DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF SERVICES TO LEP STUDENTS AND LEP STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

SPECIAL TOPIC REPORT #2

Analysis of Office for Civil Rights (OCR) Data Related to LEP Students

PAUL J. HOPSTOCK
TODD G. STEPHENSON

Submitted to:

Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA)
U.S. Department of Education
(Contract No. ED-00-CO-0089)

Submitted by:
Development Associates, Inc.

Subcontractors:
Center for Equity and Excellence in Education
The George Washington University

National Center on Educational Outcomes
University of Minnesota

August 15, 2003

This report was prepared for the U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students (OELA), under Contract No. ED-00-CO-0089. The opinions, conclusions and recommendations expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department of Education and no official endorsement by the Department of Education should be inferred.

Note

The Descriptive Study of Services to LEP Students and LEP Students with Disabilities was conducted by Development Associates, Inc., Arlington, VA, for the U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for LEP Students (OELA) from September 2000 to September 2003.

The Project Director on the Study was Annette M. Zehler, PhD, and Deputy Director was Howard L. Fleischman. Subcontractors were the Center for Equity and Excellence in Education (CEEE), The George Washington University, directed by Charlene Rivera, EdD; and the National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO), University of Minnesota, directed by Martha L. Thurlow, PhD.

This report is one of several developed as part of the Descriptive Study. The reports produced are:

Research Report (Volume I)
Methodology (Volume II)
Case Study Findings (Volume III)
Policy Report
Special Topic Report #1: Native Languages of LEP Students
Special Topic Report #2: Issues in Studying Learning Outcomes for LEP Students
Special Topic Report #3: Analysis of Office for Civil Rights (OCR) Data Related to LEP Students
Special Topic Report #4: Findings on Special Education LEP Students

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1
   - A. Purpose of This Report 1
   - B. Methodology 1

2. Numbers and Characteristics of LEP Students 3
   - A. Number of Students Needing LEP Services 3
   - B. Ethnic Background of Students Needing LEP Services 5

3. Numbers and Characteristics of Special Education LEP Students 7
   - A. Number of Special Education Students Needing LEP Programs 7
   - B. Disability Categories of LEP Special Education Students 9

4. Services for LEP Students 11
   - A. Enrollment in LEP Programs 11
   - B. Enrollment in Gifted and Talented Programs 12
   - C. Enrollment in Advanced Placement Courses 13

5. Discipline of LEP Students 15
   - A. Corporal Punishment 15
   - B. Suspensions and Expulsions 15

6. Graduation Tests and Diplomas for LEP Students 17
   - A. Tests for Graduation 17
   - B. Types of Diplomas Received 17

1. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of This Report

This report is one of a series of special topics reports produced as part of the Descriptive Study of Services to LEP and Special Education LEP Students (hereafter referred to as the "Descriptive Study"). The Descriptive Study was funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition to provide descriptions of limited English proficient (LEP) students in U.S. public schools, the instruction they receive, the alignment of that instruction with State content and performance standards, and the numbers and characteristics of instructional staff providing those services. The Descriptive Study also included a major sub-study designed to provide information on LEP students served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (hereafter referred to as "special education LEP (SpEd-LEP) students"). In addition to the special topic reports, Study products include the Research Report (Volume I), Methodology (Volume II), and Case Study Findings (Volume III). A separate Policy Report provides a summary and discussion of the key findings of the Study.

The purpose of this report is to present data concerning LEP students and SpEd-LEP students from the 2000 Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Compliance Report (E&S Survey). The 2000 E&S Survey was a mandatory national survey of all public school districts and public schools administered by the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) of the U.S. Department of Education. The Individual School Report (ED102) of the E&S Survey included a number of items concerning LEP students and a few items concerning SpEd-LEP students. Data on those items are summarized in this report.

