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ABSTRACT

Since the 1980s, Hispanics have been the fastest growing minority in the United States and have been moving into rural, Southern areas where there have previously not been populations of Hispanics. Studies of these demographic changes have concentrated on how communities impacted by the influx of Hispanics have created or adjusted socioeconomic and political infrastructures to accommodate the linguistic and cultural needs of the Hispanic population. The public-school system is a sociopolitical structure that has affected and has been affected by the increase in Hispanics. Whereas the modern Civil Rights movement had created legal precedence for students’ language rights and led to the creation of the federal Bilingual Education Act of 1968, nationalist backlash to this rise in Hispanic immigrants led to the eventual defunding of federal bilingual education programs by the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001. This thesis is a policy history of Hispanic growth in the public-school systems in Orange, Lake and Osceola counties in Florida from 1980 to 2010. During that time, the three counties grew and diversified at different rates and made decisions for their English for Speakers of Other Languages programs that correlated with the size of their Hispanic population. This time frame encompasses Osceola’s fastest period of growth which led to the creation of the Florida Consent Decree, Florida public schools’ framework for remaining compliant with federal and state language policies. Even though federal funds for English acquisition programs replaced funds for bilingual or native language instruction during this time, Hispanic and non-Hispanic teachers, administrators, community or activist groups and parents continued to exert agency in gaining culturally inclusive and linguistically affirming language instruction programs for their children.
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INTRODUCTION

Since World War II, Florida’s population has been both increasing and diversifying exponentially at rates much faster than most other states. Between 1940 and 1950, Florida’s population surpassed that of most other Southern states and by 1990 it had become the fourth most populous state in the nation behind California, Texas and New York.\(^1\) In the 1950s and 1960s, non-Hispanic white retirees migrated and refugees from the Cuban revolution flooded into the southeastern part of the state.\(^2\) Since the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act removed immigration quotas, increasing numbers of immigrants from Latin America, Africa, and Asia have been reshaping the economic, cultural, political and educational structures of the United States and Florida. Hispanics are the largest and fastest growing demographic of these immigrants. In the 1970s, Florida’s Hispanic population more than doubled while non-Hispanic white retirees migrated in peak numbers from the northeastern states.\(^3\) In the 1980s, 80% of Florida’s immigration influx were from Latin America and Hispanic settlement patterns changed.


\(^{2}\) Employing the terms “Hispanic” and/or “Latino” can be problematic as they are subjective. I have chosen to use the term “Hispanic” throughout my thesis for three reasons. First, I use U.S. Census and Florida Department of Education Data to denote population changes and both of those sources use the term “Hispanic.” Second, the Hispanics in the counties I reviewed were predominantly Puerto Rican, Mexican, or Cuban. The Office of Management and Budget include these three nationalities in their definition of “Hispanic” for the time period under review. Third, it is more fitting to use consistently use the term “Hispanic” as my study aims to evaluate school board actions as opposed to individual experiences within the system. For information regarding the various implications and uses of the terms see the following sources: Jorge J. E. Gracia, “The Nature of Ethnicity with Special Reference to Hispanic/Latino Identity,” *Public Affairs Quarterly* 13, no. 1 (January 1999): 25–43; Marrow, Helen, “To Be or Not to Be (Hispanic or Latino): Brazilian Racial and Ethnic Identity in the United States,” *Ethnicities* 3, no. 4 (December 2003): 427–64; Steve Tammelleo, “Continuity and Change in Hispanic Identity,” *Ethnicities* 11, no. 4 (December 2001): 536–54.

Instead of moving to urban areas, Hispanics have moved to rural, Southern locations like Lake and Osceola County, Florida, areas where there had not previously been Hispanic populations.

There have been many sociocultural, economic, and political changes at the national, state, and local level as a result of the growing and diversifying influx of Hispanics in the United States. For example, both Puerto Ricans and naturalized citizens, have represented their interests in political institutions in Central Florida on local school boards, city councils, and in the state legislature. They study how Hispanics have changed or created new sociocultural and economic institutions, like churches, radio stations, newspapers, restaurants, grocery stores, etc. They also examine how Hispanics have affected Central Florida communities and those communities, in turn, have impacted the lives of Hispanics through each of these new or changed institutions.

Public schools are an important example of sociopolitical institutions that are both changing in response to Latinization as well as affecting the Hispanic community. Historically, schools have been mechanisms of the state used to assimilate or “Americanize” the children of immigrant populations thus preparing the children for inclusion in the general education classroom. Yet, these students have often found themselves physically or linguistically segregated from general education students and immigrant or minority communities have had to take legal and political action to contest this segregation, the predominant reality for Hispanics in the United States. Hispanics have fought in litigation and for legislation to define and protect Hispanic student language rights and language education policies.

United States language education policies regarding teaching students in their native or home language is highly politicized and has gone through cyclical changes. During the first

---

4 Puerto Ricans are not considered immigrants because they are United States citizens.
century of existence as a sovereign nation, the United States displayed tolerance for teaching students in their native languages. However, during periods of rapid population growth through immigration, around the 1880s and the 1980s, the U.S. fostered English-Only language education policies while nursing strong anti-immigrant sentiments. From 1950 to 1980, U.S. politics and education leaned toward language tolerance and languages rights after realizing the need for multilingual intelligence during World War II. The *Brown vs. Board of Education* (1954) decision, passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1974 (EEOA) set a legal framework for students’ language rights and the *Lau vs. Nichols* (1974) decision in which the Supreme Court ruled that if a school did not provide non-English speaking students with supplemental English instruction, then it deprived those students of their right to an equal education. Congress passed the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) in 1968 which initially funded bilingual programs that taught Hispanic and minority students in their native language and English. However, BEA predominantly pushed for programs that transitioned students to English as quickly as possible. By the 1980s and 1990s, English-Only movements led by Richard Unz swept the nation and two states, California and Arizona, passed propositions mandating English-Only instruction for language minority students. By 2002 and George W. Bush’s No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), federal bilingual instruction was defunded.5

One pervasive issue regarding Hispanic and minority students’ language rights is how schools are supposed to address their language needs. *Lau vs. Nichols* mandated that schools had to provide non-English speaking students with supplemental English instruction but did not

---

define how a school system was to accomplish this task. Thus, there are various answers to that question including, but not limited to, bilingual, transitional bilingual, English as a Second Language (ESL), and dual language. In bilingual programs, minority language students spend an equal amount of time learning in their native language as well as English. Transitional bilingual programs teach students in their native language while introducing and transitioning them to English. In ESL programs students are taught completely in English through gestures, pictures, and repetition. Dual Language programs are for both Spanish-speaking and English-speaking students to remain in mixed language groups in which they work half their day in English and half their day in Spanish.

Researching the historical context of Central Florida School Districts’ responses to Hispanic population growth in the public-school system in the late twentieth century requires a historiographical review of literature from several fields of scholarship: New Immigration, Nuevo South, Puerto Rican studies, the history of Hispanic Education, and arguments in Language Education policy. The development of and changes in these fields align with broad changes in historical writing as well as reflect the national cultural, political, and economic shifts in the late twentieth century.

Reflecting U.S. cultural patterns and the field of academia at that time, seminal works in the field of immigration create a foundation for the discourse on assimilation and acculturation in New Immigration literature. In 1951, Harvard trained historian Oscar Handlin published *The Uprooted*, the seminal work in immigration history. *The Uprooted* was a consensus history in which Handlin argued that because immigrants are alienated from their native social networks, they assimilate to American capitalistic practices to be successful in their new nation. He claims
the change traumatically uproots immigrants from their homeland and culture.\textsuperscript{6} His argument is rooted in his own experience of living during the Cold War when the nation, and subsequently he, celebrate that the point of immigration is to become part of the capitalist, monocultural, unified American public.

Although this study is a policy history, the social history of migrants and immigrants moving into Central Florida’s public-school system is also present in the sources. Thus, the methodology of seminal works in social history, E.P. Thompson’s 1963 \textit{The Making of the English Working Class} and John Blassingame’s \textit{The Slave Community: Plantation Life in the Antebellum South}, provide a framework for this study as well. Thompson’s work reflected the New Left political movement in Britain and the modern Civil Rights Movement in the United States which were campaigning for a swath of social issues. His social history was a new version of England’s working-class history from the bottom up in which he gave agency to the English working-class by using their own words and stories from court records, folk songs and art, games and sports.\textsuperscript{7} Similarly, Blassingame introduced the world to a bottom up social history of slavery in the United States by using slave narratives to tell their own history. He was the first historian to give agency to the enslaved through this methodology.

Whereas Handlin posed a top-down, uniform, linear model of immigrant assimilation, later Immigration historians also employed methods from social history and wrote from the bottom up. For example, John Bodnar was both Revisionist and a social historian. He refuted Handlin’s \textit{Uprooted} and gave agency to immigrants arguing that their class, ideology, and

\textsuperscript{6} Oscar Handlin, \textit{The Uprooted} (Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company, 1951).
culture from their homeland shape their responses to capitalist America. He claimed that the process of assimilation was much more personal, dynamic, and unique as told from each immigrants’ perspective. Benedict Anderson later proposed the idea that nationalism is an imaginary construct created by people to distinguish themselves from others. Echoing the pluralistic questioning patterns of his post-modern contemporaries, he argued that an immigrant’s imagined nationalism moves with them and that they change their imagined nationalism, even create cultural events that do not exist in their home place, in response to the imagined nationalism they encounter in their receiving country.

“New Immigration” literature progresses the discourse on the experience of immigrants from assimilation to newer forms of acculturation – transnationalism and panethnicity– that reflect the increased complexity of diversity and citizenship in America. Whereas Anderson imagined that an immigrant’s nationalism moves with them, transnationalists analyze how “plural civic and political memberships, economic involvements, social networks, and cultural identities that reach across and link people and institutions in two or more nation-states in diverse, multilayered patterns.” An increasing number of American citizens and residents experience transnationalist connections due to increasing globalization, dual citizenship opportunities and reductions in the cost of international transportation. The transnational experiences of different groups, like Puerto Ricans, Mexicans and Cubans in Florida, are unique.

---

For example, Puerto Rican historians even have a term to identify these transients who move between the island and mainland in this linked and multilayered manner. Historians call them the *vaivén* – which translates as those who sway or those who change.\(^\text{12}\) In addition to transnationalism, Researchers Nancy Foner and George Fredrickson’s argue that the increasing diversity of immigrants and changing immigration patterns result in the formation of panethnic relationships as immigrants settle in their new nation. Essentially, immigrant groups from different linguistic, ethnic or cultural backgrounds work together in efforts to minimize discrimination by the dominant culture.\(^\text{13}\) Some New Immigration literature specifically focuses on understanding panethnic relationships of Hispanics.

These new immigrants impact their receiving communities and the Nuevo South literature establishes a methodological approach for analyzing the effects of Latinization in Central Florida. In “The Latinization of Florida,” Raymond Mohl first details the growth of the Hispanic populations in Florida using census data. He also presents the argument that Florida maintains a much longer tradition of Latinization and relationship with Latin America than the rest of the traditional South.\(^\text{14}\) In James Cobb and William Stueck’s 2006 *Globalization and the American South* Mohl initiates the use of the term “Nuevo New South” in his chapter which subsequent researchers change to just “Nuevo South.” This term denotes the changes to the Southern socioeconomic and political infrastructures brought on by the influx of Hispanic immigrants to the region since the 1980s. In 2010, Gregory Weeks and John Weeks argue that


the social structures created by the Civil Rights Movement paved the way for smoother racial integration and that the lower cost of living provided for a smoother economic transition for Hispanics. They also argue that while the post-Civil rights infrastructure in the South draws in Hispanics, the political infrastructure simultaneously restricts Hispanics’ opportunities for civic participation.\textsuperscript{15} Researcher Helen Marrow adds that the lower socioeconomic structures of the rural South enable generations of Hispanic immigrants to raise their status faster because the gap between classes is smaller.\textsuperscript{16}

In addition to the Nuevo South literature, Puerto Rican historiography adds vital context to my study of Hispanics in Central Florida. As citizens of the United States, Puerto Ricans have a unique experience of being Hispanic migrants with a long history of moving to the mainland. Examining Puerto Ricans’ transnational experience, researcher Jorge Duany explores their strong cultural ties to the island and examine how Puerto Ricans’ representations of those ties compare with others’ representations of how Puerto Ricans engage with the island and its culture.\textsuperscript{17} In 2006, Jorge Duany and Félix Matos-Rodríguez published the policy report \textit{Puerto Ricans in Orlando and Central Florida} in which they detail the tremendous growth rate of Puerto Ricans in the area and argue that the growth is due to the planned recruitment procedures by real estate agents and kinship networks.\textsuperscript{18} They also tie the influx of migrants in the 1980s to economic

\textsuperscript{15} Gregory B. Weeks and John R. Weeks, \textit{Irresistible Forces: Latin American Migration to the United States and Its Effects on the South} (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 2010).


\textsuperscript{17} Duany, Jorge, \textit{The Puerto Rican Nation on the Move: Identities on the Island and in the United States}, First (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002).

\textsuperscript{18} Duany and Matos-Rodríguez, “Puerto Ricans in Orlando and Central Florida.” In 2012, Julio Firpo completed his Master’s Thesis at the University of Central Florida in which he adds to this discourse by analyzing the push and pull factors that brought Puerto Ricans to the area and the creation of a Puerto Rican identity in Central Florida. See Julio Firpo, “Forming a Puerto Rican Identity in Orlando: The Puerto Rican Migration to Central Florida, 1960-2000” (Master’s Thesis, University of Central Florida, 2012).
opportunities provided by the expansion of the tourist industry.\textsuperscript{19} In 2012, Duany presented “Mickey Ricans? The Recent Puerto Rican Diaspora to Florida” at the Conference of Florida’s Hispanic Heritage in which he argues that the class background of the Puerto Ricans moving to Florida since the 1980s is higher than previous waves of migrants from the island. He argues that Puerto Ricans have made great contributions to the service sector and have a lot of potential for continued entrepreneurial and political influence.\textsuperscript{20}

The next body of literature on the history of Hispanic education focuses on the political nature of public education and how Hispanic communities have fought against discriminatory policies and practices institutionalized in the public education system. Since education is essentially a political process, researchers document how Hispanics have faced all the same race, class, and language discrimination in public schools that they’ve faced in the workplace and in politics. A common theme in this literature is that due to language education policies, equal access to education is denied to Hispanics even when schools are not physically segregated into different school buildings.\textsuperscript{21} Thus, researchers and policy makers have debated pedagogical approaches to addressing language minority students’ needs, how students should be identified, labeled and tracked through programs, and how to evaluate the effectiveness of language programs for the nation and for the student.\textsuperscript{22} Extending the panethnicity discourse, researchers

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{19} Duany and Matos-Rodriguez, “Puerto Ricans in Orlando and Central Florida.”
\end{itemize}
also write on how different subgroups of Hispanics also experience different educational policy
processes.\textsuperscript{23}

Two other ubiquitous themes in literature on Hispanic education in the United States is
the cyclical nature of language education policies and the importance of the modern Civil Rights
movement to equity in Hispanic education. Researchers like Guadalupe San Miguel and Nancy
Hornberger argue that U.S. bilingual language education policies mirror broader cultural shifts
within the nation. Both give credit to the modern Civil Rights movement for creating legal
precedence for Hispanic’s fight for equitable language education policies and both argue that
language policies cycled back to English-Only policies at the end of the twentieth century in
response to a rise in immigration and a rise in conservativism.\textsuperscript{24} In her 2004 work, Victoria-
María MacDonald utilizes primary sources to document the longue durée of Hispanic education
which she argues peaked in progress during the post-Civil Rights Era.\textsuperscript{25} Agreeing that Hispanic
educational progress peaked in the 1960s and 1970s, researcher Enrique G. Murillo argues that,
regardless of the U.S. language tolerance cycle, Hispanics have fought creatively to promote
their rights to and the public education system is structured to kept Anglos as the dominant
group.\textsuperscript{26}

Researchers also study the international implications for language education policy
resulting from the modern Civil Rights Movement in the United States and from globalization.

\textsuperscript{23} Meier, Stewart, and Jr, \textit{The Politics of Hispanic Education}.
\textsuperscript{24} Guadalupe San Miguel Jr, \textit{Contested Policy: The Rise and Fall of Federal Bilingual Education in the United States,
1960-2001} (Denton, TX: University of North Texas Press, 2004); Hornberger, “Nichols to NCLB: Local and Global
Perspectives on US Language Education Policy.”\textsuperscript{25} Victoria-Maria MacDonald, \textit{Latino Education in the United States: A Narrated History from 1513-2000}, First
\textsuperscript{26} Enrique G. Murillo, \textit{Handbook of Latinos and Education: Theory, Research and Practice} (Routledge, 2010).
Whereas the language education policies in the United States cycled back to English-Only policies in the 1990s and after 9/11, other nations and international organizations moved in the opposite direction. The United Nations and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization started to experiment more with bilingual and multilingual education to address demographic changes and student needs. Globalization continues to increase and in 2000 the United Nations declared the second of its millennium development goals is “to achieve universal primary education” which leads researchers to answer the question, “Education in what language?” Thus, researchers examine the impact of the medium of instruction as dominant languages like English or Mandarin in U.S. and international education. Another common theme in the literature is that language minority groups follow legal precedence in the modern Civil Rights movement to maintain minority language. More recent researchers argue that the United States has a lot to learn about language policies from our international neighbors.

My work reflects the intersection of these bodies of research. Orange, Lake, and Osceola Counties in Central Florida experienced an influx of Hispanic immigrants from 1980-2010 and are still growing. The three counties exemplify the demographic, sociocultural, and economic changes brought on by Hispanic in-migrants as denoted in Nuevo South research. Especially in Osceola County, Puerto Ricans were the largest group of migrants moving into these Central Florida counties. As the three counties grew and diversified, public-school systems underwent

---

30 Wright, Boun, and Garcia, Ofelia, The Handbook of Bilingual and Multilingual Education.
the same demographic and sociocultural changes. The public-school systems became responsible for ensuring equitable access to education for their new and rapidly growing population of Hispanic students. This meant the school systems had to develop and implement their own language education programs to address the linguistic needs of their Hispanic students.

My argument is that Orange, Lake and Osceola County School Districts’ responses to their Hispanic student population growth followed a pattern of change that corresponded with the size of their Hispanic student population. Although the three counties did not grow or diversify at the same rate during the same decades, all three grew and diversified significantly, including receiving a substantial quantity of Hispanic migrants and immigrants, from 1980-2010. During that time, the districts needed to work rapidly to build facilities, hire teachers and administrators, and find sources of revenue as they grew. They also had to enact changing federal and state education policies and language education policies while facing rapid growth overall and addressing the linguistic and cultural needs of their diversifying population. My study shows that while addressing facility, faculty, financial, and policy needs, the districts responded to their Hispanic population growth in a similar pattern in two areas—programming and administrative structures. In analyzing the school districts’ programs and administrative changes, my study furthers historians’ understanding about how school systems and Hispanic populations are conversely affecting each other. My study also shows some of the social history of the groups and individuals who worked to support Hispanic and non-English speaking students in public schools.

While I structured each of my three chapters in the same fashion, I present the different story of each decade in the three chapters. All three chapters first address the major federal and
state actions regarding education policy. Then I denote the demographic changes in Orange, Lake and Osceola counties overall and within their school systems. Lastly, I analyze the various structural, linguistic and cultural programs the districts implemented for their general and Hispanic student population and other issues the districts faced during each decade. Chapter One outlines how the nation was swept into an era of education reform in response to National Commission on Excellence in Education’s report “A Nation at Risk” and how the Florida Department of Education raised and redefined education expectations during the 1980s. I also argue that, while Orange County Public Schools (OCPS) proactively addressed Hispanic student social and linguistic needs through federally funded or volunteer driven programs, Lake County and Osceola County schools were only willing to teach language minority in English which led to a federal court case crucial to U.S. language education policy. Chapter Two explains the result of that federal court case, which is now known as the Florida Consent Decree, changes to BEA, and analyze the language and support programs the three counties continued to make to work with their Hispanic and minority language families during the 1990s. I argue that while Orange and Osceola took actions to abide by the consent decree, Lake County School Board demonstrated their resistance to their diversifying population through initiating an “America First” Social Studies curriculum, which also landed them a spot in national news. Lastly, Chapter Three addresses the consequences of the Bush brother’s education reforms, Florida’s A+ plan and NCLB, which increased accountability for student performance in schools in general and for limited English-speaking students. With the consent decree as a legal success for the Hispanic community, Hispanic parents in Orange and Osceola counties continued to demand for increased accountability in the school districts’ language programs. Hispanic and non-Hispanic school
officials spearheaded these programs. Mixed groups of English and Spanish speaking parents even pushed for dual language programs.

Figure 1: Florida Counties Map

Source: www.fdot.gov
CHAPTER ONE

With a total county population just shy of 50,000 people at the beginning of 1980, Osceola County Schools’ big news at the time was a utilities fiasco at Osceola High School’s new agricultural building and a struggle with the Florida Department of Education over a bond to fund the construction of a third high school.1 Within three years, however, their news revolved around responding to a sharp influx of Hispanic students because the 1980s were the beginning of a period of immense migration in the United States and in Florida’s Orange, Lake and Osceola counties.2 The influx of Hispanics, predominantly Puerto Ricans, to this area was due to declining economies in New York City and Puerto Rico, a growing labor market through Walt Disney World Resorts, cheap land and, in the wake of the Civil Rights Era, a decline in discriminatory government practices. Cheap land also ensured reasonable housing prices.3

As Hispanics moved into Orange, Lake and Osceola counties in great numbers, they and other immigrant groups impacted the public-school system. At the onset of the 1980s Orange County had a larger overall population and a larger Hispanic population. Thus, OCPS had already implemented language and cultural programs to support Hispanic and non-English speaking students. Lake and Osceola counties, however, only had experience with migrant students prior to the 1980s and therefore had to create programming and structures for their new permanent Hispanic and non-English speaking students. During the 1980s, still due to their size and the diversity of their overall and student populations, OCPS’s language programs supported

2 See Appendix A for U.S. Census Data charts denoting the overall population growth from 1970-2010, Hispanic growth from 1980-2010, and changing occupation patterns from 1970-2010 in Orange, Lake and Osceola counties.
their Hispanic and non-English speaking student populations in their native languages. OCPS also implemented diversity and cultural awareness programs to support staff and student cultural understanding development. Meanwhile, Lake and Osceola Public Schools’ programs focused primarily on English language acquisition.

National Education Reforms: 1980s

The Reagan administration began an era of conservatism that impacted public education funding and an era of criticism that challenged both the effectiveness of the American public-school system and bilingual education programs. All the while, the federal courts worked to protect educational access for language minorities and children of undocumented immigrants.

