

Overview of Program Funding for English Language Learners

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST'S OFFICE

Presented To:
Assembly Education Committee
February 5, 2003





State Programs Available for English Language Learner Services

Before and After Proposition 227 (Dollars in Millions)

Programs Exclusively for ELL Students	1997-98	2002-03
Economic Impact Aid ^a	\$327.2	\$423.9
English Language Acquisition Program	—	53.2
Community Based English Tutoring Program	—	50.0
English Language Development Assessment	—	4.4
Bilingual Teacher Recruitment Program	—	2.0
Bilingual Teacher Training Program	1.4	1.8
Spanish Assessment of Basic Education	—	1.6
Subtotals	\$328.6	\$536.9
Programs Available for ELL Students, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Low-Performing Students		
Targeted Instructional Improvement Grant ^b	\$573.9	\$737.6
Economic Impact Aid ^a	57.7	74.8
Miller-Unruh Reading Program	24.6	28.9
Healthy Start	39.0	2.0
Demonstration Programs in Intensive Instruction	5.4	—
Summer school/supplemental instruction	165.0	449.7
Subtotals	\$865.6	\$1,293.0
Totals	\$1,194.2	\$1,829.9
<p>^a We estimate based on State Department of Education data that 85 percent of EIA funds are used exclusively for ELL pupils.</p> <p>^b Chapter 891, Statutes of 2001 (SB 735, Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review), consolidates funding for court-ordered and voluntary desegregation programs into a Targeted Instructional Improvement Grant. In 1997-98, funds for desegregation programs were provided to school districts under separate categorical programs.</p>		



Federal Funds for English Language Learners

- In 2002-03, Federal Title I provided California with \$1.4 billion—an increase of \$400 million from the prior year.
- The federal government also consolidated 13 bilingual and immigrant programs into a state formula program to provide states with language acquisition grants. This funding source was renamed Title III.
- California received \$115.3 million in Title III funds in 2002-03.
- Title III requires the state to hold school districts accountable for meeting annual measurable achievement objectives, and required district and state intervention for schools not making progress.
- Achievement objectives include:
 - Annual increases in the number of children making progress in learning English.
 - Annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency by the end of each school year.
 - Adequate yearly progress for limited English proficient children as required by Title I of No Child Left Behind Act.



LAO Proposed Compensatory Education Block Grant

2002-03 In Millions

Program	2002-03
Targeted Instructional Improvement Grant	\$737.6
Economic Impact Aid	498.7
Remedial Supplemental Instruction	238.8
English Language Acquisition	53.2
Elementary School Intensive Reading	30.5
Miller-Unruh Reading	28.9
Intensive Algebra Academies	12.8
Healthy Start	2.0
Total	\$1,602.5

- In the *Analysis of the 2002-03 Budget Bill*, we recommend a Compensatory Education Block Grant that would consolidate funding for eight categorical programs into a \$1.6 billion block grant. These programs provide additional services to low-performing, ELL, and economically disadvantaged pupils.
- Existing system of programs creates several problems, including (1) overlapping program missions, (2) lack of outcome measures that indicate student progress, and (3) state funding/programmatic rules that emphasize process at the expense of education results.
- The block grant would not only provide districts with flexibility to direct resources according to local needs but would also assure that specific areas of educational need are met and that the appropriate outcome measures are achieved.
- The LAO Compensatory Education Block Grant ensures that state funding is protected and targeted for the explicit purpose of raising the academic achievement of disadvantaged pupils.



Do State Rules Restrict Needed Local Flexibility?



Proposition 227 Funding Too Restrictive (\$50 million).

- The state annually appropriates \$50 million to instruct nonfluent adults in English.
- These adults must pledge to subsequently tutor school children in the learning of English.
- The extent at which tutoring of school-aged children occurs is unknown.
- LAO recommends broadening the use to focus on students.



English Language Acquisition Program (ELAP) Restricts ELL Funding to Grade 4 to 8.

- ELAP restricts funding for supplemental instruction to ELL pupils in grades 4 through 8.
- Funding restrictions ignore the importance of assisting pupils in acquiring English proficiency in their early school years (K-3).



Do Program Funding Formulas Create Negative Incentives?



Districts Have Incentive Not to Reclassify ELL Pupils.

- Existing state programs provide funding based upon the number of ELL pupils, including Economic Impact Aid and ELAP. Once reclassified districts lose this funding.
- Creates incentive not to reclassify ELL pupils.
- The ELAP has not provided schools the \$100 for each redesignated pupil as required by statute.



The California English Language Development Test (CELDT) Helps State Ensure Districts Reclassify Students.

- If there is a disconnect between CELDT results and a district's reclassification rate, the state should investigate.