Message from the Chair and the President

The issues that present themselves change over the years, but CAL's core commitment to language as a worthy (indeed, critical) subject of attention and inquiry is unwavering. During 1997, this commitment has again been translated into action through research, education, publication, and development of resources, using CAL’s expertise about language and culture.

A solid knowledge and experience base is key to the services that CAL can offer. During 1997, we were able to continue to build on the foundation of clearinghouse operations—including the ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, the National Clearinghouse for ESL Literacy Education, and the Refugee Service Center—and our partnerships with universities and other research organizations to bring a wide network of resources, information, and expertise to bear on issues that need attention. Addressing these issues, we seek to make a positive difference in areas like foreign language teaching, refugee and immigrant education, language testing, professional development of educators, and the provision of health services to language minority populations. The five projects described in this annual report are just a sample of the exciting work that CAL has undertaken. A full list of projects active in 1997 is given at the end of the report.

We also focused increased attention on our purpose of promoting public understanding of current language issues, particularly in the public policy arena. Debates about language have recently been highly visible in press and policy circles, and our staff recognized the need for CAL to contribute to the conversation. To that end, we initiated a new discussion series on Language and Literacy in Public Life. The series will use diverse platforms as a vehicle for discussing timely topics that have strong language and culture connections.

The series premiere responded to continuing public debate over what role should be played by languages other than English (and their speakers) in our society and workforce. An October briefing at the Library of Congress was organized by CAL and cosponsored by the Library’s Center for the Book to discuss “The Politics of Language and Literacy.” CAL authors Terrence Wiley and Reynaldo Macias were joined by trustee Deborah Tannen to exchange views with each other and over 100 policy makers, educators, and press representatives in attendance.

Wiley and Macias argued for treating language diversity in our country as an asset rather than a liability and presented evidence of policies and attitudes that are rooted in myths and stereotypes rather than facts. An historical perspective defuses the crisis mentality evident in many discussions. As the speakers noted, current immigration levels have been experienced before, and our society has a tradition of both tolerance and intolerance for multilingualism.
Another language headline for 1997 concerned Ebonics and the education of African American students who speak different language varieties. During the period of intense public interest and media coverage on this issue early in the year, CAL staff responded to inquiries and provided information via our Web site and in print materials. Then, we partnered with Howard University to bring together a coalition of organizations concerned with language and education.

The result was an invitational conference on Language Diversity and Academic Achievement in the Education of African American Students, convened in New York City in early January 1998, following the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America and cosponsored by the 13 members of the coalition. It featured presentations from researchers, school superintendents, teacher educators, and program developers who supported the observation of Orlando Taylor of Howard University that "A disregard for language diversity can inhibit effective instruction and student learning and can result in inappropriate evaluation of student achievement."

Among a number of specific recommendations, speakers urged teacher education programs to give the nation's teachers accurate and practical information about language and dialect diversity to enhance their ability to teach students who come from a variety of language communities. Papers presented at the conference will be disseminated in proceedings, to further advance the cause of greater public understanding of language.

In 1998, we plan to continue the Language and Literacy in Public Life series through more public forums and through electronic discussions involving leaders in the field.

Thus, as CAL continues to build knowledge and apply it to real world issues, we also reach out to raise the level of understanding about language. Through our Web site, our publications, our Language and Literacy in Public Life events, and in many other ways, we commit ourselves to addressing real world issues with language resources that are accurate, accessible, and timely.
The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) is a private, non-profit organization: a group of scholars and educators who use the findings of linguistics and related sciences in identifying and addressing language-related problems. CAL carries out a wide range of activities including research, teacher education, analysis and dissemination of information, design and development of instructional materials, technical assistance, conference planning, program evaluation, and policy analysis.

CAL was established in 1959 and is headquartered in Washington, D.C. with a regional office, the CAL Sunbelt Office, in Sarasota, Florida. CAL is exempt from corporate federal income taxes under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Contributions to CAL are tax deductible.

CAL frequently contributes expertise about language and culture to collaborative efforts. Inquiries are welcomed from organizations interested in partnering to carry out projects that further language-oriented missions in combination with other social goals.
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who work from a multi-disciplinary research base...
DEBORAH J. SHORT TALKS ABOUT THE NEWCOMER PROGRAM PROJECT*

Q: What is a newcomer program?
DJS: The definition we're operating on is: a distinct program that provides intensive instruction to recent immigrants with little or no English proficiency, for a limited period of time, for language development and orientation to the U.S. school system. Most programs serve students who have been in the States for a year or less.

Q: What's the rationale behind the programs?
DJS: An increasing number of students that are coming to the United States as immigrants, especially at the secondary level, are not prepared for the classwork. Many are not even literate in their own languages, or they have limited formal schooling or interrupted schooling in their home countries. They come at age 13 or age 16, for example, but may have had just two or three years of schooling. They may be placed by their age in a secondary program, but the traditional ESL/bilingual programs aren't geared to support those students.

We're focusing in the study on the secondary level because I think it's a more critical age, and it's where the greatest need is. We know that it takes five years or more for most students who aren't formally schooled to acquire the academic English they need to succeed. Any students that enter the country as high schoolers are really facing an uphill path, to learn English and core academic subjects in time for graduation.

Q: So newcomer programs are accelerated programs for them...
DJS: Yes. The idea is to have the students in an intensive environment for six months to a year, usually with hand-picked staff who are committed to the program, who work closely with the parents, and who provide information on the community as well as the school system and the curriculum. This way, we hope, the kids' learning is accelerated so that they can be exited from these programs and enter the regular ESL or bilingual program, or in some cases go right into mainstream classes.

