
APPENDIX A RESEARCH OBJECTIVES, METHODS, AND DATA SOURCES AND DETAILED FINDINGS

This appendix describes the research objectives and methods and provides detailed analyses of the findings on enrollments of English language learner students in districts in Appalachia Region states.

Research objectives

The goal of this research was to describe English language learner enrollment in the Appalachia Region and to develop an understanding of how districts are responding to their newly emerging English language learner communities. Three research questions guided the work:

- To what extent are districts within the region experiencing their first enrollments of English language learner students or rapid increases in enrollments?
- How are districts responding to emerging English language learner communities? For example, what needs do administrators report and what resources are they using to meet these needs?
- What have districts learned about serving English language learner students? As districts gain experience in working with English language learner students, are there changes in how they structure or provide services for these students?

The research plan involved three types of data collection activities:

1. Analysis of available multiyear state data to identify:
 - English language learner enrollment patterns.
 - Districts with initial or significantly increased English language learner enrollments.

2. Examination of literature to identify:
 - Research and materials that address the needs of districts with emerging English language learner populations.
 - Infrastructure components important in establishing services for districts' initial English language learner student populations.
3. Interviews with district and school administrators from districts that have recently experienced initial English language learner enrollments or rapid increases in enrollments to explore:
 - Administrators' perspectives on the steps taken, needs, and resources used.
 - Any changes in responses to serving English language learner students.

Analysis of enrollment in the Appalachia Region

English language learner enrollment and the distribution of English language learner students in the Appalachia Region were analyzed to identify any significant increases in English language learner populations in recent years in individual districts. Existing district-level data as of fall 2006 were used for the analysis (see box A1 for a discussion of data sources).

The following assumptions and rationales were used in identifying districts that had experienced significant increases in their English language learner populations:

- *Assumption.* Increases in English language learner enrollment in a district should be examined in terms of English language learner students as a proportion of total student enrollment.
- *Rationale.* This ratio takes into account the impact of the English language learner population on the district independent of the size of the district.

BOX A1

Availability and sources of district-level data on English language learner enrollment

Data on district English language learner enrollments were collected in the fall of 2006. Data were obtained online from individual state and U.S. Department of Education data sources wherever possible and directly from the individual state Title III coordinators. The specific sources obtained are outlined below by state. Analyses were conducted using the most recent data available for each state.

Kentucky. Conversations with Kentucky's Title III coordinator confirmed her interest in the studies, but a research proposal was required in order to request specific datasets from the state's database. This made it impossible to obtain multiyear district-level data on English language learner enrollment and total enrollment from the state within a suitable timeframe for this study. Thus, data on total enrollment and English language learner enrollments for 2000/01–2004/05 were obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Common Core

of Data database (2004/05 data were preliminary) (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2007).

Tennessee. Discussions held in mid-October with the federal programs coordinator and the newly hired Title III coordinator revealed that Tennessee could provide only very limited data in electronic form on English language learner enrollment for recent years. Total enrollment data were obtained from the Tennessee Department of Education's web site, abstracted from the state's Annual Statistical Report, which provided a database covering total student enrollment for school years 1995/96–2004/05 (Tennessee Department of Education, 2007). A list of English language learner enrollments for 2004/05 by district was obtained directly from the state Title III coordinator (Tennessee Department of Education, 2006). The Common Core of Data does not include data on English language learner enrollment for Tennessee, so multiyear data on English language learner enrollments were not available. In November 2006 Tennessee provided electronic copies of district report forms that include

English language learner enrollment data for three years, but the effort required to collect and enter these data into an analyzable database was beyond the scope of this study.

Virginia. Total enrollment and English language learner enrollment data by district were available on the Virginia Department of Education web site, Data & Reports section (Virginia Department of Education, 2006). Data were abstracted from separate databases and tables. Data from these sources were combined, with data tables converted to a manipulable database format as necessary. The resulting database provided total and English language learner enrollment data by district for the 1995/96–2005/06 school years.

West Virginia. Historical data were not available from the state without an approvals process that would have exceeded the timeframe of this project. Data on total enrollment and English language learner enrollment for 2000/01–2004/05 were available through the NCES Common Core of Data (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, 2007).

- *Assumption.* A district may have experienced more than one period of significant increase in its English language learner population, and it is important to identify such districts.

Rationale. Districts that have experienced more than one significant increase in the number of English language learners—a sustained pattern of increase—would face even greater challenges in adapting to their growing English language learner populations. Also, such increases would be expected

to coincide with substantial demographic changes in the community, which would have implications for the type and level of resources available as well as other factors.

- *Assumption.* A significant increase in English language learner enrollment (calculated as a proportion of total population) is defined as at least a 50 percent increase.

Rationale. The 50 percent criterion was judged to reflect a level of change in English language

learner student population that would present a substantial challenge to a district for the period of time examined. (Table A6 later in the appendix shows results using alternative cutoffs to define significant increases).

Availability of the data. Conversations with Title III coordinators included discussions on availability of data and procedures for access to current and multiyear data on English language learner student enrollment by district (see box A1). At the same time a search was conducted to identify sources of multiyear, district-level data on English language learner enrollment. Search sites included individual state education agency web sites, data available through the National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, which is a national database on districts and schools maintained by the U.S. Department of Education, and national data summary sites (such as Standard & Poor's School Matters data reports, www.school-matters.com). The objective was to obtain as much district-level data as was available for the past 10 years, including the 2005/06 school year.

District-level data on English language learner enrollments were not evenly available across the four states. Ten years of data (1995/96–2005/06) on total enrollment and English language learner enrollment by district were available only for Virginia (Virginia Department of Education, 2006). Data for other states were more limited. For this reason much of the analysis focuses on Virginia. Additional analyses for a more limited set of years (2000/01–2003/04) were conducted for district-level data for Kentucky and West Virginia from the U.S. Department of Education's Common Core of Data database (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2007), which includes total enrollment and English language learner enrollments for each district. Tennessee data could not be included in these analyses since the Common Core of Data did not include Tennessee English language learner counts for the years of interest here (these data were apparently not available for inclusion in that database).

The purpose was to describe demographic changes within the states using available data. State by state comparisons were not a goal of the analyses. Thus, while a balanced dataset would have been preferable, the available data supported the goal of understanding English language learner student enrollment and demographic change in the region.

Analysis of Virginia districts experiencing significant increases over three-year periods. Three sets of analyses of Virginia district-level data were conducted to describe the extent to which districts in the state experienced significant increases in English language learner enrollments during 1995/96–2005/06. First, districts with significant increases were identified over static three-year periods. Second, districts with significant increases were identified for rolling three-year periods. The first two sets of analyses used the following definition of significant increase, based on the assumptions above:

English language learner enrollment in a district as a percentage of total student population increases at least 50 percent over a three-year period.

A third analysis examined significant increases from one school year to the next, using the following definition:

English language learner enrollment in a district as a percentage of total student population increases at least 50 percent over the previous school year.

The analyses of significant increases were conducted for the following three-year periods: 2003–05, 2000–02, and 1997–99. Data for Virginia districts were collected as of September 30 of each school year. In this appendix Virginia school years are referred to by the autumn semester (thus, for example, enrollment data for school year 2005/06 are referred to as 2005 data). In the main report, however, for ease of exposition and comparison with the other Appalachia Region states, Virginia

school years are referred to by the full academic year.

Districts with smaller English language learner populations can show a large percentage increase with the addition of a smaller number of students. (A change from one student to four would be a 400 percent increase.) Thus, this initial analysis included only districts with 50 or more English language learner students as of 2005/06. Using the definition of significant increase identified above, 42 (or approximately 32 percent) of Virginia's 132 districts enrolled at least 50 English language learners as of 2005/06 and experienced one or more periods of significant increase in enrollments. These 42 districts represented 76 percent of the 55 districts that enrolled 50 or more English language learners in 2005/06.

Of the 42 districts with significant increases in their English language learner population, 21 districts experienced significant increases over more than one fixed three-year period, indicating a sustained pattern of increases in English language learner students. There were 17 districts that experienced this rate of increase over two fixed three-year periods, and 3 districts (Martinsville City,

Charlottesville City, and Chesapeake City) that experienced this rate of growth over all three of the three-year periods examined. The impact of rapid increases in English language learner enrollment and of the resulting need for supporting resources and infrastructure is felt by a wide range of districts, both small and large, throughout the state.

