

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR DUAL LANGUAGE EDUCATION

.....
T H I R D E D I T I O N



Elizabeth R. Howard • Kathryn J. Lindholm-Leary • David Rogers • Natalie Olague
José Medina • Barbara Kennedy • Julie Sugarman • Donna Christian

CAL CENTER
FOR APPLIED
LINGUISTICS



Dual Language
Education
of New Mexico



SANTILLANA USA
Language Education Experts

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR DUAL LANGUAGE EDUCATION

.....
T H I R D E D I T I O N

Elizabeth R. Howard • Kathryn J. Lindholm-Leary • David Rogers • Natalie Olague
José Medina • Barbara Kennedy • Julie Sugarman • Donna Christian



Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (3rd edition)

The third edition of this volume is a joint publication of the Center for Applied Linguistics, Dual Language Education of New Mexico, and Santillana USA.

Recommended reference citation:

Howard, E. R., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Rogers, D., Olague, N., Medina, J., Kennedy, B., Sugarman, J., & Christian, D. (2018). *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

© 2018 Center for Applied Linguistics. All rights reserved.

With the exception of Appendix A and Appendix B, no part of this book may be reproduced, in any form or by any means, without permission in writing from the copyright holder. All inquiries should be addressed to permissions@cal.org or to Permissions, Center for Applied Linguistics, 4646 40th Street NW, Washington, DC 20016.

ISBN: 978-0-87281-130-0

Development of this edition of *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* was funded by the Center for Applied Linguistics with additional support from Dual Language Education of New Mexico. Design, layout, and production were provided by Santillana USA.

The first edition of this publication was developed with funding to the Center for Applied Linguistics from the U.S. Department of Education (ED) via subcontract from the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA) at The George Washington University in Washington, DC. The contents do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of NCELA or ED, and no endorsement by the federal government should be assumed.

Printed by Thomson-Shore Inc.

20 19 18 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9



Table of Contents

Foreword	v
Acknowledgments	vii
Introduction	1
Strand 1: Program Structure	9
Strand 2: Curriculum	31
Strand 3: Instruction	45
Strand 4: Assessment and Accountability	71
Strand 5: Staff Quality and Professional Development	89
Strand 6: Family and Community	105
Strand 7: Support and Resources	121
Appendix A: Templates for Self-Evaluation	132
Appendix B: Guiding Principles at a Glance	147
About the Authors	149
About the Co-Publishers	151



Foreword

For decades, educators have been seeking to unlock the power of dual language education to promote student success. With new research demonstrating the benefits of this powerful and effective instructional approach, an increasing number of schools (public, private, and charter) are now successfully applying the three pillars of dual language education: bilingualism and biliteracy, academic achievement, and cross-cultural understanding for all students.

In this atmosphere of renewed national and international interest, the Center for Applied Linguistics, Dual Language Education of New Mexico, and Santillana USA are pleased to present the third edition of the widely used *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education*.

In creating this new and enhanced edition, we are grateful to have contributions and input from the original authors, from current leaders in the field, and from experienced practitioners. Incorporating learning from new research and weaving in best practices used by successful programs, the new edition offers new and updated principles, updated literature reviews, and an easy-to-use format. I feel confident that *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* will continue to serve as a valuable resource for educators at all levels who seek to implement or improve dual language programs for their students.

For the Center for Applied Linguistics, this volume represents both our strong legacy of support for dual language education and our enduring commitment to language and culture as assets to be valued and cultivated. For me, professionally and personally, the publication of this new edition marks an important milestone in my lifelong journey of support for civil rights and for access and equity for all students.

It is my hope that you will find this work enlightening and useful on your journey as well.

Saludos cordiales,

M. Beatriz Arias, PhD

Center for Applied Linguistics
Professor Emerita, Arizona State University



Acknowledgments

FROM THE AUTHORS

Many individuals contributed to the development of this edition of *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education*. First and foremost, the authors thank the members of the advisory panel, who helped to define the scope and content of the revisions, provided feedback on early drafts of new and revised principles and key points, and read and provided feedback on the complete revised draft. It was a privilege to work with this distinguished panel of dual language researchers, practitioners, and advocates.

Michele Anberg-Espinosa, San Francisco Unified School District, CA
M. Beatriz Arias, Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, DC
Ester de Jong, University of Florida, Gainesville
Erika Feinauer, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT
Phyllis Hardy, Massachusetts Association for Bilingual Education
Elena Izquierdo, University of Texas at El Paso
Susana Ibarra Johnson, Independent Consultant, Albuquerque, NM
Anne Kim, Los Angeles Unified School District, CA
Wilma Valero, Elgin School District U-46, IL

We also thank the two external reviewers who provided valuable feedback on the first complete draft of the manuscript:

Carla B. Herrera, Two-Way Immersion and Biliteracy Educator Specialist, Cerritos, CA
Julie Nora, Director, International Charter School, Pawtucket, RI

We are indebted to everyone involved in the development of the previous editions of *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* as well as to the creators of the New Mexico Dual Language Standards, which provided a strong point of departure for the original *Guiding Principles* document. We extend a special thanks to Dual Language Education of New Mexico (DLeNM) and its executive director, David Rogers, who helped to support the participation in this project of some of the authors and advisors, and who very generously provided meeting time and space at the 2016 *La Cosecha* conference for the authors and advisory panel to further the work of this document. We also extend our thanks to Rosa Molina, executive director of the Association of Two-Way and Dual Language Education, who participated in our meeting at *La Cosecha* and provided valuable input to our discussions.