Q: What made you think of doing a study?
DJS: At CAL we'd been receiving an increasing number of calls from schools saying "How can we help these students?" and I suspected that newcomer programs were going to become more popular. So I've been keeping track over the last few years of their growth and had done some research to see what was available on these programs. It turned out that there was no research done on a national level. There were a few case studies of a couple of schools, or one school, but nothing describing the range of practice and program features, and certainly nothing comparing them to regular ESL or bilingual programs.

Q: How is the project designed?
DJS: It's a four-year project, with two components: the first is to do a national survey of newcomer programs and set up a database with profiles of particular programs at the secondary level. The second is to conduct case studies of different programs, to highlight their differences in terms of features or staffing or student bodies, but also to choose ones that seem to be effective and then to try to find out whether or not they are more effective than placing the students into regular ESL or bilingual programs.

Q: Where are you now?
DJS: We've finished the survey, and we're just starting the case study component, the second year of the four. We have 60 programs in the database, very diverse in design, length, languages used for instruction, kinds of courses that are offered, type of student body, type of teachers, and so on. The programs are in 18 different states: not just the states with heavy immigration like New York, California, Texas and Florida, but also states like Connecticut, Kansas, Missouri, Minnesota and Washington.
Q: Have you run across any outstanding programs?
DJS: Quite a few seem very, very interesting, and we're really looking forward to going out and visiting them. We've done a couple of preliminary site visits to prepare for the case study component, and are finding that it's helpful to compare the program on paper with its enactment on site.

One program that's really novel, and that I hope to visit soon, is a ninth-grade school in New York. High-school-aged newcomer students who have less than eight years of schooling can select a school where they are all considered ninth-grade students. They follow the ninth-grade curriculum, and then most exit and go on to tenth grade in other schools. The program offers bilingual courses in Spanish and Chinese, as well as sheltered instruction to teach content to the students; it also does some vocational work with the students to give them some real-world skills. We saw some of these skills in practice at a conference I went to in December: all the participants received little baskets of candy that newcomer students from this program had made.

Q: What do you think will be the most valuable outcome of the project?
DJS: Right from the start the directory will be the most valuable piece. Many schools are interested in starting a newcomer program, but they don't know where to begin. There aren't any manuals telling them how to design a newcomer program, no guidelines to follow. When we started the study, we thought there would be three to five different models, but it isn't like that at all—the programs are incredibly diverse. So looking at the profiles we have in the directory will be quite beneficial, for the descriptions and also for the contact information. For example, one large urban school district called us last year and again this year: they were going to start a newcomer program, and wanted to visit some others in the area. We were able, with the directory, to direct them to the types of programs that seem to fit what they think they want to establish.

Down the road, the case studies will also be significant. The major goal of the study is to see if the newcomer programs work. We're only going to do a small sample of case studies, but we'll work with those that have already started collecting data, so we can compare the data with information from ESL or bilingual programs. We'll look at a full range of data, like attendance and dropout figures, how well the students do after they exit the newcomer program, how they transition to regular programs, and anything else that seems useful.

School districts have been concerned about costs—how much more money is this kind of program going to cost? If we find that newcomer programs make a difference, they'll see that it's worthwhile to allocate some resources to set them up.

Q: How are you publicizing the study?
DJS: The directory's already published—it came out last year—and we'll prepare updates each year. We'll do reports on preliminary findings, then do a monograph on the case studies during the fourth year. We've also started presenting some of the findings at professional conferences.

* Newcomers: Language and Academic Programs for Recent Immigrants, a project for the Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence, funded by the U.S. Department of Education/Office of Educational Research and Improvement, subcontract from University of California at Santa Cruz. Deborah J. Short is a Co-Director of the English Language and Multicultural Education Division at CAL.
JUDY JAMESON TALKS
ABOUT CAL'S ENRICHING
CONTENT CLASSES FOR
SECONDARY ESOL STUDENTS*

Q: Tell me about the Florida Consent
Decree, and the materials it prompted.
JJ: In 1989, a group of organizations—
Hispanic and Haitian organizations,
migrant workers, and other minority
groups—filed a suit against the state of
Florida, saying the state was not providing
adequate access to education for language
minority students. The state agreed,
through a legal form called a Consent
Decree, to train teachers to work with LEP
students—limited English proficient stu­
dents—and provide other services like
monitoring the students' progress.

One of the parts of the Consent Decree
required all content teachers who work
with LEP students—to get 60 hours of train­
ing in how to work effectively with them.
Of course, nobody was prepared to do the
training for the thousands of teachers who
needed it, so since 1990, various products
have been written for teacher training
across the state, in particular a curriculum
developed by the former Multifunctional
Resource Center, the MRC.

The problem was that since the vast
majority of teachers who needed the train­
ing were elementary teachers, the materi­
als were written primarily with them in
mind. CAL's Sunbelt Office did training
with the various materials, and we served
on the advisory committee for develop­
ment of other training materials, and in
fact we developed other sets of materials
on language learning and cross-cultural
understanding—I think those came out
about 1994—so we've had a history of
involvement.

Q: Are the teachers who are getting the 60
hours regular classroom teachers?
JJ: Yes—they're math, science, and social
studies teachers who have English lan­
guage learners in their mainstream class­
es. The general class might look like 30
students, 25 of whom are native English
speakers, and 5 of whom are English lan­
guage learners, all learning 11th-grade
physics. The question is how the physics
teachers get the content of physics
across—how they adapt the instruction
so the language learners can learn
physics as well as the academic English
they need to understand and express
themselves in class.