Table A1 presents data on the 42 districts in Virginia (with 50 or more English language learners as of 2005/06) that were identified as experiencing significant increases in English language learner enrollments in the three fixed periods. The data are disaggregated by district size, defined by total student enrollment. Total enrollment for each period was calculated as the mean total enrollment for the three years. (Defined in this way, it was possible for a district to be classified in one size category during one period and in a different category during another; however, district membership in the size categories was largely stable across the periods.) Districts of wide-ranging population sizes are experiencing rapid proportional growth in their English language learner populations.

The analysis of increases over rolling three-year periods (1995–97, 1996–98, 1997–99, and so on)

TABLE A1

Virginia districts with 50 or more English language learner students enrolled in 2005/06 experiencing significant increases in English language learner enrollment in fixed three-year periods

District size (total number of students) ^a	Number of districts	Districts experiencing a significant increase in English language learner enrollment							
		1997–99		2000–02		2003–05		Overall	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1–2,500	8	3	37.5	3	37.5	2	25.0	5	62.5
2,501–5,000	10	5	50.0	5	50.0	7	70.0	9	90.0
5,001–10,000	13	7	53.9	4	30.8	4	30.8	11	84.6
10,001–20,000	11	7	63.6	1	9.1	2	18.2	8	72.7
20,001–50,000	9	4	44.4	3	33.3	6	66.7	7	77.8
50,001 and greater	4	1	25.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	2	50.0
Total	55	27	49.1	18	32.7	21	38.6	42	76.4

Note: Significant increase is defined as an increase of at least 50 percent across three years in English language learner enrollment defined as a proportion of total student population in the district.

a. District size is calculated as the mean total student enrollment for each three-year period.

Source: Virginia Department of Education, 2006.

during 1995–2005 included all districts so that changes in English language learner enrollment across districts could be described more comprehensively (table A2). This analysis was intended to identify the extent to which districts were experiencing sustained periods of increase in enrollments and so included both districts with 1–49 English language learner students as of 2005, and districts with 50 or more English language learner students enrolled in 2005.

More than half of all districts with English language learner students experienced three or more three-year periods with significant increases in English language learner enrollments. Districts with smaller enrollments of English language learner students (1–49 students) in 2005 were less likely to have three or more periods of increase, presumably because the influx of immigrants to the communities had begun more recently. However, most districts in this enrollment category (85 percent) experienced one or more periods of significant increase, and just under two-thirds of these districts experienced two or more periods of significant increase.

Single-year significant increases in English language learner enrollment in Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia. For a broader look at increases in

enrollment across districts in the region, additional analyses of English language learner enrollment from one school year to the next were conducted using available data for Kentucky and West Virginia for 2000–04 and parallel data for Virginia. The data for Virginia are based on the Virginia Department of Education data used in the previous analyses; the data for Kentucky and West Virginia are drawn from the Common Core of Data for all years for which data are available. (Tennessee is not included in the analysis because the Common Core of Data database did not include parallel data on English language learners for Tennessee.)

For single-year increases in an English language learner population, the following definition of significant increase was used:

English language learner enrollment in a district as a percentage of total student population increased at least 50 percent over the previous school year.

This represents a more stringent requirement for significant increase than that used for previous analyses as the change is now over a single year rather than three years. In addition, the analysis of single-year change included districts for which there were no English language learner students

TABLE A2

Virginia districts experiencing significant increases in English language learner students across rolling three-year periods between 1995 and 2005

English language learner enrollment in 2005	Number of districts	Districts experiencing a significant increase in English language learner enrollment							
		No increase across a three-year period		Increase in one three-year period		Increase in two three-year periods		Increase in three or more three-year periods	
		Number	Percent ^a	Number	Percent ^a	Number	Percent ^a	Number	Percent ^a
1–49	67	10	14.9	15	22.4	16	23.9	26	38.8
50 or more	55	5	9.1	3	5.5	8	14.5	39	70.9
All districts with English language learners	122	15	12.3	18	14.8	24	19.7	65	53.3

Note: Significant increase is defined as an increase of at least 50 percent across three years in English language learner enrollment as a proportion of the total student population in the district. The analysis is based on districts that enrolled English language learners as of 2005.

a. Percentages are row percentages.

Source: Virginia Department of Education, 2006.

enrolled in the first of the two years examined and at least one English language learner enrolled in the following year.

Table A3 provides data on the number of districts that experienced either a significant increase in English language learner students (as defined above) or their first enrollment of English language learner students (no English language learner students enrolled in the previous year and English language learner students enrolled in the year for which the data are reported). The analysis includes data for 2001–04 for Kentucky, Virginia,⁸ and West Virginia. Table A3 also shows the mean number of English language learner students for the districts with significant single-year changes in English language learner enrollment. The median numbers of English language learner students were also examined for the districts reported in table A3. The medians (all under 15; not reported in table) were much lower than the means, reflecting the many districts with new and small English language learner populations.

Kentucky and West Virginia, in particular, show a pattern of increased impact among districts from

2002 to 2004. Many districts in these two states saw a change in the number of English language learners from zero in the previous year. For Kentucky the number of districts newly enrolling English language learner students was 32 in 2001, 9 in 2002, 29 in 2003, and 28 in 2004. For West Virginia the number of districts newly enrolling English language learners was 3 in 2001, none in 2002, 5 in 2003, and 6 in 2004. These data demonstrate the increasing dispersal of English language learner students.

Summary of findings on English language learner enrollments. A majority of districts in each of the four states in the Appalachia Region now enroll English language learner students. The Virginia data show that districts experiencing significant increases in English language learner enrollments fall across a range of sizes as measured by total enrollment. While increases in English language learner populations might be expected only in larger urban districts, increases are observed among a high percentage of smaller districts as well. In many cases the numbers of English language learner students first enrolling in a district are small; nonetheless, their presence

TABLE A3

Number of districts and mean number of English language learners enrolled in districts with a single-year significant increase in, or first-time enrollment of, English language learner students in Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia, 2001/02–2004/05

State	2001/02		2002/03		2003/04		2004/05		
	Total number of districts	Number of districts	Mean number of English language learners per district	Number of districts	Mean number of English language learners per district	Number of districts	Mean number of English language learners per district	Number of districts	Mean number of English language learners per district
Kentucky	176	46	69.5	33	36.0	54	23.0	51	16.0
Virginia ^a	132	23	292.0	17	104.0	25	74.0	28	47.0
West Virginia	55	6	29.3	5	123.0	17	10.8	14	10.4

Note: Significant increase is defined as an increase of at least 50 percent over the previous year in English language learner enrollment as a proportion of total student population in the district. The totals also include districts with new English language learner enrollment (a change from no English language learner students enrolled to one or more English language learner students in the year the data are reported).

a. The data for Virginia do not include districts with new English language learner populations since the database did not clearly distinguish between blank and zero values, so the data may be underestimated. However, most Virginia districts already included English language learner students by 2000, so changes for Virginia districts are due primarily to increases in numbers of English language learner students.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2007; Virginia Department of Education, 2006.

brings substantial challenges to the district and school staff. And, as the analyses here have shown, initially small populations often increase over subsequent years, sometimes with very rapid increases from year to year.

Examination of the literature related to districts with emerging English language learner communities

The literature review focused on literature describing districts experiencing English language learner enrollments as a new challenge—that is, districts with emerging English language learner communities. These include districts enrolling their first English language learner students. They also include districts that have enrolled very small numbers of English language learner students over the years but that have recently experienced a rapid increase in enrollments. In both cases the assumption is that the district is facing new challenges in addressing the needs of English language learner students.

Literature sources were identified through searches of databases and key resource center and clearinghouse web sites and examinations of reference lists in key documents. The literature review included database searches focused on documents from 1990 to the present. Descriptors used in the search included English (second language), limited English speaking, change strategies, school demography, rural education, and English language learner. The web sites reviewed included sites for U.S. Department of Education-sponsored clearinghouses and centers, such as the What Works Clearinghouse and the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition & Language Instruction Educational Programs. When a document was identified as relevant to the research goals, the reference list was examined for additional documents. Documents were reviewed for their relevance in terms of the list of infrastructure components identified in table 3 in the main report and for their relevance to district and school situations in which English language learner students were a new or rapidly increasing population.