This analysis of E&S Survey data was included as part of the Descriptive Study in order to complement the Descriptive Study findings. There is some overlap in content between Descriptive Study variables and those in the E&S Survey, but there are also some variables (especially concerning discipline and testing) in the E&S Survey that were not included in the Descriptive Study. Where there are comparable data between the two studies, comparisons are discussed. Where there are no comparable data, descriptive findings of the E&S Survey are presented.

B. Methodology

Analyses of the E&S Survey were conducted using the public use data set for the Individual School Report. Data were entered into an SPSS data file and analyzed using the SPSS statistical software. All analyses were performed with no weights attached. This was done because the data set was virtually complete at the form level and the development of item weights for specific items was beyond the resources of the Descriptive Study.

The specific Descriptive Study findings were drawn from the main research volume of the Descriptive Study Report. The methodology associated with those findings is summarized in the Research Report (Volume I) and is described in detail in Volume II, Methodology, of the Descriptive Study final report.

In drawing comparisons between the E&S and Descriptive studies, it is important to recognize the differences in content and methodology of the two studies. First, the E&S Survey in most cases

requested data from the 2000-2001 school year (with a target date of October 1, 2000), while the Descriptive Study requested information from the 2001-2002 school year. Second, the E&S Survey was a universe survey (with a very high but not total response rate), while the Descriptive Study was a sample survey of districts and schools having LEP students. In this report, data from the E&S Survey are presented in unweighted form, while all data from the Descriptive Study were weighted for selection probability and form non-response, and selected items were weighted for item non-response.

2. NUMBERS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF LEP STUDENTS

A. Numbers of Students Needing LEP Services

The ED102 form of the E&S Survey included the Federal definition of a LEP student, but also included an additional instruction that in completing the ED102 form, the LEP count "means the number of students needing LEP programs." To the authors' knowledge, this instruction is unique to the E&S Survey, and is not included in any other Federal or State reporting system. Item 7C specifically requests the number of students "Needing LEP Programs," and other items use the term "LEP" with the instruction described above.

Schools completing the E&S Survey reported a total of 3,486,304 students needing LEP programs in grades K-12 in U.S. public schools. For the same school year (2000-2001), States reported to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition a total of 3,908,095 LEP students in grades PreK-12 on the Survey of the States' Limited English Proficient Students and Available Educational Programs and Services (State LEP Survey: total for 50 States and District of Columbia). For the following school year (2001-2002), the Descriptive Study estimated a total of 3,977,819 LEP students in grade K-12 in U.S. public schools.

The numbers from the E&S Survey are lower than the SEA counts and Descriptive Study estimates. Differences with the State LEP Survey are partially accounted for by the fact that the State LEP Survey numbers included PreK students in 37 States and the District of Columbia (there were 71,658 PreK LEP students reported in the 37 States, DC, Puerto Rico, and the territories). Differences with Descriptive Study estimates are partially accounted for by the likely growth of the LEP student population between 2000-2001 and 2001-2002. There were also small numbers of schools who did not complete the ED102 form or answer the item on LEP students.

The authors believe, however, that the unique E&S Survey definition of LEP students also partially explains the differences. There may be students who meet the Federal definition of a LEP student but whom schools do not label as "needing LEP programs." The authors believe that this is particularly likely for students with Native American or Alaskan Native backgrounds. Such students are included under the Federal definition if they "come from environments where a language other than English has had a significant impact on their level of English language proficiency; and who by reason thereof, have sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language, to deny such individuals the opportunity to learn successfully in classrooms where the language of instruction is English or to participate fully in our society" (from ED102 form). School officials may believe that students (especially Native Americans) meet the LEP definition and may need special assistance but may not "need LEP programs."

To examine this hypothesis, the authors examined the distribution of K-12 LEP students by State on the E&S Survey. The results are shown in Table 2.1. These results were then compared with the State PreK-12 LEP counts reported in the State LEP survey. All but five States reported more LEP students than did schools in those States in the E&S Survey. The largest differences were in States with the largest LEP populations (California, Florida, Texas, and New York), but the largest proportional differences were in North Dakota and Oklahoma, States with large Native American

populations. These findings supported the hypothesis that the unique E&S Survey definition of LEP students may partially account for differences with other counts.

