara@neo.tamu.edu

Dr. Martha Galloway
bilingual@tamu.edu

Dr. Lakshmi Mahadevan
hema-mahadevan@tamu.edu

Ben Mason

bmason@neo.tamu.edu

Department of Educational Psychology
College of Education and Human Development
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

Dr. Beverly J. Irby
edu_bid@shsu.edu

Dr. Genevieve Brown
edu_gxb@shsu.edu

Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling
College of Education
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas

Dr. Leo Gómez

lgomez@panam.edu

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education
The University of Texas Pan-American
Edinburg, Texas

January 2005

For Inquiries Contact

979-845-2599

Texas A&M University

Bilingual Education Programs

To view the Texas Directory of Dual Language Programs

See

<http://texastwoway.org>

(This is the only state DL directory in the U.S.)



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
Texas Dual Language Program Cost Analysis.....	8
Literature Review	8
English as a Second Language.....	9
English Immersion	10
Transitional Bilingual.....	11
Dual Language Education.....	12
The Focus of the Study: Dual Language Costs	23
Methodology	26
Results	28
Recommendations.....	46
Final Remarks.....	49
Selected References.....	50
Appendices.....	53



Executive Summary

U.S. public school systems have felt increasing pressure to produce a workforce with high levels of literacy while at the same time encountering large numbers of immigrant families whose native language is not English and who often have had limited educational opportunities. Providing a quality education for English language learners (ELLs) has become critical as nearly 4.5 million children come to school from families where the home language is other than English (U.S. Census, 2000). In fact, in 2002, ELLs comprised 9.64% of the national enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools and 79% of those ELLs were Spanish speakers (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002). More specifically, Texas had an 84% growth in the ELL population during the twelve-year period from 1989 to 2001; this percentage growth continues to rise with a current estimation of 630,000 ELLs (14% of the total public school population) for the 2003-2004 school year.

There are a myriad of educational implications related to this growing population. The U.S. Census Bureau (Therrien & Ramirez, 2000) reported that Hispanics graduate from high school at a rate of 57% compared to non-Hispanic Whites who graduate at the rate of 88.4%. Additionally, 27.3% of Hispanics have less than a ninth grade education compared to only 4.2% of non-Hispanic Whites. Two of the most cited reasons for these achievement differences are language differences and socio-economic status (SES). The large influx of Hispanic students in U.S. and Texas schools and expected population trends have resulted in a critical need to improve academic achievement for Hispanic youth.



Due to purported academic effectiveness and cultural and linguistic inclusivity, dual language (DL) programs (sometimes referred to as two-way immersion) have seen a rapid increase in Texas and the nation, however, an extensive review of literature indicated that no national or state-wide studies have addressed the issue of cost analysis of dual language programs. Information on funding of effective educational programs for ELLs is vital for all stakeholders, including policy makers and current and future DL program administrators.

In Fall 2004, Senator Florence Shapiro (Chair, Texas Senate Committee on Education) and the Texas Education Agency requested Texas A&M University, Sam Houston State University, and University of Texas Pan American to conduct a cost analysis study of dual language programs in Texas. As a result, an online survey was developed, piloted and distributed to all known Dual Language (DL) programs and to all Texas school districts. The survey, requesting information on DL costs, consisted of 91 items. From a total of 166 known DL programs in Texas, 83 DL campus surveys were included in the analysis, representing 48 school districts and resulting in a 50% response rate. For the purpose of the study a small DL program was comprised of 10-120 students, a medium DL program included 121-240 students, and a large program was designated as consisting of 240+ students.

The study was guided by the following research question: *How much does a DL program cost per pupil above and beyond the typical transitional bilingual program?* Another question concerning costs also guided this study: *Assuming the dual language class is not appreciably smaller than the typical bilingual classroom, what would be the additional management costs, staff costs, instructional costs, curriculum costs, equipment*



costs, material costs, assessment costs, staff development costs, and parent involvement costs?

The results showed that beyond the state Title III allotment, DL programs' annual costs on average were \$290 per pupil in large programs; \$406 per pupil in medium programs; and \$879 per pupil in small programs. Notably, an insignificant difference was found between the two most common program models, 50:50 or 90:10. Additionally, a two-teacher mixed model was found to be the least expensive model. The largest categorical costs for all three DL program sizes were associated with managerial costs. These costs were significantly diminished as program size increased.

The complete report details percentages of total budgetary costs in 12 categories: managerial, staff, instruction, staff development, Spanish curriculum, English curriculum, assessment, equipment, recruitment, public relations, parental involvement, and other materials. Further analyses were reported based on start-up costs, annual costs, and additional funding requests.

Our data indicated that smaller DL programs are more costly to implement and maintain. As program size increases, per pupil costs diminish. We also found a positive relationship between federal funding and program size (i.e. as program size increased so did funding). Twenty-two of the 25 reporting large DL programs (88%) received federal funds. The two-teacher mixed model was the most cost effective and the most frequently employed teacher model. Approximately half of the students in the DL programs (the native English speakers) were not supported by any state or federal ELL entitlements. Instructional materials, assessment instruments, and parental involvement programs for this population of DL students and their parents significantly impacted program costs and



feasibility. In addition the data revealed a common concern across programs related to costs associated with native English speakers and the discontinuation of federal Title III grants that funded start-up and five years of implementation for a significant number (n=53 or 64%) of reporting DL programs.

This report will not address the relationship between costs and program effectiveness. We must caution that the most cost effective DL program may not be the most educationally effective DL program. Successful schools' research points to several components such as: increased staff development, parental involvement programs, extended hours, strong educational leadership, quality curriculum, and early and sustained interventions as elements of strong, research-based programs. All of these components may incur costs above any basic program implementation.

Dual language programs provide opportunities for language minority and language majority students to reach high levels of bilingualism and biliteracy needed to prepare them for the 21st century workplace. We concur with Senate Resolution No. 50 that recognizes the worth of dual language education.

“Resolved that the State of Texas work towards the worthy goal of ensuring that someday every Texan will master English plus another language” (Texas Senate Resolution No. 50, 2001).



Texas Dual Language Program Cost Analysis

The English Language Learner (ELL) population in Texas has experienced an 84% growth since 1989 (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2002) and was at 630,000 in 2003 (Texas Education Agency, 2003). This dramatic increase places Texas second only to California in the number of school-age ELLs (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2003) and along with this demographic change comes a focused attention on effective educational programs for ELLs. Dual language (sometimes referred to as two-way immersion) bilingual programs have seen an increase nationally and a significant increase in Texas due to research that shows positive academic, linguistic, and affective results for ELLs and their English-speaking peers. However, there is a paucity of information available about the costs associated with implementation and maintenance of dual language programs. Conducted in Fall 2004 by Texas A&M University, Sam Houston University, and University of Texas Pan American, this report is the first detailed cost analysis of Texas dual language bilingual programs and is the only known report of its kind nationally for dual language programs.

Literature Review

Texas mandates that every student who has a home language other than English and that is identified as Limited English Proficient (LEP) is provided an opportunity to participate in bilingual or English as a second language programs (TEC Chapter 29, subchapter B). The state offers four bilingual education program models at the elementary level: (1) English as a second language; (2) English immersion; (3) transitional bilingual, and, (4) two-way / dual language bilingual education. As indicated



in Table 1, the four program types carry with them specific goals, student types, teacher certifications, language of instruction, and program lengths.

Table 1
Program Models Serving ELLs in Texas

Program	Goals	Students	Teacher Certifications	Role of L1/L2	Length of Program
ESL	English language and academics	ELLs	ESL Generalist	L2 used as language of instruction	1-2 years emphasis on early exit
Sheltered English Immersion	English language and academics	ELLs	ESL Generalist	L2 used as language of instruction	1-2 years emphasis on early exit
Transitional Bilingual	English language and academics; ELLs native language phased out	ELLs	Bilingual Generalist	L1 & L2 used as language of instruction	2-4 years; usually early exit; few late exit
Dual Language	Bilingualism Biliteracy Biculturalism High Academic Achievement in L1 and L2	ELLs and Native English speakers	Bilingual Generalist and ESL Generalist MS & HS Foreign language certified w/ native fluency; Content-area certification with high foreign language fluency	L1 & L2 used as language of instruction	Typically K-7 with goal of HS language maintenance

Texas law mandates that all school districts with at least 20 ELL students¹ within the same language classification in the same grade level district-wide must offer Bilingual Education (BE), otherwise, English as a Second Language (ESL), or an alternative language program must be implemented (Texas Education Code Chapter 29, Subchapter B).