Congress passed the Reagan Administration’s Elementary and Secondary Education Consolidation Act (ESECA) in 1981 which reduced federal education regulation and impacted educational programs that protected at-risk and minority populations, including migrant and bilingual populations. ESECA consolidated forty-four federal education programs into two block grants and also increased state and local school districts’ autonomy in using those grants. The first block grant, totaling $3.8 billion, combined the Title 1 program for economically disadvantaged students, programs for disabled students, and migrant and desegregation programs. The second block grant, totaling $565 million, combined programs that funded school libraries, gifted and talented programs, metric education and ethnic heritage studies. It

also provided funds for improving curriculum, decreasing school violence, increasing community involvement, increasing professional development opportunities, and funding new educational technology. ESECA was controversial because it inequitably distributed funds to states by allocating federal funding based only on the student populations serviced by the federal aid and on student population growth. Florida was one of the top six fastest growing states and therefore received an increase in federal education aid. However, the increased funding did not equitably match the rate of student growth and even with federal financial support Florida’s average per-child expenditure decreased.

In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education published the results of their eighteen-month review of the quality of America’s education system in the now infamous report “A Nation at Risk” ANAR, which was an important influence on federal education policy in the 1980s. After eighteen months of nationwide research, the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) found “high rates of illiteracy and low average test scores for American students relative to those in other industrialized nations” and suggested five areas for reform: content, standards and expectations, time students spend on task, teacher quality, and school leadership and fiscal support. Initially ANAR created positive, immediate contributions to the American education system including raised graduation requirements, increased teacher salaries, and increased state legislated hours of educational time. In response to ANAR, forty-
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four states, including Florida, raised their high school graduation requirements, sixteen states increased teacher salaries by at least 8% annually, and some states, again including Florida, began merit pay programs to further reward excelling teachers.\(^\text{12}\) Florida was also one of the states to lengthen the required hours for the school day and increase the required number of days of instruction.\(^\text{13}\) Although, ANAR’s content recommendations explicitly supported bilingual and bicultural education programming suggesting that students begin foreign languages in elementary school to achieve proficiency, that recommendation did not become a focus within state education reforms.\(^\text{14}\) Instead, states tried a top-down approach and passed lots of education legislation to quickly fix the issues noted in ANAR. Long term results of ANAR have been controversial. Teachers received unjustified blame for the education system’s at-risk status. There has been more presidential, gubernatorial, and business involvement in education, and an increase in state and national reliance on student testing data.\(^\text{15}\)

During the 1980s, the Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation (OPBE) also led a two-pronged attack that first undermined bilingual education and then the Bilingual Education Act (BEA), or Title VII. The first criticism against BEA was ideological and pedagogical. The OPBE released a series of reports in 1981 to challenge the federal bilingual policy that was based on the ideas that: 3.6 million children needed bilingual services, Limited English-proficient (LEP) students did not do well because of language limitations, transitional bilingual education was the
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\(^{13}\) McManus.


best methodology, and federal policy could ignore local constraints. The OPBE reports argued the population of LEP students the federal government needed to serve was not 3.6 million but 1-1.5 million students. Other studies argued that LEP students’ poor performance in school was due more to their low socioeconomic status than to their language limitations. Reports by Keith A. Baker and Adriana A. de Kanter argued that transitional bilingual programs were not actually creating students fluent in English and therefore not subsequently raising LEP students’ overall academic achievement. Lastly, some published reports challenged the argument that local school districts could neither afford to start and maintain these programs nor find enough bilingual staff to run the programs.\textsuperscript{16}

Thus, opponents of bilingual education, predominantly conservative politicians, educators, scholars, parent groups at all government levels and conservative activist groups like the U.S. English Only movement organized by Ronald Unz, led the way in changing BEA. Amendments to the BEA followed the recommendations of opponents to bilingual education and followed the trend of federal deregulation in ESEA. These amendments specifically emphasized that the responsibility for funding BEA programs was to transition from the federal government to the states and local schools. The 1978, 1984 and 1988 BEA amendments all expected that state and local school districts would build “enough capacity to support programs for LEP students without having to rely on federal funds.”\textsuperscript{17} The amendments also clarify the state’s role in creating and regulating the programs. The 1988 amendment explicitly requires that the “states themselves must determine and meet the needs of the local LEP student population”


\textsuperscript{17} Gloria Stewner-Manzanares, “The Bilingual Education Act: Twenty Years Later,” \textit{Focus}, Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education, no. 6 (Fall 1988).
while the federal government’s role was to “inspire local flexibility, creativity, and innovation” in creating language acquisition programs.\textsuperscript{18}

The 1984 and 1988 amendments also reflected BEA opponents’ pedagogical criticisms of bilingual education and their concerns about local personnel limitations. The 1984 amendment opened BEA funding to “special alternative instructional programs in which the native language need not be used, but English language instruction and special instructional services are given to facilitate achievement of English competency.”\textsuperscript{19} Whereas the 1984 amendment allowed from 4-10\% of BEA funds to be used for these alternative instructional programs, the 1988 amendment allowed up to 25\% of BEA funds for them. The 1988 legislation also reflects BEA opponents’ critique of the lack of local personnel because it allocated money for teacher training to increase the number of qualified teachers.

While the President and Congress deregulated federal education, the federal courts issued decisions that influenced public education populations – \textit{Plyer v. Doe} (1981) and \textit{Castañeda v. Pickard} (1981). Before \textit{Plyer v. Doe}, state and local debate about tax dollars spent on bilingual education for non-citizen students flared.\textsuperscript{20} However, as decided by the Burger Court in a 5-4 vote on June 15, 1982, the United States Supreme Court ruled that undocumented immigrants and their children qualify for civil rights protections under the fourteenth amendment in \textit{Plyer v. Doe}.\textsuperscript{21} This settled the public education debate as it required federal and state government to protect the educational rights of children of undocumented immigrants. The United States Court

\textsuperscript{18} Stewner-Manzanares.
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of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit also issued the *Castañeda v. Pickard* (1981) which was crucial to bilingual education. The *Castañeda v. Pickard* decision created a three-part list of criteria for LEP programs for states and school districts to follow to prove their programs followed BEA and the EEOA. LEP programs had to be based on “sound educational theory,” prove they had enough resources and personnel, and create student results in language acquisition and in content classes.\(^{22}\)

**Florida Education Reforms: 1980s**

In the 1980s, the Florida legislature created statutes to manage their new fiscal and educational responsibilities while the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) worked with the Florida Council for the Social Studies (FCSS) to create statewide educational standards in social studies despite pushback after ANAR. During the early eighties, the state legislature created statutes that reflected the national requirement to raise education standards and gave more educational responsibility to communities. It also passed statutes that reflected the EEOA and addressed Florida’s need for educational personnel. From the mid to late 1980s, the FCSS worked with the FLDOE to influence the maintenance of and promote the improvement of social studies education. However, although the FLDOE made progress in raising overall education standards, including in social studies, they did not successfully complete the task of clearly defining language acquisition program requirements. As will be discussed later, by 1989, the

League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), a national civil rights activist group, sued Osceola County Schools and the Florida Department of Education for this oversight.

As they returned to work in 1983, the top priority of Florida governor Bob Graham and the Florida legislature was improving Florida school systems. Graham and the legislature’s actions imitated the national government’s evaluation methods and recommendations. Governor Graham created an education commission to survey the quality of education in the state of Florida. Led by Frank B. Brown, a former superintendent of Brevard County schools, the commission’s resulting “Brown report” made the same criticism and recommendations as ANAR. The report stated that graduation requirements across the state were inconsistent and insufficient, especially in math and science.23 Senate President Curtis Peterson built his secondary education proposal on this report.

By July of 1983, the Florida legislature passed the Raise Achievement in Secondary Education Act (RAISE). RAISE added ten days to the following school year making the total 190 days of mandated education and a plan to continue raising the number of days to 210 by 1987. It dictated statewide high school graduation requirements, which included mandating three credits in math and three credits in science. This mandate increased the number of math and science credits required in many Florida school systems at that time. In terms of curriculum, RAISE required groups of Florida’s counties to evaluate the state’s Minimum Student Performance Standards (MSPS) and start creating statewide standardized courses resulting in statewide standardized tests.24 Lastly, RAISE initiated merit pay for teachers and administrators
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and set aside funds to for teacher trainings over the summer. RAISE received pushback from teachers and school boards. Teachers opposed extending the school year while school boards rebuffed the state’s plan to dictate their secondary standards and graduation requirements.

As RAISE required the state to create statewide standards, the Florida Council for the Social Studies (FCSS) worked to ensure that Social Studies and multicultural studies programs were included in the new state standards. Although RAISE required three credits of social studies courses for high school graduation during the initial process of standardizing courses, when it was written there was no state plan for social studies. FCSS requested to be a part of the state’s Social Studies curriculum development and by 1986 had successfully lobbied the legislature to include Social Studies standards in the Minimum Standards effort and to require daily instruction in Social Studies at the elementary level. Under Florida Commissioner of Education Betty Castor, FLDOE supported Social Studies education and continued to work with FCSS. Castor created the Florida Commission on Social Studies Education which reviewed Social Studies programs across the state and compiled recommendations for improvement and set the stage for her Multicultural Education Task Force in the 1990s. The commission’s report, Connections, Challenges and Choices, recommended that the state create a unifying vision for Social Studies and a K-12 Social Studies program emphasizing history and geography. Throughout the report the commission also emphasizes the importance of multicultural studies
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and interdisciplinary studies at all levels. In 1989, FCSS worked with the FLDOE to define the scope and sequence for statewide K-12 Social Studies curriculum.

In addition to passing RAISE and writing statewide Social Studies standards, the Florida legislature passed three other statutes that shaped school district administration and aimed to address the needs of the state’s growing and diversifying population. At the time, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) was in an expensive seven-year litigation battle against the Florida Constitution’s mandate that counties without charters must hold at-large elections. Minorities, specifically in Hillsborough and Escambia counties, held that at-large elections had the effect of discriminating against minorities by keeping them off county commissions boards and school boards. One of the 1984 statutes that shaped school district administration aimed to remedy this issue by creating legislation that allowed school board elections to take place via an “alternate procedure” to at-large elections. The legislature created a legal process for counties to change the kind of election process they wanted to use for school board through a county vote. Thus, counties could choose single-member representation or at-large representation on their school boards. This law enabled counties to shape their own school board administration which later enabled Orange County restructure its administration to meet its growth needs in the 1990s. For minority groups, the long-term goal of this statute was more representation and thus more political power to eventually meet, not just address, the needs of minorities in the school system.

30 “Connections, Challenges, Choices,” 7.
A second statute from 1984 that directly affected minority groups was the Florida Education Equity Act (FEEA). The FEEA “prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, sex, national origin, marital status, or handicap against any student or employee in any program, service, or function of any public education institution in Florida which benefits from federal or state financial assistance.”33 It requires school districts to comply with numerical formulas to keep student participation in academic courses and teacher hiring balanced among racial, ethnic and gender groups. In 1985, the first year of the FEEA, FLDOE required that districts to specifically investigate student enrollment in “advanced mathematics, physical and general science, computer literacy, computer science and industrial arts.”34 Districts had three years to create and implement a plan to comply with FEEA.35 The FEEA also required that districts take steps to ensure equality in hiring educators. In response to this aspect of the statute, minorities criticized counties for not actively working to comply with equitable hiring and the counties claimed there was a lack of qualified minority applicants.36

The third 1984 statute to shape school district administration and to address the needs of the state’s growing and diversifying population was a statute to allow noncitizens to qualify for Florida teacher certifications. The statute made it possible to issue teaching certificates “to any noncitizen who has been legally admitted to the United States by the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, provided such persons meet all other statutory requirements for

33 Joint Legislative Management Committee, 198-199.
licensure.” With the influx of more and more people into the state, this provision allowed Florida school districts to address their equally growing need for educators.

Orange, Lake, and Osceola County Schools at the Onset of the 1980s

At the onset of the 1980s, before these federal and state legislative and litigated changes in education, Orange, Lake and Osceola counties, and consequently schools, were growing. The largest of the three counties, Orange County had grown 36.08% from 1970 to 1980 and had a total population of 471,660 in 1980. Second largest, Lake County had grown 51.32% and had a total population of 104,870 in 1980. Smallest in comparison, Osceola county grew from 25,267 people in 1970 to 49,287 in 1980 experiencing a population growth of 95.06%. Although the three counties did not experience their largest population growth spurts in different decades, they were all nonetheless in a period of steady growth from the 1970s to the onset of the 1980s.

In 1980, the Hispanic population in the three counties was small and consisted of mostly Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and Cubans. Orange County had 19,726 Hispanics, only 4.1% of their total population. Of Orange County’s Hispanic population, 3,959 (20%) were Mexican, 6,662 (34%) were Puerto Rican, and 4,099 (21%) were Cuban. In Lake County, there were only 2,257 Hispanics which was 2.1% of their total population and 1,497 (66%) of them were Mexican. In Osceola County, there were even fewer Hispanics in 1980. There were only 1,089 Hispanics.

38 See Appendix B for population graphs based on the FLDOE’s Profiles of Florida Schools Data denoting student, LEP student, and teacher growth from 1980-2006 and denoting percentage of racial groups in the students, teacher and administrator populations from 1980-2006.
which was only 2.2% of the county’s total population. There were a mere 258 Mexicans, 417 Puerto Ricans and 148 Cubans.\(^{40}\)

Before 1980 Orange, Lake, and Osceola counties were already working to address the needs of their minority and LEP student populations through federal and state programs that continued into the eighties. Three specific groups of such students present in Central Florida counties were migrant students, Vietnamese refugees and Cuban refugees. By 1967, 40 Florida counties were working with state and federal grants to create Migrant Education programs for the 32,000 migrant children in the public-school system.\(^{41}\) The Migrant Education grants paid for teacher training, aids, and supplies.\(^{42}\) In a 1999 interview, Wheatley Elementary School’s former migrant education teacher, Edith Roach, shared that until the end of her teaching she had two aids to help her with her predominantly black migrant student class.\(^{43}\) When Roach was teaching, the majority of Florida’s migrant students were white or black, depending on where the programs were located. By 1989, 71% of Florida’s 67,000 migrant students were Hispanic.\(^{44}\)

In addition to providing such services for migrant students prior to the eighties, Central Florida schools provided bilingual and ESL support for Hispanic migrants, Vietnamese, Cuban refugees, and other nationalities of language minority students. After the fall of South Vietnam in


\(^{41}\) Susan Schauble, “Migrant Student Aid Program Planned Here,” *The Orlando Sentinel*, February 18, 1967, Other edition.


\(^{43}\) Educator’s Oral History Collection, Series 1: Interview with Edith Mae Roach, interview by Lynne Bailey, Mini Audio Cassette, June 14, 1999, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida.

\(^{44}\) Kit Lively, “School a Tough Test for Young Migrants; Dreams of Education Often Collide with the Facts of Life Spend on the Move,” *The Orlando Sentinel*, March 27, 1989, Main edition.
1975, Vietnamese refugees started to arrive in major cities across the United States, including Orlando. They moved into the area around Mills Avenue and Colonial Drive in Downtown Orlando. Although Miami-Dade schools were impacted by a much larger influx of Cuban refugees after the Muriel Boat Crisis in 1980, Central Florida schools were impacted as well. By December of 1980, there were 120 Cuban refugees who needed language support services that were enrolled in Central Florida schools and 87 in just Orange County. Orange and Lake County created these migrant and ESL programs to meet federal BEA and Office of Civil Rights requirements.

While Lake County Schools only used ESL programming to work with their small population of Hispanic students before the 1980s, OCPS created bilingual centers in addition to their ESL programs. These centers were a federal BEA and were mandated by the Office of Civil Rights. However, Orange County used state and local funds to create eleven bilingual centers in the fall of 1976 at elementary and junior high schools to service 737 students, the majority of whom needed support in Spanish, Vietnamese or Korean. To support the centers, Orange hired twelve bilingual teachers, one secretary, three fulltime teacher aides, and six bus drivers to run the centers. To support their ESL programming, Orange also hired eight ESL teachers to work with elementary and secondary schools that year. These centers supported Hispanic and non-Hispanic LEP students’ English language acquisition while supporting their native language acquisition.
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development and providing for their crucial need for transportation. Orange maintained their bilingual centers throughout the rest of the 1970s and 1980s and added more bilingual centers at the onset of the 1990s.\textsuperscript{50}

In addition to government funded support programs, community volunteers ran OCPS’s Un Poquito de Español program which positively impacted their Spanish and English-speaking elementary students. Community member, Margaret Mabry created Un Poquito de Español, which means “A little bit of Spanish,” and OCPS’s volunteer organization, ADDitions, launched the program in 1977 in eight elementary schools.\textsuperscript{51} By 1980, thirty-five volunteers ran the program in twenty-seven schools impacting more than 1,000 students. OCPS’s ADDitions volunteer program offered annual training workshops in the fall for bilingual volunteers who wanted to participate and continually recruited more volunteers through advertisements in \textit{The Orlando Sentinel} newspaper.\textsuperscript{52} Through Poquito, bilingual and Hispanic volunteers directly and positively impacted elementary students’ language development and cultural awareness. Poquito was a conversational Spanish program for elementary schools. Once a week for one to two hours Spanish speaking and non-Spanish speaking children worked with trained bilingual ADDitions volunteers to learn a little bit of Spanish. The program improved relationships between Spanish-speaking and English-speaking students by helping students communicate across the language barrier, by increasing English speakers’ cultural awareness, and by flipping students’ normal

\textsuperscript{50} Mark Pankowski, “Bilingual Centers Speak Every Kid’s Language,” \textit{The Orlando Sentinel}, November 26, 1990, Main edition.


\textsuperscript{52} Journey, “Spainish Classes Unite Students from Different Localities, Cultures”; “Potpourri: ADDitions Workshops,” \textit{The Orlando Sentinel}, October 12, 1980, Sentinel Star edition, sec. This Week.
language roles. For example, during Poquito classes English-speaking students often needed to rely on their Spanish-speaking peers for help with curriculum activities. In Orange County, as will be discussed later, the Poquito program received multiple awards as it grew through the eighties.

Orange, Lake, and Osceola Counties: 1980s Population Growth

At the onset of the 1980s, Orange, Lake and Osceola counties were already growing and their school districts already working to address their growth needs as well as the cultural and linguistic needs of their LEP students. During the 1980s, Central Florida, especially Osceola County, continued to grow and diversify which meant continued consequences for the county school districts. In calculating the state and school districts’ populations, the FLDOE denotes the following racial and ethnic categories: White non-Hispanic, Black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaska Native. For this section, I use the terms White non-Hispanic and “minority.” I use the term “minority” to represent the combination of the Department of Education’s four categories: Black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaska Native.

Orange, Lake and Osceola counties grew and diversified in the 1980s. Orange County went through a 43% increase and reached a population just shy of 700,000 by the end of the decade. All of Orange’s White, non-Hispanic population increased 34% while the minority populations grew 84.9%. The minority population represented 17.1% of total residents in Orange.
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in 1980 and 22.1% by 1989. Lake County grew to over 150,000 people making a 44% increase over the eighties. While their White, non-Hispanic population also increased by 44%, their minority population experienced the slowest growth rate of the three counties at 43% and the minority percentage of the total population stayed the same, almost 14%. Although still the smallest county by population, Osceola County grew the most significantly of the three counties. Osceola’s total population increase was 108% raising their numbers from 49,287 to 53,397 over the course of the decade. Their White, non-Hispanic population increased 108% and their minority population increased 113%. Even though Osceola’s minority population growth was so high, the overall population growth trend across the county was consistent which means the minority population percentage of the whole population stayed at only 8%.  
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Table 1: Population Growth, 1980-1989: Orange, Lake, and Osceola Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980 Population</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>1989 Population</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orange</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>471,660</td>
<td>674,593</td>
<td>43.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>391,025</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>525,440</td>
<td>77.89</td>
<td>34.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>69,557</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>112,320</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>61.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1,686</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>24.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3,714</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>7,286</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>96.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6,013</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>19,729</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>27,928</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>41.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>80,635</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>149,153</td>
<td>22.11</td>
<td>84.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lake</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104,870</td>
<td>151,193</td>
<td>44.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>90,196</td>
<td>86.01</td>
<td>130,404</td>
<td>86.25</td>
<td>44.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>13,240</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>17,115</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>29.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>66.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>28.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>3,024</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>14,674</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>20,789</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Osceola</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49,287</td>
<td>102,684</td>
<td>108.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>45,468</td>
<td>92.25</td>
<td>94,541</td>
<td>92.07</td>
<td>107.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>3,012</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>5237</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>73.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>167.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>88.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>3,819</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>8,143</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>113.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Orange, Lake and Osceola county schools’ student and fulltime staff populations reflected the population growth of each overall county. Orange and Lake county schools both had 19% student population increases over the decade. Osceola, on the other hand, had a 111% student population increase over the 1980s. The FLDOE’s county data reports use the language “fulltime staff” to denote the following four subcategories: classroom teacher, other
instructional, administrative and support staff. So, Orange County’s teachers, administrators, and other instructional and support staff increased 40%, whereas Lake County’s staff only grew 18%. Osceola County’s fulltime staff, however, increased 118%. Thus, their student and workforce population growths mirrored each other, and the overall county population increase.

Table 2: Classroom Teacher and Administration Growth, 1980-1989: Orange, Lake, and Osceola County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980 CT</th>
<th>1989 CT</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>1980 Admin</th>
<th>1989 Admin</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,512</td>
<td>6,104</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, NH</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>4,952</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, NH</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AI/AN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/PI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>310.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, NH</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>87.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, NH</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AI/AN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/PI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, NH</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, NH</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>157.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AI/AN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/PI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>516.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Although each county’s student diversification patterns are different, the three school districts’ student populations diversified during the 1980s. Orange County’s Black, non-Hispanic student population increased 37.8% and represented 25.6% of the total student
population. Orange’s Hispanic student population increased 261.4% and represented 9.6% of the total student population. Orange’s Asian/Pacific Islander student population increased 169.3% and represented 2.4% of the total student population. Whereas the populations of each group drastically increased, they nonetheless total less than half of the overall student population. Lake County’s Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander student population numbers increased the most at 238.9% and 170.7%. Hispanics, nonetheless, remained only 3.3% of the overall student population and Asian/Pacific Islanders only 0.6%. One of the notable features of Lake County’s numbers is that their Black, non-Hispanic students only increased 3.6% whereas the Black, non-Hispanic students grew in the other two counties by 37% and 76%. Although, this increase is notably smaller than the other counties, the Black, non-Hispanic students made up 18.2% of Lake’s total student population.