TABLE 2.1
Numbers of LEP Students in States
(E&S Survey: Individual School Report)

State	LEP Students	Percentage	State	LEP Students	Percentage
Alaska	16,459	0.5%	Montana	4,942	0.1%
Alabama	5,707	0.2	North Carolina	37,984	1.1
Arkansas	10,247	0.3	North Dakota	2,624	0.1
Arizona	136,148	3.9	Nebraska	9,045	0.3
California	1,425,263	40.9	New Hampshire	2,654	0.1
Colorado	56,614	1.6	New Jersey	52,324	1.5
Connecticut	19,262	0.6	New Mexico	55,483	1.6
District of Columbia	5,085	0.1	Nevada	41,273	1.2
Delaware	3,486	0.1	New York	202,506	5.8
Florida	182,210	5.2	Ohio	16,036	0.5
Georgia	46,851	1.3	Oklahoma	19,527	0.6
Hawaii	11,823	0.3	Oregon	41,490	1.2
Iowa	10,298	0.3	Pennsylvania	23,296	0.7
Idaho	13,444	0.4	Rhode Island	8,207	0.2
Illinois	121,126	3.5	South Carolina	5,480	0.2
Indiana	13,573	0.4	South Dakota	3,292	0.1
Kansas	15,545	0.4	Tennessee	11,395	0.3
Kentucky	5,314	0.2	Texas	519,165	14.9
Louisiana	5,656	0.2	Utah	33,366	1.0
Massachusetts	45,179	1.3	Virginia	36,123	1.0
Maryland	22,287	0.6	Vermont	676	0.0
Maine	1,786	0.1	Washington	60,608	1.7
Michigan	43,009	1.2	Wisconsin	24,640	0.7
Minnesota	44,539	1.3	West Virginia	574	0.0
Missouri	9,636	0.3	Wyoming	1,436	0.0
Mississippi	1,611	0.0	Total	3,486,304	100.0%

The number of respondents who provided data on this item was 85,987. The item response represented 97.0% of the total number of respondents.

The LEP population was also examined by level of school. The Descriptive Study defined four levels of schools: (1) elementary (no grade higher than 6, at least one grade lower than 5); (2) middle (no grade lower than 5, no grade higher than 9); (3) high (no grade lower than 9, at least one grade higher than 9); (4) multi-level (none of the above, e.g., K-12, 6-12). Using these groups, the percentages of the LEP population by level of school were estimated to be: elementary, 60.7%; middle, 15.6%; high, 16.9%; multi-level, 6.7%.

The E&S Survey was also distinctive in that it requested separate LEP counts for male and female students. According to school respondents, 52.5 percent of the LEP population was male and 47.5 percent was female. This is in contrast to the overall K-12 school population of which 51.4 percent was male and 48.6 percent was female. The percentages of males among LEP students were particularly high in middle schools (53.6 percent) and high schools (53.4 percent).

B. Ethnic Backgrounds of Students Needing LEP Services

An important element of the E&S Survey involves ethnic group comparisons on a range of variables. School-level respondents on the ED102 form provided the following ethnic breakdowns of LEP students: Hispanic, 76.8 percent; Asian or Pacific Islander; 12.9 percent; White, not of Hispanic Origin, 6.1 percent; Black, not of Hispanic Origin, 2.6 percent; American Indian or Alaskan Native, 1.6 percent.

This ethnic breakdown was very similar to language group estimates from the Descriptive Study. For example, the Descriptive Study estimated that 76.9 percent of LEP students had Spanish as their native language.

3. NUMBERS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION LEP (SpEd-LEP) STUDENTS

A. Number of Special Education Students Needing LEP Programs

The ED102 form asked school-level respondents to indicate the number of students with disabilities served under IDEA "needing LEP programs." Schools completing the E&S Survey reported a total of 274,756 special education students needing LEP programs in grades K-12 in U.S. public schools in 2000. For the following school year (2001-2002), the Descriptive Study estimated a total of 357,325 SpEd-LEP students in grades K-12 in U.S. public schools.