English as a Second Language

According to Lara-Alecio, Galloway, Irby, Rodriguez, and Gomez (2004), English as a second language (ESL) programs are considered “pull out” models in which

¹ The Texas Education Code (2002) lists ELL students as limited English proficient.



ELL students may be “pulled out” from classes in order to receive some sort of English as a second language instruction. Students often lose valuable access to the full curriculum and have no access to native language support in the content areas. The main focus is on reading, grammar, vocabulary, and spoken and written communication in English. Ironically, the ESL model, perceived as a deficit model or remedial approach to instruction in which students must overcome their native language “problems,” is the least effective, most costly, and one of the most implemented models (Thomas & Collier, 1997). In 2000, Alanís indicated that 38% of eligible Texas students are served in ESL programs and are the most expensive to operate since ESL teachers must be hired to attend to pull-out students. A recent trend is to certify regular classroom teachers in ESL education so that a “pull-out” ESL teacher is not required; instead, the student receives ESL education in the mainstream classroom.

English Immersion

Often referred to as structured English immersion (SEI) for minority students, this model is less successful for ELLs’ long-term academic achievement than those with native language support (Ramirez, et al., 1991; Thomas & Collier, 1996). Students with different native languages (or low-incidence language groups) where first language instruction is not feasible often make up English immersion classes. In the SEI model, content for all subjects and all instruction in a self-contained classroom is carried out in English. However, in a departmentalized situation, SEI occurs in each course and is implemented by the various teachers (Ovando, Collier & Combs, 2002).



As a result of having to learn the second language along with the content, ELLs may fall behind academically. Subtractive bilingualism is the typical outcome of SEI as the native language is not supported (Baker, 1996). The SEI model is also perceived as a deficit language model (Mora, 2001) in that students are viewed as having to overcome English language deficiencies.

Transitional Bilingual

The transitional bilingual program model serves language minority students who are not yet proficient in English and is generally considered as a segregated model. Instruction for the content areas is carried out in the native language. Thus the native language acts as a temporary bridge to the acquisition of the second language (Baca & Cervantes, 1989; Birman & Ginsburg, 1983; Bruce, Lara-Alecio, Parker, Hasbrouck, Weaver, & Irby, 1997). Instruction is also delivered in English as a second language. Gradually students are transitioned to all-English classes and are exited out of bilingual programs at the end of three years and in some cases in one or two years (early-exit transitional). Within this program type the focus is on learning English, thus there is a need to “transition” to an English classroom (Brisk, 1998). Early exit transition programs represent a deficit model in that students are exited before they have fully developed cognitive academic language proficiency (Collier, 1992). Students in early exit transitional programs have been more academically successful than those in ESL pull out models but not as academically successful as those in late-exit transitional, dual language, or two-way programs (Ramirez, Yuan & Ramey, 1991; Thomas & Collier, 1997; Thomas & Collier, 2002.) Four years ago, Alanís (2000) indicated that 49% of the eligible Texas students were served in transitional bilingual programs.



Dual Language Education

Dual language (DL) programs strive to develop bilingualism and biliteracy skills in all students, language minority and language majority alike (Christian & Whichter, 1995; Valdes, 1997) in addition to fostering language equity (Torres-Guzman, 2002). DL programs are also sometimes referred to as two-way developmental or dual language immersion and are considered as an inclusive bilingual model. DL programs include the following components: (a) instruction through two languages, (b) use of one language during periods of instruction, and (c) integrated participation of both ELLs and native English speakers in most content instruction (Lindholm, 1987).

Theoretical Foundations of Dual Language Programs. Strategies implemented within DL programs are based on critical linguistic, pedagogical and theoretical principles. The major theoretical principles are: (a) cognitive academic language learning requires five to seven years (Collier, 1992; Cummins, 1991); (b) students can transfer knowledge and skills from one language to another (Cummins, 1981b, 1991); and (c) continuous development in two languages enhances learners' educational and cognitive development (Collier, 1992; Cummins, 1992).

Christian (1994) stressed that the goal of DL programs is to balance the development of language, academic, and social development and not to choose or sacrifice one over the other. According to Thomas and Collier (1997) there are six critical factors that contribute to the success of DL programs: (1) students participate for at least six years, (2) there is a balanced ratio of speakers of each language, (3) there is a separation of languages, (4) emphasis is on the minority language in the early grades, (5) core academics are emphasized as well as instructional excellence, and (6) parents have a



positive relationship with the program. Lindholm-Leary (2001) added the following three to the list of critical success factors: (1) effective leadership and support by administrators and instructors, (2) a positive school environment composed of an additive bilingual environment, and (3) high quality instructional personnel and staff training.

DL Research Support. Research studies in the fields of bilingual and DL education indicate that academic achievement is very high for both language minority and language majority students participating in the program when compared to students receiving English instruction only (Cummins & Swain, 1986; Lindholm & Aclan, 1991; Thomas & Collier, 1996, 2001). DL programs allow native English speakers to develop advanced second language proficiency without sacrificing L1 development of academic proficiency (Genesee, 1987; Swain & Lapkin, 1982). In their recent national study, Thomas and Collier (2001) found that, enrichment 90:10 and 50:50 one-way and two-way developmental bilingual education (DBE) (or dual language, bilingual immersion) are the only programs to date that assist bilingual students to reach the 50th percentile in both L1 and L2 in all subjects. In addition, these programs enable students to maintain that level of high achievement, or reach even higher levels through the end of schooling. Notably, the fewest number of dropouts are reported by these programs. (Refer to the full report at <http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/research/llaa/1.1es.html>).

Optimal DL programs show promising results for both ELLs and native English speakers in terms of both Spanish and English linguistic and academic development, inter-group relationships, and parental-school partnerships.



Dual Language Program Types. DL programs vary in the amount of instructional time spent in the L1 and L2 and the length of the programs. The most common models are known as 50:50 or 90:10 models (Christian, 1996).

90:10. In 90:10 models, for about 90% of the instructional day, Spanish (or other minority language) is the medium of instruction and English is gradually increased until it reaches approximately 50% in the upper grades in elementary school (fifth or sixth grade) (Refer to Figure 1-a). Beginning literacy instruction is most often taught in the target language, i.e. Spanish or other minority language.




Figure 1-a. Language of Instruction in a 90:10 DL Model

The earliest known implementation of the 90:10 model was in San Diego, California in the year 1975. English speakers and Spanish speakers began their schooling in Spanish for most of the day, from kindergarten through third grade. By the fifth grade, English and Spanish were each used approximately 50% of the school day

50:50. In 50:50 models the instructional day is equally divided between English and Spanish from Kindergarten throughout the duration of the program (Refer to Figure



1-b). Language arts or literacy instruction varies from L1 literacy to L2 literacy or simultaneous teaching of both literacies.




Figure 1-b. Language of Instruction in a 50:50 DL Model

Coral Way Elementary School, Florida, is a well-known example of a DL program implemented in the 1960s (Torres-Guzmán, 2002). The original design of Coral Way was to accommodate the increasing number of Cuban children whose parents wanted to maintain their children’s Spanish academic language. Coral Way DL students scored equal to or higher than district, state and national averages on standardized tests. In a report by National Clearinghouse for Language Acquisition (NCELA), Pellerano, Fradd and Rovira (1998) reported it as a “model for bilingual education nationally and internationally.” A unique feature of a 1971 program implemented in Oyster Elementary School, Washington, D. C., was the simultaneous instruction of both English and Spanish literacy. This format of teaching has found support in Slavin and Cheung’s (2003) and Galloway’s (2003) recent research.

Other Program Characteristics. DL programs also vary in the length of the design (some continue to 12th grade while others phase out in elementary or middle



school). Further, programs vary in the percentages of “majority” and “minority” speakers and languages of instruction; however, nearly all of the DL programs in Texas are Spanish/English. Within DL programs, the English speakers experience an emphasis on the minority language (Spanish) first, and the Spanish speakers experience a maintenance model in which their native language literacy is developed.

According to Alanís (2000), the majority of Texas students are served in transitional bilingual programs (49%) or ESL programs (38%). Transitional bilingual and ESL programs are often viewed as “subtractive” and/or “deficit” models of teaching ELLs (Gomez, 2000; Hernandez-Chavez, 1984; Lambert, 1987; Ovando, Collier, & Combs, 2002). In such models, students experience “subtractive” native language and “subjugate” their native language to the majority language. Student proficiency in English and rapid mainstreaming into grade-level classes are the goals of transitional programs; therefore, these programs may be viewed, as “remediation” models where students are perceived as lacking in English skills and therefore in need of quick English remediation.