Finally, we thank the Center for Applied Linguistics for their financial support of this project and for coordinating the process from beginning to end. In particular, we'd like to thank Terry Wiley, Beatriz Arias, Susan Gilson, and Sophia Birdas for their support and guidance. We extend a special thanks to Jeannie Rennie for her strong organizational and communication skills, careful editing, and gentle yet determined persistence to keep the project moving forward according to the established timeline.

FROM THE CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS (CAL)

The publication of the third edition of *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* represents a collaboration among many individuals and organizations. CAL extends its deepest gratitude to the authors for their dedication, professionalism, and hard work. Revising this publication over the course of a year was no small feat. A special word of thanks is due to lead author Elizabeth Howard, who coordinated and facilitated the revision process and who, in addition to serving as author for two of the strands, read and edited all of the strands and literature reviews and pulled all the pieces together into a coherent whole.

Each author of this edition was responsible for revising a particular section or sections of the document: Elizabeth Howard, Strands 1 and 4; Natalie Olague, Strands 2 and 3; Barbara Kennedy, Strand 5; José Medina, Strand 6; David Rogers, Strand 7; and Kathryn Lindholm-Leary, the literature reviews for all seven strands. Julie Sugarman and Donna Christian are also credited as authors because many of their contributions to the previous editions remain in the third edition; they also provided input that helped to inform the development of the new edition.

CAL also thanks the members of the advisory panel, who provided valuable input from initial planning through review of the complete manuscript. We also extend our thanks to the external reviewers, Carla Herrera and Julie Nora, and to the many other dual language experts and practitioners from across the country who provided valuable input and feedback.

Last but not least, CAL acknowledges the invaluable contributions of our institutional partners in this effort, Dual Language Education of New Mexico (DLeNM) and Santillana USA. We thank David Rogers of DLeNM for providing financial support from his organization for some of the contributors to this volume and for the initial planning meeting of authors and advisory panel members that took place at CAL in September 2016. David also provided space for a follow-up meeting of authors and advisors at La Cosecha in November 2016. CAL is also mindful of and grateful for the instrumental role played by DLeNM in the development of the New Mexico Dual Language Standards on which the original *Guiding Principles* document was based.

Santillana USA contributed the design, layout, and production of this volume and will be managing the distribution of the print version. We extend our sincere thanks to Miguel Tapia, Arturo Castellón, and Kathy Jimenez of Santillana USA for their support, and to Jacqueline Rivera and her production team for their great design work.



Introduction

The second edition of *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education*, published by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) in 2007, has been used by dual language programs across the United States as a tool for planning, self-reflection, and continual improvement. Program leaders have come to depend on this document to guide preliminary thinking and planning, support ongoing program implementation, and inform monitoring of program effectiveness. It has also become a trusted resource for educating school and district leaders and for guiding communications with community stakeholders. As such, *Guiding Principles* has earned its place as a staple resource on the bookshelves of dual language educators across the country.

Numerous changes in education policy, research, and practice over the past 10 years, along with feedback from dual language practitioners who use *Guiding Principles* in their work, made it clear that it was time for a revised and updated edition. In collaboration with David Rogers of Dual Language Education of New Mexico (DLeNM) and Elizabeth Howard, lead author of the first two editions, CAL put together an expert team of authors and a panel of advisors to begin work on a third edition. Authors from the previous edition were joined by two CAL experts in dual language professional development and by an experienced dual language practitioner and professional development coordinator from New Mexico. The panel of advisors included experienced classroom teachers, program coordinators, principals, district administrators, and researchers. Some of the panelists were also parents of students in dual language programs.

The full panel of advisors met with the team of authors and CAL staff in September 2016 to discuss and define the scope and content of the revisions and to map out the revision process. Each author accepted responsibility for leading the revision of a particular strand or strands of principles, with Kathryn Lindholm-Leary taking on the task of updating the literature reviews for all seven strands. Members of the advisory panel divided themselves among the strands and literature reviews, creating a subgroup of advisors to work with each author. Each advisor participated in two subgroups. Each author also participated in two subgroups—one as author and one as advisor. These subgroups continued to provide input and feedback to the authors over the course of the year: through the initial writing phase, review of the complete manuscript, and submission of final drafts. The entire manuscript was also reviewed by two expert external reviewers. Additional input was received from participants in *Guiding Principles* sessions convened at the 2017 conferences of the California Association of Bilingual Education and the Southern New England Conference for Dual Language Programs (sponsored by the Massachusetts Association of Bilingual Education).

The third edition of *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* thus reflects the experience and expertise of a broad range of dual language experts—practitioners, researchers, administrators, professional development specialists, and others—from across the country. It is the result of a very productive and collegial collaboration of many individuals and organizations.