The differences between these two counts can be accounted for partially by the item non-response rate (6.3 percent) on the relevant items on the ED102 form, partially by the likely growth of the LEP student population between 2000-2001 and 2001-2002, and partially by the different definitions of LEP students on the two surveys. The difference is still large, however, in proportion to the difference between the two counts of LEP students. The Descriptive Study estimate of LEP students was 14.1 percent larger than the E&S Survey number, while the Descriptive Study estimate of SpEd-LEP students was 30.1 percent larger.

In the E&S Survey, SpEd-LEP students represented 7.9 percent of the overall LEP student population. This is in contrast to the figure for all students, of whom 12.4 percent were reported to be in special education. This difference is similar to one found in the Descriptive Study.

Table 3.1 shows the numbers of SpEd-LEP students in each State reported on the ED102 form, and the percentages of reported LEP students who were reported to be in special education. The percentage of LEP students in special education ranged from 0.0 to 17.3 percent. This suggests that schools in different States have varying levels of awareness of SpEd-LEP students.

The distribution of SpEd-LEP students by level of school was as follows: elementary, 50.5%; middle, 22.8%; high, 18.6%; multi-level, 8.1%. Comparing these percentages with the percentages of all LEP students, SpEd-LEP students made up a smaller proportion of the elementary school LEP population than they did of the LEP populations at other school levels. Of the elementary school LEP population, 6.5 percent were in special education, while in other levels of schools, 9.8 percent of the LEP population were in special education.

Data from the E&S Survey indicated that 66.0 percent of SpEd-LEP students were male and 34.0 percent were female. These percentages were very similar to those for all special education students, in which 66.4 percent were male and 33.6 percent were female.

TABLE 3.1
Numbers of Special Education LEP Students and Their Proportion of All LEP Students by State
(E&S Survey: Individual School Report)

State	SpEd-LEP Students	Percentage of All LEP Students	State	SpEd-LEP Students	Percentage of All LEP Students
Alaska	2,038	12.4%	Montana	464	9.5%
Alabama	179	3.1	North Carolina	1,416	3.7
Arkansas	437	4.3	North Dakota	494	17.3
Arizona	8,607	6.3	Nebraska	640	7.1
California	108,597	7.6	New Hampshire	167	6.2
Colorado	3,357	5.9	New Jersey	1,685	3.3
Connecticut	974	5.1	New Mexico	9,215	16.8
District of Columbia	0	0.0	Nevada	3,188	7.7
Delaware	329	9.4	New York	23,431	11.6
Florida	14,671	8.1	Ohio	976	6.1
Georgia	2,312	4.9	Oklahoma	846	4.3
Hawaii	1,595	13.5	Oregon	2,422	5.8
Iowa	631	6.1	Pennsylvania	1,535	6.6
Idaho	1,030	7.8	Rhode Island	298	3.6
Illinois	7,586	6.2	South Carolina	103	1.9
Indiana	486	3.6	South Dakota	233	7.1
Kansas	810	5.2	Tennessee	388	3.4
Kentucky	85	1.6	Texas	50,276	9.7
Louisiana	143	2.5	Utah	2,972	8.9
Massachusetts	4,293	9.5	Virginia	2,723	7.5
Maryland	1,022	4.6	Vermont	54	8.1
Maine	228	12.8	Washington	4,003	6.6
Michigan	2,117	4.9	Wisconsin	1,937	7.9
Minnesota	3,210	7.2	West Virginia	4	0.7
Missouri	257	2.7	Wyoming	244	17.0
Mississippi	48	3.0	Total	274,756	7.9%

The number of respondents who provided data on this item was 83,078. The item response represented 93.7% of the total number of respondents.

B. Disability Categories of Special Education LEP Students

The E&S Survey requested information on the numbers of LEP students in each of the following disability categories: specific learning disability, emotional disturbance, developmental delay, mild retardation, moderate retardation, and severe retardation. The form did not ask for counts of LEP students in other disability categories, including the speech and language impairment category, which in the Descriptive Study was the second most common category for SpEd-LEP students.