Q: The original curriculum didn't work for
physics teachers?
JJ: The MRC materials tried to be appro­
priate for all levels, but that's a wide range:
they worked best on the elementary level.
The middle and high school teachers who
we were training on these materials would
roll their eyes when we got to activities like 'Jazz Chants'—one of them grumbled, 'Well, I'm not going to have my students chant Newton's Third Law!' These teachers are focused on content, and they don't play games, and they're used to doing academic work in academic ways. So we wanted to develop materials that put their subject matter first and showed them how to communicate this subject matter at a high level to language minority students. That's the focus of these new materials, which are called Enriching Content Classes for Secondary ESOL Students.

Q: What does the curriculum look like?
JJ: The normal procedure in Florida is for master trainers—people who have a lot of experience in training, like us—to conduct training of district trainers, and those trainers train the teachers in their districts. The district trainers have varied back-grounds, in both ESL and training in general, so you need to give them materials that are easy to use and very straightforward. We've put together a package of presenters' notes, which is almost a script of what they should say, and a description of activities, and the transparencies they will need. There's also a study guide that contains all the readings the teachers will need and a video which shows exemplary classrooms. So the package includes absolutely everything that a district trainer will need to conduct the training, hour by hour.

Q: How did you know what to put into each hour?
JJ: We started with the required teacher competencies that have been approved by the state of Florida, like adapting instructional materials, evaluating textbooks in terms of advantages and disadvantages for LEP students, modifying or adjusting textbooks to make the content easier, and so on. We then used our experience as trainers and developers to select ESOL strategies—instructional techniques for modifying and presenting lessons—that would fulfill the competencies, but at the same time would work better in the areas of secondary math, science, and social studies, and with teachers more focused on teaching content.

It was SO HARD to get going. I don't think I've ever done something so complex: 60 hours! That's a long time. It was hard to boil everything down: this goes in and this goes out, it was real agony sometimes to let our favorite things go.

But we did. We put together a really rough draft in collaboration with the Title VII Teacher Training Project here at the University of Florida in Gainesville. They field tested the materials for us in Jacksonville, and they got rave reviews, and we used that experience and their feedback to finalize the materials.

Q: And the final materials came out this year?
JJ: December 1997—hot off the press! And they're being used in teacher training in Lee County, in Southwest Florida, as we speak!

Q: What was the best thing about the project?
JJ: Because this type of training has been a long term effort, I was really able to put my experience into these materials. I've been involved in this training going on eight years now, and I just loved having a chance to redo and refine what we started with. Activities that went into earlier materials, I can't go back and change because they're already published and distributed, but I've been able to modify them and really, really do things the way I wanted to, really get it right. That was the best part for me.

* Enriching Content for Secondary School Students, a curriculum design project funded by the Florida Department of Education. Judy Jameson is a Program Associate in CAL's Sunbelt Office.
NANCY C. RHODES TALKS ABOUT THE NEW SURVEY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS*

Q: What brought the survey about?
NCR: CAL had conducted a national survey of foreign language instruction 10 years ago, and we wanted to be able to show trends 10 years later, so we decided to do a similar survey looking at the status of foreign language in elementary and secondary schools in this country. We wanted to learn more about the languages offered, curriculum, teacher qualifications, and reactions to national reform issues.

Q: This survey is closely correlated with the previous one, then?
NCR: Yes. We wanted to make the survey instrument as similar as possible to the one that we used 10 years ago, so we asked almost all of the same questions, although we added three new ones. Lucinda Branaman and I designed a four-page questionnaire to be mailed out, with different versions for elementary and middle/high school. The first major question was “Does your school teach foreign language(s)?” And if they answered yes, then we asked a lot of detailed questions like “What languages are being taught?” “How many hours a week is the instruction?” “What kind of training do the teachers have?” and so on.

Q: Who got the questionnaires?
NCR: We did a sampling of approximately 6% of all public and private elementary and secondary schools in the country. That was a percentage that statisticians agreed would be an appropriate percentage to base conclusions on.

We got the sample of schools and principals by name from Market Data Retrieval, an educational data processing firm in Connecticut.

Before we mailed the surveys, we sent out letters to the principals saying that we were doing the survey and that they’d been selected to be in it, and that the survey instrument was on its way. Then later that week we sent them the instrument with an incentive—a magnet with a cute picture of kids and the slogan “Languages Last a Lifetime”—that we hoped would make them want to return the survey. And then we did a lot of follow-up: if they hadn’t responded within three weeks, we sent out a reminder letter, and if they hadn’t responded after that, we put them on a list of people to telephone. We did almost a hundred follow-up calls, either to get them to send in their survey or to respond over the phone. Once we got all the surveys in, we did 400 more phone calls to collect information they had forgotten to put on their survey. We’re now in the final stages of writing up the results. All together, we had a total of 1,534 elementary schools and 1,650 middle and high schools responding, for an overall 56% response rate.

Q: What were the new questions?
NCR: One was to ask how the new national standards have affected the language program. Another was about alternative assessment, since a lot of schools are doing new things with evaluation—something different from the standardized multiple-choice grammar type of exam. Teachers wrote in saying they use all sorts of oral proficiency tests, computer-based tests, hands-on types of activities, role playing, and a lot of different activities, although
there's still a lot of traditional fill-in-the-blank testing.

Q: The third new question?
NCR: It was a question on actual enrollment numbers. 10 years ago we didn't ask for specific enrollment figures, and a lot of people in the field thought that it would be useful this time.