CHANGES IN THE THIRD EDITION

Although there is considerable consistency between the second and third editions, the content has been updated to reflect new knowledge, practices, and policies. Changes were also made to the organization and formatting of the publication to increase its usability. The literature reviews for each strand have been updated, most noticeably in the areas of curriculum and instruction, where most of the recent research has been carried out. Parallel changes reflecting the new research have been made to the relevant principles and their associated key points, addressing issues such as the role of technology in curriculum and instruction, approaches for coordinating instruction across languages, and incorporating cross-linguistic instructional strategies to promote the full development of bilingualism and biliteracy as well as content knowledge. In addition, changes were made throughout the strands to put greater focus on the importance of the third pillar of dual language education—the development of sociocultural competence.

Another notable content change is in the realm of policy. Whereas the previous edition of *Guiding Principles* was clearly grounded in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, this updated edition has taken a more general stance. Rather than identify specific policies that need to be taken into consideration, the third edition references the need to align principles and instruction with relevant federal, state, and local policies and regulations.

The following changes to the organization and design of the publication are intended to make the third edition more user friendly:

- The literature review for each strand now appears immediately before the principles for that strand.
- The order of the strands has been changed to put Program Structure first, because it serves as the foundation for the remaining strands.
- Narrower page margins allow for a larger, easier-to-read font in the principles tables.
- The self-evaluation templates in the appendix now include space to record evidence to support the ratings given.

INTENDED FOCUS AND USE OF THIS PUBLICATION

Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education is intended for use by dual language programs as a tool for ongoing planning, self-reflection, and improvement. Well-established programs may choose to use it on their own, or they may seek support from dual language experts from organizations such as CAL and DLeNM. Programs in the early planning stages will definitely want to engage experienced dual language professionals to provide support in using this publication and other tools (e.g., *The Dual Language Program Planner: A Guide for Designing and Implementing Dual Language Programs* by Howard, Olague, & Rogers, 2003) to plan and implement their programs.

In this document, the term *dual language* refers to any program that provides literacy and content instruction to all students through two languages and that promotes bilingualism and biliteracy, grade-level academic achievement, and sociocultural competence—a term encompassing identity development, cross-cultural competence, and multicultural appreciation—for all students. Dual language programs can be either one-way or two-way depending on the student population.

Two-way programs include approximately equal numbers of students who are monolingual or dominant in English at the time of enrollment and students who are monolingual or dominant in the partner language at the time of enrollment. There may also be students who have proficiency in both languages at the time of enrollment. A general rule of thumb is that to be considered a two-way program, no less than one third and no more than two thirds of the student population should be monolingual or dominant in either English or the partner language at the time of enrollment.

One-way programs serve more linguistically homogeneous groups of students. One-way dual language programs in which all students are proficient in the partner language but not in English at the time of enrollment are typically called developmental bilingual programs. They use both languages to teach content, and they help students develop proficiency in English while maintaining and continuing to develop their skills in their home language. One-way dual language programs whose students are all monolingual or dominant in English at the time of enrollment are generally known as foreign or world language immersion.

It is important to note that although the principles in this volume are generally designed to apply to both two-way and one-way programs, two-way programs are the primary focus of this document. It is also important to note that this volume focuses on elementary and K–8 programs, although the third edition explicitly references the need for preK–12 articulation. While there is increased interest in and evidence of growth in dual language education in preschools and secondary schools, the majority of programs still function at the elementary school level. Educators in preschool, middle school, and high school programs may still find this document useful, but they will probably need to adapt some of the guiding principles to fit their situation.

A Practitioner's Perspective

Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education offers a comprehensive and research-supported tool to guide and support both school- and district-level staff to build the critical culture of continuous improvement that is key to achieving the intended equitable outcomes of dual language, especially in serving historically underserved students. In Portland Public Schools, where we have many different partner languages and cultures, these principles ground and focus our work across our different dual language program models and partner languages. They offer the all-important opportunity to step back, reflect, and course correct. In considering diverse partner languages and cultures, we have found that 1) equity is critical in all aspects, but must also be considered in locating different program languages and cultures within neighborhood schools; and 2) there needs to be district-level responsibility to provide infrastructure supports and advocacy.

Michael Bacon, Portland Public Schools, Oregon

A Practitioner’s Perspective

In the Los Angeles Unified School District, *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* lays the foundation for program implementation, reflection, and refinement across all the language programs. This document and its underlying principles set unified guidelines for our various program languages: Spanish, Korean, Mandarin, French, Armenian, and Arabic. This enables us to create a shared understanding of program implementation across languages and various dual language education programs, such as two-way immersion, maintenance bilingual education, and foreign language immersion. Teacher leaders and administrators from our programs meet periodically to use this resource for self-reflection, program evaluation, and planning throughout the school year. For each strand, the principles, key points, and indicators for program implementation and alignment have been very helpful in understanding where we are as a district or as individual schools and what we need to do to get to the next stage of implementation. For language-specific needs, the district provides additional opportunities for training for teachers to address curriculum, instruction, and specific issues related to the target language.