Table 3.2 shows the percentages of all students and the percentages of LEP students who were reported in each of the disability categories described above. Higher percentages of all students than of LEP students were reported in each of the disability categories except the "severe retardation" category. The largest absolute difference in percentages was for the specific learning disability" category (6.1 percent for all students versus 4.7 percent for LEP students), but the largest proportional difference was for the "emotional disturbance" category (0.9 percent versus 0.2 percent). These findings are very similar to those found in the Descriptive Study.

TABLE 3.2
Disability Categories of All Students and LEP Students
(E&S Survey: Individual School Report)

Disability Category	Percentage of All Students	Percentage of All LEP Students
Mild retardation	0.9%	0.3%
Moderate retardation	0.3	0.2
Severe retardation	0.1	0.2
Emotional disturbance	0.9	0.2
Specific learning	6.1	4.7
Developmental delay	0.2	0.1

The number of respondents who provided data on this item was from 58,809 to 71,827. The item response represented 66.1% to 81.0% of the total number of respondents.

4. SERVICES FOR LEP STUDENTS

A. Enrollment in LEP Programs

The E&S Survey requested information from school respondents on the numbers of students "Enrolled in LEP Programs." In the instructions, they were told to record "… the number of students reported … as needing LEP programs who are enrolled in a program of language assistance (e.g., English-as-a-Second-Language or bilingual education)." They were also told to not count students enrolled in a class to learn a language other than English. It should be noted that LEP students may not be enrolled in LEP programs for a variety of reasons, including parent choice and State-defined limits on the length of services.

School respondents reported that 90.3 percent of LEP students (i.e., those needing LEP programs) were enrolled in LEP programs. They also reported that among SpEd-LEP students (i.e., those needing LEP programs and served under IDEA), 86.2 percent were enrolled in LEP programs. These results are similar to those from the Descriptive Study that indicated that 88.3 percent of LEP students and 84.2 percent of SpEd-LEP were receiving either "some" or "extensive" LEP services.

There were differences in the percentages of LEP students who were enrolled in LEP programs by grade level of school. As shown in Table 4.1, LEP and SpEd-LEP students in elementary schools were most likely, and LEP and SpEd-LEP students in high schools were least likely, to be enrolled in LEP programs.

TABLE 4.1
Enrollment in LEP Programs of LEP Students and Special Education LEP Students

(E&S Survey: Individual School Report)

School Type	Percentage of LEP Students	Percentage of SpEd-LEP Students
Elementary	92.3%	90.7%
Middle School	87.6	84.0
High School	85.5	76.9
Multi-level	91.2	89.0
Total	90.3%	86.2%

The number of respondents who provided data on this item was from 80,045 to 82,255. The item response represented 90.3% to 92.8% of the total number of respondents.

Table 4.2 shows the percentages of LEP students enrolled in LEP programs by State. The percentages ranged from 54.5 percent to 100.0 percent, but the percentage was above 85 percent in 37 States and the District of Columbia.

TABLE 4.2
LEP Student Enrollment in LEP Programs by State
(E&S Survey: Individual School Report)

State	Percentage Enrolled	State	Percentage Enrolled
Alaska	96.9%	Montana	78.1%
Alabama	91.4	North Carolina	92.2
Arkansas	86.7	North Dakota	90.7
Arizona	90.7	Nebraska	94.1
California	89.5	New Hampshire	97.2
Colorado	84.1	New Jersey	93.9
Connecticut	97.2	New Mexico	91.2
District of Columbia	100.0	Nevada	75.8
Delaware	60.5	New York	90.9
Florida	99.3	Ohio	92.7
Georgia	73.6	Oklahoma	80.5
Hawaii	99.9	Oregon	91.7
Iowa	96.0	Pennsylvania	70.0
Idaho	91.2	Rhode Island	85.4
Illinois	97.1	South Carolina	88.8
Indiana	88.7	South Dakota	92.2
Kansas	97.4	Tennessee	88.3
Kentucky	74.8	Texas	89.5
Louisiana	96.4	Utah	96.6
Massachusetts	85.6	Virginia	94.4
Maryland	99.7	Vermont	81.5
Maine	80.0	Washington	92.2
Michigan	91.1	Wisconsin	88.0
Minnesota	98.5	West Virginia	54.5
Missouri	88.0	Wyoming	80.3
Mississippi	67.2	Total	90.3%