This search yielded only a few documents, including reports of case studies and documents designed to inform and guide districts or school staff on certain aspects of serving emerging English language learner communities. Fourteen documents were included in the review (table A4). The literature reviewed also referred to the lack of documents specific to the needs of districts challenged by emerging English language learner communities (Wainer, 2004). State education agency administrators also indicated a need for such resources.

Six of the documents reported case studies of districts with new or rapidly growing English language learner populations (one was categorized as both a guide and a case study). These documents varied in the components addressed and typically focused on selected components rather than a comprehensive set of infrastructure components.

Nine documents can be characterized as handbooks or guides to assist districts in developing the capacity to respond to new English language learner populations, although not all were constructed specifically as guides (for example, Chang, 1990). The documents address a range of infrastructure categories. Three of the documents address all of the categories in some way, although the emphases and amount of information differ (Bérubé, 2000; Chang, 1990; Hill & Flynn, 2004). The reports also differ somewhat in audience and purpose. For example, Bérubé (2000) is directed toward English as a second language managers in rural and small urban districts that are newly enrolling English language learner students.

Interviews with district and school administrators of English language learner services

Interviews were conducted with administrators in districts and schools that had experienced recent enrollment of English language learner students for the first time or that had experienced rapid growth in a small population of English language learner students. The intention was to obtain descriptions of the district and school responses to these enrollments and to gain the administrators'

TABLE A4

Literature review documents

Reference	Type	Description
Bérubé, B. (2000). <i>Managing ESL programs in rural and small urban schools</i> . Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. Pages 280.	Guide	Provides an overview of requirements (though certain legislative requirements have expired) for programs and incorporates specific suggestions for districts related to staffing, communication with parents, assessment, program evaluation, and links to resources.
Brunn, M. (2000). <i>Migrant children in the rural midwest: a collaboration of teachers and administrators to reform school programs</i> . Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in New Orleans, LA, April 24–28.	Case study	Describes a rural district in Illinois that experienced a rapid increase in English language learner students and through a committee of students, parents, and teachers established guiding principles for development of practice in the district.
Chang, H. N. -L. (1990). <i>Newcomer programs: innovative efforts to meet the educational challenges of immigrant students</i> . San Francisco, CA: California Tomorrow. Pages 67.	Guide	Focuses on establishing programs for newly enrolling immigrant students and provides examples of such programs, discussion of program designs, policies, and implementation based on data gathered through telephone interviews and site visits.
Colorado State Department of Education. (1997). <i>Handbook on planning for limited English proficient (LEP) student success</i> . Denver, CO: Author.	Guide	Provides educators and board members in school systems with an understanding of the needs of English language learner students and guidance on resources.
Hamann, E. T. (2003). <i>The educational welcome of Latinos in the new south</i> . Westport, CT: Praeger.	Case study	Describes the key persons, activities, and outcomes of a program developed in a Georgia district to respond to a large, new English language learner population, undertaken through a community-based effort to ensure that resources and practices support English language learner students. This unique effort was developed with local business and grant funding and involved collaboration with a Mexican university (Universidad de Monterrey) and with immigrant communities.
Hill, J. D., & Flynn, K. (2004). <i>English language learner resource guide: A guide for rural districts with a low incidence of English language learners</i> . Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.	Case study/ guide	Outlines steps taken in one district to build capacity for serving a new English language learner population and focuses on leadership, professional development, and parent involvement. The authors worked closely with the district in the efforts described, and in this respect it is not typical of the resources available to many districts.
Mid-Continent Comprehensive Center. (2005). <i>A framework for rural schools: starting out with your English language learner program</i> . Retrieved from www.helpforschools.com	Guide	Overviews some key areas associated with starting a program for English language learners, building upon a framework that includes resources, support for the program locally, staffing and scheduling, instruction and materials, assessment, connections with student homes, and community support. But this guide lacks specificity, and its recommendations are limited in that they are based on a small sample of only three rural school districts in Nebraska.
Montavon, M. V., & Kinser, J. (1996). Programming for success among Hispanic migrant students. In Judith LeBlanc Flores (Ed.), <i>Children of La Frontera: Binational efforts to serve Mexican migrant and immigrant students</i> , pp. 229–238. Charleston, WV: Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.	Case study	Describes programming and decisionmaking in a small district with rapid increases in English language learner students in the early 1990s (the implementation of a transitional bilingual program, tutoring, and a summer program). The study discusses outcomes for parent participation and student interest in school. The report includes a discussion of how students were assessed for identification, placement, and monitoring of progress.

(CONTINUED)

TABLE A4 (CONTINUED)

Literature review documents

Reference	Type	Description
Murry, K., & Herrera, S. (1998, spring). <i>Crisis in the heartland: addressing unexpected challenges in rural education</i> , 14(1), 45–49.	Case study	Focuses on the issue of professional development in geographically isolated districts in Kansas and describes a video-based distance approach that was self-directed yet also involved participants in viewing and discussing educational material together. Although video-based formats are now becoming outdated, the premise of distance-based, self-directed options and local professional community discussion and collaboration remains a valuable model.
National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition & Language Instruction Educational Programs. (2006). <i>Rural education</i> . Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, NCELA. Retrieved November 2006, from: www.ncela.gwu.edu/resabout/rural/index.html .	Guide	Provides a brief introduction to the issues facing rural districts with new English language learner populations and an overview of how some districts have responded. The document includes a list of print and online references.
New York University, Metro Center for Education. (2001). Special issue on English language learners in rural areas. <i>LEAD (Language, Equity, Access & Diversity)</i> , 1(5).	Guide	Offers suggestions to schools and districts, referring to issues common to rural districts and emphasizing the need for a positive approach and the value in taking early steps to address program needs. The guide provides bulleted lists of district-level and school-level suggestions with strategies and sources of information, but does not provide detail on implementation or address priorities among the various suggestions.
Office for Civil Rights. (2000). <i>Programs for English language learners: resource materials for planning and self-assessments</i> . Washington, DC: Author.	Guide	Provides resources to help districts ensure that they are meeting legislative requirements and suggestions for program development and evaluation. This document is not designed specifically for districts with new English language learner populations.
Wainer, A. (2004). <i>The new Latino south and the challenge to public education: strategies for educators and policymakers in emerging immigrant communities</i> . Los Angeles, CA: Center for Latino Educational Excellence, The Tomás Rivera Policy Institute.	Guide	Provides background on demographic trends, describes methodology for identifying case study districts, and outlines selected district experiences with relevance to four key areas: parental involvement, teacher training, immigration status, and discrimination.
Wrigley, P. (2000). <i>The challenge of educating English language learners in rural areas</i> . Retrieved from http://www.escort.org/html/whatsnew.htm#anchor139219	Case study	Explores the efforts of a rural Virginia district to serve its English language learner population and outlines early steps taken to establish a leadership structure. A curriculum specialist was selected to lead the program. Although she had no English as a second language background, she had a strong interest in learning. Through the specialist's lead, the program developed the capacity for serving English language learner students and became a model for other local districts. The study provides a helpful example of starting an English language learner program in a typical district context.

perspectives on the types of infrastructure changes made, the needs identified, and resources used to address them. The interviews explored the responses of the district or school at the time when English language learner students were first enrolled, approximately two to three years after the

first English language learner students enrolled, and at the time of the interview.

Identification of district and school respondents. The interviews were conducted with administrators responsible for services for English language learner

students in districts and schools that had experienced rapid and significant growth in their English language learner populations. Districts were identified through data analysis or by nomination by the state education agency coordinator. Schools were identified by nomination by the district respondent.

The plan was to select districts based on analysis of multiyear state data on district English language learner enrollments. As noted earlier, multi-year data were not available for all four states. Virginia had data covering 1995–2005. For Tennessee files providing three years (2003–05) of district survey data on English language learner enrollments were used. For Kentucky available district data on English language learner enrollments were used to identify potential districts. Nominations of districts for West Virginia were obtained through the state Title III coordinator. At the completion of a district interview the respondent was asked to identify two schools (ideally, one elementary and one secondary) that had recently experienced new or increased English language learner enrollment, and these schools were then contacted.

Development of the interview protocol. A draft interview protocol was developed to obtain a narrative of the district or school’s responses to enrollment of English language learner students at the three points in time to be covered by the interviews and addressing priorities in terms of infrastructure, needs, and resources at these three

points. The draft protocol was informed by an examination of the literature and an informational conversation with an experienced district administrator with a long history of working with the district and with schools to adapt to an eventually large English language learner population. Development was also based on the researchers’ knowledge of districts and schools serving English language learner students. An initial pilot-test call using the protocol was made to one district.