Anne Kim, Los Angeles Unified School District

The third edition of *Guiding Principles* has been updated to reflect the growing use of a variety of partner languages in dual language programs in the United States, but it is still likely to reflect the reality that programs using Spanish are the most numerous and have therefore been the context for identifying best practices up to this point. See the Practitioner’s Perspective sidebars to read the viewpoints of three practitioners on using *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* with partner languages other than Spanish.

It should be noted that this volume uses the term *program* to refer to each school that offers dual language instruction, regardless of whether the program functions as a strand within a school or as a whole school. Because so many activities that are central to the effective implementation of dual language education occur at the school level and may vary from school to school even within the same district, it is important to anchor the principles and their associated key points at the school level. This is not to say that district-level activities and resources do not play an important role in the development and maintenance of dual language programs; on the contrary, district support is vital, and this is noted through the referencing of district-level personnel, initiatives, and resources as appropriate throughout the document. Moreover, in many cases, district-level participation is required for a program to achieve the status of exemplary practice.

Finally, in implementing the guiding principles, it is important to understand that context is a vital lens through which to view one’s own program. What works in one community or with a particular population of students or teachers may not work as effectively in another community or with another population. Program leaders must keep context in mind as they think about the design, implementation, or refinement of their own program.

ORGANIZATION OF THIS VOLUME

As in the previous editions, the guiding principles are organized into seven strands, reflecting the major dimensions of program design and implementation.

1. Program Structure
2. Curriculum
3. Instruction

4. Assessment and Accountability
5. Staff Quality and Professional Development
6. Family and Community
7. Support and Resources

Each strand is composed of two primary components. The first is a review of relevant literature on research and best practices in dual language education. This literature review includes a brief summary of research studies and policy reports that can inform dual language programs. Most of the research reviewed focuses on the characteristics of programs or schools that are considered effective in promoting the language proficiency and academic achievement of English learners. The reviews also include research and program evaluations that have linked certain features, such as teacher quality or professional development, to higher student achievement.

The second component of each strand consists of tables with a series of guiding principles, each of which is broken down into several key points. These key points further elaborate on the principle, identifying specific elements that can be examined for alignment with the principle. For example, the first principle under Program Structure references the importance of ensuring that all elements of the program are coordinated in a way that promotes attainment of the three core goals of dual language programs. The key points for this principle address the alignment of the program design with mission and goals; development of bilingualism and biliteracy, sociocultural competence, and grade-level academic performance as integral components of the program design; articulation across grade levels; and coordination of curriculum, instruction, and assessment across the two program languages.

To facilitate the use of this document for program reflection and planning, each key point within the principles includes progress indicators—descriptions of four possible levels of alignment: minimal alignment, partial alignment, full alignment, and exemplary practice. For example, the key point on the need for alignment of the program design with the mission and goals of the program, mentioned above, has the following indicators:

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
It is not clear that the program design is aligned with the mission (e.g., through length of program, language allocation, language of initial literacy instruction, recruitment of students) or will enable students to attain the goals of the program.	The program design is somewhat aligned with the mission (e.g., through length of program, language allocation, language of initial literacy instruction, recruitment of students) and will enable students to attain some but not all goals of the program.	The program design is fully aligned with the program mission (e.g., through length of program, language allocation, language of initial literacy instruction, recruitment of students) and will enable students to attain all program goals.	The program design is fully aligned with the program mission (e.g., through length of program, language allocation, language of initial literacy instruction, recruitment of students) and will enable students to attain all program goals. The mission and goals are supported by district leadership and community members in addition to program personnel, and there are systems in place to ensure that alignment continues as the program mission or goals evolve.

A Practitioner's Perspective

For over 40 years, dual language education has worked well for languages like Spanish, English, French, and other colonizing languages, but programs for Indigenous language communities require special consideration. For example, the status of Indigenous languages as threatened languages needs to be taken into account. Other considerations from a Native perspective or lens include looking at how the *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* align with the Indigenous nations' or communities' own language goals, and how the Indigenous language could be used in an academic school context with meaningful connections to the larger community. A primary goal for many Indigenous language communities is to maintain or revitalize the heritage languages by creating a new generation of language speakers who will sustain and perpetuate the collective cultural identity and life ways of the communities. The current sociocultural, historical, and political contexts of these language communities must be seriously considered, including issues related to tribal sovereignty, the purpose of the language in the contemporary context, and the role and responsibility of schools in this process. Therefore, it is imperative that Indigenous communities turn to the voices and participation of their tribal leaders, elders, parents, and other community members when developing and implementing dual language programs.

Vincent Werito, University
of New Mexico

The progress indicators, then, are intended to provide a path that programs can follow toward mastery of the principle and beyond, as well as a metric on which current practice can be appraised. It may be helpful to think about the progress indicators as the gas gauge on a car.

Minimal alignment means that you have a quarter of a tank of gas or less, possibly so little that the gas light has come on, or maybe you have even had to pull over to the side of the road and call for help because the gas tank is completely empty. Putting this back into the language of the principles, minimal alignment indicates that this key point needs serious attention because it is not currently being addressed at all or very well, and this will negatively impact attempts to move forward with the program.