The number of respondents who provided data on this item was 83,548. The item response represented 94.2% of the total number of respondents.

B. Enrollment in Gifted and Talented Programs

The E&S Survey also requested information on the numbers of students "In Gifted/Talented Programs." These were defined as "programs during regular school hours for students who possess unusually high academic ability or specialized talent or aptitude such as in literature or the arts." Students were to be counted only once regardless of the number of such classes in which they were enrolled.

School respondents reported that 1.4 percent of LEP students nationwide were in gifted and talented programs. This is in contrast to 6.4 percent of all students who were in such programs.

As shown in Table 4.3, students in middle schools and high schools were those most likely to reported to be in gifted and talented programs. For LEP students, however, there were low levels of enrollment in gifted and talented programs in all grade levels of schools.

TABLE 4.3
Enrollment in Gifted and Talented Programs of All Students and LEP Students
(E&S Survey: Individual School Report)

School Type	Percentage of All Students	Percentage of LEP Students
Elementary	4.8%	1.3%
Middle School	9.2	1.6
High School	7.8	1.7
Multi-level	4.7	1.5
Total	6.4%	1.4%

The number of respondents who provided data on this item was from 77,316 to 85,308. The item response represented 87.2% to 96.2% of the total number of respondents.

C. Enrollment in Advanced Placement Courses

The E&S Survey requested information on the numbers of senior high school students in advanced placement courses in mathematics and science. Approximately 50 percent of high schools provided responses to this item (many of the remaining schools can be assumed not to have advanced placement classes in these subjects). Among responding schools, 1.0 percent of LEP students were enrolled in advanced placement mathematics courses, and 0.8 percent were enrolled in advanced placement science courses. These percentages are considerably below those for all students, of whom 3.2 percent were enrolled in advanced placement mathematics and advanced placement science courses.

5. DISCIPLINE OF LEP STUDENTS

A. Corporal Punishment

The E&S Survey included a series of questions about disciplinary actions taken with students. One item asked how many students had received corporal punishment in the previous school year (1999-2000). Corporal punishment was defined as "paddling, spanking, or other forms of physical punishment imposed on a student." Each student was to be counted only once, and schools in which there was a State or school district policy banning corporal punishment were told to skip the item (approximately 47 percent of schools completed the item for all students and 42 percent for LEP students).

For schools providing responses, Table 5.1 shows the percentages of all students and of LEP students receiving corporal punishment by grade level of school. Overall, 0.4 percent of LEP students and 1.5 percent of all students had received corporal punishment in the previous school year. Students in multi-level schools (including LEP students) were much more likely to receive corporal punishment than students in elementary, middle, and high schools. This may be because multi-level schools (K-8, K-12, etc.) may be more common in rural areas, and corporal punishment may be more common in such areas.

TABLE 5.1
Corporal Punishment of All Students and LEP Students
(E&S Survey: Individual School Report)

School Type	Percentage of All Students	Percentage of LEP Students
Elementary	1.3%	0.2%
Middle School	1.8	0.7
High School	0.9	0.2
Multi-level	4.0	2.3
Total	1.5%	0.4%

The number of respondents who provided data on this item was from 37,066 to 41,622. The item response represented 41.8% to 47.0% of the total number of respondents.

B. Suspensions and Expulsions

The E&S Survey also included items on out-of-school suspensions and expulsions. Out-of-school suspensions were defined as "excluding a student from school for disciplinary reasons for one school day or longer," and did not include students suspended from a classroom who served the suspension in school. Each student was to be counted only once, and the data reported was the number of students suspended in the previous school year.