Conversely, DL programs are often described as “language additive or language maintenance” programs in which students acquire a second language (L2) while maintaining their first language (L1) (Cloud, et al, 2000). Table 2 summarizes research outcome trends for the 90:10 and 50:50 DL models.



Table 2
Students' Outcome in DL Programs and Comparison between 90:10 and 50:50 Models

Areas Evaluated	Results	Comparison between 90:10 and 50:50
Language Proficiency L1 proficiency L2 proficiency	Both DL models promoted language proficiency in students' L1 and L2;	Students in 90:10 developed higher <i>bilingual</i> and <i>Spanish</i> proficiency than students in 50:50.
Reading and Academic Achievement L1 L2	Students make significant progress in reading; English speakers who received reading instruction in English by grade three reached at least grade appropriate level. 50 th percentile in both L1 and L2 in all subjects	No differences found.
Drop Out Rate	Lowest rate of all Bilingual or ESL models for ELLs	No differences found.
Content Area achievement mathematics (science and social studies) achievement in L1 mathematics (science and social studies) achievement in L2	Both groups of students performed on par with their peers in California state norm-referenced standardized tests in mathematics; close to grade-level in social studies (90:10); average or above average in science and social studies.	No differences found.

Number and Types of DL Programs in U.S. and Texas

U.S. According to the Center for Applied Linguistics' *Directory of Two-Way Immersion Programs in the U.S.* there were 248 two-way programs in 23 states and the District of Columbia in 2000. This directory also reported an expansion within existing programs adding new grade levels each year, and 40 programs extended into the middle or secondary grades. The 2000 CAL Directory indicated that the majority of the programs are Spanish/English programs (234 out of the 248). Additionally, data collected uncovered tremendous variability in program implementation (Christian, 1994).



Texas. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) collects basic school descriptive data about Texas districts and ELL programs through a software program called PEIMS (Public Education Information Management System). According to the TEA, “in compliance with the Texas Education Code, PEIMS contains only the data necessary for the legislature and the TEA to perform legally authorized functions in overseeing public education. It does not contain any information relating to instructional method, except as required by federal law” (Refer to <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/peims/about.html>). Therefore, the State does not collect specific information about bilingual program type. However, nationally, the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) has been collecting data and monitoring the growth of two-way programs in the U.S. since 1991.

In Texas, the CAL *Directory of Two-Way Immersion Programs in the U.S.*, (<http://www.cal.org/twi/directory>) identified 39 schools located in 17 districts. At that time, there was no known directory created exclusively for the purpose of identifying DL schools in Texas. To this end, in December 1999, a Texas-wide group of bilingual and dual language educators formed the Texas Two-Way/Dual Language Consortium (TTC) to address three fundamental needs: (1) Create a Texas directory of DL schools, (2) consolidate Texas-wide research on the effectiveness of these programs, and (3) positively impact state and local policy. The TTC commissioned an expansive statewide project supported by Texas A&M University's Bilingual Education Program. The purposes of the project were to create a website (to identify DL programs across the state) and serve as a network resource. By the end of 2001, the TTC was able to identify 63 DL programs located in 32 school districts. By the end of 2003, 166 programs were identified. Fifty-three percent used a 50:50 model, while 47% employed a 90:10



model. According to CAL, nationally, the 50:50 model is the most frequently reported type of DL program ((Lara-Alecio, Galloway, Irby, Rodriguez, & Gomez, 2004).

DL Programs by Grade Level and Classes. According to Lara-Alecio, et al. (2004), the majority of DL programs in Texas are situated at the early elementary levels (Refer to Figure 2). They further noted that nationally, DL programs are frequently implemented at grade levels PK-3. CAL’s 2000 directory showed 39% of DL programs are situated at the early elementary grades while 40% continue on to the upper elementary grades. The Texas data from the Lara-Alecio, et al. (2004) report indicated that 58% of the classes are in grades PK-2 which are higher than the national percentages, however, this percentage also implies that many of the Texas programs are "recent" programs that are adding grade "levels" each year versus mature programs with campus-wide implementation.




Figure 2. Texas Grade Levels and Classes



DL Programs by Language of Instruction. In the 2004 Lara-Alecio et al. report all programs in Texas reported that their DL programs used Spanish and English as the languages of instruction. Two programs reported using a third foreign language for enrichment (French or American Sign Language). According to the CAL national data, Spanish and English are the predominant languages of instruction in DL programs in the U.S. (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2002).

DL Distribution of Native Spanish and Native English Speakers. Further reporting on DL programs, Lara-Alecio et al. (2004) found that 47% had a language ratio of 75% native Spanish (NS) speakers to 25% native English (NE) speakers. The optimal instructional environment in DL programs is an equal division of native English and Spanish speakers. Nearly half of the programs reported being near balanced between native Spanish and English speakers (27% were 50/50 and 20% were 60/40). Only 6% of the programs were weighted in favor of native English speakers. Figure 3 depicts the DL programs by language distribution (Lara-Alecio et al., 2004).






Figure 3. Distribution of Native Spanish (NS) Speakers to Native English (NE) Speakers.

Dual Language Programs by Regional Education Service Center. The state of Texas is divided into 20 Regional Education Service Centers (ESCs) that function as assistance centers for the Texas Education Agency and local public school districts.

Figure 4 depicts a map of Texas by ESC with the number and percent of the dual language programs (Lara-Alecio, et al., 2004). Data indicated that DL programs are implemented in 14 of the 20 ESCs. Region 1 reported the most DL programs with 26.5% of the programs. Region 1 is situated in the Lower Rio Grande Valley and has a large percentage of Spanish-speaking students due to its proximity to the U.S.- Mexico border. Notably, two other areas, Region 4 (Houston area) and Region 19 (El Paso area) also had a large percentage of the total DL programs with 23.8% and 24.3% respectively.

Collectively, these three regions contain 74.6% of the total reported DL programs in Texas. It should be noted that these regions also have high percentages of Hispanic and ELL student populations and are situated in South Texas or border with Mexico.




Figure 4. Percentage of DL Programs by Regional Texas Education Service Centers

DL Programs by Years of Implementation. According to the Lara-Alecio, et al. (2004) report, 54% of the programs reported being within the planning year to three years of implementation. Forty-six percent of Texas' DL programs reported being within four to six years of implementation. This indicates that over half of the DL programs in Texas in 2003 were relatively new programs. Seventy-nine percent of the DL programs

that were in the planning year in 2001-2002 reported forecasting a 50:50 model while 30.6% reported planning that they were planning to implement a 90:10 model. Thirty-eight percent of DL programs in Year 1 of implementation reported having 90:10 models, and 61.8% reported implementing a 50:50 model.

The Focus of the Study: Dual Language Costs

Both the Center for Applied Linguistics' 2000 national study and Lara-Alecio et al.'s 2004 study indicated a growing number of DL programs. Additionally, national and state professional conferences and research journals on bilingual and ESL education demonstrate an increasing interest in the research and implementation of DL programs. However, one significant feature that is absent from the literature on DL programs are costs associated with implementation and maintenance of DL programs. Information on funding of effective educational programs for ELLs is vital for all stakeholders, including policy makers and current and future DL program administrators.

While there has been some research into the costs of bilingual programs (Cardenas, Bernal, & Kean, 1976; Chambers & Parrish, 1992), the research team was unable to find studies concerning the costs associated with dual language programs above and beyond the costs of transitional bilingual programs. The previous research on bilingual costs provide insight into DL costs; however, DL costs may differ from costs associated with traditional, transitional bilingual programs due to some significant programmatic differences (i.e. inclusion of English speaking students and parents, additional curriculum and assessment materials for English speakers, additional staff development training costs, additional costs for staffing, teaching and management.)



Our study examined many of the same cost structures as the Cardenas study; however, we included certain funding costs that Cardenas et al. (1976) intentionally excluded due to the differing and specific nature of DL programs. For example, while the previous study chose not to include in-service training (staff development) because it is a general state requirement for all teachers, we, on the other hand considered DL program teachers to be in need of differentiated staff development in order to provide quality program support. After discussions with DL coordinators, it was confirmed that DL staff development was an additional funding need beyond the traditional, transitional bilingual staff development. In fact one administrator responded, “In this time of shrinking support for schools from tax based state funds, additional funds are needed from Title allocations to ensure the continued strength of DL programs. The subtle differences between DL and more traditional bilingual programs necessitate steady staff development and monitoring to ensure that the DL protocols are implemented in alignment with research-based designs.”