Q: Enrollment figures aren't available elsewhere?
NCR: Not directly from schools. One of the reasons the Department of Education wanted this survey done was because they don't have a mechanism for collecting these kinds of data. Because our education system is so decentralized, it's very hard to get national figures. ACTFL—the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages—collects enrollment data every four years from the state foreign language consultants, but not from schools themselves. Since the states collect different types of data, it's difficult to get comparable information from all the states.

And other organizations collect various types of data on language teaching: the Joint National Committee for Languages does an annual survey of specific areas of foreign language study, collected from the state coordinators, and MLA—the Modern Language Association—does a survey every five years of higher education. Those are the only other sources of national data on foreign languages.

So our survey can really contribute to the national picture. We're especially pleased because there's good comparability between this survey and the one 10 years ago; we tried to make them parallel and were able to, so we can add some historical perspective as well and show trends.

Q: What are your major findings?
NCR: Things look really good on the elementary school level. About 10% more elementary schools than a decade ago are teaching foreign languages in some form or another, from 22% in 1987 to 31% in 1997. The percentage of secondary schools teaching foreign languages remained fairly stable—from 87% in 1987 to 86% in 1997.

As we expected, Spanish teaching has increased significantly on both elementary and secondary levels. An interesting finding was that classes for native speakers are on the increase, especially for Spanish. I think this is showing that people are beginning to realize that the children who come into school already proficient in another language have resources that they can offer the school and the country. The schools are building on the language skills that these children already have and are encouraging them to develop their native language. I think that's a promising trend.

Another language that is on the increase is Japanese, on both levels. A reason for this is probably that the United States is feeling that Japanese is a wide open market, that we need to be working with the Japanese more, and that we should start teaching Japanese at a younger age. Another reason for the increase is that the Japanese government and private foundations have contributed funding for materials, exchange programs for teachers, and other resources that help Japanese teaching.

One of the findings that causes us concern deals with the amount of time secondary school teachers spend using the foreign language in the classroom. For at least the last decade there's been a tremendous impetus towards teaching oral proficiency in the classroom, as opposed to focusing on rote memorization or grammar and translation. We thought we'd see a real increase in the amount of the foreign language used by the teacher in the classroom, but we didn't. The amount of time has increased only slightly in 10 years (from 18% of teachers using the language most of the time in 1987, to 22% in 1997). This has been a disappointment for people in the field. Perhaps it shows that even though leaders in the field are talking about proficiency and communicative teaching, we have to look and see what teachers really do in the classroom: maybe they understand the principles, but maybe the principles are hard to implement. We really need to investigate this aspect further.

Q: What happens next?
NCR: What we want to look at next is long-sequence K-12 programs. Despite the encouraging results of the survey at the elementary level, well-articulated elementary through secondary programs are still rare, and designing intensive instructional programs, as outlined in the national standards document, still needs to be our top priority. This is what the field is really aiming at: to get children started early in order to develop a real foundation to build on all the way through their schooling.

*National K–12 Foreign Language Survey, funded by the U.S. Department of Education/International Research and Studies Program. Nancy C. Rhodes is a Co-Director of the Foreign Language Education and Testing Division at CAL.
DORRY M. KENYON TALKS
ABOUT CAL’S INVESTIGATION
INTO COMPUTERIZED ORAL
PROFICIENCY INTERVIEWS*

Q: What is this new project doing with
computers and language testing?
DMK: We’re basically doing a research pro­
ject to explore administering the SOPI
over the computer.

Q: And the SOPI is...
DMK: Something CAL has been designing
and refining for 12 years: the Simulated
Oral Proficiency Interview, an oral profi­
ciency test administered by tape and
scored according to the ACTFL Speaking
Proficiency Guidelines. In a SOPI, the stu­
dents are faced with a variety of oral tasks
that allow them to demonstrate what they
can do with the language. For example,
tasks to show Intermediate level ability
might be answering simple questions or
giving basic personal information; at the
Advanced level they might be giving
advice or apologizing; and at the Superior
level they might be hypothesizing about
an unreal situation, and so on. SOPI tasks
include different content areas, also; on
the Intermediate level, for example, the
tasks involve personal and autobiographi­
cal topics, whereas on the Advanced level,
more concrete and factual topics are asked
about.

Q: What is the advantage of a SOPI over a
regular face-to-face interview?
DMK: One of the biggest is that it can be
administered by anybody, not necessarily
a trained interviewer, and then be sent
away to be scored. This is a great advan­
tage for a lot of the uncommonly taught
languages, since there might be only a few
individuals in the United States who have
the training to score them. It’s also easier
to train people to score oral interviews
than it is to train them to give interviews.
As we worked with SOPIs more, we dis­
covered another advantage and that is
that in high stakes or large scale testing,
where it’s important that everybody gets
the same quality of interview, the SOPI
ensures that everyone is receiving the
same questions and getting the same
opportunity to demonstrate ability.

Q: How are you thinking of extending the
SOPI to computers?
DMK: With the tape-driven SOPI, the
examinees have very little choice: the test
is totally controlled by the tape as it goes
along. It’s like talking to an answering
machine. Although our research shows
that students will get a very similar rating
whether it’s a live Oral Proficiency
Interview or a tape-mediated test—in
general examinees like the SOPI tasks and
feel they’re realistic—they sometimes feel
they haven’t been given an opportunity
to do their best because the test format
can produce anxiety.

So we’re experimenting with a model in
which the examinees are given much
more control, which is something that
can be done with the computer. For exam­
ple, the computer will make it easy for the
examinees to control the thinking time
and the response time.

Q: How?
DMK: They hear the instructions for a
task, they click to start when they’re
ready to respond, and they click when
they're finished. There will have to be a maximum thinking time to keep the program running, but we'll determine by field testing how long it should be. Having too much thinking time is not a good idea because you don't want the students, especially the lower level ones, to compose everything in their mind and sort of recite it after they've composed it and gotten all the jots and tittles out.