Table 5.2 shows the percentages of all students and of LEP students receiving suspensions by grade level of school. Overall, 3.9 percent of LEP students and 6.7 percent of all students had received

suspensions in the previous school year. Suspensions were more common both for all students and for LEP students in middle schools and in high schools than in elementary or multi-level schools, and rates were higher for all students than for LEP students at all levels of schools.

TABLE 5.2
Out-of-School Suspensions of All Students and LEP Students
(E&S Survey: Individual School Report)

School Type	Percentage of All Students	Percentage of LEP Students
Elementary	2.3%	1.3%
Middle School	11.1	9.7
High School	11.0	7.9
Multi-level	7.1	3.0
Total	6.7%	3.9%

The number of respondents who provided data on this item was from 80,221 to 86,561. The item response represented 90.5% to 97.6% of the total number of respondents.

In the E&S Survey, expulsions were defined as "the exclusion from school for disciplinary reasons that results in the student's removal from school attendance rolls or that meets the criteria for expulsion as defined by the appropriate state or local school authority. This includes expulsions where the student, although expelled from a particular school, continues to receive educational services from the district."

Table 5.3 shows the percentages of all students and of LEP students who were expelled by grade level of school. Overall, 0.1 percent of LEP students and 0.2 percent of all students were expelled in the previous school year. Expulsions were very rare in elementary schools, but represented either 0.3 or 0.4 percent of all students and of LEP students at others levels of schools.

TABLE 5.3
Expulsions from School of All Students and LEP Students
(E&S Survey: Individual School Report)

School Type	Percentage of All Students	Percentage of LEP Students
Elementary	0.0%	0.0%
Middle School	0.3	0.3
High School	0.4	0.3
Multi-level	0.3	0.3
Total	0.2%	0.1%

The number of respondents who provided data on this item was from 74,763 to 86,521. The item response represented 84.3% to 97.6% of the total number of respondents.

6. GRADUATION TESTS AND DIPLOMAS FOR LEP STUDENTS

A. Tests for Graduation

High school respondents who completed the E&S Survey were asked to indicate the performance of students on "a district- or state-required test that students are either required to pass or that is used as a significant factor in making graduation decisions for all students taking the test." Respondents were asked to indicate for the previous school year (1999-2000) the numbers of students who: (1) "tested and passed;" (2) "tested and failed;" (3) (were) "not tested;" and (4) (received) "alternate assessments." As defined, these were mutually exclusive categories. Students who received accommodations (different setting, extended time, Braille, use of dictionaries) were included in categories (1) or (2). The "tested and failed" group (category (2)) included students who failed one or more of the required tests.

Table 6.1 shows the results nationwide for all students and for LEP students. LEP students were much more likely to fail on such tests, and slightly more likely not to be tested. The fact that only a third of LEP students pass such tests has important implications for educational policy-makers.

TABLE 6.1
Performance on Tests for Graduation
By All Students and LEP Students
(E&S Survey: Individual School Report)

Performance	Percentage of All Students	Percentage of LEP Students
Tested and passed	62.4%	33.1%
Tested and failed	23.9	49.7
Not tested	12.7	15.8
Alternative assessments	1.0	1.3
Total	100.0%	100.0%

The number of respondents who provided data on this item was from 13,949 to 16,220. The item response represented 70.0% to 81.3% of the total number of respondents.

B. Types of Diplomas Received

E&S Survey respondents at the high school level were also asked to indicate the numbers of students who in the previous school year (1999-2000) received either a "diploma" or a "certificate of attendance or completion." A certificate of completion or attendance was defined as "an award of less than a regular diploma, or a modified diploma, or fulfillment of an Individual Education Plan for students with disabilities." The results indicated that 97.0 percent of LEP students and 97.5 percent of all students were reported to receive a "diploma" rather than a "certificate of attendance or completion."