We also decided to include textbooks as a regular DL operating cost because of the need for DL programs to supply Spanish textbooks for the native English speakers enrolled in each campus program. We specified that these reported costs should only include costs over and above the traditional, transitional bilingual program costs. We chose not to include library costs for similar reasons; bilingual library resources, while still not adequate in many cases, have improved dramatically since 1976. It was also difficult to claim that DL library issues were any different from traditional, transitional bilingual library issues.



Since our study design was focused on DL campus costs, we did not include state agency administrative costs. However, we did include school administrative costs if the inclusion of a dual language program led to greater administrative costs than the transitional bilingual program. This differed from the prior studies as well, and it was impossible to ignore the expenses of a dual language program administrator, secretary, or parent involvement personnel and still offer a realistic cost analysis.

Central to conducting this survey were the key questions:

1. How much more does a DL program cost to operate than a traditional, transitional bilingual program?
2. Assuming the dual language class is not appreciably smaller than the typical bilingual classroom, what would be the additional management costs, staff costs, instructional costs, curriculum costs, equipment costs, material costs, assessment costs, staff development costs, and parent involvement costs?

These are complex questions on a number of levels. It was very important that we determine what, if any, differences in cost were related to program and teacher model. Finally, we wanted to determine how much of these additional costs were related to teaching model, program model, and program size.

Program size is an important variable due to the large disparity of pupil participation in the DL program from campus to campus. Obviously, a program with 20 students and one classroom will not require the managerial or support staff that a program consisting of over 600 students will require. A second issue is that of program composition and its effect on program cost. While a prototypical or ideal DL program



consists of relatively equal numbers of native English and native Spanish-speaking students, many programs have very different ratios. Some DL programs have as much as a 99% Spanish speaking to a 1% English speaking population.

The relatively large number of Spanish-speaking children in many dual language programs also has a confounding effect on the results of the cost analysis. As the previous Lara-Alecio, et al. (2004) study indicated, a large number of DL programs were found in South Texas which has on average a larger percentage of ELLs than native English speakers. These border districts are likely to be majority Hispanic, receive Title III funds for a large portion of their student body, and tend to be property-poor.

Methodology

Our study was developed as a descriptive study to provide an in-depth understanding of costs related to DL programs. Additionally, we included qualitative comments by the bilingual directors or campus administrators. These provided additional data for understanding the needs and reasons for costs as they currently exist in DL programs.

Definition of DL Program

For the purpose of this study, we defined a DL program as an instructional bilingual education model integrating both native English speakers and native Spanish speakers in content classes taught in both languages and with a goal of bilingualism and biliteracy for both language minority and language majority students. We required at least 10% English-speaking students for inclusion in the DL program. The state average is approximately 40% English-speaking students in DL programs (Lara-Alecio, et al., 2004).



Participants

Participants for our study were purposefully selected. They included 304 identified bilingual directors and the 166 DL coordinators identified in the Lara-Alecio, et al. (2004) study. E-mail information was collected from the Texas A&M University's Language Diversity Network (<http://ldn.tamu.edu>), Texas Two-way Consortium Website (<http://texaswoway.org>), the Texas Center for Bilingual/ESL Education (<http://www.tcbee.org>), from school district websites, and from a superintendent mailing list provided by the Texas Education Agency. Specifically 1042 superintendents received an e-mail as a notification of the survey. The e-mail requested that they direct the message to the bilingual director or the principal of the school should they be implementing a DL program. This was sent as a deliberate effort to determine any previously unidentified DL programs in the state.

Instrument

After conducting a comprehensive review of the literature related to bilingual and dual language program components, the research team with the aid of school finance personnel developed a DL 91- item campus survey. It was reviewed by an economist for accuracy and was pilot tested with bilingual administrators and DL teachers in both written and online format (Refer to Appendix A). A second, shorter survey of fourteen items was also developed for the district level (Refer to Appendix B). This survey was designed to briefly gather district information and was not used in the final cost-analysis. The surveys, in both formats, were deemed to have a high internal consistency ($\alpha=.90$) and face validity.



Procedures

After completing our study of the number and features of DL programs in Texas (Lara-Alecio, et al., 2004), we were provided with a contact list of administrators of DL programs in Texas. We utilized this list to send an e-mail invitation to participate in our survey. To ensure that we also reached those districts with DL programs initiated after our last survey, we utilized a comprehensive list of Texas district superintendents and on the first of October 2004 we sent an e-mail letter inviting participation. After two weeks a second e-mail invitation and phone calls were placed to the known 166 DL programs. During October 2004, 93 online responses were received representing a 56% response rate. Eighty-three of the surveys were determined to be useable (representing approximately 50% of the known total DL programs in Texas).

Results

Demographics

Ninety-three online DL cost surveys were completed in Fall 2004. After review by the research team, ten surveys were omitted due to missing data or after it was determined that the programs were not DL programs as defined for the purpose of this study. Table 3 reveals that 48 schools districts with DL programs completed the survey which included 83 DL programs consisting of 27 small-size programs, 31 medium-size programs, and 25 large-size programs. For the purpose of the study small DL programs were comprised of 10-120 students; medium DL programs included 121-240 students; and large programs were designated as 240+ students. The researchers made these category distinctions based on the average number of students in DL programs that had one DL class per grade level (small program), two-classes per grade level (medium



program), and three or more classes per grade level (large program). Over 67% of the responses utilized the 50:50 model. The 50:50 DL program model may be overrepresented in the cost analysis since the Lara-Alecio, et al. (2004) study found that 53% of the state’s DL programs were 50:50 models. However we hypothesize that it may also reflect the noted trend in the growth of 50:50 programs in contrast to 90:10 models.

Table 3
DL Survey Response Demographics

	Districts	Programs	Students	50:50	90:10	Small Programs	Medium Programs	Large Programs
Total	48	83	16,231	56	27	27	31	25

Note: 50:50 = 50:50 DL Program Model; 90:10=90:10 Program Model; Small Programs = 0-120 Students; Medium Programs = 121-240 Students; Large Programs = 240+ Students

Program Age. Another distinctive feature of the reporting DL programs was the mean age of the programs by program size. Small programs reported a mean age of three years. Medium size programs were on average six years old, and large programs were on average almost five years into implementation.

Geographic Region. In an attempt to ascertain that our responses were geographically representative of the known DL programs, we divided the state into four regions (Northeast, Southwest, East and South). We tabulated responses by regional education service center area (1-20). Table 4 reports that the majority of responses (45.12%) were in the Eastern Region which included the Houston and Dallas Metroplexes and the Southern Region (35.37%) which included the Rio Grande Valley. The third largest reporting region was the Southwest (15.85%) which included the El Paso area, another area of high concentration of known DL programs. The Northwest



Region reported few programs (3.6%). These data reflect the regional distribution of DL programs found in the previous Lara-Alecio, et al. (2004) study.

Table 4
Responding DL programs by Texas Region

Region	Northwest	Southwest	Eastern	Southern
DL Programs	3	13	37	29

Note: Northwest= Regions 9, 14, 16, and 17; Southwest= Regions 15, 18, and 19; Eastern=Regions 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 12; Southern= Regions 1, 2, 3, 13, and 20.

Grade Levels. Figure 5 illustrates the grade levels of the reporting dual language programs. This figure is comparable to the grade level data from the Lara-Alecio, et al. (2004) study. It is evident that the majority of the programs in the current study are concentrated at the early elementary grades. The number of programs in Grades 6-12 drops significantly. Please note that only one high school program is included in the current study.




Figure 5. Grade Levels of Reporting DL Programs.



Per-pupil Costs

Per-pupil costs were calculated by small, medium and large DL program models for start-up years, annually, and additional funds that the DL program administrators reported as needed to adequately support their current DL programs. The research team determined, after discussions with administrators of current programs, that there may be differences in start-up year costs and ongoing annual costs by size of programs. Also, administrators frequently reported that they do not have sufficient funds to maintain current program levels; therefore, another category, “additional needed funds,” requested from them these amounts.

Table 5 reveals that the average per pupil start-up costs and the average per pupil annual costs for DL programs are approximately \$500.00. Programs requested an additional \$263.00 per pupil. This table also calculates costs across program type, program size, and instructional model.

Table 5
Mean Per-Pupil Costs for All Reporting Programs Over and Above Transitional Bilingual Program

	Start-up Costs	Annual Costs	Additional funds
Reporting DL Programs (n=83)	\$512.00	\$525.00	\$263.00

Table 6 reveals that smaller programs (0-120 students) were more costly per pupil to operate in all three categories: start-up, annual, and additional funds requested.

Conversely, large programs were the most cost effective in all three categories. Large programs spent approximately 1/3 of the amount per pupil compared to small programs.