Q: How else can the computer test give the examinees more control?
DMK: They can choose from among tasks presented. We're going to experiment with giving a brief synopsis of what the task entails and then presenting, say, three tasks, and out of those three the examinee would choose one. For example, one task might be talking about your favorite weekend activity, or another giving directions using a map, or another describing a family member.

Another area for choice is that the examinee will be able to choose the language of directions. In the SOPI, directions are given in English to ensure that the examinees know what they need to do. Higher-level examinees often don't like going back and forth between English directions and the target language, and so the COPI—that's what we're calling it, the Computerized Oral Proficiency Interview—will give them the option of having the test directions in either language, although possibly only at the higher levels.

Q: Are you thinking of using the computer to improve the SOPI in any other ways?
DMK: We're also looking at rater efficiency. Currently, when raters listen to examinee response tapes, they have to listen linearly, in the order in which the answers were recorded. That's not necessarily the most efficient way to listen to the test. For example, you want to see right away how higher-level examinees did on the higher-level tasks because you can assume that they handled the lower-level tasks okay if they can do the higher-level tasks. With the COPI, raters can choose to listen to the tasks in any order, which may make the rating process more efficient and less time-consuming.

Q: What other aspects of the COPI will you be looking at?
DMK: We're looking at how long it will take to give the test. COPIs could be shorter for higher-level examinees because they may not have to respond to lower-level tasks. We're looking at rating affect as well as efficiency and hoping that the rater's job can be made a little easier and smoother. Of course, we're looking at the compatibility of performances. Our study involves COPIs in Spanish, Arabic, and Chinese, and students from each group will be given an OPI, a current SOPI, and the new test, and their performances across all will be compared. We'll be getting qualitative feedback from examinees and raters as well.

Q: Where are you in the project?
DMK: We're about a month into the project, still in the design stage; we've done a lot of the conceptual work for the design, contacts have been made, so there's a lot that's been done. The second stage will be programming. In the third stage we'll pilot the tests, then revise and evaluate them in the fourth and fifth stages. The whole project will take about 18 months.

The final product will be a CD-ROM that will contain the operating shell that runs the program, and the underlying task pool. I've discussed with our programmer the possibility of having a very open program structure so that end users could add tasks into the task bank that would be more reflective of what they're teaching or what they desire to teach.

Q: How are you planning to publicize the results of the study?
DMK: Several ways. We're developing a SOPI Web site at CAL, and the research and development section will contain updates on the project. We'll make presentations at conferences, we'll tell SOPI workshop participants and maybe involve them in piloting—we've already got Stanford on board as a pilot site.

At this point in time, I don't know how many end users actually have the capability to use a COPI operationally; that's why the operational aspects aren't as important in this project as the conceptual ones. But everyone will eventually have the capability, so we're building for the future.

Q: What's the best thing about the project to you?
DMK: It gives us a chance to integrate performance-based testing—the OPI field has been a leader in the overall field of testing—with technology, and to expand our capabilities in technology.

But I guess what excites me most is the use of technology to improve the quality of assessment, particularly treating the human examinee in a responsible way.

* Investigation into Computer Administered Speaking Tests, funded by the U.S. Department of Education/International Research and Studies Program. Dorry M. Kenyon is a Co-Director of the Foreign Language Education and Testing Division at CAL.
MARGO PFLEGER TALKS ABOUT THE ILLINOIS HEALTH GUIDES FOR REFUGEES*

Q: Why did Illinois ask CAL to do the health guides?
MP: State public health officials have been talking for a long time about the need for health orientation materials for refugees. One state—Illinois—undertook a test project to do a health guide for refugees in the state, and asked us to coordinate the project.

Q: Why do the health officials think that refugees need anything special?
MP: There are two compelling reasons: the presence of infectious diseases that have to be contained, and the shift from government programs to private health care systems not designed specifically for refugees.

Q: Infectious diseases?
MP: Tuberculosis is the biggest problem. The current refugees are coming from places in the world—Somalia and Bosnia, for example—where TB is endemic, and many of them test positive for it at their first health screening here. If they test positive, they have to go through the six-month drug therapy, but if they don't have active symptoms, they don't understand why they have to continue with the medicine. So public health officials are anxious for them to understand why the drug therapy is so important.

Q: Infectious diseases?
MP: Tuberculosis is the biggest problem. The current refugees are coming from places in the world—Somalia and Bosnia, for example—where TB is endemic, and many of them test positive for it at their first health screening here. If they test positive, they have to go through the six-month drug therapy, but if they don't have active symptoms, they don't understand why they have to continue with the medicine. So public health officials are anxious for them to understand why the drug therapy is so important.

There are other health problems as well—low nutrition, injuries or trauma, and lack of preventive care.

The other big issue with refugees and health care is that many of them are coming from socialist countries where they've had government health care all their lives, and now they're being directed to HMOs where the services are not tailored to refugees. It's confusing enough for just the average U.S. citizen to navigate the health care system; imagine what it's like for a refugee with low English, coming out of a different political system, and one who needs more health care than usual. So the public health officials and particularly states that receive large numbers of refugees, like Illinois, wanted to produce health education materials that would explain how to access the mainstream systems.