Osceola County Schools’ student population growth data represents the most significant change over time of all three counties. Osceola’s White, non-Hispanic population growth student population increased 81.8% and represented 74.9% of the total student population. This is four times the rate of increase of White, non-Hispanic students in Lake; and eighty times the rate of increase in Orange. Osceola’s Black, non-Hispanic population growth student population increased 76.7% and represented 8.6% of the total student population. This is also more than twice the rate of increase in Orange. Osceola’s American Indian/Alaska native population growth student population increased 169.6% but only represented .34% of the total student population. Notably Osceola’s Asian/Pacific Islander population growth student population increased 450% but represented just 1.71% of the total student population. The largest increase of student populations by far is Osceola county’s Hispanic student population. Osceola’s Hispanic population growth student population increased 1,556.7% during the 1980s. They went
from 157 Hispanic students as 1.8% of the total student population in 1979 to 2,601 Hispanic students that represented 1.4% of the total student population in 1989.56

Table 3: Student Population Growth, 1980-1989: Orange, Lake, and Osceola County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980 Student Population</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>1989 Student Population</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80,831</td>
<td></td>
<td>97,647</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>58,304</td>
<td>72.13</td>
<td>60,753</td>
<td>62.22</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>18,492</td>
<td>22.88</td>
<td>24,981</td>
<td>25.58</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2,909</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>9,388</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>222.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17,053</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,344</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>13,351</td>
<td>78.28</td>
<td>15,843</td>
<td>77.88</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>3,370</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>3,704</td>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>170.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,953</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,021</td>
<td></td>
<td>101.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>7,729</td>
<td>86.33</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>74.91</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The School Districts’ Responses to Student Population Growth

While also addressing federal and state mandates to raise education standards, Orange and Osceola County Schools were faced with many financial, logistical and programming challenges due to their rapidly growing student populations. At that time, Lake did not face these challenges to the same degree. Orange and Osceola school districts lacked the physical space to accommodate their growing numbers. They needed to create space in cost effective ways. The districts also needed to increase, train and retain classroom teachers, administrators and support staff, including equitable hiring of minorities. Whereas, all three school districts had to follow federal mandates to address the linguistic needs of their diversifying student body. Orange also created programs to proactively address other needs that arose as a result of their rapidly diversifying student populations.

Orange and Osceola school districts worked to meet their facility needs in three ways: creating split schedules for their facilities, constructing new school buildings, and using portable classrooms. In 1980, two high schools led the way in implementing split scheduling, also called split sessions. While Lake County’s Leesburg High School (LHS) remodeled their main building from 1980 to 1981, they implemented a split session during the construction. Juniors and seniors attended class from 7:15am to 12:20pm and sophomores and freshman attended class from 12:30pm to 5:35 pm. Teachers worked a seven-and-a-half-hour day.\(^5\) Neighboring Central Florida counties also used split scheduling to find space for all their students. For example, Seminole County’s Lake Brantley High School implemented a split schedule in 1980 while their

new building was under construction. Like LHS, half of the high school students attended their classes in the morning while the other half attended classes in the afternoon and Lake Brantley had two separate shifts of teachers for the two sessions.58

Orange, Lake, and Osceola County Schools also built new school buildings, their most expensive option, to alleviate overcrowding. OCPS built thirty-one school buildings from 1980 to 1989; they grew from 117 total public schools to 148.59 Osceola County schools built eleven public schools and, in doing so, more than doubled their total public-school facilities from ten buildings to twenty-one from 1980 to 1989.60 Osceola’s most notable construction project during that time was Gateway High School. Built as a joint campus with Valencia Community College, Gateway’s construction cost was $13 million, which came from local and state sources and which was the controversial center of many Osceola County School Board discussions.61 In comparison, Lake County only added two new buildings total public-school facilities and, by 1989, had forty-four school buildings total.

The school districts most commonly used portable, or modular, classrooms to create space. Portables provided flexible space for campuses under construction and as student populations shifted. The counties built, rented, lease-purchased, and purchased portables depending upon their available finances and who was on their board. However, school boards had to use portables strategically. They had to balance their real-time classroom needs with their
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58 Educator’s Oral History Collection, Series 2: Interview with Nancy Williams, interview by Jacque Dunegan, Audio Cassette, May 12, 2001, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida.
future needs for capital outlay finances. Facility surveys by the FLDOE justified the state’s distribution of future monies for school construction. So, as a result there were times when principals at the school level used portables as resource facilities, guidance offices, therapy spaces, or spaces for migrant program classes so that the portables would not count as classrooms on FLDOE’s facility survey.62 Most of the time, however, the counties could not get enough portables to their schools fast enough to meet their needs. Portables meant that principals could move classes from stages, maintenance and storage areas, and cafeterias into the temporary classrooms.63 Counties also used portables as temporary spaces while schools or parts of new buildings were under construction. Even construction of Osceola’s Gateway High School included the use of temporary portables. Gateway started as fifteen portable classrooms on the Osceola High School campus. Students attended class in portables during the fall of the 1985-1986 school year. Then when their new building was complete in January 1986, 500 freshman and sophomores moved to the new campus.64

In addition to addressing facility needs, the school districts also needed to increase their workforce, especially classroom teachers while abiding by the Florida Education Equity Act. In 1980, Orange County had 4,512 classroom teachers, 81% of whom were White, non-Hispanic, 17.9% of whom were Black, non-Hispanic, and .85% who were Hispanic. By 1989 total number of classroom teachers had increased to 6,104 yet, despite efforts from the county to increase their numbers of minority teachers the racial percentages stayed almost the same. In 1989, 81.1% of

63 Davis.
Orange’s teachers were White, non-Hispanic, 16% were Black, non-Hispanic and 2.6% were Hispanic. Lake County had only 950 teachers in 1980, 85.2% White, non-Hispanic, 14.3% Black, non-Hispanic, and only four Hispanic teachers. By 1989, Lake County had ten Hispanic teachers out of 1,208 classroom teachers. Their percentage of Black, non-Hispanic teachers decreased to 8.3% while their percentage of White, non-Hispanics teachers rose to 90%. The smallest of the three counties, Osceola started the eighties with only 418 classroom teachers. By 1989, Osceola’s teachers doubled in size to 882 and their Black, non-Hispanic and Hispanic teacher percentages rose to 4%.

In the 1980s, Osceola County school board worked to train new teachers and to hire teachers to maintain a workable student-teacher ratio considering the steadily increasing student population. To train new teachers Osceola implemented a new teacher program in 1981, per the instructions of the state legislature. First year teachers would meet often with supervisors or other teachers to get help writing appropriate lesson plans and to get immediate feedback on their work. After the yearlong program, first year teachers were then “evaluated by their principal, another teacher and another professional educator – a supervisor or peer” before they could be offered a teaching contract.65 The goal of the program was to support new teachers in their transition to the classroom but more importantly to help the school board decide who to hire permanently.66 In Osceola County the teacher hiring process was centralized in the hands of the school board, specifically Bill Vogel, the district’s assistant superintendent for personal and administrative services, who oversaw the hiring of every Osceola teacher during his tenure.67

66 Thomas.
Osceola started the eighties with only 418 classroom teachers. Of those 418, 94.7% were White, non-Hispanic, 3.4% were Black, Non-Hispanic and 1.4% were Hispanic. One of the teachers counted in that Hispanic percentage was, Osceola’s first bilingual “floating teacher” hired in 1980. The teacher traveled between schools to teach conversational English to the county’s then total of fifty-seven foreign language speaking students. By 1989, Osceola’s doubled their teacher workforce to 882 teachers and their Black, non-Hispanic and Hispanic teacher percentages each rose to 4% of the total. The Osceola chapter of the NAACP praised the Osceola county school board for this increase. They affirmed Osceola County School board for being receptive to their pressure to increase the number of black teachers and staff, and then actually increasing their numbers of black teachers and staff.

Another move the school board made to help reduce student-teacher ratios was to hire more aides, more support staff and more school-based administrators. In 1980, Osceola had forty-four employees considered “other instructional” employees or aides. Even considering overworked county administrators, the school board voted to hire eleven elementary school aides over three administrators when money was available for the 1988 school year increasing their “other instructional” staff to sixty-nine employees. By 1989, Osceola had one hundred and eight “other instructional” employees to support teachers and students. Over the decade, the county went from 403 to 903 support staff employees, a 124% increase. This includes
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68 “School Board to Hire Teacher to Tutor Foreign-Born Students,” The Orlando Sentinel, September 17, 1980, Other edition.
secretaries, counselors, bus drivers, book keepers, maintenance workers and others.\textsuperscript{73} One important hire that directly affected Hispanic students was Osceola County School Board and Osceola High School’s first Hispanic and bilingual counselor, Jorge Perez in 1983. Perez played an important role in supporting Hispanic students at Osceola High School. He oversaw the school’s entire Spanish-speaking population. He met with individual students, formed support groups, and strove to make sure students felt they were “a part of [the school’s] community.”\textsuperscript{74} In addition to support staff, the county also doubled the number of their administrators from thirty-five to seventy by 1989 as the number of their schools also doubled from eleven to twenty-one.\textsuperscript{75}

While Osceola’s scrambled to hire enough staff to keep up with their student population growth, Orange County publicly focused on minority hiring. In 1982, OCPS’s John Hawco, who oversaw equal employment management, stated that Orange was making progress in hiring minority teachers and were fulfilling federal and FEEA hiring requirements.\textsuperscript{76} But by 1987, Orange County’s black teacher quota was below a set 1970 federal court order.\textsuperscript{77} In June of the 1988-1989 school year, Orange accepted a $60,000 grant from the FLDOE to initiate a three-year minority recruitment program. An eleven-person task force created their hiring program which targeted minority substitutes, teacher aides, and support staff already on the school board’s payroll. The goal was to provide these employees with more education and training to

\textsuperscript{73} “Schools to Hire New Workers,” \textit{The Orlando Sentinel}, April 6, 1989, Other edition.
\textsuperscript{74} David Karpook, “Counselor to Ease Life for Students: Spanish-Speaking Teens Will Find Friend at School,” \textit{The Orlando Sentinel}, August 21, 1983, Other edition.
\textsuperscript{76} Laura Santos, “Schools in Orange Make the Grade with Hiring of Minorites,” \textit{The Orlando Sentinel}, August 4, 1982, Main edition.
\textsuperscript{77} Mildred Williams, “County: Need for Minority Teachers Critical,” \textit{The Orlando Sentinel}, August 15, 1988, Other edition.
become teachers. Another goal of the program was to increase minority student enrollment in the University of Central Florida’s graduate and undergraduate education programs and Valencia College’s undergraduate education program.\textsuperscript{78} Initially this recruitment program, nicknamed the “grow-your-own” teacher project, was problematic because the program rolled out late. This meant that OCPS ended up with a shortage of teachers because they were holding positions for minority teachers who hadn’t yet gone through the program. Although working to address minority hiring requirements, the program targeted black employees even though the fastest growing student population in Orange was Hispanic.\textsuperscript{79} Increasing the number of black teachers and administrators supports and benefits all staff and student populations and was an important program for OCPS. However, it was also a missed opportunity to include a focus on Hispanic hiring as well.

\textbf{School District Educational Programming: Orange County}

Having begun prior to the 1980s, Orange County programs for cultural and linguistic minority students –the migrant education program, bilingual centers, and “Un Poquito de Español” –continued throughout the eighties.

Over the course of the decade, the migrant education program worked to provide services for a larger age range of students with their limited resources. At the onset of the program, migrant education programs created classrooms for 3, 4, and 5-year olds to support their early childhood development by teaching them basic social and academic skills. Teacher Edith

\textsuperscript{78} Mildred Williams, “Orange Schools to Recruit More Minority Teachers,” \textit{The Orlando Sentinel}, June 15, 1988, Main edition.

\textsuperscript{79} Williams, “County: Need for Minority Teachers Critical.”
Roach’s migrant education class was an early childhood class in which she taught art, music, colors, shapes, numbers, letters, and nursery rhymes on rhyming boards and stories through “fingerplays,” which are mini-plays with finger puppets.80 By 1989, OCPS’s migrant program was working with elementary grade levels of migrant students with limited English by facilitating bilingual centers, to be discussed shortly, and transitional bilingual programs. Because middle school students typically have more experience with English and need less language support than elementary students, the district planned to bus their middle school migrant students to the schools with appropriate services when applicable. Migrant students in their high schools received one hour of English tutoring and then attended the rest of their content classes in English; and there was only one high school with bilingual instruction for only ninth graders. Other services the county provided were through counseling. By 1989, Orange County had six employees who visited the county’s 1,900 migrant students’ homes to make sure these students were attending school and to provide counseling as needed.81 Orange’s migrant program worked to keep the county in compliance with BEA and Plyer v Doe while supporting migrant students social and linguistic development.

Orange County and their bilingual centers supported and celebrated their language minority students in many ways during the 1980s. In 1982, the students in Hillcrest Elementary school’s Vietnamese-English bilingual program put together a Vietnamese New Year and Spring Festival to introduce their peers and teachers to Vietnamese culture.82 In 1986, the bilingual
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80 Educator’s Oral History Collection, Series 1: Interview with Edith Mae Roach.
81 Lively, “School a Tough Test for Young Migrants; Dreams of Education Often Collide with the Facts of Life Spend on the Move.”
programs at Stonewall Jackson Junior High, Hillcrest Elementary, and Pinar Elementary were all promoted in *The Orlando Sentinel*’s “School of the week” series. Stonewall Jackson’s bilingual program supported their Hispanic LEP students by offering math and science courses in Spanish. By 1986, the students in Hillcrest’s bilingual program had diversified. Consequently, Hillcrest hosted an international fair to celebrate their students from Haiti, Ethiopia, Southeast Asia, and Eastern India. Proving its effectiveness with high language test scores, Hillcrest’s bilingual center led the way in creating a language and speech program to “break any language barrier” that was used across Orange county. Later in 1987, Stonewall Jackson’s neighbor Englewood Elementary was highlighted in the “School of the week” series. To support their bilingual center students, Englewood put a unique dual buddy system in place. First, teachers matched LEP students with English speakers for language support. Then, to give the students an equal opportunity to help others, the teachers matched LEP students with handicapped students. Englewood also celebrated diversity and encouraged cultural awareness through an annual international festival and a World Friendship Program where community members dress in their native clothes for the students. Orange County also supported their students and bilingual centers by ensuring that students had appropriate transportation. Pinar Elementary received students for their bilingual program from three surrounding elementary schools. OCPS bussed forty-seven LEP students to spend entire school day at Pinar working through “a concentrated
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curriculum in English” with two bilingual center teachers until they were ready to be back in their classroom at their home school.86

During the 1980s, the Un Poquito de Español program grew and received recognition for the program’s unique implementation. Having doubled in size by the 1982-1983 school year, ADDitions had 112 volunteers, which included high school students, and 2,743 students in 32 elementary schools.87 Through Poquito, Hispanic community members supported Hispanic students by modeling their own bilingual skills and directly instructing lessons on cultural awareness for both Hispanic and non-Hispanic students. Poquito was unique because it was implemented and managed by volunteers. Orange County received national recognition for the work done by Poquito’s Hispanic volunteers. They were the first school system in the nation to start a district-wide Spanish class run by volunteers and to create a curriculum handbook. Soon other states replicated the program.88 In addition to national recognition, Poquito founder Margaret Mabry won the outstanding award at OCPS’s 1981 annual recognition day for creating the program. Three years later the ADDitions program honored Mabry with a scholarship in her name. Then in 1986, first lady of Florida Adele Graham was present to celebrate Martha Baskin as OCPS’s “Outstanding Volunteer for the Year” for the two years of volunteer work she put into writing and implementing more Poquito curriculum.89

Poquito and coordinators played an important role in inspiring other bilingual education programming in OCPS. Mabry’s vision for Poquito was to invite parents, businesses, and

88 Feltus, “ADDitions Volunteers Honored for Schoolwork.”
government officials to work towards implementing twelve continuous years of language education in Florida public schools. Mabry argued that learning to be bilingual in public school gave students a “major job skill opportunity.”  

By February of 1984, ADDitions assistant coordinator, Leslie Curry, pushed the school board to take steps to fulfill Mabry’s vision. Curry wanted the school board to apply for state grants to incorporate Poquito as a part of the regular elementary curriculum taught by professional educators instead of volunteers. Although the school board had reservations about Curry’s plan because the state grant money only lasted for a year, they, nonetheless, did apply for a grant with Duval County to create sequential foreign language program that started in elementary schools. Orange County’s intentions for the grant money was bilingual education, ESL, and foreign language education for elementary students.

Curry also worked with Lake Sybelia Elementary’s Parent Teacher Association to raise money for a matching grant to hire a full-time Spanish teacher for their school to pilot the program.

During the 1988 and 1989, Orange County also implemented programs diversity, cultural awareness and mediation programs to support their staff and students positively adjust to their own cultural diversification. OCPS created their “Diversity in the Workplace” program for Orange County’s new teachers and administrators. The county also created the Cultural Awareness Mediation Program for high school students and a second student interaction-based program for elementary students.

In 1989 as the numbers of Hispanic students were continuing to rise in the county schools, OCPS implemented a district level diversity training program – “Diversity in the
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Workplace.” Through the program, OCPS trained 100 of their new teachers, all the personnel participating in their principal training program, and their district administrators. The goal of the program was to “increase the respect of employees for the dignity and worth of students and fellow employees who are members of different racial, ethnic, cultural, linguistic and economic groups.”92 This program sent a positive, inclusive message to the Orange County community that the school board was paying attention to their diverse populations, would advocate for inclusivity, and was working to address broader cultural needs within their school environments. It directly impacted Hispanics students by fostering changes in how the trained non-Hispanic employees understood and engaged with Hispanic students.

First of its kind in Florida, Superintendent James Schott proactively put the Cultural Awareness and Conflict Mediation Program (CACMP) in place to teach cross-cultural communication and mediation skills to high schoolers. When Dr. Philips High School opened in 1987 with a mix of students from different socioeconomic levels more than a dozen students were suspended for fighting. During the same year, fights had also broken out between racial groups at Evans High School and Oak Ridge High School. At the time, high school violence had made the national news in Los Angeles and other major U.S. cities. Schott wanted to stop this behavior and prevent other forms of youth violence as seen in those other cities. Thus, OCPS and Group Dynamics and Strategies, Inc. from Marlboro, Maryland created CACMP.93

CACMP was a three-phase program that taught Orange County high school students’ cultural awareness, cross-cultural communication and mediation skills to ease tensions between

diverse groups. The first phase of CACMP was a one-day workshop for staff and community members. The second phase was a two-day retreat for sixty students representing a cross-section of the student population from the three Orange County high schools. As a part of the retreat, the participating students created three one-act plays, one per high school, to depict what they had learned in the workshop. Orange County chose to send some who had been suspended for fighting to participate in the second and third phases of the program. Other students who participated were students that teachers and administrators deemed to be leaders within their social circles. The third phase of the program was that the high school students who had participated in the retreat created Young People Guidance Clubs on their home campuses that created similar presentations to the one-act plays to take to elementary and middle schools. The county expanded the program to include Colonial High School and its ninth-grade center; and eventually expanded it to twelve other schools. OCPS students, teachers, and administrators learned valuable leadership, cultural awareness, and mediation skills from CMP.

OCPS also created two other programs to address cultural awareness with their younger students. First, the school district piloted an elementary program in 1987 that “enhanc[ed] interaction between elementary schools with predominately black students and those with predominantly white students.” The elementary program created opportunities for the elementary students from different schools and backgrounds to participate in field trips and
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extracurricular activities together. Second, Orange County’s Center for International Studies also sought to teach students cross-cultural awareness. Located on the Dr. Philips High School campus, the Center for International Studies was a districtwide resource. Like CACMP, the Center for International Studies was the first of its kind and it met the FCSS recommendations for promoting multicultural studies and interdisciplinary studies argued for in their Connections, Challenges and Choices report. The program required students to study two foreign languages, “international economics, politics, humanities, business and law.” It also provided students with opportunities to interact with people from diverse cultures. All the pieces of the center’s programming were created to proactively teach students to have a global perspective.

School District Educational Programming: Lake County

In the 1980s, Lake County School District’s priority was teaching English to their LEP students or, by the end of the decade, supporting foreign language opportunities for their English-speaking students. The school district was prepared to support their seasonal migrant Hispanic populations. The district preferred ESL to bilingual programs to the point that they were willing to fight against federal bilingual mandates. Yet by 1987, some leaders in Lake County started to see there were benefits to teaching Spanish as teacher Nancy Dunn initiated a program that taught Spanish as a foreign language to elementary students.

Being that Lake County is a large agricultural producer for the state, Lake County Schools were used to working with an annual influx of migrant students whose families followed
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crop cycles. At the peak of the 1981 winter season when the schools expected the most migrant students, the school board estimated they had 2,100 Hispanic migrant students in class. Some schools had federally funded pre-Kindergarten programs for their youngest migrant students which taught social skills, numbers and sight words. While in school, primary and secondary aged migrant students received English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) services. These students spent the majority of their school day in the general education classroom with their English-speaking peers being taught in English. When it was time for their support class, migrant students would go to another classroom for specialized reading instruction.

Lake County School officials prioritized teaching English through ESOL instructional methods and actively resisted their Hispanic parents and a federal mandate to initiate bilingual education opportunities for non-English speaking students. In 1980, the school district had three ESL teachers on staff and sought to hire two more ESL teachers for the following year. These teachers traveled the county to serve the 2,100 Hispanic students enrolled in Lake County Schools by teaching them basic English skills. In July of 1980, 100 Hispanic parents petitioned the school board for bilingual education programs. Also, at that time a federal court and the United States Department of Education (USDOE) decided that if a local school district had bilingual students, then the school district should be responsible for providing those students with a bilingual education to ensure more equitable access to the curriculum content. Lake County officials refused to meet the request of their parents and the federal mandate, claiming
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their ESL program sufficiently met their students’ needs. Instead of complying with the mandate, school officials, including Lake’s superintendent and multiple school board members, claimed it violated the rights of the state and local school board, took away local schools’ decision-making autonomy, was expensive to implement and track, and was “a program to generate jobs rather than further education.”  

Lake County Schools supported other agencies that challenged the mandate by sending two officials, the assistant for curriculum and instruction Dr. C. A. Vaughn and school board member Don Berry, and a resident, Richard Jelsma, to testify against the mandate in court proceedings in New Orleans. Jelsma argued that English is the “root language” of the United States and that “a division of language is the sword that cuts a nation in parts and will destroy the unity of America.”  

Berry, on the other hand, argued that the USDOE did not have the authority to implement the bilingual education mandate. The USDOE announced the following January that they were recalling the bilingual education mandated. This kept the power to decide how to teach LEP students at the state and local level which, for Lake County Hispanic students, meant the continuation of Lake’s ESL program and no opportunities for bilingual support or support in Spanish from instructors.