Procedures for conducting the interviews. The interviews were generally 40–50 minutes long. Probe questions were asked for each item on the interview protocol as appropriate and to elicit responses to the five categories of infrastructure components. At the conclusion of the interview, district administrators were asked to recommend elementary and secondary schools with recent increases in English language learner enrollments. An overview of the interview respondents is provided in table A5. The interview protocol is provided in box A2.

Additional technical information

This study defined significant increase as at least 50 percent increase in English language learner enrollment as a proportion of the total student population in a district compared with the previous year. Table A6 shows the variation that would result if alternative definitions using other rates of increase were used.

TABLE A.5
Overview of district and school administrator interviews

District or school	State	Area type ^a	Current total enrollment	Current English learner enrollment	Number of language groups	Predominant language	Respondent	Comments on history of English language learner population and English language learner services
District A	Tennessee	Rural	3,883	100	1	Spanish	District English as a second language teacher	In only five years District A's English language learner population has grown from only a few students to approximately 100. The district has one English as a second language teacher who travels between eight buildings, meets with students 1–2 times per week (depending on level), and meets with teachers to coordinate and discuss effective practices. In some classes peer tutoring is also used.
District B	Virginia	Urban fringe, large city	5,268	150	6	Spanish (others: various Middle Eastern languages)	District director of instruction	With only about eight English language learner students in 1999, District B saw slow change at first, then a jump in population due to economic conditions in the area, with increases in 2003/04, 2004/05, and the highest increase in 2005/06. The district director of instruction headed the program—providing basic information to mainstream teachers, sharing strategies, assigning students to classes where there was already one English language learner. The district made use of existing resources: Spanish language Title I teacher, Korean English as a foreign language–certified spouse of a district teacher. The district will begin to offer a “sheltered” class at the high school level.
District C	Virginia	Rural	7,228	153	7	Spanish (others: Hindi, Vietnamese, Korean, Chinese, Ethiopian, Russian)	District coordinator/principal	Since 2001 District C has seen a steady increase in English language learner students with about 25 enrolling each year. With a pattern clearly developing, the district was not taken by surprise these past years. Initially one English as a second language (ESL) resource teacher served 11 schools (mostly elementary). As the population grew, the district created a centralized program located in two schools, and then later moved away from a centralized plan to the current structure with eight ESL teachers, most working with only one school. The district sees services becoming more individualized, through individualized education programs—with goals, plans, and stated assessment accommodations. Recently, additional older students are arriving, and with them new needs for language development curricula.

(CONTINUED)

TABLE A.5 (CONTINUED)
Overview of district and school administrator interviews

District or school	State	Area type ^a	Current total enrollment	Current English learner enrollment	Number of language groups	Predominant language	Respondent	Comments on history of English language learner population and English language learner services
District D	West Virginia	Rural	7,414	307	24	Spanish (others: Russian, Urdu, Bulgarian, Chinese, French)	District coordinator	The district has seen a steady increase since the late 1990s in English language learner students—with greater diversity of languages (beyond Spanish) and more students coming from nonmigrant families in contrast to the former largely migrant population. English as a second language (ESL) is present in all 14 schools, using push-in and pull-out services, and ESL teachers are part of grade-level teams. Translators were drawn from the parent community and trained to work with teachers on individual education program teams. The district is also beginning new professional development efforts with classroom teachers and teachers new to the district.
District E	West Virginia	Rural	16,277	474	25	Spanish (others: Chinese, Burmese, French)	District coordinator of federal programs	District E gained 150 English language learner students between June and August of the previous year. This district has enrolled English language learner students in two separate waves: Indo-Chinese refugee groups in the late 1970s and Spanish speakers in the late 1990s. However, the district is experiencing the current English language learner enrollments as a new population. The Title I coordinator has responsibility for ensuring that services are in place; a Spanish teacher has led the initial efforts in the schools. The district developed an ESL library and faced difficulties in hiring staff. With increased enrollments, there is an effort to formalize the program. Schools use computer-based instruction, such as programs to develop English proficiency.
District F	West Virginia	Urban fringe, mid-size city	28,104	184	34	Several languages (Chinese, Vietnamese, Spanish, Farsi, Arabic, German, Gujerati)	Lead English as a second language teacher	Many students arrived in need of social services and with limited education backgrounds. The Title I coordinator was given initial responsibility, and a consulting couple was hired to provide a six-week course to students. Then a substitute teacher was hired as a consultant to lead (she had a master's in linguistics and English as a foreign language teaching experience). When a formal identification process was instituted, the district found that other English language learner students were present. The program leader interacted with social services to address student needs and provided information to teachers on cultures and strategies. The consultant was hired full time, and a part-time English as a second language (ESL) specialist was added. The district has pull-out ESL services and is working to "blend and braid" funding sources. Its program includes ESL summer school classes for adults; students may bring their children with them to these classes.

(CONTINUED)

TABLE A5 (CONTINUED)
Overview of district and school administrator interviews

District or school	State	Area type ^a	Current total enrollment	Current English learner enrollment	Number of language groups	Predominant language	Respondent	Comments on history of English language learner population and English language learner services
Elementary school (District B)	Virginia	na	451	24	4	Spanish	Title 1 bilingual instructional aide	The school began enrolling English language learner students about five years ago. Even though the school was alert to the demographic changes in the region, the new enrollments were earlier than anticipated, and the school was not prepared. The Title I aide was assigned responsibility by virtue of her own experience as a former English language learner, her language ability, and her background in working in Title I. The school provides push-in services and also pairs English language learners with a classroom buddy of the same language background. The Title I aide provides web sites that can be useful as resources to teachers and assists as a translator. The program needs more resources, and the school is reaching out to the community to bring in volunteers to assist in working with students.
Intermediate school (District E)	West Virginia	na	489	16	1	Spanish	Principal	English language learner students in the past were few and scattered—coming and leaving—throughout the year. But now, enrollments are no longer seasonal, English language learner students are staying, and there are more of them. This is particularly the case during the last two years. The school tries to place English language learner students in a classroom with another speaker of the same language. But this strategy is becoming less viable as the numbers increase, and teachers are finding it too demanding. Using both pull-out and push-in instruction, the school also uses computer software to provide instruction.
High school (District E)	West Virginia	na	1,566	30	6	Spanish	Assistant principal	English language learner students have increased in the previous five years. The school uses the pull-out system and uses a “grow your own” staff model, working with a substitute teacher and a Latin teacher who is working toward English as a second language (ESL) credentials. The increases in enrollments have led the school to focus on English language learner services and to designate program components. Next year it will begin to provide a team-taught class with an English language arts teacher and an ESL teacher.

na is not applicable.

a. Area type is defined for counties by U.S. Department of Census; the area type is not defined for individual schools.

Source: Authors’ compilation based on personal communication with district administrators.

BOX A2

Interview protocol**Background:**

(Note: Gather this information in advance of the interview or obtain estimates during interview.)

Total district enrollment:

Number of English language learners:

Number of language groups:

Predominant language group:

A. To begin, we'd like to know more about your district's earliest experience in responding to enrollment of English language learner students.

1. When did the district first enroll English language learner students? (Or if known, confirm year).
2. Did the district anticipate that English language learners would be enrolling—or was this unexpected?

YES NO

Comments:

3. What steps did the district first take to respond to the new English language learner students? Who took the lead in these steps?

4. What were the district's areas of greatest need at this point?

5. What types of resources did you use and which were most helpful?

B. We'd next like to talk about your district's response/services after two or three years of enrolling English language learner students as your English language learner population grew in size.

1. At this second point, were there changes in your district's needs in responding to English language learner student enrollments and in the types of steps taken?

YES NO

Comment and responses to probes:

2. What were the district's areas of greatest need at this point?

3. What types of resources did you use and which were most helpful?

C. Currently, what are the key issues for the district in addressing English language learner students' needs?

1. What has now changed in how the district meets English language learner student needs?

2. What are key areas of development/steps being planned?

3. a. What types of resources are most helpful to the district?

b. Are there additional resources that would be helpful, if available?

D. If you had the opportunity to provide guidance to a district as it was just enrolling its first few families of English language learner students, what would you suggest that the district give greatest priority to . . . ?