Q: How did you develop the guide?
MP: The public health officials had hammered out a basic outline of topics that any state health guide should address, like taking medicine and using an interpreter. Illinois took that outline, identified a work group of 10 health providers around the state, and asked CAL to coordinate the project. We went to Chicago, brought all those people together, reviewed the outline, and modified it somewhat to tailor it specifically to Illinois. Once this work group agreed on the final outline, we divided up the content and went home and drafted the chapters. The chapters were sent to CAL, I brought them all together into one book and did some rough editing. Then we sent the manuscript to some 40 people who were prominent in public health—30 in Illinois, 10 in other states—for review and comments. It came back to us, we incorporated the comments as best we could, and put the book into production.

Q: Were there any special design considerations?
MP: We knew from experience that refugees would be more likely to hang onto a book that looked serious and attractive, rather than a short throwaway pamphlet kind of thing. We wanted to produce a product that refugees would respect and value, and would read and keep in their...
homes. So we agreed that an attractive book, with photographs that would help low-literacy level refugees access the material, would be best.

The prototype was produced in English, and was sent around to every public health department in Illinois, every agency working with refugees, and everybody else that had anything to do with refugees in the state, both to show the service providers what was in the book, and to let them know that the book was going to be made available to refugees in their languages. CAL was then asked to produce three language versions, Russian, Bosnian and Vietnamese, the languages spoken by the largest refugee populations in Illinois.

Q: Who is doing the translations?

MP: Most of the material is being written in the native languages by bilingual health workers who work with refugees every day in public clinics, so they know intimately the refugee population, what questions they ask, and what confusions they have about the American system. These people know how to explain the health care system in terms the refugees can understand.

It's extremely important for people who do the translating/writing to be knowledgeable about the refugee backgrounds, as well as to have medical knowledge. The problem is not the translating of the material into the languages—people have been doing that for a long time. What we all want this book to do is to be biculturally oriented. For example, if the refugee comes from a country where there's no concept of health insurance, the book can't just describe health insurance in the United States; it has to explain in great detail what health insurance is and then describe the different ways that refugees might get health insurance, and at the same time, pay a lot of attention to alternatives for the refugees who don't have health insurance.

Q: Are there plans for translations into other languages?

MP: Illinois might continue with Arabic, Farsi, and maybe Somali guides—the Chicago area attracts a lot of Middle Easterners. Our designer, Vincent Sagart, has created a basic template that's really flexible, so future language versions will be much less expensive to produce, which means that more resources can be put into the translating/writing. Production is still expensive because of the languages—more proofreading, editing, and so on—but the template cuts down on the cost of design.

Q: Are other states interested?

MP: Six or seven states have called us to ask questions about production costs and procedures and processes. I think they'll ask us for help with production because they don't have the capability to publish in the different languages, and of course we have the fonts and capabilities in all the refugee languages.

Q: What's the most valuable outcome of this?

MP: Clearly, future refugees will have a terrific resource. Soon after they arrive, they'll be given this book that will give them background information and help them understand what they're going through, so that when they meet with their bilingual health workers, they can build on their knowledge, and the health workers can concentrate on specific questions.

The book, of course, isn't supposed to be the be-all and end-all of help to the refugees with their health problems. But it's a crucial piece of a comprehensive package of information and services. And it's the first of its kind. No one has brought together comprehensive information in a single publication that's been translated appropriately, with sensitivity to the cultural backgrounds of the people it's for.

* Health Guide for Refugees, funded by the Illinois Department of Public Health. Margo Pfleger is a Co-Director of the English Language and Multicultural Education Division at CAL.
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Benchmark Study
U.S. Department of Education/Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, subcontract from Institute for Policy Analysis and Research
Evaluation study to investigate the dynamics of school change over time in schools serving limited English proficient students through Title VII Comprehensive School grants.
http://www.cal.org/benchmark

Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE)
U.S. Department of Education/Office of Educational Research and Improvement, subcontract from University of California at Santa Cruz
Dissemination activities including research reports series, articles, conference planning, networking with other research organizations, and outreach. http://www.cal.org/crede

CREDE: Effects of Sheltered Instruction on the Achievement of Limited English Proficient Students
Development and implementation of an explicit model for the teaching of core curricular material to English language learners in middle schools.

CREDE: National Survey of School/Community-Based Organization Partnerships Serving At-Risk Students
Examination of partnerships between schools and community-based organizations supporting the academic achievement of language minority students to identify successful practices.

CREDE: Newcomers: Language and Academic Programs for Recent Immigrants
Study of short-term newcomer programs for recently arrived secondary students with limited English proficiency and the programs’ effects in promoting successful transition to U.S. schools.

CREDE: Two-Way Language Immersion Education
Investigation and documentation of two-way immersion programs: instructional outcomes, effects on student populations, articulation issues, and implementation.

English Digest and La Familia de la Ciudad
City Family Magazine
ESL and Spanish editing of two magazines, published six times per year, and writing and production of accompanying teachers' guides.

How to Buy a Home in the U.S.
Fannie Mae Foundation
Adaptation of adult ESL materials on homeownership for adult basic education learners. Work completed in 1997.

Identifying Content Standards for English Language Arts in Maryland
U.S. Department of Education, subcontract from Maryland State Department of Education
Identification and development of English language arts content standards and standards for teaching English language arts.

Montgomery County Adult ESL Program Review
Maryland State Department of Education
Review of the adult ESL program in the county, followed by recommendations for curriculum and materials, assessment, professional development of teachers, and program evaluation.

Multilingual Health Education Resource Guide
Illinois Department of Public Health
Translation and production of Bosnian, Russian, and Vietnamese language versions of CAL’s previously developed Health Guide for Refugees.