In 1987, teacher Nancy Dunn’s Spanish program was well received by Lake County leaders and residents. Dunn began a Spanish program at two Lake County elementary schools and one middle school with a $13,500 grant funded by the Foreign Language for Elementary Schools grant from the state of Florida and matched by Lake County. The state created this grant program because state universities added two years of foreign language study as a requirement
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for admission. In Lake County, Dunn taught her middle schoolers daily and visited the elementary schools every other day.\textsuperscript{107} She pulled on her experiences teaching ESL in El Salvador and Costa Rica and attended workshops like The National Foreign Language in Elementary School Institute to help her create her curriculum.\textsuperscript{108} Parents, teachers, and principals responded so positively to the program that the county expanded the program to include second and third graders the following school year.\textsuperscript{109}

Although Dunn was not Hispanic, she played an important role for Hispanics through the Spanish foreign language program in her small corner of Lake County. She introduced Lake County Public Schools to Spanish as a foreign language for elementary students and argued that there are important benefits to introducing foreign languages to younger students. She believed that her program proved that teaching Spanish to English-speaking and non-English speaking students helped to “bridge the cultural gap” between the two groups, especially since most of her non-English speakers were Hispanic. \textsuperscript{110}

\textbf{School District Educational Programming: Osceola County}

At the onset of the 1980s, Osceola County School District did not have programs in place for migrant or non-English speaking students. The county’s sharp population growth in the first half of the decade revolutionized the school district’s migrant and ESL programming. The school district did not have time to create programs as proactively as Orange County. Yet, they did not
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respond to their new Hispanic student population with the same resistance to native language support as Lake County. Osceola created programs to assist their migrant students and their rapidly Latinizing student population. Abiding by BEA, they created a program that the district called “Intensive English” which was designed to help students learn English in intensive, group settings while also supporting other academic needs.

Due to their demographics, Orange and Lake schools had plans in place for migrant education before the 80s whereas Osceola schools started their migrant program in the early 1980s. Osceola schools had so few migrant students at the start of the decade that they could not create an instructional program. In 1981, the school district identified only ten migrant students in the county.111 By 1983, they had enough migrant students enrolled in the district to receive federal funds for migrant education programs through the FLDOE. They received $12,698 in early 1983 to put towards locating and identifying migrant students.112

The school district’s plan and programming for ESL students grew as rapidly as the student population. Osceola schools’ first experiences with ESL programming was with Vietnamese refugees. The county hosted a summer program and students were taught by volunteers. By 1980 there were 255 Hispanic students enrolled in all of Osceola County Schools and the district had hired one ESL teacher, Wilma Santiago, to travel to the all the schools to work with the 55 foreign born students in their ESL program.113 In 1981, the county hired a second ESL teacher to split the growing work with Santiago. Within the year, the school district
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called on a community planning group of parents, teachers and administrators to plan how to more effectively address the needs of the growing ESL population because there were already too many students for just two teachers. By the end of the 1982-1983 school year, the community planning group had rejected ESL and bilingual programming and decided to implement Intensive English instead.\footnote{Karpook, David, “Class Tunes Foreign-Born into English.”} The next school year there were 559 Hispanic students enrolled in Osceola County Schools, many of whom were also enrolled in Intensive English, and Santiago had a staff of seven instructors executing the Intensive English program.\footnote{Florida Department of Education, Profiles of Florida School Districts: 1980-1981; Karpook, David, “Hispanics Find Home in Osceola.”} In the fall of 1985, there were 205 students enrolled in the Intensive English program who spoke Spanish, Vietnamese, French, Chinese and Hindu as their native language.\footnote{“English Program Awarded $2,500,” \textit{The Orlando Sentinel}, November 22, 1985, Other edition; “English Program Wraps up Meetings,” \textit{The Orlando Sentinel}, September 10, 1985, Other edition.} As Santiago had done, Naomi Winbush, the program director at the time, held a series of meetings for parents, teachers and administrators in 1985 to increase awareness and support for the program.\footnote{“English Program Wraps up Meetings.”} By 1989 there were 588 students in Osceola’s Intensive English program and 544 of those students were Hispanic.

Osceola County Schools’ Intensive English program was different from ESL and bilingual programs. Osceola’s Intensive English program was different from ESL because ESL only focused on teaching English to non-English speaking students whereas the Intensive English program focused on English, social skills, and other academic skills. Like ESL programs and the reason, it is distinct from bilingual programs, Osceola’s Intensive English program was only taught in English, not English and their native language. In fact, their textbooks were only in English and the teachers only spoke English. Osceola’s Intensive English students spent most
of the school day in the regular general education classroom where content was taught in English. They went to the Intensive English class for 30 to 90 minutes a day in mixed English-ability groups. The teachers encouraged students to speak in English and Spanish, to help each other through a buddy system, and to “pick up the language as a new experience.” As students’ English skills increased, they spent less time in the Intensive English class.

In addition to ESL teachers, many volunteers supported Osceola’s Intensive English program. Consequently in 1985 the school district received a $2,500 award from Walt Disney World’s Community: Operation program. The award was given to school programs effectively engaged their community through volunteer work. Osceola schools chose to put that money towards a computer lab for their brand-new Gateway High School.

The Intensive English model had positive and negative aspects for Hispanic students. The program did support LEP Hispanic students’ English language development, however, students still spent most of the day in the general education classroom where teachers only taught content in English. Whereas it was positive for Hispanic students to support each other in their native language in their Intensive English class, the schools still essentially created segregated classrooms by pulling LEP Hispanic students from their general education class for their Intensive English lessons. Although the LEP students were encouraged to experience English through “enjoyable chatter and experiences” in the Intensive classroom, the Intensive English course did not teach or affirm the students’ native language development.
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For those reasons and others, the civil rights group LULAC challenged Osceola’s Intensive English program and the FLDOE’s management of similar programs in court. By the end of the 1980s, 72% of Florida’s 67 counties used programs like Osceola’s Intensive English program to address the needs of their non-English speaking students.\textsuperscript{122} LULAC argued the programs perpetuated the “sink or swim” teaching methodology and were concerned with the high Hispanic dropout rate, 13% of the state’s student dropouts. LULAC argued that Florida school districts, Osceola included, were not appropriately identifying, servicing, or counseling students in preventative dropout measures and so they filed a lawsuit in the U.S. District Court in Miami. Whereas Osceola school officials touted the progress made in their Intensive English program, the program was not a comprehensive plan of action with measurable objectives and a plan for accountability. So, LULAC specifically brought charges against Osceola County schools for neglecting to adopt a “formal, acceptable plan” for addressing the needs of their LEP students, essentially for failing to meet the requirements in \textit{Castañeda v. Pickard}.\textsuperscript{123} In August of 1990, the federal court decided the case in favor of LULAC and the Hispanic students which I address at length in the following chapter.

\textbf{Conclusion}

Orange, Lake and Osceola County School Districts’ responses to their Hispanic student population growth followed a pattern of change that corresponded with the size of their Hispanic student population. OCPS began the 1980s with 2,909 Hispanic students and grew to 9,388
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Hispanic students, which represented growth from 3.6% to 9.66% of their total student population. Lake and Osceola Public Schools started the decade with only about 250 Hispanic students per district which was 1.5% of Lake’s total student population and 2.9% of Osceola’s. Lake and Osceola’s Hispanic growth pattern diverged in the 1980s. By 1989, Lake only had 671 Hispanic students enrolled, 3.3% of their total student body, whereas Osceola had 2,601 Hispanic students enrolled, 14.4% of their total student population. Consequently, OCPS had programming and administrative structures in place prior to the onset of the decade. They also implemented language and cultural programs more proactively than Lake and Osceola. As their Hispanic student population numbers aligned, Lake and Osceola began the 1980s implementing the same ESL/ESOL programming and support structures. However, by the end of the decade as Osceola tried to retain its programming despite the spike in Hispanic student growth, they faced charges by LULAC.

Throughout this chapter, it is not only evident that the school systems and Hispanic populations are conversely affecting each other but also that there were many groups of people who shaped Orange, Lake and Osceola school districts’ responses to federal and state mandates and their population changes—teachers, principals, parents and community members.

In the 1980s OCPS created and supported programs that addressed more than just language needs for their LEP students. OCPS created bilingual centers, their Diversity in the Workplace program, and the CACMP program in response to their Hispanic and their diversifying student population. The county’s bilingual centers, which supported various nationalities of LEP students including Hispanic students, taught students in English and their native language to support their English language acquisition. OCPS’s Diversity in the
Workplace and CACMP trainings proactively worked with staff and students to promote and practice cultural understanding and cross-cultural communication. OCPS supported and encouraged the Poquito program, which was created and implemented by volunteers, and impacted many elementary schools as it grew during the 1980s.

Teachers, administrators, parents and community members from Orange County played an active role in supporting these OCPS programs and OCPS’s Hispanic and non-English speaking students. OCPS teachers and principals staffed and supported the county’s bilingual centers. In planning and implementing elementary international fairs and managing programs like Engelwood’s World Friendship Program, educators supported their Hispanic and international students’ transnational identities and promoting global and cultural awareness. Superintendent Schott was responsible for the creation of CACMP which positively benefitted students in elementary, middle and high school grades. Orange’s bilingual Hispanic community played an important role in supporting and running Poquito as well as other OCPS volunteer programs. Not only did OCPS Poquito volunteers model the county’s panethnic Hispanic community working together to support elementary students, but Poquito’s creators and coordinators, Margaret Mabry and Leslie Curry, built the program to introduce elementary students to panethnic Hispanic cultures and to celebrate those cultures through learning the Spanish language.

Due to their similar population size in the early 1980s, Lake and Osceola County Public Schools’ programming for their Hispanic and non-English speaking student population are the
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same. Both school districts initially hired only a few ESOL teachers who drove around the county to provide language services for LEP students. Both ESOL programs were pull out programs which segregated LEP students from their classmates during ESOL instruction. Both programs also focused on English language acquisition and did not provide support for students in their native language.

As their Hispanic population numbers diverged, so did the school districts’ responses. As Lake’s Hispanic student population stayed under 4% of their total, the district did not waver from English only programming despite formal petitions from Hispanic parents for bilingual opportunities for their students. Lake County Schools only offered ESOL which did not include support with study skills, social skills, or support outside of English language acquisition. As Osceola’s Hispanic population spiked, the school district changed from using ESOL programming to their own Intensive English program, which provided students with support for a range of academic and social skills in addition to English. However, they did not provide direct instruction in the students’ native language and the focus of the program was still English language acquisition. The district had also responded to the Hispanic population growth by creating an ESOL director position in the Curriculum and Instruction department and hiring Wilma Santiago to fill that position over seven ESOL instructors. As their need for bilingual support at Osceola High School grew, the district also responded to Hispanic growth by hiring bilingual counselor Jorge Perez.

Although their programming lacked the bilingual and proactive cultural support of OCPS’s programs, Lake and Osceola County teachers and parents still fought for and worked to meet the needs of their Hispanic students. Although their petition fell on deaf ears, Lake
County’s Hispanic parents lived the panethnic immigration experience as they united to petition the public-school system for bilingual education opportunities for their children. Due to the small numbers of LEP students, teachers Nancy Dunn, in Lake, and Wilma Santiago, in Osceola, literally drove LEP language development in their counties. In Lake County, Dunn noted the importance and benefits of teaching Spanish to Hispanic students two decades before Lake was even willing to consider such a program. In Osceola, although Santiago empowered teachers, administrators and parents to participate in creating their Intensive English program, the program still segregated LEP students from the general education classroom and only taught them in English. By 1989, there was not a large enough Hispanic and minority language population in the schools and community to be able to successfully push Lake County Public Schools to create bilingual or dual language programs to support Hispanic LEPs’ native language development and cultural identity. However, by 1989, there was a large enough Hispanic population in Osceola County to initiate a lawsuit in the federal district courts against Osceola County Public Schools’ LEP programming.
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CHAPTER TWO

While the USDOE continued to increase education standards and prioritized low performing schools, Florida’s Multicultural Education Law and the Florida Consent Decree are the two most prominent catalysts for change within the central Florida school districts in the 1990s. During this decade, Florida required its school districts to fix the lack of multicultural education in their curriculum and the Consent Decree defined specific requirements for the districts’ ESOL programs. The two mandates ushered in an era of state audits, new curriculum, and creative strategies to comply with the Consent Decree. Orange, Lake and Osceola county school districts worked to fulfill these federal and state education regulations while continuing to address the needs of their increasing and diversifying student population.

At the onset of the 1990s, Osceola County Public Schools’ Hispanic student population was as large as OCPS’s had been in 1980 but exceeded OCPS’s 1990 percentage of Hispanic students. Consequently, Osceola County Schools continued to diverge from Lake County Schools programming decisions and began to implement strategies that OCPS implemented in the 1980s, including revising their ESOL programming to better comply with the state requirements. Meanwhile, OCPS continued expanding previously existing cultural and language education programs and created new programs and structures of support within their district offices. With the smallest Hispanic and smallest minority population, Lake County Schools language programming lagged behind the other two counties. They also made state and national news as a result of their members’ stance against the state’s new multicultural education policies.
National Education Reforms: 1990s

The Clinton Administration created two notable education reforms in the 1990s – the Goals 2000: Education Standards and the Improving America Schools Act.¹ Like ANAR, RAISE, and the reform work he implemented as Arkansas’s governor, Clinton’s Goals 2000 required higher expectations for all students with better course content, improvements in teaching methods and teacher preparation, accountability for student growth, and new partnerships with parents, businesses, and communities.² It created “voluntary” national standards in math, science, English, language arts, geography, history, the arts and foreign languages, however, only awarded grants to states that complied the new standards.³ As a result of Goals 2000 “49 states implemented standards in core subjects and the proportion of graduating high school seniors completing a core curriculum rose to 55%.”⁴

The second of President Clinton’s notable education reforms was the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the BEA. Renamed Improving America’s Schools Act and signed into law in October 1994, the reauthorized act increased funding for Title I, teacher training, and state testing on the state level.⁵ BEA was still Title VII of the act and the reauthorization strengthened federal support for implementing bilingual programs. It increased
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the scope of bilingual education goals to include proficiency in multiple languages and proficiency in multicultural understanding.\(^6\)

Unfortunately, opponents to a federal bilingual education program worked through the late 1990s to create legislation to end or modify BEA. In early 1998, the US House of Representatives debated the English for Children Act which would have stopped about $215 million federal dollars a year from running some 750 bilingual education programs nationwide. The bill did not pass in the House; however, others that aimed at making changes to BEA did make it further through the legislation process. For example, the House did approve the English Language Fluency Act, but the Senate did not. The English Language Fluency Act tried to change the BEA grants to block grants, to limit students’ time in programs, and to void all BEA consent agreements that states and districts were following. The act even proposed changing the name of the federal department from the “Office of Bilingual and Minority-languages Affairs” to the “Office of English-Language Acquisition” denoting a shift away from supporting native language development.\(^7\) Similarly, the Republicans on the House drafting committee wanted to encourage language acquisition programs that used English-only to teach English and they wanted bilingual programs to stop using students’ native languages in instruction.\(^8\) The Clinton administration tried to reauthorize Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1999. Although the reauthorization did not pass, the push to modify and end BEA continued to grow.
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The Consent Decree

In 1990, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida heard a crucial court case for Limited English-speaking students in Florida. Working on behalf of Osceola County’s then sixth grader Juan Carlos Gonzalez and six other students, LULAC, ASPIRA of Florida, the Farmworker’s Association of Central Florida, Florida State Conference of NAACP, the Haitian Refugee Center, the Spanish American League Against Discrimination, American Hispanic Educator’s Association of Dade, and the Haitian Educators’ association filed a lawsuit against the Florida Board of Education and the FLDOE. These institutions sued the FLDOE on the grounds that Gonzalez et al. were not receiving an adequate or equitable education because they were not fluent in English. Prior to the case, there were no state statutes, regulations or prior litigation that set a guideline for how to treat, teach, support, assess, or monitor LEP students as they progressed through Florida’s public education system. In winning their case, LULAC et al. and the DOE created Florida’s Consent Decree. The Consent Decree is the DOE’s plan and procedures for staying in compliance with “federal and state laws and jurisprudence regarding the education of English Language Learner (ELL) students.”

The Consent Decree created a framework, compliant with federal and state laws, for Florida public schools to follow when implementing their ELL programs. The decree created a six-part procedure for working with LEP students. The first task is identification and assessment. For every LEP student in their system school districts had to: conduct a home
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language survey, create an ELL committee, create an ELL student plan, conduct an English language assessment, and monitor student progress in English language acquisition. Second, all LEP students must receive “equal access” to appropriate programming which is defined as intensive English language instruction at their level of proficiency and quality subject area instruction at their level of proficiency. “Appropriate Programming” means providing “positive reinforcement of the self-image and esteem of participating students, promote cross-cultural understanding, and provide equal educational opportunities” and includes parent involvement in district ELL plans.12 Third, the decree requires districts to provide LEP and immigrant student with equal access to handicapped and gifted education, dropout prevention, and pre-Kindergarten programs while protecting LEP students from disciplinary action resulting from their use of languages other than English. This section also requires that all information from schools to parents be communicated in the family’s first language.13 Fourth, the decree defines which incoming and existing school personnel are required to be trained in ESOL teaching methods and are required to add an ESOL Endorsement to their professional certification.14 Enacted, this means that all the teachers at the time had to take in-service training, whether through their district or through college courses, on “dealing with children who have limited English.”15 Fifth, the decree states that the DOE will monitor districts to ensure they comply; and, lastly, the decree requires schools to measure outcomes of their program’s effectiveness.16
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In 1991, the Florida Legislature and the Florida Commissioner of Education, Betty Castor, created a Multicultural Education Task Force (METF) to determine whether Florida school districts were providing effective educational programming for “all the geo-cultures” that existed in the state’s public schools or if the legislature needed to implement statutory changes. The task force reviewed “curricula, instructional materials, library media centers, in-service training, counseling services and extra-curricular activities in elementary and secondary schools.” The task force was required to submit an initial report of their findings to the legislature by October 1, 1991 and a final report by November 15, 1991. The task force noted that more than 100 countries were represented within the state’s student population, found many examples of social studies texts presenting one-sided accounts of historical events, and noted high dropout rates among minority students. Although METF found 160 multicultural programs across the state, the task force only deemed that seventeen of them were comprehensive enough to recreate in other districts.

Subsequently, METF made many suggestions to the Florida legislature that became part of the Multicultural Education law passed in 1992. Per METF’s suggestion, the law required the
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Florida Commission on Education Reform and Accountability to evaluate the school districts multicultural education and multicultural in-service training programs and to write a report for the legislature on their findings. The law also amended the Florida Career Education Act to say its purpose is to promote career opportunities for students of all cultural and economic backgrounds. Other METF recommendations included sensitivity trainings for educators and administrators, district-wide plans for multicultural education programming, and new methods for evaluating appropriate multicultural messages in textbooks. Thus, the statute required “multicultural education as a subject area for in-service training institutes.”

22 School districts had to create five-year plans for in-service trainings that included multicultural sensitivity trainings for classroom teachers and guidance counselors that could but didn’t have to include conflict mediation training. Districts were also given the task of “clarifying, strengthening, and expanding” their multicultural education programs within the 1992-1993 school term.

23 Prior to the law, committees in Tallahassee and local school districts met to approve textbooks with no stipulation of the demographics of the committee. The Multicultural Education Law required these committees to reflect “the broad racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, and cultural diversity of the district and that each committee have the expertise to address the diversity of the student population of the district.”

24 The law also created rules for the committees to use to evaluate the
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cultural sensitivity within the textbooks.\textsuperscript{25} Lastly, the law establishes standards for considering the racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, and cultural diversity of the children when selecting library books and all other reading and supplemental materials used in the schools.\textsuperscript{26}

Continuing to address diversity in education, the Florida legislature later turned its focus from curriculum and textbook to teachers.\textsuperscript{27} The legislature created the Florida Fund for Minority Teachers in 1996. At that time, a white student was “three times as likely to have a teacher of the same race as is a Hispanic American student or an African American student.” While African American male students made up “more than 12\% of the total enrollment in grades kindergarten through 12,” less than three percent of enrolled or graduating teachers were black males.\textsuperscript{28} The law created a statewide organization to create policies and strategies to reverse this trend. Their goal was to increase the number of minority teachers employed by Florida’s K-12 public schools thus creating more racially balanced student-teacher ratios.\textsuperscript{29} To meet this goal, the law created a board of directors appointed by the governor to facilitate the program. It created the Minority Teacher Education Scholarship, a $4,000 annual scholarship that students can put towards a degree in Education at twenty-nine different Florida public and private universities and colleges.\textsuperscript{30} The law also required the Florida Fund for Minority Teachers, Inc’s administration to
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create a training system for the participating colleges to help them recruit and retain minority teacher candidates.31

Orange, Lake, and Osceola Counties: 1990s Population Growth

The population growth in Orange, Lake and Osceola counties decreased at different rates during the 1990s. Whereas the total population in Orange increased 43.03% in the 1980s, it increased 32.8% in the 1990s.32 Orange’s total population by the 2000 census was 896,344. Lake’s population increase slowed down from 44.17% to 39.21% and their total population count for the end by the decade was 210,528.33 Still the smallest of the three counties, Osceola County’s total population by 2000 was 172,493. Although Osceola’s rapid growth trend significantly exceeded the other counties, compared to its own growth in the 1980s it did experience slower population growth in the 1990s. Having grown 108.34% in the 1980s, Osceola’s total population grew 67.98% in the 1990s. As Florida’s total state population grew 23.5% from 1990 to 2000, growth in all three counties exceeded the state’s total growth rate with Osceola growing at three times the rate as the state.34

31 Florida Department of State, “Minority Teacher Education Scholars: Laws of Florida.”
33 Orange County Planning Division.
Minority growth during the 1990s, specifically Hispanic growth, within the counties is also important to note. As previously stated, Orange’s total population by the 2000 census was 896,344, 68.6% of whom were White, non-Hispanic, 18.2% Black, non-Hispanic and 18.8% Hispanic. While this Black, non-Hispanic population percentage represents a small increase over the course of the decade from 16.65% in 1989, the Hispanic percentage of the population tripled from 4.14% of the total population in Orange County in 1989. By the end of the 1990s, Lake County’s total population was 210,528, 82% of whom were White, non-Hispanic. Lake County’s Black, non-Hispanic population totaled 11.32% of their total population in 1989 and decreased over the 1990s to 9.8%. Like the other two counties, Lake also experienced a large increase in their Hispanic population over the 1990s. Hispanics in Lake grew from only 2% of the population in 1989 to 12.1% in 2000. Although these demographic changes show an influx of Hispanics to the Central Florida region, the county most affected by the increase is Osceola. By 2000, Osceola’s population totaled 172,493, 45.5% of whom were Hispanic which was up from 2% in 1989. Osceola’s Black, non-Hispanic population grew from 5.1% of the total to 11.3% of their total population. This drastic shift in minority demographic of the county brought
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36 Florida Legislature, “Orange County: Florida’s 5th Most Populous County with 6.4% of Florida’s Population,” Economic and Demographic Report (Tallahassee, Florida: Office of Economic and Demographic Research, August 2018), [http://www.edr.state.fl.us/content/area-profiles/county/orange.pdf](http://www.edr.state.fl.us/content/area-profiles/county/orange.pdf).