We speculate that the reduced costs for large programs is due to minimized teacher and



student recruitment for the program, shared resources, materials and administrative costs, reduced staff development and certification costs, larger percent of bilingual students in the district with associated Title III allotments, and a history of bilingual education programs and funding therefore having opportunities to have previously purchased bilingual materials. Likewise, medium programs spent less than 1/2 the amount per pupil than small programs in all three categories.

Table 6

Mean Per-Pupil Costs for Start-Up, Annual and Additional Funds Needed by Program Size

Program Size	Start-Up	Annual	Additional
Small Program (n=27)	\$825.00	\$ 879.00	\$568.00
Med. Program (n=31)	\$399.00	\$406.00	\$209.00
Large Program (n=25)	\$312.00	\$290.00	\$197.00

Note: Small Programs = 0-120 Students; Medium Programs = 121-240 Students; Large Programs = 240+ Students; Start-Up = Costs required to initiate program; Annual = yearly program costs; Additional = additional funds requested to maintain adequate program.

50:50 v. 90:10 Cost Differences

Since the Lara-Alecio, et al. (2004) study found approximately equal proportions of 50:50 and 90:10 DL programs, the research team was interested to discern whether there were cost differences associated with the two most common DL program models. Table 7 reveals these data. Notably, Table 7 indicates approximately equal per pupil costs annually and requested additional funds for 90:10 and 50:50. There appears to be an insignificant difference in mean per pupil annual costs or requested additional funding associated with the two most common DL program models in Texas.

Though costs associated with 90:10 and 50:50 models appear to be similar, it should be noted that the goals of these two program models are somewhat different.

There also seems to be an additional outcome in that both language groups (native



English and native Spanish) develop higher bilingual and Spanish skills than in the 50:50 model (Thomas & Collier, 2002).

Table 7

Mean Per-Pupil Annual and Additional Costs as Reported by 50/50 and 90/10 Instructional Models

DL Model	Annual	Additional
90:10 Model (27)	\$389.00	\$246.00
50:50 Model (56)	\$388.00	\$238.00

Note: 50:50 = 50:50 DL Program Model; 90:10=90:10 Program Model; Annual = yearly program costs; Additional = additional funds requested to maintain adequate program.

Teacher Models

After reviewing the literature and discussions with DL administrators, three typical teacher arrangements or administrative models were revealed. The three distinct teacher arrangements are: (a) two-teacher mixed, (b) one-teacher mixed, and (c) two-teacher separated. Two-teacher mixed was the most common arrangement (n=39) and two-teacher separated was the least common (n=13) (Refer to Table 8).

The two-teacher mixed model is one in which students are being served by two different teachers, one in Spanish, the other in English, for differing periods of the day or week. Native English and native Spanish speakers are mixed within the same class group. This model typically represents (minimally) two classes of students (approximately 40 students) which rotate between English and Spanish instruction in a “team-teaching” type situation in which planning, curriculum materials, and paraprofessionals are usually shared. The two-teacher mixed model is the least expensive model.

The one-teacher mixed, the second most common model, is one in which native English and native Spanish DL students are being served by a single bilingual teacher



instructing in both Spanish and English for different periods of the school day or week.

Usually, this model requires hiring an additional teacher who is bilingual certified to serve as the DL teacher which may contribute to the expense of this design. This model was the most costly model reported.

The two-teacher separated model is one in which students are being served by different teachers, one in Spanish, the other in English, for differing periods of the day or week. Native English and native Spanish speakers are separated into different class groups, which are then switched for shifts in language of instruction and are occasionally integrated. This model is not the prototypical DL model since the integration of the two language groups is minimal.

The two-teacher separated model (n=13) was the least reported and the second most expensive per pupil. Often such models require additional instructional support, such as an instructional aide, since students in this grouping are not mixed by language regularly and therefore are not able to provide one another with language clarifications, i.e., clarifying the English instruction with Spanish or the Spanish instruction with English (Lara-Alecio & Parker, 1994). Additionally, this model does not foster collaborative planning and sharing of resources. These factors may contribute the significant difference in cost between the two-teacher mixed model and this model.



Table 8

Mean Per-Pupil Annual and Additional Costs as Reported by Three Administrative Program Models

Teacher Model	Annual	Additional
Two-Teacher Mixed (n=39)	\$297.00	\$231.00
One-Teacher Mixed (n=31)	\$522.00	\$241.00
Two-Teacher Sep. (n=13)	\$448.00	\$277.00

Note: Two-Teacher Mixed= One Spanish speaking teacher and one English speaking teacher “team teaching” two mixed groups of native English and Spanish DL students. One-Teacher Mixed= One bilingual teacher serving one class of DL students (mixed group of native English and Spanish speakers). Two-Teacher Sep= Two-teacher separated serving native English and Spanish speakers in separate classrooms. The two language groups are separated.

Cost Categories

The survey requested information on 12 categories associated with dual language programs. Respondents were asked to determine mean start-up², annual³, and additional requested costs across 12 cost categories above and beyond their expenditures for traditional transitional bilingual programs. The categories were: managerial, staff, instruction, staff development, Spanish curriculum, English curriculum, assessment, equipment, recruitment, public relations, parental involvement, and other materials. Following is a brief explanation of each category.

Managerial costs include costs associated with professional staff needed to operate the DL program such as a Dual language coordinator. This managerial staffs were solely dedicated to the dual program.

Staff costs were associated with staff needed to operate the DL program such as a clerk/typist, secretary, parent liaison or/and assessors.

² Start-up costs include, but are not limited to, initial costs associated with planning, training, purchasing, and recruiting prior to program implementation.

³ Annual costs are those costs associated with normal operations of the program in one academic year.



Instructional costs include costs associated with instructional staff dedicated to the dual program that otherwise would not be on campus such as teachers, paraprofessionals, tutors, etc.

Staff Development/Training costs were for both staff and teachers focused on dual language programs such as site visits, conferences, travel, registration, on-site presentations, etc. over and above the required five state days.

Curriculum material costs were for Spanish speakers learning English (i.e. leveled readers, texts, videos, audio books, computer software, etc.) over and above those needed for the traditional bilingual classroom.

Curricular material costs were for English speakers learning Spanish (i.e. leveled readers, texts, videos, audio books, computer software, etc.) over and above those needed for the traditional bilingual classroom.

Assessment material costs were for English and Spanish speakers over and above those needed for the traditional bilingual or mainstream classroom.

Equipment costs were necessary to the proper functioning of the program (for example: card readers, listening stations).

Recruitment costs were included for both students and teachers (newspaper, radio, television, meetings, and flyers). These costs were over and above the typical school-home communications.

Public relations costs included items such as videos, brochures, and meetings. These costs were over and above the typical school-home communications.



Parental involvement costs included parental instructional or orientation programs during or after school. These include L2 language programs and academic support for families.

Other material costs included unanticipated costs reported by programs.

Start-up Costs. Table 10 details the mean start-up costs across the 12 categories for small, medium and large programs.

Table 10
Mean Start-up Costs by Program Size above Typical Transitional Bilingual Program Costs

Costs Category	Small	Medium	Large
Managerial	\$14,333.00	\$19,616.00	\$27,800.00
Staff	\$3,148.00	\$7,823.00	\$9,409.00
Instruction	\$1,548.00	\$9,633.00	\$9,400.00
Staff Development	\$6,986.00	\$6,557.00	\$18,113.00
Spanish Curriculum	\$3,480.00	\$6,513.00	\$20,499.00
English Curriculum	\$3,572.00	\$6,352.00	\$12,297.00
Assessment	\$1,522.00	\$1,447.00	\$5,060.00
Equipment	\$1,389.00	\$1,961.00	\$6,339.00
Recruitment	\$178.00	\$911.00	\$790.00
Public Relations	\$946.00	\$484.00	\$1,104.00
Parental Involvement	\$744.00	\$2,695.00	\$5,193.00
Other Materials	\$667.00	\$758.00	\$2,542.00
TOTAL	\$38,513.00	\$64,750.00	\$118,546.00

Note: Category Costs: 12 major cost categories; small=small DL program; medium= medium DL program; large=large DL program.

The largest costs for all three DL groups were associated with managerial costs. While many may believe managerial costs to be overstated, one principal indicated, “While the program can be sustained at an adequate level, the loss of managerial and support personnel will impact the program’s effectiveness. Once the additional funding ends, the bilingual department which already has a huge case load will have to consider ways to maintain positions.” The least costs across the three groups were associated with recruitment for both students and teachers. All three groups reported start-up costs associated with instruction and staff development. Instruction costs were similar for



medium and large programs, and staff development costs were similar for small and medium programs. Large programs needed over \$18,000 for start-up training and staff development.