. . . At the very beginning of English language learner enrollment?

. . . After one to two years of working with English language learners?

TABLE A6
Number of districts by state experiencing significant increases in English language learner enrollment in specific years using alternative definitions, in Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia, 1996/97–2005/06

State	Rate of increase (percent)	1996/97		1997/98		1998/99		1999/2000		2000/01		2001/02		2002/03		2003/04		2004/05		2005/06	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Kentucky (176 districts)	70	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1.1	22	12.5	23	13.1	15	8.5	—	—
	60	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	5.7	23	13.1	24	13.6	20	11.4	—	—
	50	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12	6.8	24	13.6	25	14.2	23	13.1	—	—
	40	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	13	7.4	28	15.9	27	15.3	31	17.6	—	—
	30	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	14	8.0	29	16.5	31	17.6	42	23.9	—	—
Virginia (132 districts)	70	12	9.1	11	8.3	16	12.1	30	22.7	14	10.6	15	11.4	14	10.6	19	14.4	18	13.6	10	7.6
	60	15	11.4	13	9.8	19	14.4	31	23.5	16	12.1	18	13.6	14	10.6	22	16.7	22	16.7	13	9.8
	50	18	13.6	14	10.6	21	21	34	25.8	21	15.9	23	17.4	17	12.9	25	18.9	28	21.2	18	13.6
	40	26	19.7	18	13.6	25	18.9	38	28.9	23	17.4	23	17.4	20	15.2	31	27.5	35	26.5	20	15.2
	30	33	22.2	24	18.2	30	22.7	45	34.1	34	25.8	29	22.0	29	22.0	33	22.2	44	33.3	26	19.7
West Virginia (55 districts)	70	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	3.6	5	9.1	6	10.9	6	10.9	—	—
	60	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	3.6	5	9.1	8	14.5	7	12.7	—	—
	50	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	5.5	5	9.1	12	21.8	8	14.5	—	—
	40	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	5.5	5	9.1	15	27.3	10	18.2	—	—
	30	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	5.5	5	9.1	15	27.3	11	20.0	—	—

— is not available.

Note: Data from the 2004/05 Common Core of Data are preliminary.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2007, for Kentucky and West Virginia; Virginia Department of Education, 2006.

APPENDIX B

LISTS OF DISTRICTS WITH ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNER STUDENTS IN KENTUCKY, TENNESSEE, VIRGINIA, AND WEST VIRGINIA

There are wide variations in English language learner enrollments across districts within each state. Table B1 shows the distribution of districts by level of English language learner student population as a proportion of the total enrollment.

Tables B2–B5 list districts within each state in four categories of English language learner student enrollment as a proportion of total enrollment in the district: none, less than 1 percent, from 1 percent to 4.9 percent, 5 percent to 9.9 percent, and 10 percent or more.

TABLE B1

Number and percentage of districts by English language learner student representation in districts in Appalachia Region states

English language learner representation in district (percent of total enrollment)	Kentucky 2004/05		Tennessee 2004/05		Virginia 2005/06		West Virginia 2004/05	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
None	57	32.4	17	12.5	10	7.6	20	36.4
0.1–0.9	77	43.8	52	38.2	55	41.7	30	54.5
1.0–4.9	36	20.5	53	39.0	48	36.4	5	9.1
5.0–9.9	6	3.4	11	8.1	10	7.6	0	0.0
10 percent or more ^a	0	0.0	3	2.2	9	6.8	0	0.0
Total number of districts	176	100.0	136	100.0	132	100.0	55	100.0

Note: Percentages are districts as a proportion of all districts in the state. Components may not sum to 100.0 because of rounding.

a. The highest percentages within any district are 9.4 percent in Kentucky, 38.4 percent in Tennessee, 36.2 percent in Virginia, and 4.3 percent in West Virginia.

Source: Tennessee Department of Education, 2006, 2007; U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2007, for Kentucky and West Virginia; Virginia Department of Education, 2006.

Kentucky

Table B2 lists districts in Kentucky by English language learner student enrollment as a percentage of total enrollment. The list was compiled using district-level data available online from the

Common Core of Data (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2007). The list is based on preliminary numbers of English language learner and total enrollments for the 2004/05 school year. Kentucky had 176 school districts in 2004/05.

TABLE B2

Kentucky school districts by English language learner student enrollment as a percentage of total enrollment, 2004/05

None (n = 57; 32 percent of all districts)	Less than 1 percent (n = 77; 44 percent of all districts)	From 1 percent to 4.9 percent (n = 36; 21 percent of all districts)	From 5 percent to 9.9 percent (n = 6; 3 percent of all districts)	10 percent or more (n = 0; 0 percent of all districts)
Allen County	Anchorage Independent	Adair County	Bowling Green Independent	None
Augusta Independent	Anderson County	Boone County	Mayfield Independent	
Ballard County	Ashland Independent	Carroll County	Shelby County	
Barbourville Independent	Bardstown Independent	Christian County	Southgate Independent	
Bell County	Barren County	Danville Independent	Warren County	
Berea Independent	Bath County	Eminence Independent	Webster County	
Bracken County	Beechwood Independent	Erlanger-Elsmere		
Burgin Independent	Bellevue Independent	Independent		
Carlisle County	Bourbon County	Fayette County		
Caverna Independent	Boyd County	Franklin County		
Clay County	Boyle County	Gallatin County		
Cloverport Independent	Breathitt County	Garrard County		
Crittenden County	Breckinridge County	Glasgow Independent		
Cumberland County	Bullitt County	Graves County		
Dawson Springs	Butler County	Harrodsburg Independent		
Independent	Caldwell County	Henry County		
Dayton Independent	Calloway County	Jefferson County		
East Bernstadt Independent	Campbell County	Jessamine County		
Edmonson County	Campbellsville Independent	Kenton County		
Elliott County	Carter County	Livingston County		
Fairview Independent	Casey County	Marion County		
Frankfort Independent	Clark County	Monroe County		
Fulton County	Clinton County	Montgomery County		
Fulton Independent	Corbin Independent	Monticello Independent		
Greenup County	Covington Independent	Murray Independent		
Harlan County	Daviess County	Newport Independent		
Harlan Independent	Elizabethtown Independent	Ohio County		
Hickman County	Estill County	Oldham County		
Jackson County	Fleming County	Paducah Independent		
Jackson Independent	Floyd County	Paris Independent		
Jenkins Independent	Fort Thomas Independent	Russellville Independent		
Johnson County	Grant County	Somerset Independent		
Knott County	Grayson County	Todd County		
Knox County	Green County	Trimble County		
Lawrence County	Hancock County	Washington County		
Lee County	Hardin County	Williamstown Independent		
Leslie County	Harrison County	Woodford County		
Letcher County	Hart County			
Ludlow Independent	Hazard Independent			
Magoffin County	Henderson County			
Marshall County	Hopkins County			

(CONTINUED)

TABLE B2 (CONTINUED)

Kentucky school districts by English language learner student enrollment as a percentage of total enrollment, 2004/05

None (n = 57; 32 percent of all districts)	Less than 1 percent (n = 77; 44 percent of all districts)	From 1 percent to 4.9 percent (n = 36; 21 percent of all districts)	From 5 percent to 9.9 percent (n = 6; 3 percent of all districts)	10 percent or more (n = 0; 0 percent of all districts)
Martin County	Larue County			
McCreary County	Laurel County			
Menifee County	Lewis County			
Owsley County	Lincoln County			
Paintsville Independent	Logan County			
Perry County	Lyon County			
Pike County	Madison County			
Pineville Independent	Mason County			
Providence Independent	McCracken County			
Raceland Independent	McLean County			
Robertson County	Meade County			
Rockcastle County	Mercer County			
Science Hill Independent	Metcalfe County			
Trigg County	Middlesboro Independent			
West Point Independent	Morgan County			
Whitley County	Muhlenberg County			
Wolfe County	Nelson County			
	Nicholas County			
	Owen County			
	Owensboro Independent			
	Pendleton County			
	Pikeville Independent			
	Powell County			
	Pulaski County			
	Rowan County			
	Russell County			
	Russell Independent			
	Scott County			
	Silver Grove Independent			
	Simpson County			
	Spencer County			
	Taylor County			
	Union County			
	Walton Verona Independent			
	Wayne County			
	Williamsburg Independent			

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2007.