37 Florida Legislature, “Lake County: Florida’s 19th Most Populous County with 1.6% of Florida’s Population,” Economic and Demographic Report (Tallahassee, Florida: Office of Economic and Demographic Research, August 2018), [http://www.edr.state.fl.us/content/area-profiles/county/lake.pdf](http://www.edr.state.fl.us/content/area-profiles/county/lake.pdf).
down the White, non-Hispanic percentage from 92.07% in 1989 to 71% in 2000. Although Osceola County experienced a decline in their overall growth rate, Hispanics continued to pour into the county over the 1990s.

Table 4: Population Growth, 1990-2000: Orange, Lake, and Osceola Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>89-90 Population % of Total</th>
<th>2000 Population</th>
<th>2000 Population % of Total</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>674,593</td>
<td>525,440 (77.89)</td>
<td>896,344</td>
<td>614,892 (68.6)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>112,320 (16.65)</td>
<td>163,135</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>1,686 (0.25)</td>
<td>2,689</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>7,286 (1.08)</td>
<td>31,372</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>330.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>27,928 (4.14)</td>
<td>168,513</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>503.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>151,193</td>
<td>130,404 (86.25)</td>
<td>210,528</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>17,115 (11.32)</td>
<td>17,474</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>318 (0.21)</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>333 (0.22)</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3,024 (2)</td>
<td>11,790</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>289.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td>102,684</td>
<td>94541 (92.07)</td>
<td>172,493</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>5237 (5.1)</td>
<td>12,764</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>318 (0.31)</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>171.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>524 (0.51)</td>
<td>3,967</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>657.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2,054 (2)</td>
<td>50,713</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>2,369.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


By 2000, the Hispanic population in Orange, Lake and Osceola had grown significantly and included more nationalities. In 1980, Orange County had 19,726 Hispanics and by 2000 they had 168,361, which was 18.8% of their total population. Of Orange County’s Hispanic population, 19,755 (11.7%) were Mexican, 86,583 (51.4%) were Puerto Rican, 12,371 (7.3%)

---

38 Florida Legislature, “Osceola County: Florida’s 18th Most Populous County with 1.6% of Florida’s Population.”
were Cuban, 7,676 (4.6%) were Colombian, and 6,358 (3.8%) were Dominican. In Lake County, there were only 2,255 Hispanics in 1980 and by 2000 there were 11,808 which was still only 5.6% of their total population. Of Lake’s Hispanic population 5,638 (47.7%) were Mexican and 2,978 (25.2%) were Puerto Rican. Lastly, there had only been 1,089 Hispanics in Osceola County in 1980. By 2000, there were 50,727 Hispanics which 29.4% the county’s total population. Of Osceola County’s Hispanic population in 2000, only 3,400 (6.7%) were Mexican, 30,728 (61%) were Puerto Rican, 2,178 (4.3%) were Cuban, 2,071 (4.1%) were Colombian, and 2,313 (4.6%) were Dominican.39

The overall population growth and the demographic changes were reflected throughout the school systems.40 From 1989 to 1999 the total student population in OCPS increased by 47.49% from 97,647 students to 144,308. Orange’s Black, non-Hispanic population grew 67.77% and their Hispanic population grew 220.43%. The Asian/Pacific Islander student population grew 112.85 to 5,036 students; and the American Indian/Alaskan Native population grew 196.23% to 471 students. Although the two groups total less than two percent of the overall student population in Orange, they, nonetheless, grew significantly over the 1990s.41 Lake County’s total student population growth was 40.31%, growing from 20,344 students in 1989 to 28,545 students in 1999. By the 1999-2000 school year, 7.33% of Lake’s students were Hispanic which was a 211.92% increase from 1989. Again, although they made up less than two percent

40 See Appendix B for FLDOE data showing student, teacher and administrator growth and diversification for Orange, Lake and Osceola counties from 1980-2006.
of the total number of students, Lake’s Asian/Pacific Islander population grew 142.3% and their American Indian/Alaskan Native student population grew 260%.\textsuperscript{42} Lastly, Osceola County Schools increased 76.89% from 18,021 total student in 1989 to 31,877 students in 1999. Hispanic students had made up 14.43% of the total student population in 1989 and after 315.72% growth over the decade made up 33.92% of the total student population in 1999. Osceola also experienced a 94.97% Black, non-Hispanic student increase and a 173.1% Asian/Pacific Islander student increase over the 1990s. However, by 1999, Black, non-Hispanic students only made up 9.48% of the total student population and Asian/Pacific Islanders only 2.64%.\textsuperscript{43}


### Table 5: Student Population Growth, 1990-2000: Orange, Lake, and Osceola County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>89-90 Student Population</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>99-00 Student Population</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orange</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97,647</td>
<td>144,308</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>60,753</td>
<td>62.22</td>
<td>66,141</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>24,981</td>
<td>25.58</td>
<td>41,910</td>
<td>29.04</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>196.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2,367</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>5,036</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>112.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9,388</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>30,082</td>
<td>20.85</td>
<td>220.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutiracial</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lake</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,344</td>
<td>28,545</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>15,843</td>
<td>77.88</td>
<td>21,226</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>3,704</td>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>4,742</td>
<td>16.61</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>211.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutiracial</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Osceola</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,021</td>
<td>31,877</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>74.91</td>
<td>16,625</td>
<td>52.15</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3,022</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>173.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>10,813</td>
<td>33.92</td>
<td>315.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutiracial</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Required by the Consent Decree, the state also started collecting data on LEP student enrollment by school district in the 1990s.\(^{44}\) By 1996, Orange had 8,646 students in their LEP program which was 6.69% of their overall student population.\(^{45}\) By the 1999-2000 academic

---

\(^{44}\) See Appendix B for FLDOE data showing LEP growth for Orange, Lake and Osceola counties from 1996-2006.

year, Orange was providing language services for 12,886 LEP students, 8.95% of their total student population, 67.74% of whom were Hispanic.\textsuperscript{46} Lake only enrolled 535 LEP students in 1996 which increased to 619 by 1999, 88.21% of whom were Hispanic.\textsuperscript{47} Lake’s LEP students in 1999 were only 2.17% of Lake’s overall student total.\textsuperscript{48} Although the overall smallest of the three, Osceola County serviced the second largest group of LEP students out of Orange, Lake and Osceola. In 1996, Osceola had 2,971 LEP students, 86.54% of whom were Hispanic.\textsuperscript{49} By 1999-2000, Osceola’s LEP program grew 40.5% to 4,173 students, 87.01% of whom were Hispanic.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{46} Education Information and Accountability Services, “Profiles of Florida School Districts, 1999-2000: Student and Staff Data.” 96.
\textsuperscript{48} Education Information and Accountability Services, “Profiles of Florida School Districts, 1999-2000: Student and Staff Data.” 70.
\textsuperscript{49} “Profiles of Florida School Districts, 1996-97: Student and Staff Data.” 106.
\textsuperscript{50} Education Information and Accountability Services, “Profiles of Florida School Districts, 1999-2000: Student and Staff Data.” 98.
Table 6: Limited English Proficient Student Population Growth, 1996-2000: Orange, Lake, and Osceola County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>96-97 LEP Population</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>99-00 LEP Population</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,646</td>
<td>12,886</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5,844</td>
<td>67.59</td>
<td>8,729</td>
<td>67.74</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutiracial</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>88.04</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>88.21</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutiracial</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,971</td>
<td>4,173</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2,571</td>
<td>86.54</td>
<td>3,631</td>
<td>87.01</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutiracial</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The counties hired more minority and Hispanic teachers over the 1990s. In 1989, OCPS had 977 Black, non-Hispanic teachers, 160 Hispanic teachers, nine Asian/Pacific Islanders teachers and six American Indian/Alaskan native teachers on staff. By 1999 they had increased those appointments to 1,230 Black, non-Hispanic teachers, 614 Hispanic teachers, sixty-nine Asian/Pacific Islanders teachers and fourteen American Indian/Alaskan native teachers. This was a 283% increase in their Hispanic teacher population. Although Lake County Schools made less
progress in hiring minorities overall, they increased their number of Hispanic teachers 240%. Lake went from having 100 Black, non-Hispanic teachers and ten Hispanic teachers out of 1,208 teachers on staff to having 109 Black, non-Hispanic teachers and thirty-four Hispanic teachers out of 1,569 from 1989 to 1999. Osceola County Schools doubled the total number of teachers on their staff and tripled, and even quadrupled, the total number of minority teachers as well. In 1989, Osceola had thirty-six Black, non-Hispanic teachers, thirty-seven Hispanic teachers, two Asian/Pacific Islanders teachers and three American Indian/Alaskan native teachers on staff. By 1999 they had increased their minority teacher hires to 100 Black, non-Hispanic teachers, 172 Hispanic teachers, sixteen Asian/Pacific Islanders teachers and six American Indian/Alaskan native teachers. This was a 365% increase in their Hispanic teacher staff.\textsuperscript{51}

Lastly, the school districts also hired more minority and Hispanic administrators. OCPS increased the number of minority administrators on their staff from eighty Black, non-Hispanics and seven Hispanics out of 471 to 107 Black, non-Hispanics, twenty-four Hispanics, and five American Indian/Alaskan Native out of 475 by 1999. Lake County Schools also made less progress in hiring minority administrators. They went from eleven Black, non-Hispanic and zero Hispanic administrators out of ninety-nine in 1989 to having fourteen Black, non-Hispanic and hiring only one Hispanic administrator in 1999. In 1989, Osceola County Schools had seventy administrators in total, sixty-five of whom were White, non-Hispanic and five of whom where Black, non-Hispanic. By 1999, they had ninety-five administrators in total and had only

increased their Black, non-Hispanic administrators to eight whereas they had hired seven Hispanic administrators.

Table 7: Classroom Teacher and Administration Growth, 1990-2000: Orange, Lake, and Osceola County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>89-90 CT</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>99-00 CT</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>89-90 Admin</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>99-00 Admin</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>6,104</td>
<td>8,019</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, NH</td>
<td>4,952</td>
<td>6,092</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>-10.7</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, NH</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI/AN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/PI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>283.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>242.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>242.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, NH</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, NH</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI/AN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/PI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, NH</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, NH</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI/AN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/PI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The School Districts’ Responses to Student Population Growth

In the 1990s Central Florida’s school districts had to respond to their increasing and diversifying student population, new state education and Consent Decree regulations, and a national push to turn around low performing schools while addressing a lack of multiculturalism.
in curriculum. The Consent Decree required schools to inform and include parents in their ESOL programming and “to be able to communicate with the home language.” Orange, Lake and Osceola employed multiple strategies to address this requirement. The three school districts also hired more minority teachers, minority administrators, and bilingual and ESOL certified teachers.

Osceola County Schools benefited from volunteer support and implemented many strategies as they worked to improve communication with Hispanic parents and families. The county’s Bilingual Reassurance Assistance Volunteer program (BRAVO), which was created by the county’s Hispanic American Association to support non-English speaking Hispanics access county services, consistently supported the School Board communicating with their Hispanic parents.52 BRAVO often initiated the partnership between themselves and the school board. Their volunteers supported Hispanic parents navigating the county’s ESOL program, helped them with forms in English, and hosted meetings to educate them on their children’s educational rights and program options. In 1997 as the state rolled out their Sunshine State Standards, BRAVO encouraged the School Board to cosponsor an informational parent conference with them to update the community on the new educational changes.53 A later strategy the School Board implemented to the displeasure of the English-Only supporters was issuing high school and middle school students’ report cards in Spanish in 1998. Families had to request the report cards in Spanish and elementary schools could not participate because their report cards were

still created manually.\textsuperscript{54} At the very end of the decade, Osceola County School Board invested in translation technology to improve communication with Hispanic families and to foster more community involvement in the school system. Using a federal grant, they purchased three translation kits which totaled 3 microphones for the bilingual translators and 36 earpiece devices for community members to borrow at no cost during school board or campus advisory meetings. They also sought out translators.\textsuperscript{55}

To improve communication with their growing and diversifying population, OCPS opened their own language bank and created multilingual resources for their non-English speaking parents. Among other examples pre-dating the school district’s language bank, the Miami Beach Chamber of Commerce started a language bank in 1965 and the Orlando Police Department created their own in the early 1980s.\textsuperscript{56} Following those models, OCPS implemented their own bank in the spring of 1991. Their language bank was a list of bilingual or multilingual volunteers who aimed to support schools, teachers, ELL students and their parents. Volunteers helped schools by translating materials like notes home, forms and newsletters, and by interpreting at parent-teacher conferences or in counseling sessions.\textsuperscript{57} They helped ELL students and parents by tutoring students in English, acting as role models and helping pre-school parents.\textsuperscript{58} As they started the language bank, the school district needed bilingual volunteers in 43 languages for the language bank; and by 1994 they needed volunteers to help in more than 56 languages.


languages. Later in 1993, the district translated their Student Code of Conduct and other important districtwide documents in Spanish, French, Haitian Creole, Portuguese and Vietnamese. By December 1993, they had also created a new student orientation video in Spanish, Haitian Creole, Vietnamese and Portuguese.

Another strategy the counties employed to comply with the Consent Decree was creating Parent Leadership Councils (PLCs). Osceola County School Board printed regular advertisements for their PLC meetings in *The Orlando Sentinel*, hosted the meetings in Spanish, provided English translations and childcare. In 1997, Osceola’s Superintendent Tom McCraley specifically pressed for more Hispanic parents to participate in the county’s PLC meetings after low participation rates the previous year. OCPS also created PLCs. Their School Board hosted PLC meetings at their main office downtown Orlando where they also provided free childcare and translators. Each meeting focused on a different topic like the county’s LEP plan or transportation. Individual schools in Orange also created PLCs. Hunter Creek’s PLC discussed school issues or sponsored family nights bimonthly. In 1993, Colonial High School’s PLC created their own task force and compiled a list of goals for the county to address. The parents wanted OCPS to increase the number of Hispanic administrators and improve teacher-parent
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In addressing legal complaints from Orange County Hispanic parents and students, the FLDOE made those same requests among others in April of 1993. 

OCPS and Superintendent Don Shaw worked to address their PLC’s request and the state mandate to hire more minority staff and train more staff in ESOL. In May 1993, Shaw promised to hire at least sixty new full and part time teachers with ESOL training. He promised that the district would train about twenty minority employees already in the district to become school administrators in the future. By December 1993, Shaw announced the school district’s progress in hiring more Hispanic faculty and promoting Hispanics to leadership positions. They had hired sixty-four Hispanic teachers, 111 Hispanic support workers, and added sixty ESOL positions across the county. The district placed Hispanic assistant principals at one high school and one middle school, hired two Hispanic psychologists to help test Spanish speaking students, and hired a Hispanic senior director to facilitate their multicultural services program. Hiring more Hispanic teachers did not cease to be an issue with Shaw’s progress report and, in fact, Orange County was still working out creative ways to address the issue at the end of the decade. In 1999, for example, OCPS reached out to the University of Puerto Rico to recruit their new bilingual teachers.

Also addressing the state requirement to increase the number of minority classroom teachers and administrators, Lake County Schools made a historical appointment when selecting
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Feliciano Felix Ramirez as assistant principal of Mascotte Elementary. Over the 1990s the county went from having 100 to 109 black teachers, from having 10 to 34 Hispanic teachers, and from having 10 to 15 black administrators; and they hired only one Hispanic administrator over the whole decade.\(^{69}\) In 1998, Lake County hired Feliciano Felix Ramirez, their first Mexican-American administrator, and the following year the Florida Department of State awarded Ramirez the Outstanding Hispanic Achievement Award. *The Orlando Sentinel* celebrated his hire and his achievement award with a story on his life experiences and accomplishments.

Ramirez was an important role model and voice for migrant and Hispanic students and the Hispanic community at Mascotte Elementary, within the school district, the county, and for the nation. Like many of the Hispanic student population in Lake County, Ramirez had been a migrant student and dropped out of school in 6\(^{th}\) grade to work as a migrant fruit picker. After finishing degrees at the University of Central Florida and Nova University, he worked for the Florida Migrant Child Compensatory Program. Ramirez began working for Lake County Schools in 1975. He taught adult ESL, elementary and middle school Language Arts, and worked as a program specialist for Lake’s Title I program.\(^{70}\) He worked with the county’s 500 Spanish-speaking students and parents and also sat on the board of directors of the East Coast Migrant Head Start Project helping migrant parents with infants to children four years of age.\(^{71}\) He was also an important influence in the county outside of the school system because he was pastor of the oldest and largest Spanish-speaking Baptist church in the county, La Primera Iglesia Bautista.

---
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de Mascotte. In 1996 he was selected to attend a conference at the Clinton White House with Education Secretary Richard Riley, Senator Bob Graham (D-FL), and 150 other Hispanic leaders from across the United States. Ramirez reported that he was able to share his concerns for migrant workers and migrant families with the leaders at the conference.\(^\text{72}\)

Osceola County Schools implemented multiple strategies to address their need for more minority, Hispanic and ESOL certified teachers. In response to the state’s thirty-day mandate, Osceola hired more staff to reduce the LEP screening test time. Director of Instructional Programs, Blaine Muse also responded to the parent and state complaint with reassurance that the county’s teachers were undergoing ESOL training.\(^\text{73}\) Enacting an idea unique to Osceola, the school board awarded a few English-speaking teachers scholarships in the Spring of 1995 for a teacher’s version of a cultural exchange trip to Puerto Rico. Although two of the scholarship recipients, Pam Ollis and Laurel Hagood, were already working on their master’s degrees in ESOL, the trip provided them with invaluable insight into their students’ cultural backgrounds.\(^\text{74}\) Whereas Ollis and Hagood earned degrees in ESOL, by 1995 Osceola provided all of their teachers with some basic ESOL training and by 1996 the county started to offer the college-level ESOL courses for their teachers through professional development.\(^\text{75}\) By 1996, the county was also actively seeking to hire bilingual teachers.\(^\text{76}\)
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School District Educational Programming: Orange County

In the 1990s OCPS’s ADDitions volunteer coordinators continued to run the innovative “Un Poquito de Español” program and received recognition for their efforts. By 1990, the Poquito program ran in thirty elementary schools across the county. Throughout the decade, the ADDitions volunteer coordinating program continued to recruit and train bilingual volunteers for the Poquito program. The volunteers taught elementary students the Spanish language and culture for about a half an hour on average once a week.

School based Poquito programs celebrated their volunteers. For example, Englewood Elementary School, which had a large bilingual population served by the program, hosted a bilingual luncheon to thank and celebrate all the volunteers who ran their Poquito program.

Surrounding counties noted the success of the program. By 1994, Osceola County Schools intended to start their own version of the Poquito program but had to delay its start due to staffing issues.

Walt Disney World even awarded Colonial High School’s Ninth Grade Center’s Poquito program the Outstanding Category award for Community Service in Arts and Culture in 1998.

Throughout the 1990s, OCPS complied with state requirements and METF recommendations through the CACMP. In 1988, OCPS hired cultural awareness consultant John Norris and his company, Group Dynamics and Strategy Training, Inc., to create CACMP, which is described in Chapter One. OCPS later hired Norris as a full-time consultant. Norris lead

---
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cultural-awareness workshops for Orange County administrators, staff and students. By 1990, CACMP was in seventeen schools and Norris led the two-day retreats for Orange County students.\textsuperscript{82} Norris worked with parents, educators and law enforcement officers to survey students about violence in schools and to help facilitate proactive anti-violence discussions with students.\textsuperscript{83} In 1994, Norris worked with students from Orange, Osceola and Seminole counties at the “Partners in Change Non-Violence Conferences” at Walt Disney World.\textsuperscript{84} Even as the county faced 1995 budget cuts, Orange kept Norris as a full-time consultant to continue his cultural sensitivity and conflict mediation programming.\textsuperscript{85} Noting his success in Orange County, by 1997 neighboring Lake County Schools was looking to hire Norris to help address racial incidents among their diversifying student body population.\textsuperscript{86} OCPS worked to address students’ cultural needs by continuing CACMP and by ensuring there was a budget for Norris’s cultural sensitivity trainings for students, staff, and administrators.

In 1993, the OCPS created an Office of Multicultural Services and a committee of administrators to plan for the multicultural needs of their ELL and minority students. The school board named Javier Melendez as the office’s first senior director. As director, Melendez worked to ensure schools promoted programs celebrating cultural awareness, included multicultural views in lesson plans, and taught about multicultural role models.\textsuperscript{87} OCPS also created the “Beyond Cultural Awareness” committee in 1994. Along with Melendez, one of the committee’s
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\textsuperscript{84} “Ready or Knot, It’s Teamwork,” \textit{The Orlando Sentinel}, November 30, 1994, Other edition.
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primary goals was to recruit more minority educators and keep them in the Orange County system.\textsuperscript{88} The committee held that schools needed to increase minority representation in their curriculum materials, so in 1997 the school system updated “its lists of instructional materials to include more books by or about blacks, Hispanics and other minorities.”\textsuperscript{89} Another project Melendez’s committee encouraged the county to undertake in 1997 was to rewrite district wide tests to include reading passages that no only reflected higher standards but also reflected the experiences of minority groups.\textsuperscript{90}

Later in April of 1998, Orange County School Board announced they were going to restructure the district departments including the Bilingual and ESOL Services department. The School Board eliminated about 100 jobs and relocated or reassigned about 350 jobs.\textsuperscript{91} They also changed the name of the “Bilingual and ESOL Services Department” to the “World Languages and Second Language Acquisition Department,” which reflects the district’s commitment to the growing trend of teaching foreign languages to English speaking students. Hispanic parents passionately contested the name change, as the change inferred that the school district was shifting away from prioritizing bilingual education to only promoting English acquisition for their ELL students. Consequently, School Board member Linda Sutherland had to convince Hispanic parents that the name change did not indicate that they county would overlook their ELL children’s needs.\textsuperscript{92} She argued that the school district had not “waivered in their support of
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bilingual education” and that “if anything, the name change reflects a desire to teach more English-speaking children other languages.”

The district changed the department’s name again in 1999 to “Second Language Learning,” which it remained until 2004.

Over the 1990s, OCPS continued addressing and increased their capacity to address ELL students’ language needs through their bilingual centers. OCPS ran 12 elementary bilingual centers in 1989 and opened five more at the start of the new decade. Twelve of those centers offered Spanish programs, three were Haitian Creole programs, and two were Arabic, Japanese and Korean programs. Over the 1990-1991 school year more than 1,300 elementary students received content area instruction in their home language, received daily English lessons, and joined their general education classmates for special classes like physical education, art, and music at these bilingual centers.

OCPS also opened their seventh bilingual center for middle school students at Ocoee Middle School in 1990.