Two areas of concern for funding in DL programs are costs associated with serving the native English speakers in the DL program. State or federal Title III allotments cannot be used to purchase materials or fund instruction for non-ELL students. One principal stated, “The district received Title VII funds and those funds were used to assist with start-up costs. State funds are needed to pay for additional Spanish textbooks for each of the non-ELL students in all content areas. This is one of our school’s biggest financial concerns. If native English speaking students are served in DL programs, the state should support the purchase of textbooks for the non-ELLs.” The survey indicated that DL Programs incurred start-up Spanish curriculum costs for the native English speakers on average of \$3480 for small programs, \$6352 for medium programs and \$12,297 for large programs. Additionally, DL programs may need additional assessment materials for the native English speakers. Small programs reported assessment start-up costs of \$1522; medium programs reported assessment start-up costs of \$1447, and large programs reported assessment start-up costs of \$5060.

Table 11 and Figure 6 show that costs per pupil increased as the percentage of native English speakers increased. In programs with 10-30% native English speakers, the costs per pupil were \$326, compared to programs with 30-49% native English speakers with costs per pupil were at \$445 or a difference of \$119 per student. This figure represents a 36.5% increase of costs associated with service to increased numbers of native English speakers.



Table 11
Average cost per pupil based on % of Native English Speakers

	% of English Speakers		
	10-29%	30-49%	50% and above
Average annual costs	\$90,574.36	\$76,750.69	\$62,715.64
Average cost per pupil	\$326.37	\$445.36	\$413.81

Figure 6 offers a visual representation of the cost increases per pupil as the percentage of native English speakers increases. This increasing cost per pupil was predicted since the cost data calculations were based on expenditures over and above the traditional transitional bilingual program (native English speakers are not included in the transitional bilingual classrooms). Since State ELL funds cannot be used for purchases for this population of students, any additional resources needed for the English speakers in the DL program must come from local funds.




Figure 6. Mean Costs per Pupil as Related to Percentage of Native English Speakers



Annual Costs. Notably in Table 12, the largest annual cost category for medium and large programs is administrative/managerial costs. For small programs, the largest annual cost category is instruction. The total annual costs of a small program approaches the total costs associated with a medium program.

Table 12
Mean Annual Costs by Program Size above Typical Bilingual Program Costs

Costs Categories	Small	Medium	Large
Managerial	\$15,907.00	\$16,626.00	\$23,990.00
Staff	\$3,444.00	\$8,355.00	\$10,037.00
Instruction	\$22,185.00	\$15,570.00	\$12,451.00
Staff Development	\$4,537.00	\$7,115.00	\$20,529.00
Spanish Curriculum	\$2,676.00	\$4,477.00	\$15,120.00
English Curriculum	\$2,787.00	\$4,517.00	\$10,058.00
Assessment	\$1,354.00	\$1,381.00	\$4,200.00
Equipment	\$815.00	\$2,645.00	\$6,059.00
Recruitment	\$237.00	\$629.00	\$728.00
Public Relations	\$328.00	\$1,203.00	\$838.00
Parental Involvement	\$752.00	\$2,966.00	\$3,533.00
Other Materials	\$815.00	\$445.00	\$2,426.00
TOTAL	\$55,837.00	\$65,929.00	\$109,969.00

Note: Category Costs: 12 major cost categories; small=small DL program; medium= medium DL program; large=large DL program.

Table 13 reports costs associated with the three teacher/instructional models: (a) two-teacher mixed; (b) one-teacher mixed; and (c) and two-teacher separated. Notably, the two-teacher mixed model reports the smallest amount of annual expenditures; however, the two-teacher mixed model was only slightly less expensive than the two-teacher separate model. The two-teacher mixed model was the least expensive model per pupil (Refer to Table 8). The difference between the two-teacher mixed and the two-teacher separated models in costs appears to be in the areas of managerial support and instructional categories. The most costly teacher model is the one-teacher mixed model with the amount totaling nearly \$20,000. The one-teacher mixed model reported significantly more cost than the other two models in that areas of: curriculum,



assessment, equipment, recruitment and instruction. This is reasonable since one extra teacher would have to be employed to serve the program.

Table 13
Mean Annual Funds by Teacher Model above Traditional Transitional Bilingual Program Costs

Cost Category	2 Teachers Mixed	1 Teacher Mixed	2 Teachers Sep.
Managerial	\$17,928.00	\$17,484.00	\$23,342.00
Staff	\$6,229.00	\$8,742.00	\$6,846.00
Instruction	\$14,366.00	\$18,941.00	\$18,884.00
Staff Development	\$11,289.00	\$10,207.00	\$7,659.00
Spanish Curriculum	\$6,150.00	\$9,819.00	\$3,446.00
English Curriculum	\$3,360.00	\$9,819.00	\$2,408.00
Assessment	\$1,822.00	\$3,389.00	\$635.00
Equipment	\$2,230.00	\$4,339.00	\$2,615.00
Recruitment	\$426.00	\$813.00	\$177.00
Public Relations	\$1,029.00	\$653.00	\$515.00
Parental Involvement	\$1,804.00	\$3,710.00	\$1,169.00
Other Materials	\$1,653.00	\$710.00	\$769.00
TOTAL	\$68,286.00	\$88,626.00	\$68,465.00

Note: Category Costs: 12 major cost categories; small=small DL program; medium= medium DL program; large=large DL program.

The next analyses depict cost category breakdowns as a percentage of annual costs in terms of small, medium and large districts.



Figure 7 illustrates that the largest percentage of costs were associated with instruction for small campuses. In fact, instruction and managerial costs represented over 73% of the total expenditures.




Figure 7. Percentages of Annual Costs per Category for Small Programs (0 – 120)

Figure 8 charts instruction, staff and managerial costs as 71% of the total expenditures for DL programs of medium size. Staff development costs were 11% of the total budget.




Figure 8. Percentages of Annual Costs per Category for Medium Programs (120 -239)

Figure 9 reveals that nearly one quarter of annual costs were associated with Spanish and English curriculum materials for large DL programs. Managerial and instructional costs are lower than that of medium and small programs. Staff development costs were higher than those of medium and small programs.




Figure 9. Percentages of Annual Costs per Category for Large Programs (240 and above).

Middle and High School Programs. There are few known middle or high school DL programs in the nation or Texas. We have only been able to identify 11 such programs in Texas. Only one high school program responded to the DL cost survey. We will be seeking additional data from these programs to provide better insight into the costs associated with secondary DL programs. The one high school that completed the



survey reported a per pupil cost of \$358 per pupil. More complete secondary data will be sought in a follow-up study.

Federal Funding

With the inception of the No Child Left Behind Act (2001), bilingual education was mandated. Prior to 2001, there were capacity-building policies (McDonnell, 1994) that provided for additional funding to enhance local district efforts, rather than mandated policies for bilingual education. Many school districts applied directly to the U.S. Department of Education for supplemental funds such as those that supported start-up and continued implementation for dual language programs. Under this funding formula, funds could be used for native English speakers not eligible under the current federal flow-through funds under the Title III allotment. Lara-Alecio et al. (2004) determined that DL programs in Texas were positively impacted by these USDOE capacity-building funds.

Due to their typical three to five-year funding cycles, many of the current DL programs are either out of federal monies or soon will be. Our current study indicated that 88% of large programs and over half of small (51.8%) and medium (54.8%) programs have received federal funds. Overall, 53 of the campus' DL programs (63%) received federal funding with an average award of \$498, 874 over a three to five year period. This number includes 22 large DL programs which may skew the data upward. Only three of the large programs did not report receiving federal funds. The significant federal support for DL programs contributed to the growth of DL models in Texas and calls into question the sustainability of these programs should an alternate funding source not be found. One dual language coordinator remarked, "Although we could maintain



the program due to an already established school culture and commitment, we could not maintain the high expectations we have set without funding for personnel. The federal funds we received paid for a school coordinator, bilingual aides, a parent liaison, consultants, and tutors. These positions supported stronger recruitment efforts, instructional and parental support. The aides were able to support classroom teachers during the school day, and tutors provided small group instruction. The quality of our program overall increased greatly with these components.”

Recommendations

Based on the current review of literature of effective practices, we believe that DL programs are viable bilingual models that promote bilingualism and biliteracy for both language majority and language minority students. The current study makes no link between dual language program costs and program effectiveness. Our recommendations follow.