Tennessee

Table B3 lists districts in Tennessee by English language learner student enrollment as a percentage of total enrollment. The list was compiled using district-level data supplied by the Tennessee

Department of Education (Tennessee Department of Education, 2006, 2007). The list is based on English language learner and total enrollment numbers for the 2004/05 school year. Tennessee had 136 school districts in 2004/05.

TABLE B3

Tennessee school districts by English language learner student enrollment as a percentage of total enrollment, 2004/05

None (<i>n</i> = 17; 13 percent of all districts)	Less than 1 percent (<i>n</i> = 52; 38 percent of all districts)	From 1 percent to 4.9 percent (<i>n</i> = 53; 39 percent of all districts)	From 5 percent to 9.9 percent (<i>n</i> = 11; 8 percent of all districts)	10 percent or more (<i>n</i> = 3; 2 percent of all districts)
Bradford SSD	Anderson County	Alcoa City	Alamo City	Bells City
Carroll County	Benton County	Athens City	Bedford County	Coffee County
Clinton City	Bledsoe County	Cannon County	Crockett County	Lenoir City
Fentress County	Blount County	Chester County	Davidson County	
H Rock-Bruceton SSD	Bradley County	Cleveland City	Dayton City	
Hancock County	Bristol City	Cumberland County	Franklin SSD	
Lake County	Campbell County	DeKalb County	Hamblen County	
Meigs County	Carter County	Dickson County	Lebanon SSD	
Moore County	Cheatham County	Dyersburg City	Manchester City	
Oneida SSD	Claiborne County	Etowah City	Murfreesboro City	
Perry County	Clay County	Fayette County	Sweetwater City	
Pickett County	Cocke County	Fayetteville City		
Richard City SSD	Decatur County	Grainger County		
Scott County	Dyer County	Greeneville City		
Van Buren County	Elizabethton City	Hamilton County		
Wayne County	Franklin County	Haywood County		
West Carroll County SSD	Gibson County SSD	Henry County		
	Giles County	Humboldt City		
	Greene County	Jefferson County		
	Grundy County	Johnson City		
	Hardeman County	Knox County		
	Hardin County	Lauderdale County		
	Hawkins County	Lexington City		
	Henderson County	Loudon County		
	Hickman County	Macon County		
	Houston County	Madison County		
	Humphreys County	Marshall County		
	Huntingdon SSD	Maryville City		
	Jackson County	Mauzy County		
	Johnson County	McKenzie SSD		
	Kingsport City	McMinn County		
	Lawrence County	Memphis City		
	Lewis County	Monroe County		
	Lincoln County	Montgomery County		
	Marion County	Oak Ridge City		
	McNairy County	Obion County		
	Milan SSD	Putnam County		
	Morgan County	Rhea County		
	Newport City	Robertson County		
	Overton County	Rogersville City		
	Paris SSD	Rutherford County		

(CONTINUED)

TABLE B3 (CONTINUED)

Tennessee school districts by English language learner student enrollment as a percentage of total enrollment, 2004/05

None (<i>n</i> = 17; 13 percent of all districts)	Less than 1 percent (<i>n</i> = 52; 38 percent of all districts)	From 1 percent to 4.9 percent (<i>n</i> = 53; 39 percent of all districts)	From 5 percent to 9.9 percent (<i>n</i> = 11; 8 percent of all districts)	10 percent or more (<i>n</i> = 3; 2 percent of all districts)
	Polk County	Sequatchie County		
	Roane County	Sevier County		
	Smith County	Shelby County		
	Stewart County	South Carroll County SSD		
	Sullivan County	Sumner County		
	Tipton County	Trousdale County		
	Trenton SSD	Tullahoma City		
	Union County	Unicoi County		
	Washington County	Union City		
	Weakley County	Warren County		
	White County	Williamson County		
		Wilson County		

Source: Tennessee Department of Education, 2006, 2007.

Virginia

Table B4 lists districts in Virginia by English language learner student enrollment as a percentage of total enrollment. The list was compiled using district-level data available online from the Virginia Department of Education (Virginia

Department of Education, 2006). The list is based on English language learner and total enrollment numbers for the 2005/06 school year. They are presented in categories of increasing proportion of English language learner students as a percentage of total enrollment. Virginia had 132 school districts in 2005/06.

TABLE B4

Virginia school districts by English language learner student enrollment as a percentage of total enrollment, 2005/06

None (<i>n</i> = 10; 8 percent of all districts)	Less than 1 percent (<i>n</i> = 55; 42 percent of all districts)	From 1 percent to 4.9 percent (<i>n</i> = 48; 36 percent of all districts)	From 5 percent to 9.9 percent (<i>n</i> = 10; 8 percent of all districts)	10 percent or more (<i>n</i> = 9; 7 percent of all districts)
Bland County	Alleghany County	Augusta County	Accomack County	Alexandria City
Buchanan County	Amelia County	Carroll County	Albemarle County	Arlington County
Charles City County	Amherst County	Chesapeake City	Charlottesville City	Fairfax County
Craig County	Appomattox County	Chesterfield County	Falls Church City	Galax City
Dickenson County	Bath County	Clarke County	Fredericksburg City	Harrisonburg City
Giles County	Bedford County	Colonial Beach	Loudoun County	Manassas City
King and Queen County	Botetourt County	Colonial Heights City	Northampton County	Manassas Park City
Mathews County	Bristol City	Culpeper County	Roanoke City	Prince William County
Norton City	Brunswick County	Danville City	Rockingham County	Winchester City
Southampton County	Buckingham County	Essex County	Westmoreland County	
	Buena Vista City	Fauquier County		
	Campbell County	Floyd County		
	Caroline County	Franklin County		
	Charlotte County	Frederick County		
	Covington City	Goochland County		
	Cumberland County	Greene County		
	Dinwiddie County	Hampton City		

(CONTINUED)

TABLE B4 (CONTINUED)

Virginia school districts by English language learner student enrollment as a percentage of total enrollment, 2005/06

None (n = 10; 8 percent of all districts)	Less than 1 percent (n = 55; 42 percent of all districts)	From 1 percent to 4.9 percent (n = 48; 36 percent of all districts)	From 5 percent to 9.9 percent (n = 10; 8 percent of all districts)	10 percent or more (n = 9; 7 percent of all districts)
	Fluvanna County	Henrico County		
	Franklin City	Henry County		
	Gloucester County	Highland County		
	Grayson County	Hopewell City		
	Greensville County	Lexington City		
	Halifax County	Lunenburg County		
	Hanover County	Lynchburg City		
	Isle Of Wight County	Madison County		
	King George County	Martinsville City		
	King William County	Mecklenburg County		
	Lancaster County	Montgomery County		
	Lee County	Nelson County		
	Louisa County	Newport News City		
	Middlesex County	Norfolk City		
	New Kent County	Northumberland County		
	Nottoway County	Orange County		
	Petersburg City	Page County		
	Poquoson City	Patrick County		
	Portsmouth City	Pittsylvania County		
	Powhatan County	Richmond City		
	Prince Edward County	Richmond County		
	Prince George County	Roanoke County		
	Pulaski County	Salem City		
	Radford City	Shenandoah County		
	Rappahannock County	Spotsylvania County		
	Rockbridge County	Stafford County		
	Russell County	Virginia Beach City		
	Scott County	Warren County		
	Smyth County	Waynesboro City		
	Staunton City	Williamsburg City-James City County		
	Suffolk City	York County		
	Surry County			
	Sussex County			
	Tazewell County			
	Washington County			
	West Point			
	Wise County			
	Wythe County			

Source: Virginia Department of Education, 2006.

West Virginia

Table B5 lists districts in West Virginia by English language learner student enrollment as a percentage of total enrollment. The list was compiled using district-level data available online from the

Common Core of Data published by U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. The list is based on preliminary numbers of English language learner and total enrollments for the 2004/05 school year. West Virginia had 55 school districts in 2004/05.