In addition to supporting their ELL students’ linguistic needs through their bilingual centers, some schools in OCPS implemented dual language and foreign language programs which expanded program options for ELLs and extended language learning opportunities to English speaking students. As previously described, dual language programs are for English-speaking students and Spanish-speaking students in which they spend half their day learning and working in English and half their day learning and working in Spanish. In 1993, two kindergarten teachers at Palmetto Elementary rolled out the district’s first dual language program. Promoting the benefits of the program, the teachers reported that their program built “a
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bond between children of different races and backgrounds.”\(^96\) The Palmetto teachers and principal encouraged other elementary administrators to observe their program and to adopt a similar dual language format for their own students.\(^97\) In 1994 Blanker Elementary began an English-Spanish bilingual program in their first grade and kindergarten classes. By 1997, Englewood Elementary was running an English-Spanish dual language program for students from first through fifth grade and had five bilingual teachers on staff.\(^98\) Implemented in 1997, the foreign language programs at Hillcrest Elementary and Jackson Middle School preceded a district-wide commitment to teach foreign languages English-speaking students. Hillcrest was already known for working with non-English speaking students as Orange’s only Vietnamese bilingual center, but in 1997 the elementary school started their foreign language academy.\(^99\) Jackson Middle School started a similar foreign language program the same year.\(^100\)

**School District Educational Programming: Lake County**

Lake County Schools centralized their language programs for their ELL students. Replacing traveling bilingual instructors, the county created English Language Proficiency Centers at Roseborough, Mascotte, and Sken elementary schools and at middle schools and high schools in Groveland and Mount Dora, seven centers in all. The county opened these centers in 1990 and, with parental consent, bussed their ELL students to the center closest to the students’
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zonated school. Although the county’s largest group of ELL students’ native language was Spanish, the county’s ELL students also came from various native language backgrounds including Haitian, Korean, Chinese, Japanese, Vietnamese, Hungarian and “Arabian.”

According to Lake’s migrant program supervisor, the county had decided to centralize their ELL program in order to provide a “comprehensive program” to address their ELL students’ English needs.

In terms of multicultural programming, however, Lake County School Board made the news in the 1990s for two drastically different programs – their “Tossed Salad” and “America First” programs. During the summer of 1990, a Lake County curriculum team created a K-12 activity book entitled “America is a Tossed Salad.” The workbook included ideas like “cooking American Indian fry bread or French crepes, or compiling ethnic-themed scrapbooks.” Although the county intended for the workbook to be a constructive resource in addressing teachers’ need for multicultural education curriculum, it was difficult to monitor that teachers were actually implementing the program. Teachers also pushed back against using the curriculum, complaining that they could not spare the time away from core subjects, that the content in the workbook did not fit with their math or science lessons, and that there was not enough training on how to implement the lessons. Although the “America is a Tossed Salad” program was in place before METF’s review of similar programs across the state and modeled that at least some curriculum developers in the county wanted to implement multicultural lessons,
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it was not possible to measure the success or even the consistency of implementation of the program.\footnote{Badie.}

Whereas Lake’s “Tossed Salad” curriculum demonstrated internal initiatives to implement multicultural lessons in Lake County schools, their School Board’s now infamous “America First” was a direct response to Florida’s Multicultural Education Law. In July 1993, Lake County School Board Chairwoman, Pat Hart, introduced five district policies she wanted the school board to adopt –one of which was her “America First” policy.\footnote{Rick Badie, “Board Delays Talks about Ban on Yoga,” \textit{The Orlando Sentinel}, July 3, 1993, Other edition.} Although Hart’s policy intended to comply with Florida’s 1992 Multicultural Education Law, she also wanted to instruct all students to have an “appreciation of our American heritage and culture, such as: our republican form of government, capitalism, a free enterprise system, patriotism, strong family values, freedom of religion and other basic values that are superior to other foreign or historic cultures.”\footnote{Rick Badie, “Board Pushes ‘cultural Superiority’ but Doesn’t Spell It Out,” \textit{The Orlando Sentinel}, March 23, 1994, The Lake Sentinel edition.} With a 3-2 conservative Christian majority on the board, Hart passed the policy in May of 1994 without holding any public meetings to clarify the policy or field questions, much to the chagrin of teachers and administrators.\footnote{Badie.} The policy created a division in the school system. While the Lake County Education Association Teacher’s Union filed a lawsuit against the school board in order to repeal the policy, the American Center for Law and Justice from Virginia, the conservative counterpart to the American Civil Liberties Union, came to the school board’s aid.\footnote{Jill Jordan Spitz, “Teachers Union Will Add to Revised ‘U.S.-First’ Suit,” \textit{The Orlando Sentinel}, July 15, 1994, Other edition, sec. Friday Follow-up.} However, the case never went to a full trial because, as school board elections
approached, candidates for the open school board seats promised to retract the policy and so the lawyers from both sides held off on the case. After the November 1994 elections the new board majority did take down the “America First” policy.

Although short lived, Lake County’s “America First” policy sparked controversy locally and nationally in 1994 and throughout the rest of the decade. Teachers showed up to school board meetings to speak out against the policy and even compared it to Hitler’s ethnocentric ideals. Lake County editor Sam Fenton fielded responses from the community on the policy and, after receiving a “heavy” mail response, reported that three out of four members in the Lake County community opposed the policy. Conservative nationwide talk-show host Pat Buchanan, who later ran in 1996 Republican presidential primaries against Bob Dole, hosted an interview with Pat Hart praising and defending her “America First” policy. The School Board itself received local, national and international phone calls, including calls from Ireland, Texas, California, Colorado and New York asking about and responding to the policy. Three years after “America First” was repealed, national televised debates about education policy even referenced the Lake County policy as a negative example of the possible consequences of giving local communities control over education policy.

---

110 Badie, “Board Pushes 'cultural Superiority' but Doesn’t Spell It Out.”
111 Sam Fenton, “'American Superiority' Issue Draws Quick Response from Readers,” The Orlando Sentinel, April 6, 1994, Other edition.
113 Rick Badie, “Love It or Hate It, School Policy Commands Attention,” The Orlando Sentinel, May 22, 1944, Other edition.
School District Educational Programming: Osceola County

Despite Osceola County’s rapid Hispanic growth pattern and despite the Consent Decree court case originating in Osceola County, Hispanic parents still had to pressure Osceola Schools to abide by the Consent Decree in the early 1990s. Having already tried less publicized ways of addressing the school board, many Hispanic parents went before the school board in November 1991 and argued that the district was not abiding by the Consent Decree and was still not providing their children with their right to equal access to education. Unfortunately, the School Board did not make any changes to their LEP programs as a result of the parents’ presentation.\(^{115}\) However, the FLDOE responded to an August 1991 complaint by reviewing the county’s LEP program in December 1992 and found they agreed with ten of the parents’ thirteen complaints.\(^{116}\) The state gave Osceola a month to address the complaints which included addressing 2,489 students who were not enrolled in LEP services but needed to be, insufficient transportation for LEP students, taking too long to perform screening tests for LEP students, and using teachers in language instruction for content areas outside their certification.\(^{117}\)

Although Osceola addressed the state’s 1992 concerns about their Consent Decree violations, the school district did not actually modify their ESOL programming until later and when they did, they continued to prioritize English acquisition. In 1992-1993, Osceola worked to address some of the state’s concerns by creating district level positions for ESOL and multicultural programming. They placed ESOL and multicultural programming responsibilities


\(^{117}\) Grogan, “School Report Raps Osceola.”
under the Curriculum and Instruction Department.\textsuperscript{118} Up until the 1996-1997 school year, Osceola had been using a “pull out” ESOL program. ESOL certified teachers took LEP students out of their general education classroom for small group English language instruction in English. After the FLDOE chided Orange County for their similar “pull out” program, Osceola decided to change their program to avoid another state reprimand. Instead of a “pull out” ESOL model, Osceola implemented an “emerging model.” In this new model, LEP students stayed in their general education classroom with an ESOL certified teacher in charge of the whole class or an ESOL certified teacher would come into the class to aid the LEP students.\textsuperscript{119} As the goal of both program models was for LEP students to acquire and master English skills, neither program aimed to maintain or support the LEP students’ native language skills. The “emerging model,” however, protected LEP students’ language and civil rights by keeping them integrated with their general education classmates and ensuring they had linguistic support during content lessons.

\textbf{Conclusion}

Orange, Lake and Osceola County School Districts’ responses to their Hispanic student population growth continued to follow a pattern of change corresponding with the size of their Hispanic student population through the 1990s. OCPS began the 1990s with 9,388 Hispanic students and grew to 30,082 students, which represented growth from 9.6\% to 20.9\% of their total student population. Lake County Public Schools began the 1990s with 671 Hispanic students and grew to 2,093, which represented growth from 3.3\% to 7.3\% of their total student population.
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population. Osceola County Public Schools began the decade with 2,601 Hispanic students and grew to 10,813 students, which represented growth from 14.4% to 33.9% of their total student population. Osceola’s Hispanic growth pattern was comparable to OCPS’s 1980s growth pattern, though their percentage of Hispanic students was higher. Consequently, OCPS continued to lead the three counties in linguistically and culturally supportive programming and administrative structures, Lake County resisted changing their ESOL programs and Florida’s Multicultural Education Law, and Osceola Public School Districts’ responses mirrored OCPS responses from the 1980s.

In the 1990s, OCPS responded to their large Hispanic population by expanding programs already in place, by implementing new language programs, and by creating district level structures of support. OCPS continued and expanded their Poquito program and bilingual centers, including expanding bilingual centers to provide services for Middle School age students. OCPS initiated their own language bank, Dual Language programs, the majority of which were Spanish-English programs, and Foreign Language programs. Prior to the 1990s, OCPS already had enough Hispanic and LEP students to warrant district level positions responsible for ESOL and Bilingual Services and during the 1990s, as previously written, they changed this departments name multiple times eventually calling it Second Language Learning. These programs and the department’s name change demonstrated OCPS’s proactive and inclusive ideology about language use and student language development, which reflected their large and growing Hispanic and LEP student population. The programs provided opportunities for native language instruction for Hispanic and LEP students as well as second language acquisition for English speaking students. In addition to district level language support, OCPS’s Hispanic and diverse student population size also warranted the creation of the Office of
Multicultural Services, which proactively addressed the broader cultural needs of the district’s Hispanic and diverse student population.

Irrespective of their Hispanic student population growth over the 1990s, Lake County School District’s response to their smaller Hispanic population was to continue prioritizing English language acquisition, segregating LEP students, and to resisting parent requests and state mandates for more culturally sensitive programming and increasing Hispanic faculty. Lake did change to their ESOL programming due to LEP student growth; however, their programming changes further segregated their Hispanic and LEP students and their ESOL programming continued to focus on English language acquisition without providing opportunities for Hispanic and LEP students to learn in their native language. Although the “America is A Tossed Salad” curriculum does demonstrate that the district did try to implement multicultural lesson plans, the district did not require schools to implement the program. The School Board, however, did require that, for a short time, Lake schools implement their “America First Policy,” which went against the state’s mandate to promote multicultural education. Lake County Schools did not have or add any district level departments for ESOL or multicultural services and only increased their Hispanic classroom teacher staff by 2.1% and administrators by 0.9%.

Osceola’s Hispanic student totals and growth in the 1990s mirrored OCPS in the 1980s and thus Osceola County School District responded with similar district level structures but was slow to modify their Intensive English program or to implement other district created programs. OCPS had a district level ESOL and Bilingual positions by the end of the 1980s and in 1992 Osceola nested their LEP responsibilities under their Curriculum and Instruction Department. After the Consent Decree, FLDOE ESOL audits, and continued push back from parents, Osceola
finally changed their Intensive English program from the segregating “pull out” model to an emerging “push in” model in 1996. Furthermore, the BRAVO volunteer program was similar to OCPS’s language bank. However, OCPS initiated their language bank whereas Osceola County Schools received help from and worked with but did not create BRAVO.

As in the 1980s, the three public-school systems and Hispanic populations continued conversely affected each other and many people, like civil rights activist groups, teachers, administrators, parents, and community members, shaped Orange, Lake, and Osceola School Districts’ responses to education policies and their population changes.

At the onset of the 1990s, the organization that was most influential and beneficial for LEP and Hispanic students across the state of Florida was LULAC. LULAC consisted of multiple political organizations representing various Hispanic groups that worked to protect students’ civil rights. The group itself was a panethnic model of cooperation and, in the Florida Consent Decree case, they followed precedence from the modern Civil Rights movement to standardize LEP programming across the state thus forcing counties to provide equitable programs for students regardless of the student’s native language or location.

However, for Orange, Lake and Osceola counties, teachers and Hispanic administrators continued to be the primary agents of change and support for LEP and Hispanic students. Many teachers spent a lot of time and money to go through 300 extra hours of training to become ESOL certified, a choice they made to provide more effective services for their LEP students. Teachers piloted Dual Language programs in OCPS which, unlike the LEP programs in Lake and Osceola, promoted LEP students’ language rights by supporting native language
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Even in Lake County, where teachers had initially complained about implementing multicultural curriculum, it was their teachers who actively protested and eventually sued the school board for their “America First” policy which would have marginalized their Hispanic and foreign-born students. Hispanic administrators also played an important role in changing education practices. OCPS’s Javier used his administrative position to promote cultural awareness and Hispanic and minority representation in classroom materials, library books, and on standardized tests. Similarly, Feliciano Felix Ramirez fought for programs to more effectively support Lake County’s migrant students.

Especially in Orange and Osceola counties, Hispanic parents and volunteers were actively involved in the public-school system during the 1990s. Hispanic parents pushed for the counties to address weaknesses in the LEP programs, to improve communication with parents, and to hire more Hispanic teachers and administrators. When the counties did not address their concerns, the parents filed complaints with the state. OCPS’s language bank volunteer program and Osceola’s BRAVO were panethnic, sociocultural institutions created by or for Hispanics. Both programs demonstrate the importance of community support because neither program could have existed without the multilingual community volunteers who donated their time and linguistic skills to run the programs.
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CHAPTER THREE

Student achievement as measured by standardized tests and school accountability were important federal and state priorities in the 2000s. The Florida Department of Education continued to audit school districts and their ESOL programs to hold counties accountable for failing to meet state and federal requirements. To measure their non-English speaking population’s achievement the state had to create and implement new testing structures. As Central Florida’s population continued to grow, Orange, Lake and Osceola continued to address the needs of their LEP and multicultural populations while the federal and state government held them accountable for student progress on standardized tests.

By 2000, OCPS and Osceola County Public Schools’ Hispanic student populations were almost or more than a quarter of their total student population whereas Lake County Schools’ Hispanic population still lagged in size and percent of their total. Consequently, OCPS and Osceola County Schools responded with adapting their language programming and restructuring or creating new structures at their district office level to handle the massive task of tracking LEP student progress. Meanwhile, increased attention from the state and continually growing Hispanic student totals finally forced Lake County Public Schools adapting their LEP programming.

National and Florida Education Reforms: 2000

George Walker Bush and John Ellis (Jeb) Bush shaped education reform as they held the chief executive offices for Texas, Florida and for the United States. George W. Bush served as Texas’s 46th governor from 1995-2000 prior to campaigning for President of the United States.
Jeb Bush became Florida’s forty-third governor on January 5, 1999 and served until 2001 as the state’s first ever two-term Republican governor. After a highly contested presidential election, George W. Bush was sworn in as the nation’s forty-third president on January 20, 2001. Both Bush brothers campaigned on and initiated education reforms that prioritized putting more money into education based on the results of standardized testing. Both men used their executive positions to reshape public education’s priorities – for Florida and the nation. They also created new challenges for bilingual and multicultural education.

As George W. Bush was making plans to campaign for President, Jeb Bush signed his A+ Plan for education on June 21, 1999 as Florida’s new governor. Jeb Bush’s A+ plan set multiple goals for education reform in Florida. The A+ Plan ended social promotion, a practice in which students are promoted to the next grade level without mastering the necessary skills or content in order to keep the student with their same aged peers. The plan also increased the number of grade levels that were required to take the annual standardized test, the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). The FCAT had begun under Governor Lawton Childs and, until the A+ plan, only tested students in grades 4, 8 and 10. Like Texas’s plan, A+ legislated that students grades 3-10 would take the FCAT. The plan expected students to show Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) by increasing their test scores from year to year. Prior to A+ schools received a grade based on their students’ performance on the FCAT based on a number system of “1” through “5,” the A+ plan changed this to “A” through “F.” Schools sent these grades home via letters, newspapers printed the grades, and the state posted the grades online. The A+ the plan financially rewarded schools that met their AYP goals, mandated that “D” and “F” schools create
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and implement improvement plans, and required the FLDOE to monitor “D” and “F” schools. Teachers were also held to higher standards and financially rewarded for their student’s progress on FCAT.\(^2\) Jeb also signed into law the nation’s first statewide voucher plan as part of the A+ plan, called the “Opportunity Scholarship Program.”\(^3\)

As President, George W. carried these education reforms from Texas and Florida to the national stage when he appointed his Secretary of Education and signed NCLB into law. Former superintendent of Houston Independent School District Roderick Paige was Bush’s first Secretary of Education.\(^4\) Paige worked with a Republican led Congress on creating a new national education reform law and one year into his first term, Bush signed the bipartisan act into law. Like the Texas and Florida plans, NCLB required states to create their own state standards and testing platforms to measure student achievement of those. NCLB required states to measure students’ academic progress on those standardized tests annually in grades 3-8 and once in high school. Like the Texas plan, states had to report and disaggregate student testing data based on race, low income status and participation in special education programs including the ELL program.\(^5\) States were required to evaluate schools based on student test scores showing AYP. If schools did not meet AYP for two, three, four and five consecutive years, NCLB mandated consequences for each year. Like Paige’s model in Houston and Jeb’s model in Florida, one of the consequences for failing schools was that the state had to offer vouchers for parents to send


students to higher-performing public schools, charter schools or private schools. Also like in Texas and Florida, states had to define and measure teacher quality to provide “highly qualified” teachers for their students.6

As George W. signed and implemented NCLB at the national level, Jeb Bush experimented with different kinds of voucher programs in Florida. Jeb signed the McKay Scholarship Program into law in May 2001; and he later signed the Corporate Income Tax Credit Scholarship Program into law in January 2002.7 The McKay Scholarship Program was a voucher program that aimed to provide disabled children with better academic opportunities. If their zoned public school was unable to meet their students’ specialized needs, families could use state funded vouchers to send their disabled child to a private school through the McKay program.8 Testing voucher programs from the private sector, Bush started the Corporate Income Tax Credit Scholarship Program. This program allowed businesses to donate up to 75% of their corporate income tax to create vouchers for low-income students in low performing schools. Families of low-income students were able to use the vouchers to send their student to a private school or to cover the cost of transportation to send their student to a public school in a different county.9

After the Bushes implemented school voucher programs at the state and national level, voucher opponents took the programs to state and federal court questioning their constitutionality. Many school vouchers sent students to private religious schools in the place of

8 Hegarty, “‘Other’ Voucher Plan to Unfurl.”
9 Dunn, “Schools Wary of Choice Program.”
their zoned public school. Consequently, opponents to these programs argued that vouchers violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment which forbids Congress from making any law “respecting an establishment of religion.”\(^\text{10}\) In 2002 the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in a 5-4 opinion in favor of school vouchers in the case of *Zelman v. Simmons-Harris* and upheld the Sixth Circuit’s decision that vouchers do not violate the Establishment Clause. The Court argued that vouchers directly aided low income students giving them as equal a choice to attend other public schooling options as private or religious. Thus, the vouchers did not directly establish religious institutions and any government aid given to a religious institution was only possible by way of student choice.\(^\text{11}\) Pro-voucher Floridians were happy with the ruling because similar case was working through the Florida Court System.\(^\text{12}\) When the Florida Supreme Court finally ruled on the state case in 2006, however, they ruled against the state’s voucher program. In a 5-2 ruling, the court concluded that the Opportunity Scholarship vouchers “violate the Florida Constitution’s requirement that the state provide a uniform, efficient and high quality, free school system for all children living within its borders.”\(^\text{13}\) In spite of the ruling, Bush continued to promote school vouchers as governor.\(^\text{14}\) Whereas the Opportunity Scholarship program ended while Bush was still in office, the Tax Credit Scholarship voucher program continued after his final term and voucher opponents did not take it to the state courts until 2014.\(^\text{15}\)

\(^{10}\) Mr David Carlson, “Establishment Clause,” LII / Legal Information Institute, June 10, 2009, https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/establishment_clause.


\(^{15}\) Colburn; Leslie Postal, “Teachers Union Appeals Tax-Credit-Scholarship Ruling,” *The Orlando Sentinel*, June 16, 2015.
NCLB changed BEA and the nation’s new bilingual education focus was evident in the new naming structures. NCLB moved bilingual education from Title VII of the ESEA to Title III of NCLB and renamed the section as “Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Children.” Under this new title, students were no longer framed as “English Language Learners” but marked as “Limited English Proficient.” Although both terms have been scrutinized for their underlying biases, many educators and policy makers deemed this name change unfairly marked non-English speaking students as challenges to be overcome.\(^{16}\) The new title also clearly indicated that the federal government prioritized English instruction and mastery of English over bilingual instruction or mastery of native languages, bilingualism or multilingualism.\(^{17}\) In 2002 the federal government also renamed the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, the federal department responsible for bilingual programming, to the Office of English Language Acquisition. NCLB and the Bush administration clearly marked a federal shift away from bilingual education practices.\(^{18}\)

Although at first glance Title III of NCLB expanded federally funded options for bilingual education programming but in practice it essentially repealed BEA. Title III created two federally funded provisions for bilingual education that, according to NCLB, could not coexist. Both provisions promoted English fluency and academic achievement for ELLs while holding state governments accountable for those increases. Both created federal grant programs to fund the creation and implementation of language learning programs. However, the first
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\(^{17}\) Jr.

provision created a formula-based grant program for English-only instructional programs to be enacted if Congress allocated an amount equal or surpassing $650 million dollars. The second provision funded and promoted bilingual programs that focused on multilingual proficiency and multicultural understanding. In 2002, Congress appropriated more than the needed amount of money for the first provision to take effect and, in doing so, essentially repealed BEA and removed federal funding for bilingual programs.19

Since NCLB and A+ required that all students take content area standardized tests, Florida had to address the issue of how to test their ELL students for content mastery. According to NCLB, one of Florida’s options was to test ELL students in their native language. However, NCLB only allowed ELL students to take native language tests for up to three years before requiring that they take the test in English.20 In Florida, passing the FCAT was vital for all students because they had to pass the exam to graduate with their full diploma and yet the state only offered the test in English. One solution that Florida employed was that they gave LEP students certain accommodations when taking the FCAT, for example they could use a native language-English dictionary and they could have extra time. In 2003, freshman Representative John Quiñones, a Puerto Rican Republican from Kissimmee and Central Florida’s first Hispanic elected to the lower house, led the way in proposing multiple other options for how the Florida could address this issue. After lawmakers had won alternate methods to meet graduation requirements for students with disabilities, Quiñones proposed similar legislation to support

19 Jr, 87-98.
20 James Crawford, “No Child Left Behind: Misguided Approach to School Accountability for English Language Learners” (Forum on Ideas to Improve the NCLB Accountability Provisions for Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners, National Association for Bilingual Education, 2004).
Florida’s ELL students. His proposal included making the FCAT available in Spanish, allowing full diplomas for ELL students who had failed the FCAT but had less than two years of experience in English and held a 2.5 grade-point average, and allowing comparable SAT or ACT scores or other native language standardized tests to count towards graduation for ELL students who did not pass the FCAT. Quiñones, supported by fellow Representative Marco Rubio, was able to get legislation passed to allow ELL students to use alternate exam scores to graduate if they were unable to pass the FCAT.