1. One of our recommendations is to conduct an analysis of effectiveness of DL programs related to costs. Since there is a known sample of dual language programs, state achievement data could be drawn on that sample and compared to the associated costs.
2. Another recommendation is to perform a follow-up study of programs that received federal funding to determine the level of sustainability. We found the lowest costs per pupil were associated with the following: (a) Larger DL Programs and (b) Two-Teacher Mixed Model Programs. No real cost difference was detected between 50:50 and 90:10 DL program designs.



3. Our findings are based on actual expenditures above and beyond the traditional transitional bilingual education program. The data indicated that the average per pupil costs across programs sizes was \$525, so for a 24-student classroom, the estimated additional funds would be \$12,600. For a 24-student classroom under the two-teacher mixed model the costs for funding a DL program above and beyond the traditional, transitional bilingual program is \$7128. The reduced costs of the two-teacher mixed model plus the additional benefits of “team-teaching,” curriculum planning and sharing, and peer language clarifications lead us to recommend the two-teacher mixed model, whether it is in a 50:50 or a 90:10 arrangement.
4. A recurring theme within the data was the lack of funding for native English speakers who represent nearly 40% of the students served in DL programs in Texas. The need for additional curriculum and assessment materials in Spanish for these students is a financial challenge for these districts, many of which are low SES, Title I campuses. As reported, as the percentage of native English speakers increases in a DL program so does the costs per pupil. In fact, a 36.5% local expenditure increase was detected for programs with larger percentages of native English speakers. We recommend that the State determine alternative funding avenues for supporting these additional student costs related to serving the English speaker in a bilingual program.
5. Additionally, the State should reflect on the volume of programs that were fostered under capacity-building federal funding initiatives and that now are facing a critical stage as this additional program funding has been depleted. The



- data revealed immediate concerns from campus and district administrators about sustaining adequate funding levels that would maintain program integrity. The State might consider a competitive grant process to pilot new programs and to sustain existing ones including middle school and high school programs, so that the intended goal of K-12 DL programs can be better realized. We recommend that new programs funded under such a competitive grant process begin at Kindergarten adding one grade level per year. We also recommend that programs should be maintained at least through middle school.
6. Although not studied in our current research, we have a related recommendation to the two-teacher mixed model, and that is to develop a dual language teacher certification process allowing for testing in a teacher's native language thereby strengthening both language components and potentially increasing the number of certified dual language teachers. Bilingual and ESL teachers are in critical shortage in Texas and the question of how to attract and retain certified bilingual teachers is paramount (Lara, Galloway, Irby & Brown, 2003). The state might consider assisting local districts with the increasing costs associated (a) with bilingual and ESL teacher stipends in dual language programs⁴, (b) with offering additional loan forgiveness programs or (c) state bonuses/stipends for individuals willing to serve in districts with extreme shortages⁵. Increasing the numbers of students that graduate from Texas' schools fully biliterate and bilingual may have the potential over time to significantly address the bilingual teacher shortage as well as other employment areas where bilingual skills are required.

⁴ This may be in the form of district reimbursement for such individuals.

⁵ This may be in the form of district reimbursement for such individuals.



7. The DL program can serve the English speakers or Spanish language learners (SLL) and the Spanish speakers well by allowing them to obtain their academic proficiency in Spanish by the time they reach junior high. At such time, they can begin advanced placement Spanish credit. Dual language and foreign language programs can work collaboratively to ensure the foreign language TEKS are included in the curriculum between grades PK-5.

Our study provided insight into the actual start-up and annual costs by program size over and above transitional bilingual program costs; we recommend for new, small programs that the average start-up cost allocations should minimally approximate \$39,000 and annual cost allocations should minimally approximate \$56,000 (or \$879 per pupil).

Final Remarks

The study results are strong and timely related to the costs of educating the nearly 16,500 students represented in this sample. Dual language programs can assist students in becoming fully biliterate citizens of Texas who can serve as a unique linguistic, cultural, and economic resource, who are much needed for the constructive future of our State and Nation.



Selected References

- Alanís, I. (2000). A Texas two-way bilingual program: Its effects on linguistic and academic achievement, *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24.
- Baker, C. (1996). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. 2nd Edition. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Brisk, M. E. (1999). *Quality bilingual education: Defining success*. LAB Working Paper No 1. Providence, RI: Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Lab. at Brown Univ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 445549).
- Cardenas, J., Bernal, J. & Kean, W. (1976). *Bilingual education cost analysis*. San Antonio, TX: Intercultural Development Research Association.
- Center for Applied Linguistics. (2002). *Directory of two-way bilingual immersion programs in the U.S.* Retrieved November 19, 2002 from <http://www.cal.org/twi/directory>
- Chambers, J. & Parrish, T. (1992). Meeting the challenge of language diversity: An evaluation of programs for pupils with limited proficiency in English. Berkeley, CA: BW Associates
- Christian, D., & Whitcher, A. (1995). *Directory of two-way bilingual programs in the U.S.* Santa Cruz, CA/Washington, DC.: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.
- Christian, D. (1994). *Two-way bilingual education: Students learning through two languages*. Education Practice Report, 12. Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Christian, D. (1996). Two-way immersion education: Students learning through two languages. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80 (1), 66-76.
- Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Collier, V. P. (1992). A synthesis of studies examining long-term language minority student data on academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16, 187-222.
- Cummins, J., & Swain, M. (1986). *Bilingualism in education*. New York: Longman.
- Cummins, J. (1981b). *The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los



- Angeles: California State University: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, 3-29.
- Cummins, J. (1991). Interdependence of first- and second-language proficiency in bilingual children. In E. Bialystok (Ed.) *Language processing in bilingual children*. (pp. 70-89). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, J. (1992). Empowerment through biliteracy. In J. V. Tinajero & A. F. Ada, (Eds.) *The power of two languages: Literacy and biliteracy for Spanish-speaking students* (pp9-25). New York, NY: Macmillan/ McGraw-Hill.
- Galloway, M. (2003). The impact of a minimal English reading intervention on young Hispanic bilinguals. An unpublished dissertation. Texas A&M University.
- Genessee, F. (1987). *Learning through two languages: Students of immersion and bilingual education*. Cambridge, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Gómez, L. (2000). Two-way bilingual education: Promoting educational and social change. *The Journal of the Texas Association for Bilingual Education*, 5 (1), 43-54.
- Hernandez-Chavez, E. (1984). The inadequacy of English immersion education as an educational approach for language minority students in the U.S.. In *Studies on immersion education*. (pp. 144-180). CA: Bilingual bicultural education, California State Department of Education.
- Lara-Alecio, R., & Parker, R. (1994). A pedagogical model for transitional English bilingual classrooms. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 18 (3&4), 119-133.
- Lara-Alecio, R., Galloway, M., Irby, B., & Brown, G. (2003) Superintendents' Study of Bilingual Teacher Recruitment and Retention. A report prepared for the Texas A&M Regent's Initiative.
- Lara-Alecio, R., Galloway, M., Irby, B., Rodriguez, L. & Gomez, L. (2004). Two-Way immersion bilingual programs in Texas, *Bilingual Research Journal*, 28(1).
- Lindholm, K. J., & Aclan, Z. (1991). Bilingual proficiency as a bridge to academic achievement: Results from bilingual/immersion programs. *Journal of Education*, 173, 99-113.
- Lindholm, K. J. (1987). *Directory of bilingual immersion programs*. Educational Report No. 8 of the Center for Language Education and Research, UCLA.



- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (2002). *Rate in LEP growth*. Accessed at <http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/reports/state-data/2000/>
- Ovando, C.J., Collier, V.P., & Combs, M. C. (2002) *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts* (3rd edition). McGraw Hill.
- PEIMS, (2002). Public Education Information Management System. Online at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/peims/>.
- Ramirez, J., Pasta, D., Ramey, D., & Yuen, S. (1991). *Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit bilingual education programs for language minority children. Vol. 1*. Prepared for U.S. Department of Education (Contract No. 300-87-0156). San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.
- Slavin, R. & Cheung, A. (2003). *Effective reading programs for English language learners: A best synthesis*. <http://www.csos.jhu.edu/crespar/techReports/Report66.pdf>
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1982). *Evaluating bilingual education*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Texas Education Agency. (2003). *Pocket edition*, p. 3 (<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/pocked/2002/pocked0102.pdf>)
- Texas Education Code (2001). *TEC, Chapter 39, Subchapter B*. Available online at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac>.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students*. Washington, DC: NCBE. Available online: <http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/resource/effectiveness/index.htm>.
- Thomas, W. P. & Collier, V. (2001). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long term academic achievement*. Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence. Available online at <http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/research/llaa/1.1es.html>
- Torres-Guzman, M. (2002). *Dual language programs: Key features and results*. Washington, D.C: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Valdes, G. (1997). Dual-Language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(3), 391-429.