National Clearinghouse for ESL Literacy Education
U.S. Department of Education/Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Library of Education
Maintenance of adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse that collects, analyzes, and disseminates information on literacy education for adults and out-of-school youth learning English.
http://www.cal.org/ncle

Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory
U.S. Department of Education/Office of Educational Research and Improvement, subcontract from Brown University
Applied research and professional development on implementing standards, resource development on portfolio assessment, and provision of foreign language resources.

PreK–12 ESL Standards and Assessment Project
Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
Direction of TESOL’s national effort to develop ESL Standards for preK–12 students, including development of content standards, assessment guidelines, and implementation activities.

Professional Development for Secondary School Teachers
Arthur Vining Davis Foundations
Multi-site extension of CAL’s professional development model to help ESL and content area teachers and administrators integrate language and content instruction for English learners.
Program in Immigrant Education
Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
Coordination of the Foundation’s precollegiate immigrant education program, including participation in research and evaluation, coordination of project publications, and dissemination. http://www.cal.org/cal/html/prime.htm

Refugee Service Center
U.S. Department of State
Continuation of support to intensive English language and cultural orientation programs for refugees prior to their admission to the United States. http://www.cal.org/cal/html/rsc.htm

FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION AND TESTING

Adapting Cambridge Test Materials for an American English Audience
University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES)
Assistance to the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate in developing American versions of their EFL tests. Work completed in 1997.

Alexandria School Spanish Immersion Evaluation
Alexandria, VA, Public Schools

Assessment of Oral Proficiency of Students in the Georgia Elementary School Foreign Language Program
Georgia Department of Education

Development of Russian SOPI and Rater Training Kit
U.S. Department of Education/International Research and Studies Program
Development of a Simulated Oral Proficiency Interview in Russian, including an accompanying self-instructional rater training kit.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics
U.S. Department of Education/Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Library of Education

Evaluation of Academy of the Americas
Detroit Public Schools
Evaluation of the preK-5, two-way Spanish immersion program of the Detroit Public Schools.

Evaluation of Foreign Language Immersion Programs
Detroit Public Schools

Evaluation of Georgia Elementary School Foreign Languages Model Program
Georgia State Department of Education
Development, field testing, implementation, and analysis of an assessment program for fifth graders in the Elementary School Foreign Languages Model Program and other programs.

Formative Evaluation Study of the French Immersion Magnet Program
Prince George’s County, MD, Public Schools
Evaluation and assessment of the Prince George’s County Public Schools’ French Immersion Magnet Program. Work completed in 1997.

International Language Education Study
Spencer Foundation

Investigation into Computer Administered Speaking Tests
U.S. Department of Education/International Research and Studies Program
Examination of the potential for computer-administered speaking tests for measuring oral language proficiency.

Montgomery County, MD, Two-Way Immersion Evaluation
Montgomery County Public Schools
Evaluation of the Burnt Mills Elementary School Spanish two-way immersion program, in conformity with Title VII guidelines.

National Capital Language Resource Center
U.S. Department of Education/International Research and Studies Program, subcontract from Georgetown University
Projects to develop test materials, provide information on materials for teaching the less commonly taught languages, and train language teachers in testing and in the use of technology. http://www.cal.org/nclrc

National K-12 Foreign Language Resource Center
U.S. Department of Education/International Research and Studies Program, subcontract from Iowa State University
Projects to conduct a search of foreign language assessment instruments, to coordinate summer institutes on assessment, and to revise and validate the Student Oral Proficiency Assessment. http://www.cal.org/cal/html/k12nflrc.htm
National K–12 Foreign Language Survey
U.S. Department of Education/International Research and Studies Program
Comprehensive national survey of foreign language programs in elementary and secondary schools, replicating CAL's 1985–87 survey.

National Network for Early Language Learning
Membership organization
900-member organization (housed at CAL) of teachers, administrators, researchers, and parents. Activities include the journal Learning Languages, networking, and advocacy sessions.
http://www.cal.org/cal/html/nnell.htm

National Survey of Assessment of Foreign Language Teachers
U.S. Department of Education/International Research and Studies Program
Survey of state certification boards, local school districts, and teacher preparation programs on how foreign language competency is being assessed for K-12 teachers.

Sounds of Contemporary Polish
U.S. Department of Education/International Research and Studies Program

Training Modules for Foreign Language Teaching Assistants
U.S. Department of Education/International Research and Studies Program
Development of instructional packets for use in pre- and in-service training of graduate assistants who teach undergraduate sections of foreign language courses.

SUNBELT OFFICE
Comprehensive Regional Technical Assistance Center Region XIV
U.S. Department of Education/Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, subcontract from Educational Testing Service
Collaboration with ETS to operate a regional assistance center focusing on needs of children from high poverty backgrounds in Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Enriching Content for Secondary School Students
Florida Department of Education
Development of a manual and video providing 60 hours of training in ESL and cultural issues to Florida's secondary school teachers.

Project in Adult Immigrant Education
Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
Assistance to programs serving adult immigrants, to improve their capacity to provide quality English language and literacy instruction and employment skills training to their clientele.
CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON EDUCATION, DIVERSITY & EXCELLENCE (CREDE)

From At-Risk to Excellence: Research, Theory, and Principles for Practice.
Roland G. Tharp

Deborah J. Short & Beverly A. Boyson

Christopher L. Montone & Donna Christian

PROGRAM IN IMMIGRANT EDUCATION

Into, Through, and Beyond Secondary School: Critical Transitions for Immigrant Youths.
Tamara Lucas

New Concepts for New Challenges: Professional Development for Teachers of Immigrant Youth.
Josué M. González & Linda Darling-Hammond

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS

Foreign Language Assessment in Grades K-8: An Annotated Bibliography of Assessment Instruments.
Lynn Thompson, Compiler