In addition to testing ELL students for content area mastery, NCLB also required states to create and implement testing measures to track ELL progress in English proficiency. To fulfill that NCLB requirement, Florida rolled out the expensive Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) in 2006-2007. Prior to CELLA, FLDOE allowed counties to choose how to evaluate the English proficiency levels of their ELL students. There were twenty different language tests used across Florida and counties did not share their data with each other or with the state. Florida and four other states, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Maryland used a federal grant to pay Educational Testing Service (ETS), a company based out of Princeton, New Jersey to create CELLA. From 2006 to 2008, Florida paid ETS about $13
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million to implement and grade the test in Florida.\textsuperscript{25} The test standardized Florida’s ELL English proficiency testing and gave the state uniform data on the various ELL programs across the state.

CELLA was a multipart test designed to measure ELL students’ English listening, speaking, reading and writing proficiency in grades K-12. CELLA administration was divided into four testing levels: Grades K-2, Grades 3-5, Grades 6-8 and Grades 9-12.\textsuperscript{26} Students were tested on their grade level unless they had just entered an English program. CELLA allowed new ELL students to take the reading and writing portions of the test one level below their grade level. Schools administered all parts of the test to all participating Kindergarten students in an individual setting; whereas students Grades 1-12 took paper-based listening, reading, and writing portions of the test in small groups. For the listening test, teachers would read a script or play an audio segment and then students bubbled in answers to multiple choice questions based on the segment.\textsuperscript{27} In the reading portion of CELLA students read short passages at a “wide range of literacy levels” and answered multiple choice questions about what they had read.\textsuperscript{28} Students responded to short prompts for the writing test, the required length of which aligned to their age or testing level.\textsuperscript{29} The speaking portion of CELLA was a one on one scripted interview which CELLA projected should last about fifteen minutes for every student taking the test regardless of their level.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{27} “Florida CELLA Fact Sheet” (Florida Department of Education, 2006), http://oada.dadeschools.net/CELLA/cellainfosheet.pdf.
\textsuperscript{28} “Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Online” (AccountabilityWorks and AWSchoolTest.comS, 2008), https://www.awschooltest.com/photos/CELLA_Brochure_v2.pdf.
\textsuperscript{30} “Florida CELLA Fact Sheet.”
The USDOE, FLDOE, school districts, schools and teachers used CELLA test results for various reasons. CELLA fulfilled the USDOE’s requirement to measure English proficiency and track growth for ELL populations to ensure that schools and districts were successfully meeting the needs of ELLs. NCLB also required that states use data from English proficiency tests in their formula to measure school, district, and the state AYP. Thus, LEP students’ CELLA scores impacted schools’ performance ratings and had the potential affect each school’s Title III federal language funding. Florida reported CELLA data to parents to show how schools and districts were meeting the needs of their students. The FLDOE also used the data to compare districts, compare individual schools, identify successful ELL programs, and identify highly effective teaching strategies. At the school level, teachers and schools used CELLA data to plan lessons to address students’ areas of weakness as determined by the test. Schools also used CELLA scores to determine when students were ready to officially exit their ESOL program.

Though beneficial for improving ELL accountability and data collection, implementing CELLA was time consuming, challenging, and costly, especially in Central Florida. In 2006, the rollout year, the state tested all ELL students using CELLA twice. At the time, Central Florida had 62,000 students to test—35,000 in Orange County and 2,300 in Lake County. CELLA was time consuming for districts because they had to organize and distribute all the testing materials as well as organize testing schedules for their test administrators and students. Osceola County’s

---

33 Brown, “Students Learning English Out to Test: No Child Left Behind Act Mandates CELLA.”
34 “Florida CELLA Information For Parents.”
36 Zequeira, Claudia, “Test Rates Kids’ Gains in English.”
Multicultural Department coordinator, Dalia Medina, reported she was organizing “at least 100 staff members and numerous teachers to accomplish the task of testing 10,000 students over the testing window.”

CELLA was also time consuming and school districts had to coordinate and pay substitutes to cover for all the classroom teachers and ESOL paraprofessionals that were proctoring the test. This was problematic because those teachers and ESOL paraprofessionals lost important time away from their regular classrooms and schedules to administer the test.

CELLA was also problematic because it cost so much money to implement. For example, Hillsborough County schools reported spending $90,000 from a federal grant to cover the cost of substitutes and then paid another $23,000 from their own funds to hire retired teachers to proctor the test.

At some schools it was also difficult to find physical space to administer the test, so schools proctored the test in their media centers, cafeterias, computer labs, and wherever they could find the space.

Due to accountability testing and the direct consequence of losing school funding through the national and state vouchers programs, national and state bilingual and language education shifted away from bilingual proficiency and towards English mastery. NCLB and A+ held Florida schools accountable for ELL scores on state standards in content areas of reading and math by 2005 and, by 2007, science by counting the ELL subgroup scores towards a school’s AYP.

Once CELLA rolled out, ELL scores on CELLA were figured into the AYP formula. NCLB, A+ and CELLA put clear and real pressure on schools to demonstrate ELL students
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progressing in English acquisition or to face consequences like losing students funding and students through vouchers programs.\(^{41}\)

**Orange, Lake, and Osceola Counties: 2000s Population Growth**

Even though the population growth rate in Orange, Osceola and Lake counties slowed down from 2000-2010, the counties did not stop growing.\(^{42}\) Orange County’s population grew 32.8% in the 1990s and only 21.7% from 2000 to 2010. Lake County’s population growth continued to slow down from 39.21% in the 1990s to 29.13% during the 2000s. Of the three counties, Osceola’s population growth slowed down the most. They were growing at a rate of 67.98% in the 1990s and only 35.8% during the 2000s.\(^{43}\)

Orange, Lake, and Osceola’s growth rates still notably exceeded the average growth rate of the state and nation. The average growth rate for Florida was only 17.6% whereas the average growth rate for the nation was only 9.6%. Florida was third highest increase in number, not percentage, of population growth in the 2000s. The state grew by 2.8 million people.\(^{44}\) Orange, Lake and Osceola’s population growth totaled 432,328 which was 15.44% Florida’s 2.8 million new people. Texas increased by 4.3 million people while California increased by 3.4 million people. Georgia, North Carolina and Arizona were the only other states to grow by over a million people.
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\(^{42}\) See Appendix A for U.S. Census Data charts denoting the overall population growth from 1970-2010, Hispanic growth from 1980-2010, and changing occupation patterns from 1970-2010 in Orange, Lake and Osceola counties.


people. The growth in Texas, California, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and Arizona “accounted for over half of the overall increase for the United States.”

As in the previous two decades, Hispanic growth exceeded other minority groups’ growth in Orange, Lake and Osceola counties. In 2000, 68.6% of Orange County residents were White, non-Hispanic, 18.2% Black non-Hispanic and 18.8% Hispanic. By 2010, 40.5% of the county’s population was White, non-Hispanic, 22.8% was Black, non-Hispanic, and 31.4% were Hispanic. In 2000, Lake County’s population was 82% White, non-Hispanic, 9.8% Black, non-Hispanic, and 12.1% Hispanic. By 2010, 70.2% of Lake County’s population was White, non-Hispanic, 11.1% was Black, non-Hispanic, and 15.4% was Hispanic. In Osceola County in 2000 71% of the population was White, non-Hispanic, 11.3% was Black, non-Hispanic, and 45.5% was Hispanic. By 2010 Osceola’s population was 32.3% White, non-Hispanic, 13.7% Black, non-Hispanic, and 53.7% Hispanic.

---
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As the overall, the Hispanic population totals grew, the Hispanic groups with the largest representation in Orange, Lake and Osceola continued to be Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, and Colombians. By 2010, Orange County’s Hispanic population had grown to include 26,652 (11.9%) Mexicans, 149,457 (48.5%) Puerto Ricans, 22,528 (7.3%) Cubans, 22,208 (6.5%) Dominicans, and 22,668 (7.3%) were Colombian. In Lake County, there were only 11,808 Hispanics in 2000 and by 2010 there were 36,009 which was 12.1% of their total population. From 2000 to 2010 Lake’s Puerto Rican population surpassed its’ Mexican population and by 2010 11,851 (32.9%) of Lake’s Hispanics were Mexican and 12,960 (35.9%) were Puerto Rican. Lastly, there were 50,727 Hispanics in Osceola in 2000 and by 2010 there
were 122,146 which 45.5% the county’s total population. Of Osceola Hispanic population in 2010, 7,381 (6.0%) were Mexican, 72,986 (59.7%) were Puerto Rican, 5,424 (4.4%) were Cuban, 10,223 (8.3%) were Dominican, and 7,418 (6.0%) were Colombian.  

The population and minority growth across the region were also evident in the school system. The FLDOE discontinued their annual Profiles of Florida School Districts Student and Staff Data after the spring of 2007. Comparing the 2000-2001 and 2006-2007 profiles shows that Orange County student population increased 16.06% from 2000 to 2007. By 2007 there were 175,238 Orange County students, 34.84% were White, non-Hispanic, 27.62% were Black, non-Hispanic, and 30.56% were Hispanic. Lake County Schools’ student population increased by 35.42% to 39,623 from 2000 to 2007. In 2007, Lake County’s population was 63.79% White, non-Hispanic, 15.89% Black, non-Hispanic and only 2.08% Hispanic. From 2000 to 2007 Lake’s total Hispanic student population decreased 63.37% from 2,247 to only 823. Originally the smallest of the three counties, Osceola County’s total student population surpassed Lake’s student population by 2007. By 2007, Osceola had 51,888 students which was a 50.11% increase from 2000. Of the total student population, 32.35% were White, non-Hispanic, 10.32% were Black, non-Hispanic, and 49.49% were Hispanic.

47 U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census. Summary File 1, Table PCT 11.
48 See Appendix B for population graphs based on the Florida Department of Education’s Profiles of Florida Schools Data denoting student, LEP student, and teacher growth from 1980-2006 and denoting percentage of racial groups in the students, teacher and administrator populations from 1980-2006.
Table 9: Student Population Growth, 2000-2010: Orange, Lake, and Osceola County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000 Student Population</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>2006 Student Population</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150,984</td>
<td>175,238</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>65,961</td>
<td>61,049</td>
<td>43.69</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>44,052</td>
<td>48,404</td>
<td>29.18</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5,290</td>
<td>7,397</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>34,168</td>
<td>53,552</td>
<td>22.63</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>4,076</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>296.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29,260</td>
<td>39,623</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>21,738</td>
<td>25,275</td>
<td>74.29</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>4,716</td>
<td>6,209</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>248.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>182.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>6,296</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>180.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>288.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34,567</td>
<td>51,888</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>16,965</td>
<td>16,784</td>
<td>49.08</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>3,304</td>
<td>5,357</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>103.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>141.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>102.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>12,672</td>
<td>25,677</td>
<td>36.66</td>
<td>102.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>2,633</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>265.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Since NCLB required the FLDOE to collect LEP program data, the state added LEP data to their annual Profiles report. By 2007, there were 34,365 Orange County students in the ELL program which was a 124.89% increase from 2000 and 72.08% of that group were Hispanic.\(^{49}\)

Lake’s LEP student population grew 258.17% from 2000 to 2007 and in 2007 86.43% of the 2,586 students in the LEP program were Hispanic. This was significant because none of the other racial groups represented in Lake’s LEP population surpassed 5.5%. In 2007, Osceola 9,821 students, an 89.74% increase from 2000, enrolled in their LEP program. Like in Lake County, 89.70% of Osceola’s LEP students were Hispanic while no other racial group surpassed 3.7% of the LEP total.

Table 10: Limited English Proficient Student Growth, 2000-2010: Orange, Lake, and Osceola County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>00-01 LEP Population</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>06-07 LEP Population</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,281</td>
<td>34,365</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>124.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>2,559</td>
<td>5,156</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>101.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10,277</td>
<td>24,771</td>
<td>72.08</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutiracial</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>335.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>258.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>194.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>86.01</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutiracial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>433.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,176</td>
<td>9,821</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, non Hispanic</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, non Hispanic</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>136.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4,529</td>
<td>8,809</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutiracial</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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After 2007, the Florida Department of Education started publishing their annual data on their Archives website via multi-tab Excel sheets aggregated under different categories, for example their ELL report. The FLDOE’s 2010 ELL report shows similar overall student growth patterns and similar ELL participation patterns as found in the three counties from 2000 to 2007. The 2010 ELL report shows that Orange County’s total student population reached 175,986 by 2010 and 28,333, or 16.1%, of their students received ELL services. Lake County’s total student population in 2010 was 41,100 and 1,602, or 3.9%, of their students were enrolled in their ELL program. Osceola County’s total student population increased to 53,466 by 2010 and 9,677, or 18.1%, of their total student population were in the ELL program. The ELL report only shows a breakdown of ELL students by race for the entire state. It does not show a racial analysis of the programs by county. By 2010 across Florida, 75.8% of ELL students were Hispanic, 13.9% were Black, non-Hispanic, 5% White, non-Hispanic, and 4.3% Asian.

As the counties continued to hire more minority classroom teachers, Osceola continued to lead Orange and Lake in hiring higher percentages of Hispanic teachers and all three counties hired significant numbers of Asian/Pacific Islander teachers. In 1999, OCPS had 1,230 Black, non-Hispanic teachers, 614 Hispanic teachers, sixty-nine Asian/Pacific Islander teachers and


fourteen American Indian/Alaskan native teachers. By 2007, Orange had 1,969 Black, non-Hispanic teachers, 1,386 Hispanic teachers, 161 Asian/Pacific Islander teachers, and twenty-three American Indian/Alaskan native teachers. This was a 99.14% increase in Hispanic teachers and a 155.6% increase in Asian/Pacific Islander teachers from 2000 to 2007. In 2000, Lake had 131 minority teachers on staff, 97 were Black, non-Hispanic, 32 were Hispanic, zero were Asian/Pacific Islander, and two were American Indian/Alaskan Native. By the 2006-2007 academic year Lake had 289 minority teachers on staff, 175 were Black, 101 were Hispanic, ten were Asian/Pacific Islander, and three were American Indian/Alaskan Native. Although Lake’s 101 Hispanic teachers was significantly less than Orange County’s 1,386 or Osceola’s 527, Lake had increased their Hispanic teacher population by 215% from 2000 to 2007. Similar to Orange, Lake also hired a significant number of Asian/Pacific Islander teachers. In 2000 Osceola County already had higher percentages of Hispanic classroom teachers on staff than Orange and Osceola. While 8.57% of Orange County’s teachers and 2.05% of Lake County’s teachers were Hispanic, 12.04% of Osceola’s teachers were Hispanic. In 1999, Osceola had 100 Black, non-Hispanic teachers, 172 Hispanic teachers, sixteen Asian/Pacific Islanders teachers and six American Indian/Alaskan native teachers on staff. By 2007, Osceola had 228 Black, non-Hispanic teachers, 527 Hispanic teachers, forty-five Asian/Pacific Islanders teachers and five American Indian/Alaskan native teachers on staff. This was a 163.5% increase in their Hispanic classroom teachers and a 136.8% increase in their Asian/Pacific Islander classroom teachers.

The counties also hired more minority administrators during the 2000s and Osceola led Orange and Lake in hiring higher percentages of Hispanic administrators as well. In 2000, Orange had 31 Hispanic administrators, 6.15% of all their administrators. Lake County had 1 Hispanic administrator of 110 total. Osceola had 9 Hispanic administrators which was 8.36% of their total administrators. By 2007, 9.92% of Orange’s administrators and 1.82% of Lake’s administrator were Hispanic while 12.12% of Osceola’s 165 administrators were Hispanic. From 2000 to 2007, OCPS increased the number of their minority administrators from 116 Black, non-Hispanics, thirty-one Hispanics, zero Asian/Pacific Islanders and one American Indian/Alaskan Native out of 504 administrators to 158 Black, non-Hispanics, sixty-one Hispanics, four Asian/Pacific Islanders, and zero American Indian/Alaskan Native out of 615. Lake County Schools went from fifteen Black, non-Hispanic and one Hispanic administrator out of 110 in 2000 to having twenty-four Black, non-Hispanic and three Hispanic administrators in 2007. Osceola County Schools had 109 administrators in total in 2000. That year they had only seven Black, non-Hispanic administrators and nine Hispanic administrators on staff. By 2007, Osceola had 165 total administrators, thirteen of whom were Black, Hispanic, an 85.7% increase, and twenty of whom were Hispanic, a 122.2% increase.
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Table 11: Classroom Teacher and Administration Growth, 2000-2010: Orange, Lake, and Osceola County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>00-01 CT</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>06-07 CT</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>00-01 Admin</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>06-07 Admin</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,126</td>
<td>11,312</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, NH</td>
<td>6,045</td>
<td>7,773</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, NH</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AI/AN</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/PI</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>155.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, NH</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>2,105</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, NH</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AI/AN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/PI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>215.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>2,961</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, NH</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, NH</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>123.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AI/AN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/PI</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>136.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>163.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>122.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Orange County Responses to Student Population Growth

Orange County School Board’s 1998 plan to restructure their district leadership roles to meet the needs of their growing student population had varying consequences for their ESOL structure and programming. In 1998 the school board and superintendent, Dennis Smith, approved and implemented a plan to restructure school district leadership responsibilities by dividing the county into five geographic regions and hiring an area superintendent for each of
region. Calling the plan a “new management structure,” they interviewed candidates from across the United States to find the best people to fill the positions.

Some in OCPS were hopeful that these new leaders would bring about positive changes for the county’s ESOL programs and, at first, hopes were addressed by Rosalinda Hernandez. Smith appointed Hernandez, a Mexican-American teacher and administrator from Texas, to be East Orlando’s’ first area superintendent. Hernandez was tasked the job of revamping the county’s ESOL program. At the time, OCPS was using an English immersion pull-out program that was expensive and was not decreasing their Hispanic drop-out rate. Hernandez proposed and piloted a transitional bilingual program, which first teaches students predominantly in their home language, transitions into English and then decreases the use of their home language. She also intended the county to create multiple levels of English instruction to support ESOL students based on their age and English proficiency, an idea with a “proved track record” from Texas. By July 1, 2000, however, Hernandez left OCPS and Hispanic parents’ glimpses at hope for improved ESOL changes went with her.

By 2001 ESOL parents on Orange County’s Parent Leadership Council (PLC) were increasingly unhappy with the new area superintendent structure because the five different leaders resulted in inconsistent ESOL support across the county. The PLC argued that the new
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structure resulted in insufficient accountability within ESOL programs at the school and district level allowing both the opportunity to violate the consent decree. Superintendent Smith appointed Ruth Perez-Christian as Hernandez’s replacement as East Orlando area superintendent in July 2000. By 2002 Perez-Christian returned Hernandez’s transitional bilingual pilot program back to pull-out ESOL services in three schools, got rid of one elementary ESOL program entirely, and did not provide the legally mandated number of bilingual teachers to support her ESOL students. Perez-Christian made these changes without consulting the PLC and without informing students’ parents of their options. Both of which are violations of the mandate. The PLC complained to OCPS about these violations and pushed for “uniformity in practices, procedures, and instruction across the county’s” ESOL programs.

In addition to demanding uniformity from the county, the PLC pressured the Florida Department of Education to hold OCPS accountable for meeting the needs of their students and the state acted. The PLC reported to the DOE that OCPS was not complying with the requirements of the consent decree. Consequently, the state conducted audits of Orange’s ESOL programs in 1999, 2001, 2002, 2003 and eventually audited ESOL programs in all 67 Florida counties in 2004. In 2001, OCPS parent Evelyn Rivera was the president of the PLC and she filed their official complaint with the state which led to the 2001 audit. Yet in 2005, after multiple years of DOE audits, she was still unsatisfied with OCPS’s progress in fixing ESOL accountability at the district and state level.
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The auditors found a long list of ESOL violations in OCPS regarding students’ access to materials and teachers, communication with parents, and funding. The audits found that students did not have enough access to bilingual teachers or aides, teachers lacked appropriate ESOL training or were teaching out of field. In some instances where there were bilingual aides, the aides were doing secretarial work, making copies, or supervising lunches instead of working with ESOL students. The audits also found that classrooms and school media centers lacked native-language dictionaries and native-language books for student use.69 Other violations regarded school communication with parents. For example, schools did not consistently inform parents of their child’s ESOL progress or when their child was eligible for gifted or other programs. Nor did schools consistently send communication home in the parents’ native language.70 There was also misuse of ESOL funding without accountability and in some instances the audits found that principals “cheated students by using ESOL funds for unrelated programs.”71 Even when OCPS did restructure their ESOL administration and programs, journalists complained that new district ESOL coordinators did not have the proper authority over funding to successfully hold schools accountable.72

In response to parent pressure and the state audits, OCPS reviewed and eventually changed their ESOL leadership structure. At the time, OCPS did have a director of second language learning, Tomasita Ortiz but the area superintendents had the authority to regulate their
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area’s ESOL programming.73 In April of 2000, the school board invited parents to their meeting to review the county’s ESOL program.74 However, OCPS did not directly address ESOL programs and structure until the state’s 2002 audit and the next superintendent Ron Blocker initiated his own plan in January of 2002.75 Blocker appointed his deputy superintendent over instruction and curriculum, Deborah Manuel, to monitor and review the county’s ESOL programs. Manuel called on the PLC, business leaders and civic leaders to start her review.76 The 2002 state audit called for the county to centralize its’ ESOL department which they did before the 2003-2004 school year began.77 OCPS created the Office of Multicultural Student Language Education, hired Ortiz to run the department, and tasked her staff of five with overseeing ESOL compliance for the entire district.78 By 2005, OCPS had rearranged leadership positions again to create an associate superintendent position in charge of Exceptional Education, Special Needs and Gifted services, and Multilingual Education Services and appointed Anna Diaz to the position.79 PLC leader Evelyn Rivera was unsatisfied with this new position because Diaz lacked the authority to regulate ESOL funding. Many were also unhappy with the position because the two student populations’ needs differ greatly, and the addition of Exceptional Education responsibilities was too much work for one leader to do successfully.80

In addition to centralizing their ESOL and multilingual programming responsibilities, OCPS also changed their ESOL programming. OCPS rolled out five new programs at the start of
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the 2003-2004 school year which were based on long-term research models that encouraged native language development. They offered a two-way bilingual program, a one-way bilingual program, sheltered ESOL, mainstream/ESOL, and ESOL. OCPS’s two-way bilingual program, also known as Dual Language, was for Spanish-speaking and English-speaking students to master both languages. Their one-way bilingual program was for non-English speakers to learn English while being supported in their home language, also called transitional bilingual education. OCPS’s sheltered program was for non-English speaking students from various language backgrounds. Sheltered students were taught using only English. The mainstream/ESOL program put non-English speaking students in mainstream classrooms with English speaking students to be taught in English but to also be taught by teachers using ESOL strategies. Lastly, OCPS’s ESOL program was specifically designed to help non-English speaking students improve their listening, speaking, reading and writing skills in English.