Appendix A



Two Way Dual Language (DL) Operational Cost Survey at Campus Level

1. Your Name

2. Your Title/Position

3. School/Campus Name

4. District

5. Region No. 6. Email Address

7. Phone Fax

8. Total District Enrollment

9. Number of total students (both Native Spanish and English Speakers) enrolled in the dual language program on this campus:

10. What grade levels are being served in your campus dual language program?

<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input type="checkbox"/> K	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 10
<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. Percentage Native English Speakers in Dual Language Program

12. Percentage Native Spanish Speakers in Dual Language Program

13. Number of Dual Language Teachers

14. Number of Dual Language teachers instructing in Spanish

15. Number of Dual Language teachers instructing in English

Program Model (Please note: We are targeting Spanish/English Dual Language Programs.)

16. While all dual language programs include both native English and native Spanish speakers, the administrative models vary. Please choose the administrative model which most closely mirrors your own.

- Students being served by different teachers, one in Spanish, the other in English, for differing periods of the day/week. Native English and native Spanish speakers are mixed within the same class group.
- Students being served by a single bilingual teacher instructing in both Spanish and English for different periods of the school day/week.
- Students being served by different teachers, one in Spanish, the other in English, for differing periods of the day/week. Native English and native Spanish speakers are separated into different class groups which are then switched for shifts in language of instruction.

17a. This DL program is (check one):

- This campus has dual language as its only **bilingual** option
- The entire campus is Dual Language
- The campus consists of both a dual language and a transitional bilingual program

17b. Our Dual Language program is best described as: 90/10

50/50

18. Number of years Dual Language program has been in place on your campus:

VERY IMPORTANT: Before filling in the following information, be aware that these costs are only to be considered if they are over and above what is required of a traditional bilingual program as is required of your district. For example, if a bilingual classroom with twenty students would normally receive the following: texts in English and Spanish, one bilingual teacher, a half-time bilingual aide and content mastery blocks for those students in need of extra assistance in a given subject area, then only include costs for the dual language program which are over and above these baseline costs.

Personnel Budget

19. Additional Managerial staff needed to operate the DL program (coordinator). Staff duties should be solely dedicated to the dual program	19A) Initial Startup Need? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	19B) Estimated Total Start-up Costs	19C) Ongoing Annual Need? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	19D) Estimated Total Annual Costs	19E) Total Number of DL Personnel

20. Additional Staff solely dedicated to the DL program (clerk/typist, parent liaison, assessors).	20A) Initial Startup Need? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	20B) Estimated Total Start-up Costs	20C) Ongoing Annual Need? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	20D) Estimated Total Annual Costs	20E) Total Number of DL Personnel

21. Additional Instructional staff dedicated to the dual program that otherwise would not be on campus (e.g. paraprofessionals, teachers, tutors).	21A) Initial Startup Need? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-left: 5px;" type="button" value="?"/>	21B) Estimated Total start-up Costs	21C) Ongoing Annual Need? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	21D) Estimated Total Annual Costs	21E) Total Nuber of DL Personnel

22. Additional Staff Development/Training for both staff and teachers (site visits, conferences, travel, registration, on-site presentations) over and above the required five state days.	22A) Initial Startup Need? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	22B) Estimated Total Start-up Costs	22C) Ongoing Annual Need? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	22D) Estimated Total Annual Costs

Materials Budget

23. Additional Curricular Materials for Spanish speakers learning Spanish (i.e. leveled readers, texts, videos, audio books, computer software, etc.) over and above those needed for the traditional bilingual	23A) Initial Startup Need? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	23B) Estimated Total Start-up Costs?	23C) Ongoing Annual Need? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	23D) Estimated Total annual Costs

classroom.

24. Additional Curricular Materials for English speakers learning Spanish (i.e. leveled readers, texts, videos, audio books, computer software, etc.) over and above those needed for the traditional bilingual classroom.	24A) Initial Startup Need?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	24B) Estimated Total Start-up Costs		24C) Ongoing Annual Need?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	24D) Estimated total Annual Costs	
		<input type="radio"/> No				<input type="radio"/> No		

25. Additional Assessment Materials (additional kits, forms) needed to assess students in both English and Spanish. (e.g. materials needed to assess native English Speakers otherwise not needed)	25A) Initial Startup Need?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	25B) Estimated Total Start-up Costs		25C) Ongoing Annual Need?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	25D) Estimated Total Annual costs	
		<input type="radio"/> No				<input type="radio"/> No		

26. Additional Equipment necessary to the proper functioning of the program (for example: card readers, listening stations).	26A) Initial Startup Need?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	26B) Estimated Total Start-up Costs		26C) Ongoing Annual Need?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	26D) Estimated total Annual Costs	
		<input type="radio"/> No				<input type="radio"/> No		

27. Additional Recruitment costs for both students and teachers (newspaper, radio, television, meetings, flyers) Factor these costs only if they are in addition to typical school-home communications.	27A) Initial Startup Need?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	27B) Estimated Total Start-up Costs		27C) Ongoing Annual Need?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	27D) Estimated Total Annual Costs	
		<input type="radio"/> No				<input type="radio"/> No		

28. Additional Public Relations costs. (videos, brochures, meetings) Factor these costs only if they are in addition to typical school-home communications.	28A) Initial Startup Costs	<input type="radio"/> Yes	28B) Estimated Total Start-up Costs		28C) Ongoing Annual Need	<input type="radio"/> Yes	28D) Estimated Annual Costs	
		<input type="radio"/> No				<input type="radio"/> No		

29. Additional Parent Involvement costs (meetings, incentives, training, take home reading materials, take home instructional materials).	29A) Initial Startup Need?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	29B) Estimated Total Start-up Costs		29C) Ongoing Annual Need?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	29D) Estimated Total Annual Costs	
		<input type="radio"/> No				<input type="radio"/> No		

30. Other additional materials costs not otherwise specified in previous questions.	30A) Initial Startup Need?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	30B) Estimated Total Startup Costs	<input type="text"/>	30C) Ongoing Annual Need?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Estimated Total Annual costs	<input type="text"/>
---	----------------------------	---	------------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	---	------------------------------	----------------------

31. Briefly describe any additional materials costs referenced in question 30. **A)**

Funding Sources

32. Federal Funds or Grants-- Federal Title III/VII(Not from TEA).	32A) Did the DL program receive these funds?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	32B) For what years?	<input type="text"/>	32C) Estimated Total Funding	<input type="text"/>	32D) Would the DL program have been possible without this specific support?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
--	--	---	----------------------	----------------------	------------------------------	----------------------	---	---

33. Local Businesses and Organizations	33A) Did the DL program receive these funds?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	33B) For what years?	<input type="text"/>	33C) Estimated Total Funding	<input type="text"/>	33D) Would the DL program have been possible without this specific support?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
--	--	---	----------------------	----------------------	------------------------------	----------------------	---	---

34. Private Foundations/Grants	34A) Did the DL program receive these funds?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	34B) For what years?	<input type="text"/>	34C) Estimated Total Funding	<input type="text"/>	34D) Would the DL program have been possible without this specific support?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
--------------------------------	--	---	----------------------	----------------------	------------------------------	----------------------	---	---

35. Other funds not listed under previous categories.	35A) Did the DL program receive these funds?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	35B) For what years?	<input type="text"/>	35C) Estimated Total Funding	<input type="text"/>	35D) Would the DL program have been possible without this specific support?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
---	--	---	----------------------	----------------------	------------------------------	----------------------	---	---

36. Briefly describe any additional funding sources referenced in question 35.

37. Will you be able to sustain the dual language program without federal assistance?

Yes
 No

38. If not, why?

39. How much additional annual funding will you need to sustain the program at an adequate level?

40. This space is provided for additional comments. Any additional information that you can provide is appreciated:

Submit

Appendix B



Bilingual Director Survey

1. Your Name _____

2. Your Title/Position _____

3. District _____

4. Region No.

5. Total District Enrollment _____

6. Number of schools that house dual language programs in the district _____

7. Grade levels of dual language programs:

PK K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

you must check at least one item

8. Number of total students (both Native Spanish and English Speakers) enrolled in this district's dual language program: _____

9. Number of students served in this district's transitional bilingual program outside of the two-way dual language program _____

10. Number of students served in ESL _____

11. Total state allocation for English-language learners

12. Total annual grant funds for English language learners

13. Total additional local funds for English language learners

14. What is the first year the dual language program was in place? _____

Submit