Profiles in Two-Way Immersion Education.
Donna Christian, Christopher L. Montone, Kathryn J. Lindholm, & Isolda Carranza

REFUGEE SERVICE CENTER

Margo Pfleger, Editor

NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE FOR ESL LITERACY EDUCATION (NCLE) AND THE PROJECT IN ADULT IMMIGRANT EDUCATION

Learning to Work in a New Land: A Review and Sourcebook for Vocational and Workplace ESL.
Marilyn K. Gillespie

Workplace ESL Instruction: Interviews from the Field.
Miriam Burt

FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION AND TESTING (FLET)

Computer-Assisted Polish Pronunciation Tutor (CAPPTor).
Waldemar Walczynski

Directory of Total and Partial Immersion Language Programs in U.S. Schools, 1997.
Nancy Rhodes & Toya Lynch, Compilers

SUNBELT OFFICE

Enriching Content Classes for Secondary ESOL Students.
Trainer’s Manual.
Florida Department of Education, Division of Human Resource Development, & Center for Applied Linguistics, Sunbelt Office

PREK–12 ESL STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT PROJECT

ESL Standards for PreK-12 Students.
Available from Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (TESOL)

WEB-BASED PUBLICATIONS AND RESOURCES, 1997

WorkWorld Resources Database
(Project in Adult Immigrant Education)
http://www.cal.org/workworld/default.html

Ñanduti: Early Foreign Language Learning
(Web site at the Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory At Brown University (LAB))
http://www.cal.org/earlylang/

Teaching Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Learners: Effective Programs and Practices
(edited by Christopher L. Montone)

Linguistics and the Human Capital Initiative
(by Walt Wolfram, for the National Science Foundation)
http://www.cal.org/cgi/html/pubs/lhci.htm

Center for Applied Linguistics Ebonics Information Page
http://www.cal.org/ebonics
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Statements of Financial Position  
September 30, 1997 and 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>Restated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$183,907</td>
<td>$631,966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billed contracts and grants</td>
<td>223,375</td>
<td>44,016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbilled contracts and grants</td>
<td>368,032</td>
<td>296,906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances and other receivables</td>
<td>32,323</td>
<td>20,731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits and prepaid expenses</td>
<td>18,022</td>
<td>2,878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current assets</strong></td>
<td>825,659</td>
<td>996,497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noncurrent assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and equipment, net of $312,184 and $305,923 accumulated depreciation</td>
<td>110,529</td>
<td>80,996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term investments</td>
<td>2,029,391</td>
<td>1,561,290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>$2,965,579</td>
<td>$2,638,783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Liabilities and Net Assets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities and Net Assets</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>Restated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts in excess of revenues</td>
<td>$93,959</td>
<td>$108,191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and other expenses</td>
<td>117,859</td>
<td>114,641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued annual leave</td>
<td>103,238</td>
<td>104,779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll taxes withheld and other</td>
<td>63,252</td>
<td>49,432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current liabilities</strong></td>
<td>378,308</td>
<td>377,043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Net assets**                | 1997          | 1996          | Restated |
| Unrestricted                  | 1,805,389     | 1,525,373     |          |
| Temporarily restricted         | 681,882       | 636,367       |          |
| Permanently restricted         | 100,000       | 100,000       |          |
| **Total net assets**          | 2,587,271     | 2,261,740     |          |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total liabilities &amp; net assets</strong></th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>Restated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,965,579</td>
<td>$2,638,783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Center for Applied Linguistics  

Statements of Activities and Changes in Net Assets  
for the years ended September 30, 1997 and 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1996 Restated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted net assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts and grants</td>
<td>$3,342,212</td>
<td>$2,502,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain/Loss on investment</td>
<td>133,802</td>
<td>37,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest revenue</td>
<td>116,602</td>
<td>116,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing revenue</td>
<td>147,540</td>
<td>106,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant fees and workshops</td>
<td>11,125</td>
<td>30,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of publications</td>
<td>60,666</td>
<td>54,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>45,006</td>
<td>46,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total unrestricted support</strong></td>
<td>$3,856,953</td>
<td>$2,895,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets released from restrictions</td>
<td>738,973</td>
<td>613,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total unrestricted support &amp; reclassifications</strong></td>
<td>$4,595,926</td>
<td>$3,509,172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Expenses** |            |               |
| Program services |            |               |
| Government contracts and grants | 2,943,743 | 2,325,831 |
| Private contracts and grants | 693,148 | 839,203 |
| Test activities | 104,419 | 141,037 |
| Venture activities | 99,561 | 60,963 |
| Pass-thru and project participant costs | 457,956 | 65,417 |
| **Total program costs** | 4,298,827 | 3,432,451 |
| Less: support costs | (1,061,590) | (1,032,791) |
| **Program direct costs** | 3,237,237 | 2,399,660 |
| Support costs |            |               |
| General administration | 1,078,673 | 1,048,802 |
| **Total expenses** | 4,315,910 | 3,448,462 |
| **Increase (decrease) in unrestricted net assets** | 280,016 | 60,710 |

| **Temporarily restricted net assets** |            |               |
| Grants | 745,292 | 325,000 |
| Interest | 39,196 | 31,183 |
| Net assets released from restrictions | 738,973 | (613,623) |
| **Increase (decrease) in temporarily restricted net assets** | 45,515 | (257,440) |
| **Increase (decrease) in net assets** | 325,531 | (196,730) |
| Net assets at beginning of year, as restated | 2,261,740 | 2,458,470 |
| **Net assets at end of year** | $2,587,271 | $2,261,740 |
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