Partial alignment means that you have about half of a tank of gas in your car, enough to get a considerable distance, but not enough to make it to your destination. In the language of the principles, this means that some but not all features of the key point are being addressed, or they are not being addressed sufficiently to fully meet the needs of all groups of students or to be effective for both languages of instruction.

Full alignment corresponds to at least three quarters of a tank of gas, which is enough to get you to your destination. Thus, in the language of the principles, full alignment indicates high-quality implementation at the program level.

Exemplary practice means that you have a full tank of gas, and you are also always in proximity to a gas station so that you can continue to refuel as needed. From the standpoint of the principles, to achieve exemplary practice, there must be evidence that systems or processes are in place to ensure continued full alignment, or evidence that there is some type of activity beyond the program in the form of dissemination, advocacy, or leadership, frequently in conjunction with district efforts.

As was the case with the second edition of *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education*, there is a fair amount of intentional repetition across the strands. The goal is for each strand to be

comprehensive in its own right, allowing a program to work with all principles, a select strand, or a group of strands at a time. Similarly, there are a number of core themes that are woven throughout the principles because they are central to the mission and structure of dual language education. These themes include attention to the three core goals (academic achievement, bilingualism and biliteracy, and sociocultural competence), equity, leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and infrastructure.

This document concludes with two appendixes. Appendix A includes self-evaluation templates for each principle and key point. Programs are encouraged to print copies of the templates and fill them in on a periodic basis to chart their progress toward full alignment with the principles. The templates have been updated to provide a space to record evidence in support of each rating. Appendix B, Guiding Principles at a Glance, provides a chart listing all of the guiding principles. This may be particularly useful in sharing with stakeholders such as superintendents and other district-level personnel.

STRAND

1



Program Structure

1 Program Structure

The significance and consequence of the organizational work involved in establishing an effective dual language program cannot be understated. Researchers and educators have identified several characteristics associated with high-quality schools and programs, including vision and goals; equity; leadership; and processes for model design, refinement, planning, and implementation.

VISION AND GOALS FOCUSED ON BILINGUALISM, BILITERACY, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, AND SOCIOCULTURAL COMPETENCE

Studies of effective schools consistently and conclusively demonstrate that high-quality programs have a cohesive school-wide shared vision; a set of goals that define their expectations for achievement; and an instructional focus and commitment to achievement and high expectations that are shared by students, parents, teachers, and administrators (Berman, Minicucci, McLaughlin, Nelson, & Woodworth, 1995; Calderón, Slavin, & Sánchez, 2011; Corallo & McDonald, 2002; Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Marzano, 2003; Parrish et al., 2006; Slavin & Calderón, 2001). The importance of these shared values is reinforced in studies of mainstream schools, low-performing schools, dual language schools, and other bilingual programs serving English learners.

In dual language programs, the need for a clear commitment to a vision and goals focused on bilingualism, biliteracy, and sociocultural competence has been demonstrated in studies and advocated by dual language education teachers and administrators (Berman et al., 1995; de Jong, 2011; Genesee et al., 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Montecel & Cortez, 2002). Research on effective schools has also shown that successful outcomes result from a program model that is grounded in sound theory and best practices associated with an enriched—not remedial—instructional model (e.g., Genesee et al., 2006; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Montecel & Cortez, 2002). Researchers have consistently reported that the higher the quality of implementation of the dual language education model, the stronger the results of dual language over English-only instruction for English learners (Genesee et al., 2006; National Academies, 2017). Also, it is important to note that English learners who participate in a mix of different programs demonstrate the lowest outcomes of all (Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2006; Menken, Kleyn, & Chae, 2012). Thus, a consistent, sustained program of dual language education is crucial, ideally one with a preK–12 pathway.

EQUITY AND A POSITIVE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

Research on effective schools has consistently shown that students are more successful when they are engaged in a positive school that is orderly and safe, has a warm and caring community, and facilitates

learning. Students and teachers benefit when the school (and each classroom) is a caring community, particularly in schools with a large number of English learners, ethnic minorities, or students who live in poverty (Gay, 2010; U.S. Department of Education, 2012).

An environment that facilitates learning requires equity among all groups; that is, all participants are treated with justice and fairness. Equity must be incorporated at several different levels—district, school, and classroom—and with respect to students, families, and teachers. Equitable treatment requires a clear understanding of the needs of culturally, linguistically, and socioeconomically diverse students and includes the integration of multicultural themes into instruction (Alanís & Rodríguez, 2008; de Jong, 2011; Genesee et al., 2006). While important in all schools, equity is crucial in the dual language program model with its emphasis on integrating students of different ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds. Thus, effective schools have teachers and staff who are committed to equity: They demonstrate awareness of the diverse needs of students, are trained in sociocultural understanding, use multiethnic curricular materials, integrate students’ cultural values into the classroom, celebrate and encourage the use of all home language varieties, invite students to think critically and engage in learning activities that promote social justice, and perhaps most importantly, believe that all children can learn (Alanís & Rodríguez, 2008; Banks & Banks, 2010; de Jong, 2011; García, Johnson, & Seltzer, 2016; Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2004; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2006).