TABLE B5

West Virginia school districts by English language learner student enrollment as a percentage of total enrollment, 2004/05

None (n = 20; 36 percent of all districts)	Less than 1 percent (n = 30; 55 percent of all districts)	From 1 percent to 4.9 percent (n = 5; 9 percent of all districts)	From 5 percent to 9.9 percent (n = 0; 0 percent of all districts)	10 percent or more (n = 0; 0 percent of all districts)
Boone County	Barbour County	Berkeley County	None	None
Brooke County	Braxton County	Hardy County		
Calhoun County	Cabell County	Jefferson County		
Clay County	Fayette County	Kanawha County		
Doddridge County	Gilmer County	Monongalia County		
Hampshire County	Grant County			
McDowell County	Greenbrier County			
Monroe County	Hancock County			
Pendleton County	Harrison County			
Pleasants County	Jackson County			
Pocahontas County	Lewis County			
Randolph County	Lincoln County			
Ritchie County	Logan County			
Summers County	Marion County			
Taylor County	Marshall County			
Tucker County	Mason County			
Upshur County	Mercer County			
Webster County	Mineral County			
Wirt County	Mingo County			
Wyoming County	Morgan County			
	Nicholas County			
	Ohio County			
	Preston County			
	Putnam County			
	Raleigh County			
	Roane County			
	Tyler County			
	Wayne County			
	Wetzel County			
	Wood County			

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2007.

APPENDIX C

RESOURCES FOR DISTRICTS SERVING ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNER STUDENTS

State education agency Title III coordinators

<p><i>Kentucky</i></p> <p>Shelda Emmick Hale Academic Program Consultant Title III, Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students Kentucky Department of Education 500 Mero St., 18th Floor Frankfort, KY 40601 Phone: 502-564-2106 Fax: 502-564-9848 E-mail: Shelda.Hale@education.ky.gov</p>	<p><i>Virginia</i></p> <p>Judy Radford Coordinator, ESL Virginia Dept of Education P.O. Box 2120 Richmond, VA 23218-2120 Phone: 804-786-1692 Fax: 804-371-7347 E-mail: Judy.Radford@doe.virginia.gov</p>
<p><i>Tennessee</i></p> <p>Jan Lanier ESL Coordinator Tennessee Department of Education Andrew Johnson Tower 5th Floor 710 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, TN 37243-0375 Phone: 615 532-6314 Fax: 615 253-5706 E-mail: Jan.Lanier@state.tn.us</p>	<p><i>West Virginia</i></p> <p>Amelia Davis Courts, Ed. D. Executive Director, ESL/WV International Schools West Virginia Department of Education Bldg. 6 Room 318, 1900 Kanawha Blvd. E Charleston, WV 25305 Phone: 304-558-2691 Fax: 304-558-6268 E-mail: aadavis@access.k12.wv.us</p>

Resources on legislative requirements

This appendix lists online links to information on the regulatory requirements of serving English language learners. Included here are resources addressing the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act in general and NCLB requirements specific to English language learner students. Also included are resources provided by the Office for Civil Rights relevant to services for English language learner students. (Note: English language learner students are referred to in the legislation as limited English proficient [LEP] students; however, English language learner has become the more commonly used term.)

General No Child Left Behind resources

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind Act) of 2001. On January 8, 2002, President Bush signed into law the No Child Left

Behind Act of 2001, reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This link is to the full text of the legislation.

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html>

No Child Left Behind Desktop Reference. *No Child Left Behind: A Desktop Reference* outlines what is new under the NCLB Act of 2001 for each program supported under the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 and other statutes. It also describes how the act's four guiding principles (accountability, flexibility and local control, parental choice, and what works) are brought to bear on many of these programs.

<http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbreference/index.html>

No Child Left Behind: A toolkit for teachers. This toolkit provides an overview of the different elements of the NCLB Act. The booklet focuses on

how NCLB supports teachers and lists resources.
<http://www.ed.gov/teachers/nclbguide/toolkittoc.html>

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, legislation, regulations, and guidance. This page from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education lists key U.S. Department of Education resources, particularly with relevance to the NCLB Act.
<http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oesel/legislation.html>

Resources about the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. This page lists various references for NCLB regulations and resources provided through the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition web site.
<http://www.nclb.gov/pubs/legislation/nclb/index.htm>

No Child Left Behind at Five: A Review of Changes to State Accountability Plans. This report by the Center on Education Policy describes changes in state accountability and testing under the NCLB Act (January 2007).
<http://www.cep-dc.org/nclb/stateaccountability/StateAccountabilityPlanChanges.pdf>

No Child Left Behind resources specifically addressing English language learners

New NCLB Regulations: flexibility and accountability for LEP students. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings' announcement of final regulations for English language learner students, with major points outlined (September 13, 2006).
<http://www.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2006/09/09132006a.html>

A fact sheet on the regulations for English language learner students (September 11, 2006).
<http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/lepfactsheet.html>

Title III Toolkit. A toolkit focused on Title III from the Office of English Language Acquisition

(OELA). It includes sections for parents, administrators, and classroom teachers.
http://www.nclb.gov/oela/Summit2006/CD/2006_Title_III_Toolkit.pdf

Understanding the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001: English proficiency. A reference guide on English proficiency.
<http://www.learningpt.org/pdfs/qkey5.pdf>

No Child Left Behind: A toolkit for teachers (page 20). This link is to the overall NCLB toolkit (listed in the general section above), pointing directly to the page that focuses on English language learner students.
http://www.ed.gov/teachers/nclbguide/toolkit_pg20.html

Office for Civil Rights resources

Programs for English language learner students. The Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, developed these materials in response to requests from school districts for a reference tool to assist them through the process of developing a comprehensive English language learner program.
<http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ell/index.html>

Memoranda on schools' obligations toward LEP students. This page lists official memoranda related to English language learner students.
<http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/laumemos.html>

Resource centers and clearinghouses

Comprehensive Centers. The Comprehensive Centers Network consists of 16 regional and 5 content centers located throughout the country. The U.S. Department of Education established the Comprehensive Centers Network to provide technical assistance services focused on the implementation of reform programs. The Comprehensive Centers work primarily with states, local education agencies, tribes, schools, and other recipients of

NCLB funds. Priority for services is given to high-poverty schools and districts, Bureau of Indian Affairs schools, and NCLB recipients implementing schoolwide programs.

<http://www.ed.gov/about/contacts/gen/othersites/compcenters.html>

The Appalachia Region Comprehensive Center serves Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

<http://www.arcc.edvantia.org/>

National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. The National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition & Language Instruction Educational Programs collects, analyzes, synthesizes, and disseminates information about language instruction educational programs for English language learner students and related programs. It is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement & Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students under Title III of

the NCLB Act of 2001.

<http://www.ncela.gwu.edu>

What Works Clearinghouse. The What Works Clearinghouse collects, screens, and identifies studies of effectiveness of education interventions (encompassing programs, products, practices, and policies).

<http://www.whatworks.ed.gov/>

The What Works Clearinghouse has completed a review of interventions designed to improve the English language literacy or academic achievement of elementary school students who are English language learners.

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/topic.aspx?tid=10>

In addition, the What Works Clearinghouse has developed a practice guide on effective literacy and English language instruction for English language learner students in the elementary grades.

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/20074011.pdf>

NOTES

1. Using national data from the American Community Survey, Jacobson (2007) calculated the correlation between the number of foreign-born residents and the size of the population that does not speak English fluently at 0.925. In the Appalachia Region the correlation is 0.998.
2. A related document, “Registering Students from Language Backgrounds Other Than English” (Marcus, Adger, & Arteagoitia, 2007), also in the Issues & Answers series, offers guidance to district administrators, school registrars, and district information technology staff on handling differences in naming practices that can present challenges in the registration of students from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. It offers recommendations on how to ensure consistency and accuracy in entering student names into district databases. The report is an example of basic on-the-ground assistance that can substantially improve district and school capacity for working with English language learner populations.
3. Tables B2–B5 in appendix B are based on the most recent district-level data available for each state at the time this report was prepared.
4. The literature review and interviews were an initial exploration of these issues, given the time and scope limitations of the Fast Response research format. Further in-depth research could involve a broader review and a larger, comprehensive sample of districts in the region.
5. This example is also consistent with the broad literature on change and leadership (such as Fullan, 2001).
6. These stages are developed out of the literature review and interview findings and also were informed by discussions with Title III coordinators in the region.
7. The concept of stages may also be useful for technical assistance providers. Understanding the level of experience of a district that works with English language learner students may assist in differentially targeting the types of assistance and guidance provided to districts. Of interest in this regard is a recent web cast by the Appalachia Regional Comprehensive Center on working with English language learner students that also included references to differentiating assistance to states and states differentiating assistance to districts (Appalachia Regional Comprehensive Center, October 26, 2006).
8. The Virginia data do not include districts with new English language learner populations since the database did not clearly distinguish between blank and 0 values, and so the Virginia data may be underestimated. However, since most Virginia districts already included English language learners by 2000, changes for Virginia districts would be due primarily to increases in the numbers of English language learners.