From 2000 to 2010, OCPS changed their ESOL programming multiple times. By 2006, OCPS simplified their five options to a “three-pronged approach” in which parents choose one of three options for their LEP student. Parents could choose between one-way bilingual education, mainstream/ESOL or sheltered. Due to budget cuts and strict enforcement of the state’s class size legislation, OCPS cut their one-way programs for 4th grade and up in 2010. This changed affected more than 1,000 students in 29 schools across the district. The affected students were moved into the sheltered program. At that point, parent’s options were based on their child’s age.
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The county kept the one-way program for students in kindergarten through 3rd grade but required 4th grade students and older to attend sheltered programs. \(^{84}\)

While Orange County began dual language programs in the 1990s, they initiated more programs in the 2000s. Principal Gloria Fernandez rolled out a dual language program in the fall of 2006 in one class in every grade level of her school, Engelwood Elementary. \(^{85}\) Tildenville Elementary became a dual language magnet school in 2000 at the behest of White, non-Hispanic parents. By 2005 Tildenville Elementary and Cheney Elementary had 363 students enrolled in their dual language program. \(^{86}\) OCPS continued to open dual language programs focusing on dual language kindergarten programs. By 2007, there were dual language programs in eight elementary schools across the county. \(^{87}\)

Lake County Responses to Student Population Growth

Lake County’s had far fewer LEP and Hispanic students and parents than Orange and Osceola. In 2000, Lake had only 722 LEP students, 621 of whom were Hispanic. In the same year, OCPS had 15,281 LEP students, 10,277 of whom were Hispanic, and Osceola had 5,176 LEP students, 4,529 of whom were Hispanic.

The state audits, called for by the parent advocates in Orange County, impacted Lake County Schools’ ESOL programs and students. In the FLDOE’s 1999 audit of Lake County’s
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ESOL programs, the state found that Lake’s pull-out program violated the 1990 Consent Decree. Lake County was busing their LEP students to 10 centrally located schools and then pulling them out of class for an hour a day to work with 13 ESOL teachers on English language skills. The Consent Decree required school districts to hire teachers or assistants who are fluent in the students’ native language if there are more than 15 students who speak that language in a school. None of Lake’s ESOL teachers spoke Spanish, the native language of 91% of their LEP students. Consequently, the FLDOE required Lake to hire Spanish-speaking aides. Many Lake teachers and the School Board initially pushed back against the mandate citing the cost of the switch to aides, even though most of the money would come from federal government funds that support LEP students and citing their concern that aides were not certified teachers. Implementing the mandate for the 2000-2001 academic year, Lake changed their LEP pull-out program to a push-in program. They replaced the 13 English-speaking ESOL teachers with 27 bilingual aides assigning the aides to 16 schools. The aides went into classrooms to support LEP students by clarifying directions and instruction during their content area classes as well as tutoring small groups in English. By November, principals in schools with the new bilingual paraprofessionals reported positively on the change from ESOL pull-out to push-in support for their LEP students.
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From 2007 to 2010, Lake County School Board and schools made further changes to address their diversifying population. First, after a failed attempt to hire similar consultants in 2005, the School Board tried again to hire diversity consultants in 2007 to teach their students, teachers, and administrators to appreciate cultural diversity. Second, Lake hired more minority teachers and, as also described above, increased their Hispanic classroom teacher population 215% from 2000 to 2007. Lastly, Lake County Schools implemented a few dual language programs, predominantly in Kindergarten classes. Eustis Heights Elementary and Groveland Elementary began a dual language Kindergarten program in the 2008-2009 academic year and the Eustis Heights program rolled up with the initiating group of students. By 2009 Round Lake Elementary also had a dual language Kindergarten program. However, by 2010, implementing the statewide class size law prompted Lake to cut the third-grade dual-language program at Eustis Heights. Whereas changes like these in Orange County directly resulted from pressure from Hispanic parents, Lake’s impetus for changes was that they wanted to reduce the achievement gap between White and minority students, decrease their minority dropout rate, and increase FCAT scores.
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Osceola County Responses to Student Population Growth

While state audits reported Osceola’s mismanagement of finances, private audits celebrated the county’s ESOL program DOE audits in Osceola County reported the school officials failed to monitor $1.7 million in internal school funds, health and safety violations, and employee health-insurance claims.\textsuperscript{99} In addition to the statewide DOE audits which focused on financial accountability, Osceola County Schools underwent a privately funded audit in 2001-2002. The Kissimmee-Osceola Chamber of Commerce paid SchoolMatch, an Ohio-based consulting firm, $62,000 to audit “the schools’ test scores, curriculum, attendance and graduation rates” in comparison with similar districts across the nation. A third of the cost was covered by the Walt Disney World Company.\textsuperscript{100} While SchoolMatch identified Osceola’s transient student population as their biggest challenge and inflated grades as their biggest downfall, the audit cited good communication between parents and schools and strong LEP programs as two of their greatest strengths.\textsuperscript{101} An example of how Osceola worked to communicate with parents and proactively address the needs of their LEP families was that the School Board implemented TalkSystems interpretation systems at their school board meetings in March of 2000. Fully bilingual staff translated the school board meetings from English to Spanish in real-time.\textsuperscript{102}

In response to their continued growth, Superintendent Blaine Muse and Osceola County Schools restructured their departments to support the needs of their LEP and multicultural student population. With a background in instruction and curriculum, Muse was an important
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leader for ESOL and multicultural development and support within the district. In 1992-1993, Osceola had placed ESOL and multicultural programming responsibilities under the Curriculum and Instruction Department. By 2003, Muse created Osceola’s Multicultural Education Department, moved all ESOL and multicultural programming responsibilities to the new department, and, in doing so, increased the responsibilities of the coordinator of multicultural education. He worked to track individual student progress and to implement ESOL programs that would support the Hispanic student population, including Dual Language programs. In 2001, he “secured $1.2 million dollars in federal funds for Dual Language programs ensuring that non-English speakers become bilingual by the time they reach middle school.” Muse’s support of the county’s Dual Language program paved the way for school-based leaders to support LEP students and families.

Supported by Muse, principals Ken Meyers and Melba Luciano initiated dual language programs in Osceola County Schools. Meyers and Luciano launched dual language pilot programs at Central and Thacker Elementary in the fall of 2000. Both elementary school populations were around half Hispanic, Central was 55.7% Hispanic and Thacker was 47.1%, making them perfect locations to begin the pilot program. To initiate their program, Meyers and Luciano started with two classes of kindergarteners in which half of the students were native Spanish speakers and half were native English speakers. The goal of their program was to
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produce fully bilingual students who can read, write and speak both languages by age nine.\textsuperscript{106} Called the 60/40 model, the students spent 60\% of their day receiving instruction and doing classwork in English and 40\% of the day working in Spanish.\textsuperscript{107} After the first year of Osceola’s pilot program, the schools rolled the program up into first grade for the originating students and then also begin four new dual language kindergarten classes at each elementary.\textsuperscript{108} Luciano oversaw the dual language program as principal of Thacker Elementary until 2003 when she was appointed Assistant Superintendent, making her the highest ranked Hispanic in Osceola County Schools.\textsuperscript{109} After advocating for and launching the dual language program at Central Elementary, Meyers left Central Elementary in 2000 to open Kissimmee Charter Elementary as its new principal. Within two years of opening, Meyers initiated the same dual language program at Kissimmee Charter Elementary.\textsuperscript{110}

Osceola’s Dual Language programs grew and gained support over the 2000s. By 2005, Boggy Creek Elementary began the school district’s fourth program, Poinciana Elementary launched its fifth, and the county had 625 students enrolled in dual language classes. This made Osceola’s Dual Language program the largest in Central Florida.\textsuperscript{111} There were areas, for example at Boggy Creek Elementary, where the Hispanic population was so large that it was difficult for the school to find non-Hispanic participants to keep a balance between Spanish and English speakers in their programs. Yet overall, support and interest in the program from English
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\textsuperscript{109} Stein, Letitia, “Principal Earns Key Promotion in District,” \textit{The Orlando Sentinel}, August 10, 2003.
\textsuperscript{110} Debbie Barr, “Principal Earns Honor as Leader,” \textit{The Orlando Sentinel}, October 16, 2005.
\textsuperscript{111} Zequeira, Claudia, “Dual-Language Classes Increase in Central Florida.”
speaking, non-Hispanic parents grew between 2000 to 2005, as did the number of non-Hispanic students in the program. Non-Hispanic students in the program increased 36% in the first five years of the program.\footnote{Zequeira, Claudia.} By March of 2006, Osceola had six dual language programs in elementary schools. The following fall, the school district initiated the program at Kissimmee Middle School to accommodate the initial kindergarten group who had started at Thacker and Central in 2000.\footnote{“Dual-Language Promotions,” \textit{The Orlando Sentinel}, May 10, 2006, sec. Schools In Brief.}

Osceola school district’s dual language programs suffered when the state’s class-size legislation rolled out. In 2007, Thacker Elementary fulfilled the state class size requirements because at that time they could report the school average of students per class. That year their one of their first-grade classes had six students more than the limit; yet their dual language and special education classes were small enough to keep the school’s average in compliance. The following year, districts and schools had to strictly comply with the mandated class size in every classroom. For Thacker Elementary and other schools across the county and state, this meant they still needed more classrooms and teachers.\footnote{Postal, Leslie, “Key Test for Class-Size Law,” \textit{The Orlando Sentinel}, December 17, 2007.} Unfortunately, this also meant minimizing dual language programs with small enrollment numbers. By 2009, Osceola still offered dual language programs at six elementary schools, however, in limited grade levels. Only Kissimmee Elementary offered the program for Kindergarten through fifth grade. Thacker, Ventura and Poinciana Elementary schools only offered dual language for kindergarten through third grade while the other two, Koa and Westside K-8, only offered it for Kindergarten. That same year,
Thacker and Koa also offered the Dual Language program in their Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) program.\textsuperscript{115}

Although their Dual Language programs were restricted to the younger grades in their participating elementary schools, Osceola schools supported multilingual and multicultural programming for their middle school students though foreign language programs and by introducing the Foreign Language Experience in 2009. By 2009, five middle schools in Osceola offered foreign language programs. Horizon Middle, Osceola County School of the Arts, Narcoossee Middle School, and Celebration K-8 offered the Spanish foreign language course. Bellalago K-8 Charter offered both the Spanish and French course. In 2009, the Foreign Language Experience was a new multilingual program the district implemented at three schools, Koa Elementary, Westside K-8, and Thacker Avenue Elementary School for International Studies. The goal of the program was to help the districts’ graduates be “competitive and successful” in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century by providing them with “general exposure to another language and culture.”\textsuperscript{116} It used a combination of the Rosetta Stone program and teacher led instruction. All three schools offered the Foreign Language Experience program in Spanish and Thacker offered the program in Italian as well.\textsuperscript{117}
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\textsuperscript{116} “Foreign Language Programs Expand for Osceola Students.”
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Conclusion

The three school districts’ responses to their Hispanic student population growth continued to follow a pattern of change corresponding with the size of their Hispanic student population through the 2000s. While OCPS began the 2000s with 34,168 Hispanic students and grew to 53,552 by 2006, which represented growth from 22.6% to 30.6% of their total student population, Lake County Public Schools began the new century with 2,247 Hispanic students and grew to 6,296 by 2006, representing growth from 7.7% to 15.9% of their total student population. Osceola County Public Schools began the 2000s with 12,672 Hispanic students and grew to 25,677 by 2006, representing growth from 36.7% to 49.5% of their total student population. Lake County School District’s Hispanic growth reached that of OCPS in the 1980s while Osceola School District’s Hispanic growth increased to half of their overall student population. Thus, Osceola and OCPS lead the three counties in linguistically and culturally supportive programming and adapting administrative structures while Lake County finally had to change their ESOL programming.

The Hispanic and multicultural student population in Orange and Osceola grew so large that both school districts could no longer manage the populations’ needs with mere programs. Consequently, Orange created its Office of Multicultural Student Language Education and Osceola created its Multicultural Education Department. Not only do these structural changes demonstrate a social history, as OCPS made changes due to continual pressure from their PLC, but they also embody Nuevo South institutional changes. These new sociopolitical institutions supported Orange and Osceola’s LEP population by identifying, tracking, providing support
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services for and assess their LEP student population. The counties hired bilingual staff for these departments and created new positions within these department, like an ESOL compliance specialist position. By 2005, OCPS had also created an Associate Superintendent position responsible for ESOL and Exceptional Student Education. Lake County Public Schools, however, still did not have enough LEP students to warrant such a structural change. In fact, as of July 2019, Lake County Public Schools still does not have a department for Multicultural Education, ESOL or Bilingual Services.

Orange, Lake, and Osceola School Districts also responded to continuing Hispanic and LEP student growth by modifying their LEP programming. With their larger Hispanic and LEP populations, OCPS continued and Osceola implemented Dual Language programs which supported both native language development for Hispanic and LEP students as well as second language acquisition for English-speakers. Dual Language programs also supported cross cultural communication and cultural awareness because LEP and English-speaking students work through course material in both languages together. While OCPS initiated a wider range of LEP programs that all supported native language development and allowed parent choice, Osceola County Schools implemented more second language acquisition programming opportunities for all their students. As Osceola had done with a similar size Hispanic and LEP population in the mid-1990s, Lake County Public Schools changed their ESOL programming from the pull-out model to push in. The FLDOE, however did have to mandate this change before Lake County implemented it in 2000-2001. Yet before the decade ended, Lake County Public Schools initiated their own Dual Language programs, worked to keep the programs even after budget cuts, and, as OCPS had done in the 1980s, sought to implement programs addressing diversity.
The growing Hispanic population and Orange, Lake, and Osceola County School Districts continued to conversely affect each other. Through the districts’ PLCS, parents played an important role in advocating for programming changes to benefit their Hispanic and LEP students. As in the 1980s and 1990s, teachers and administrators also continued to shape Orange, Lake, and Osceola School Districts’ responses to education policies and their population changes.

From 2000 to 2010, OCPS’s PLC was one of the most influential groups working for LEP and Hispanic students. The PLC, led by Hispanic parent Evelyn Rivera, demonstrated a social history from the bottom up as they continually exerted agency in petitioning the School Board and, ultimately, in petitioning the state for an audit of the county’s ESOL programs. As a result of the state audit, OCPS changed its departmental structures and responsibilities as well as its ESOL programming. Yet, the state ESOL audit affected other public-school districts, including Lake and Osceola.

Teachers and administrators also continued to enact change at the school level to support their Hispanic and LEP students. From 2000 to 2010, teachers and principals in Orange County continued to support their bilingual centers and increase their Dual Language programs. Meanwhile teachers and principals in Lake and Osceola counties began implementing Dual Language programs as Orange had done in the 1990s. In 2009, middle school teachers and principals in Osceola even implemented a multilingual and multicultural program to provide their students with foreign language opportunities.
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CONCLUSION

Orange, Lake and Osceola County School Districts’ responses to their Hispanic student population growth followed a pattern of change that corresponded with the size of their Hispanic student population. Although growing and diversifying at different rates, the three public school districts responded to their Hispanic population growth in a similar pattern in two areas—programming and administrative structures. In analyzing the school districts’ programs and administrative changes, my study furthers historians’ understanding about how school systems and Hispanic populations are affect each other and denotes the social history of the groups and individuals who worked to support Hispanic and non-English speaking students in public schools.

Orange, Lake and Osceola County School Districts’ ESOL and language programming followed a pattern of change from 1980 to 2010 that corresponded with the size of their Hispanic student population. When Hispanic and LEP population totals were below 2,000 students or constituted less than a quarter of their overall student population, the districts employed “pull out” English immersion programs which physically segregated their LEP students and only employed English as the medium of instruction. As their Hispanic and LEP populations increased, the districts used “push in” or “immersion” methods where LEP students stayed in general education classrooms and either had individual support from an ESOL certified aide or their teacher was ESOL certified. Although this addressed the issue of physical segregation, push in or emergent ESOL models did not support the students’ native language development and the
medium of instruction was still a barrier between the student and the content. OCPS’s bilingual centers were progress for the their LEP programs because the bilingual centers employed native language instruction as LEP students transitioned into English. As Hispanic populations continued to grow, Hispanic and non-Hispanic parents pressured the counties for Dual Language options, which protected and supported LEP students’ native language rights and development but also encouraged bilingualism and biculturalism for LEP and English-speaking students.

The districts’ and Hispanic population’s engagement over these programming changes paralleled the Hispanic Education and language education narratives. In the literature, Hispanic parents and communities have continually had to fight against physically and linguistically segregated classrooms. Orange, Lake and Osceola School Districts were not an exception to this fight. Hispanic and non-Hispanic parents’ requests for Dual Language programs in the later 2000s reflect more of the global response to language education policy than the predominate U.S. response towards English Only policies prevalent in the 1990s and 2000s.

The three school districts also had to restructure or create new district level positions to

123 As a bilingual individual and a Social Studies educator, I am hold that multilingualism and multiculturalism should be the ends of an “effective” LEP program. In this study, my goal is not to define the LEP programs in Orange, Lake, and Osceola as “effective” or “ineffective,” but to delineate how well their programs protect students’ language rights. As LEP program “effectiveness” is debated in research, I do not pose an argument about which LEP program discussed in the study is most “effective” or which produces the best student learning gains but offer suggested readings. For further discussion see: Rachel A. Valentino and Sean F. Reardon, “Effectiveness of Four Instructional Programs Designed to Serve English Language Learners: Variation by Ethnicity and Initial English Proficiency,” Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 37, no.4 (December 2015): 612–637; Francesca López, Elizabeth McEneaney and Martina Nieswand, “Language Instruction Educational Programs and Academic Achievement of Latino English Learners: Considerations for States with Changing Demographics,” American Journal of Education 121, no. 3 (May 2015): 417-450.
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accommodate the linguistic and cultural needs of their growing Hispanic and LEP student population. Their structural changes aligned with their population growth. Before OCPS reached 9,000 Hispanic students in the 1980s, OCPS had created their Bilingual and ESOL Services department, which underwent many name changes in the 1990s. By 1993, OCPS had over 10,000 Hispanic students and therefore created their Office of Multicultural Services. Approaching 50,000 Hispanic student OCPS created an associate superintendent position responsible for ESOL and Exceptional Student Education in 2005. Having over 3,000 Hispanic students and LEP students in 1993, Osceola created district level positions for their ESOL specialists and placed them under the responsibility of their Curriculum and Instruction Department. By 2003 when they reached more than 13,000 Hispanic students, Osceola created their Multicultural Education Department to facilitate multicultural programming and moved ESOL responsibilities to the new department as well. During the period covered in this study, Lake County Schools’ Hispanics student did not exceed the 10,000 or 13,000 mark, when OCPS and Osceola created their separate departments. Thus, Lake County Schools did not create a separate department for their Hispanic or LEP student programs. These structural changes embody the Nuevo South literature because the counties adapted socioeconomic and political infrastructures, in this case public school department structures, to accommodate their regions’ Hispanic population.
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In addition to delineating a pattern of programming and structural change as the Hispanic student population grew within each county, my study of Orange, Lake and Osceola County School Districts’ responses to their Hispanic population growth also shows how groups and individuals exemplified the arguments found in literature on New Immigration, Puerto Rican Studies and Social History.

New Immigration literature describes how immigrant groups work together to overcome dominance by the majority culture. Hispanic parents and LULAC modeled that panethnic cooperation as they fought to hold the school districts accountable, to support their LEP and English-speaking students, to implement effective language education programs for their LEP and English-speaking children, and to promote culturally inclusive curriculum. Although predominately Puerto Rican, the Hispanic parents modeled that panethnic cooperation as they worked together to influence the school districts by participating in the PLCs. Through the PLCs and later through state audits, they successfully pushed for better communication between families and school districts, for more Hispanic teachers and administrators, and for the FLDOE to ensure the counties complied with the Florida Consent Decree. Through their case against Osceola County, LULAC, which consists of activist groups representing various Hispanic nationalities, impacted not just Orange, Lake and Osceola counties but the entire state by securing the Consent Decree framework.

This study this exemplifies Duany and Matos-Rodríguez’s research on Puerto Ricans in Central Florida. From 1980 to 2010, for the entire period covered in this study, the largest group of Hispanics in Orange and Osceola were Puerto Rican. In Lake County, Mexicans were the
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predominate Hispanic population from 1980 until 1999, when their Puerto Rican population surpassed their Mexican population. Thus as the three counties gained more Hispanic students and, in complying with federal and state legislations, hired more Hispanics employees, the majority of these Hispanics were Puerto Rican. OCPS even employed Walt Disney World’s tactic, as described by Duany and Matos-Rodríguez, of recruiting Puerto Ricans directly from the island of Puerto Rico by partnering with the University of Puerto Rico in 1999.

Following E. P. Thompson and John Blassingame’s social history framework, this study demonstrates how community volunteers and teachers exerted agency within Orange, Lake, and Osceola School Districts from 1980 to 2010. Multilingual community volunteers were a crucial support system for communication between the school districts and parents with limited-English abilities through Orange’s Language Bank and through BRAVO in Osceola County. Spanish-speaking volunteers wrote, organized, and implemented Orange’s Un Poquito de Español program which impacted student language and cultural development. Teachers also exercised their agency in many ways. Many teachers chose to complete their own ESOL training. To enact the programs reviewed in this study, individual teachers communicated with parents, monitored student progress, created lesson plans, and implemented daily instruction for their LEP and English-speaking students. They organized and hosted international fairs, created programs like Englewood’s World Friendship Program, and successfully organized against Lake

---

133 “Mickey Ricans- Puerto Ricans and Central Florida”; Berry, “Language Lessons: Schools Consider New Approaches to Teaching.”
County’s “America First” policy. Alongside school-based administrators like Ken Meyers and Melba Luciano in Osceola, teachers pushed for, supported and implemented Dual Language programs for LEP and English-speaking students in the three counties.

Finally, this study also demonstrates how Hispanic school-based and district level leaders exerted agency within their leadership roles and supported LEP students through language education programs and culturally inclusive practices. Hispanic principals, like Feliciano Felix Ramirez, and counselors, like Jorge Perez, created support groups, met with students one on one, translated for their school, their parents and their district, and recruited more minority teachers. Javier Melendez, Wilma Santiago, Dalia Medina, supervisors for the multicultural and LEP programs in Orange and Osceola and Melba Luciano, Osceola’s Assistant Superintendent, used their leadership roles to promote cultural awareness and to create and beneficial learning opportunities for their students. They impacted LEP and English-speaking students’ educational opportunities by enacting multicultural lesson plans, investing in multicultural resources for their media centers, and by pushing for linguistically and culturally inclusive content on countywide tests.
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