This vision of multilingualism and multiculturalism for dual language programs incorporates the concept of *additive bilingualism*, in which students are provided the opportunity to acquire a second language at no cost to their home language (Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013). Considerable research over several decades demonstrates that additive bilingual programs are associated with content area achievement and proficiency in the second language and the home language (e.g., Genesee et al., 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; U.S. Department of Education, 2012) and with improved self-esteem and cross-cultural attitudes (de Jong & Bearse, 2011; Lindholm-Leary, 2016b; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008; Potowski, 2007). Conversely, *subtractive bilingual contexts*, in which a second language replaces the native language, have negative effects on the school performance of many English learners. Native language loss is associated with lower levels of second language attainment, scholastic underachievement, and psychosocial disorders (Hammer, Lawrence, & Miccio, 2008; Lindholm-Leary, 2014; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2006; Montrul, 2016). Thus, there are more positive outcomes for English learners who are able to develop both the home language and the second language simultaneously.

Successful dual language programs not only value and support the linguistic and cultural diversity of their students but also attend to the socioeconomic diversity that may exist in the school population. In some schools, native English speakers are more likely than English learners to live in economically advantaged homes and to have parents with high levels of formal education (Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010; Lindholm-Leary & Hernández, 2011); in other schools, there may be more socioeconomic, ethnic, and linguistic diversity within each population. Regardless, all of these differences must be acknowledged and addressed to ensure equitable educational opportunities in the classroom for all students (Gathercole, 2016; Genesee et al., 2006). These differences must also be recognized and addressed in professional development, parent training, assessment, and interpretation of evaluation results.

EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP

Over the last several decades, most studies that have looked at the issue of leadership have demonstrated that successful schools have effective leadership (e.g., Herman, Gates, Chavez-Herrerias, & Harris, 2016). As Herman et al. point out: “Principals are second only to teachers as the most important school factor affecting student achievement.” They go on to say that “research identifies conditions that can be influenced by principals and are associated with student success: developing and communicating a vision; establishing a culture of high expectations for students and staff; monitoring and supporting instruction; evaluating teachers; hiring, developing, and retaining school staff; maintaining student discipline; managing the school budget; and engaging with the community” (p. 14).

While the principal must be the main advocate for the program, providing guidance for an equitable program that is of high quality and has school-wide support, in schools where the dual language program exists alongside other programs, the principal may be too busy with the needs of the whole school to provide the necessary instructional leadership specifically for the dual language program. If the principal cannot fulfill the leadership needs of the program, the responsibility may be passed to a vice principal, program coordinator, resource teacher, or a distributed leadership team composed of teachers and other educators. In fact, it is probably more advantageous to have a team with a designated leader to coordinate the program, rather than rely on a single leader. As Castellano, Stringfield, & Stone (2002) point out, effective principals are usually “strong leaders and agents of change,” and thus are often lured away by new challenges. In other cases, the most effective principals may be moved to a new post by the district administration. If a program relies on one person for leadership, even the most successful program can collapse if that leader is drawn away. Shared leadership through a leadership team can provide higher stability and sustainability for the program.

There are various titles for a program’s leader or leadership team, but the responsibilities are quite similar, regardless of the title. At least three major roles are expected of program leaders: program advocate and liaison; supervisor of model development, planning, and coordination; and facilitator of staff cohesion, collegiality, and development.

First, an effective leader serves the critical role of spokesperson for the program with the local school administration, the local Board of Education, the parents, and the community. Thus, this leader advocates for the program with stakeholders at all levels within the district but also with state-level policy makers.

Second, an effective leader or leadership team is in charge of planning, developing, implementing, and evaluating the model at the school site. This role requires a clear understanding of the theory underlying the model in order to make appropriate instructional decisions when implementation questions arise. Once the instructional model is developed and implemented, it is important that leadership continue supervising model development, as research shows that a higher level of planning and coordination across grades is almost always a feature of more successful programs (Herman et al., 2016). A key factor in planning is the leadership’s ability to acquire the necessary financial and instructional resources for the program (Castellano et al., 2002; Herman et al., 2016).

Third, effective leaders work to develop a high degree of faculty cohesion, collaboration, and collegiality (Castellano et al., 2002; Herman et al., 2016; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). This means that all teachers and staff are engaged in promoting achievement for all students, even in schools where the dual

language program is just one strand within the school; teachers are integrated for school-wide planning and coordination; and all teachers are supportive of and knowledgeable about the dual language program. In addition, effective leaders oversee staff training. Leaders do not simply send teachers off to various unrelated in-service training courses but focus training on the topics most necessary for ensuring the success of the teachers and students in the program. Effective leaders also ensure that all training is strongly aligned with the goals and strategies of the program (Corallo & McDonald, 2002) (see also Curriculum and Instruction strands in this volume).