REFERENCES

- Appalachia Regional Comprehensive Center. (2006, October 26). *Working with English language learners and bridging the achievement gap*. [webcast]. Retrieved January 2007, from <http://www.edvantia.org>
- August, D., & Hakuta, K. (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children: a research agenda*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Bérubé, B. (2000). *Managing ESL programs in rural and small urban schools*. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages Inc.
- Capps, R., Fix, M., & Passel, J. S. (2002). *The dispersal of immigrants in the 1990s* (Immigrant families and workers: Facts and Perspectives. Brief No. 2). Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Capps, R., Fix, M., Murray, J., Ost, J., Passel, J., & Herwanto, S. (2005). *The new demography of America's schools: immigration and the No Child Left Behind Act*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Carrington, W. J., & Detragiache, E. (1999). How extensive is the brain drain? *Finance and Development*, 36(2). Retrieved February 1, 2007, from <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/1999/06/carringt.htm>
- Chang, H. N. -L. (1990). *Newcomer programs: Innovative efforts to meet the educational challenges of immigrant students*. San Francisco, CA: California Tomorrow.
- Collier, V. P. (1987). Age and rate of acquisition of second language for academic purposes. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(4), 617–641.
- Cummins, J. (1991). Language development and academic learning. In L. M. Malavé and G. Duquette (Eds.), *Language, culture, and cognition*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. (2004). *Making content comprehensible for English language learners: The SIOP Model*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Francis, D. J., Rivera, M., Lesaux, N., Kieffer, M., & Rivera, H. (2006a). *Practical guidelines for the education of English language learners: Research based recommendations for instruction and academic interventions*. Retrieved December 2006, from <http://www.centeroninstruction.org/files/ELL1-Interventions.pdf>
- Francis, D. J., Rivera, M., Lesaux, N., Kieffer, M., & Rivera, H. (2006b). *Practical guidelines for the education of English language learners: research based recommendations for serving adolescent newcomers*. Retrieved December 2006, from <http://www.centeroninstruction.org/files/ELL2-Newcomers.pdf>
- Francis, D. J., Rivera, M., Lesaux, N., Kieffer, M., & Rivera, H. (2006c). *Practical guidelines for the education of English language learners: research based recommendations for the use of accommodations in large scale assessments*. Retrieved December 2006, from <http://www.centeroninstruction.org/files/ELL3-Assessments.pdf>
- Garcia, G. N. (2000, September). *Lessons from research: What is the length of time it takes limited English proficient students to acquire English and succeed in an all-English classroom?* (NCBE Issue Brief No. 5). Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- George Washington University. (1996). *Promoting excellence: ensuring academic success for English language learners. Guiding principles*. Arlington, VA: George Washington University, Center for Equity and Excellence in Education.
- Hamann, E. T. (2003). *The educational welcome of Latinos in the new South*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Hill, J., & Flynn, K. (2004). *English language learner resource guide: A guide for rural districts with a low incidence of English language learners*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Hill, J., & Flynn, K. (2006). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Hopstock, P. J., & Stephenson, T. G. (2003). *Native languages of LEP students. Descriptive study of services to LEP students and LEP students with disabilities* (Special Topic Report No. 1). Arlington, VA: Development Associates, Inc., U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition.
- Infrastructure. (2007, January 6). In *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. Retrieved January 6, 2007, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Infrastructure&oldid=208877784>
- Jacobson, L. (2007). *Putting English language learner growth in perspective*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Jenkins, J. C. (1977). Push/pull in recent Mexican migration to the U.S. *International Migration Review* 11(2), 178–189.
- Jensen, L. (2006). New immigrant settlements in rural America: problems, prospects, and policies. *Carsey Institute Reports on Rural America*, 1(3). Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire.
- Marcus, N., Adger, C. T., & Arteagoitia, I. (2007). *Registering students from language backgrounds other than English* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 025). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Appalachia. Available from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>
- Martin, P., & Midgley, E. (2006). Immigration: shaping and reshaping America. *Population Bulletin*, 61(4), 1–28.
- Mid-Continent Comprehensive Center. (2005). *A framework for rural schools: Starting out with your English language learner program*. Retrieved January 2007, from <http://www.helpforschools.com>
- Migration Policy Institute. (2008). *2006 American Community Survey and Census Data on the Foreign Born by State*. Retrieved April 30, 2008, from: <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Datahub/acscensus.cfm#>
- Montavon, M. V., & Kinser, J. (1996). Programming for success among Hispanic migrant students. In J. L. Flores (Ed.), *Children of la frontera: Binational efforts to serve Mexican migrant and immigrant students*. Charleston, WV: Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.
- Murry, K., & Herrera, S. (1998). Crisis in the heartland: Addressing unexpected challenges in rural education. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 14(1), 45–49.
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition & Language Instruction Educational Programs. (2006a). *Rural education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs. Retrieved November 2006, from www.ncele.gwu.edu/resabout/rural/index.html
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs. (2006b). *The growing numbers of Limited English Proficient students 1994/5 to 2004/5*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs. Retrieved January 2007, from http://www.ncele.gwu.edu/policy/states/reports/statedata/2004LEP/GrowingLEP_0405_Nov06.pdf
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs. (2007). *The growing numbers of Limited English Proficient students 1995/6 to 2005/6*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs. Retrieved April 30, 2008, from http://www.ncele.gwu.edu/stats/2_nation.htm
- New York University, Metro Center for Education. (2001). English language learners in rural areas [special issue]. *LEAD (Language, Equity, Access & Diversity)*, 1(5).
- Office for Civil Rights. (2000). *Programs for English Language Learners: resource materials for planning and self-assessments*. Washington, DC: Office for Civil Rights.

- Olson, L. (2000). Children of change. 2000 & beyond: The changing face of American schools [special issue]. *Education Week*, 20(4). Washington, D.C: Editorial Projects in Education, Inc. Retrieved August 2007, from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/19/5f/25.pdf
- Passel, J. S., & Zimmerman, W. (2001). Are immigrants leaving California? Settlement patterns of immigrants in the late 1990s. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Regional Advisory Committee–Appalachia. (2005). A report to the U.S. Department of Education on educational challenges and technical assistance needs for the Appalachia region. Alexandria, VA: CNA Corporation. Retrieved April 30, 2008, http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/1b/ab/61.pdf
- Schmidley, D. (2003). *The foreign-born population in the United States* (Report No. P20-539). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, Economics and Statistics Administration, 9.
- Short, D., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners*. A report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Tennessee Department of Education. (2006). District level English language learner enrollment data provided by the State Title III coordinator.
- Tennessee Department of Education. (2007). *Annual Statistical Report*. Data on enrollment retrieved April 24, 2007, from <http://www.k-12.state.tn.us/asr0405/>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). *Projections of the resident population by race, Hispanic origin, and nativity: Middle series, 2050 to 2070*. Retrieved February 9, 2007, from www.census.gov/population/projections/nation/summary/np-t5-g.txt
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2005). *American Community Survey 2005*. Retrieved February 1, 2007, from <http://factfinder.census.gov>
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2007). Common Core of Data. Data retrieved May 24, 2007, from <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/>
- Virginia State Department of Education. (2006). *Data & Reports*. Data for school year 1995-96 to school year 2005-06 were retrieved on November 9, 2006, from <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Publications/>
- Wainer, A. (2004). *The new Latino South and the challenge to public education: strategies for educators and policymakers in emerging immigrant communities*. Center for Latino Educational Excellence, The Tomás Rivera Policy Institute.
- Wrigley, P. (2000). The challenge of educating English language learners in rural areas. *NABE News* 24(2), 10–13, 38. [NCELA Resource ID: BE023380]. Retrieved November 2006, from <http://www.escort.org/html/whatsnew.htm#anchor139219>
- Zehler, A. M., Fleischman, H. L., Hopstock, P. J., Stephenson, T. G., Pendzick, M. L., & Sapru, S. (2003). *Descriptive study of services to LEP students and LEP students with disabilities. Volume 1: Research Report*. Report submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition. Arlington, VA: Development Associates, Inc.