To carry out these leadership responsibilities, it is important to have extensive knowledge of and a commitment to the dual language model being implemented at the site (Alanís & Rodríguez, 2008). Overseeing a successful dual language program also involves knowledge of second language development, bilingual and immersion education theory and research, instructional methodologies, and effective classroom practices.

ONGOING, CONTINUOUS PROGRAM PLANNING

The amount of planning within and across grade levels varies by school site, but in general, a higher level of planning is associated with more successful programs (National Academies, 2017; U.S. Department of Education, 2012; Williams et al., 2007). Strong planning processes should be in place that focus on meeting the goals of the program (i.e., promoting bilingualism, biliteracy, and sociocultural competence) and on improving all students' achievement. While programs need to be flexible in understanding how the model can be adapted to their community and students, decisions about modifications should be based on student outcomes, research, and best practices. That is, there should be a clear rationale for modifications, and programs should avoid frequent changes based on an uncritical attempt to keep up with the latest curricular or instructional approaches.

Program articulation should be both vertical across grade levels and horizontal within grade levels. It should include proper scope, sequence, and alignment with developmentally appropriate practices and clearly defined language proficiency levels based on assessment measures in both languages. If the dual language program is a strand within the school, the program planning should be school-wide and include teachers from all programs in the school.

Finally, planning in effective schools includes a district-wide plan that provides a clear description of the dual language program model and components, at least for K–6 planning and ideally including a preK–12 pathway. This pathway should be developed prior to implementation.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR DEVELOPING OR REFINING A DUAL LANGUAGE PROGRAM

The selection of an appropriate model design for a dual language program should include a needs assessment to provide a solid basis for informed decision-making about program development and instructional issues that support successful student outcomes. Once the data from the needs assessment are analyzed and interpreted, a realistic plan can be developed. Montecel and Cortez (2002) found that in successful bilingual programs, teachers and parents participate in the selection and design of a bilingual program that is consistent with the characteristics of the English learner population. In addition, effective

programs fully plan out the model prior to implementing, rather than trying things out as they go and making major changes.

The needs assessment process should include systematic reviews of the literature on effective dual language education models to build a knowledge base and to establish a rationale for decisions about choosing a model and other program choices that need to be made.

Program Duration

Research shows that the duration of the program is a significant factor. Dual language programs lead to higher student outcomes when they are provided to the participating students for a period of at least 6 years. This is the average time required to reach native-like proficiency and grade-level achievement, as confirmed by a number of evaluation studies on immersion and bilingual programs and by large-scale studies on English learners (Carroll & Bailey, 2015; Genesee et al., 2006; Hill, Weston, & Hayes, 2014; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Parrish et al., 2006; Thompson, 2015; Umansky & Reardon, 2014).

Reviews of the research on bilingual education (August, McCardle, & Shanahan, 2014; August & Shanahan, 2006; Genesee et al., 2006; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010) showed that the most successful outcomes in English achievement, as measured by norm-referenced standardized tests, occurred among English learners who received home language instructional support over a longer period of time. Further, sustained and consistent dual language instruction benefits both English learners and native English speakers, and leads to achievement measured in English that is similar to or higher than that of matched groups who were in English mainstream programs (e.g., August, McCardle, & Shanahan, 2014; Genesee et al., 2006; Howard, Christian, & Genesee, 2004; Jepsen, 2009; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Steele et al., 2017; Thomas & Collier, 2012; Thompson, 2015; Umansky & Reardon, 2014).

Language Allocation

In choosing or designing a dual language model, another consideration is the ratio of the use of English to the use of the partner language for instruction. There are few investigations, summarized below, that assess whether the amount of home language instruction is a significant factor in promoting achievement for English learners. These studies have compared English learner outcomes from different variations of the same program model—late exit schools with more or less Spanish in the later grades and 90:10 versus 50:50 dual language immersion programs. It is important to note that these studies were not designed specifically to examine this issue; thus, the comparison may yield results that are influenced by many factors other than the amount of home language instruction. However, the results are still helpful as they present evidence that is contrary or consistent with results presented in other parts of this program factors section. In a review of research on whether there are different outcomes associated with the ratio of English to partner language use in the instructional day (i.e., 90:10 vs. 50:50 programs), Lindholm-Leary (2016a) concluded the following:

Various researchers have empirically demonstrated or reviewed the research to determine whether more English in the instructional day is associated with higher levels of proficiency and reading in English and/or whether more partner language in the instructional day is associated with higher levels of proficiency and reading achievement in the partner language (for reviews,

see August & Shanahan, 2006; Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2013; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2006; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008). Briefly, this research has compared programs with more or less English in the instructional day, for example, English mainstream (more English) vs. DL (less English) programs or 50:50 (more English) vs. 90:10 (less English) DL programs. This research is consistent in showing that students who spend less time in English in DL programs tend to score at similar levels as their peers who receive more English; this is true for level of English language proficiency (listening, speaking, reading, writing), reclassification rates from EL to Fluent English Proficient, and reading achievement measured in English. Further, these findings are observed as early as preschool (Barnett, Yarosz, Thomas, Jung, & Blanco, 2007; Lindholm-Leary, 2014; Paez, Tabors, & Lopez, 2007). Furthermore, differences between DL and non-DL students that appear to favor non-DL peers tend to disappear by later elementary grades, and some studies show that children in DL programs may outperform their peers in non-DL English mainstream programs in English (Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2006; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008; MacSwan & Pray, 2005). Thus, these findings corroborate previous reviews of research in DL (particularly bilingual education) and in immersion education for native English speakers showing that greater amounts of instruction through English are not necessarily associated with higher levels of proficiency in English or higher reading or math achievement in English.

However, with respect to proficiency in the partner language, comparative studies show that students demonstrate higher levels of partner language proficiency when they participate in programs with higher levels of the partner language, that is, in 90:10 compared to 50:50 programs or DL vs. English mainstream programs (Lindholm-Leary, 2001, 2007; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2006; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008). In addition, students rate their proficiency in Spanish and level of bilingualism higher in 90:10 than 50:50 programs (Lindholm-Leary, 2007). Finally, reading achievement measured in Spanish is higher in 90:10 than 50:50 programs, especially for EL students (Lindholm-Leary, 2017; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008). This research is consistent with research in Canada and elsewhere, showing that students in total immersion programs have higher levels of proficiency in the partner language than students in 50:50 immersion programs (Genesee, 2004; Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2013).

In summary, these program and school factors clearly impact student outcomes of bilingualism and achievement, but not necessarily in expected ways. First, findings demonstrate that students in segregated/low income schools can develop grade-level language proficiency and academic achievement as measured in both languages, and they can achieve at similar or higher levels than their peers in English mainstream. Second, programs with a higher amount of instruction through the partner language can lead to stronger proficiency in the partner language with no sacrifice to English proficiency. Thus, bilingualism and biliteracy may be enhanced to a greater degree when children receive higher levels of instruction in the partner language. (p. 209)

Studies of bilingual and immersion students and opinions of experts in the field of dual language education show that a minimum of 50% partner language instruction is necessary to promote high levels of partner language proficiency among native English speakers and to promote academic achievement among students who speak the partner language at home. Some one-way world language immersion programs that serve exclusively native English speakers use a model in which the partner language is used for 100% of instruction for the first year or several years of the program. Furthermore, although stu-

dies have not specifically addressed the minimum level of English necessary, it appears that a minimum of 10% initial English instruction may be important to promote English language development for the nonnative speakers of English in two-way programs. Also, to develop a high level of academic English proficiency among the English learners, content instruction in English should increase to about 50% by the late elementary school years (Grades 4–6). While there is no research to date that supports or refutes these points, this is the case in effective dual language programs. No research has yet determined the best ratio of English to the partner language in instruction. Thus, this decision should be made with respect to student outcomes, family and community needs, and in connection with the resources (teacher language proficiency and materials) available for providing instruction through the partner language.

Another question that arises concerning the amount of instruction in each language is whether students should learn in both languages each day or whether instruction can alternate between the two languages daily or weekly. The first answer is that there is no research that has compared these approaches. In addition, among programs that do not provide instruction in both languages every day, there are a number of ways that language alternation can take place, such as alternating days (e.g., Escamilla et al., 2014; Gomez, Freeman, & Freeman, 2005), alternating weeks, or even alternating academic content units. One argument against this alternating language approach is that students need to practice both languages every day in order to optimize language development, particularly in the partner language. For example, research on learning and memory distinguishes two types of learning: massed (e.g., longer sessions of learning spaced further apart) versus distributed or spaced practice (e.g., daily learning). Extensive research over several decades clearly shows that distributed practice over a period of time is more effective than massed practice for long-term memory (e.g., Cepeda, Pashler, Vul, Wixted, & Rohrer, 2006; Kang, 2016). No research has examined whether alternate day learning is less or as effective as daily learning through each language, and it is not clear whether alternate day programs could be considered distributed practice since the alternation occurs every other day. However, especially for young learners of a second language, daily use is likely important to promote higher levels of second language development, especially since content is taught through that language.

Literacy Instruction

In developing a dual language program, another issue to consider is literacy instruction in the two languages: Should children be taught literacy in their native language first, and then have the second language added later? Can children be taught literacy simultaneously in two languages, or will they be confused? These are not questions that have received much empirical attention, but they have received considerable attention recently. Although this is not an issue in 90:10 programs because all children learn to read first in the partner language, it is a consideration in 50:50 programs.

Not surprisingly, the less socially prestigious language in a society is the one most subject to language loss. To promote the prestige of the partner language and counteract the dominant status of the mainstream society's language, the partner language must receive more focus in the early stages of a dual language program. For 90:10 dual language programs, in which students are receiving almost all of their instruction through the partner language, it is important that literacy begin in that language for all students. This recommendation is based on two bodies of research. The first is the bilingual education literature, which shows that English learners who receive considerable native language literacy instruction eventually score much higher on literacy tests in English and in their native language than students who have been provided literacy instruction largely or entirely in English (e.g., August, McCardle, & Shana-

han, 2014; August & Shanahan, 2006; Genesee et al., 2006; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010). For these students, then, a considerable body of current research suggests that they should first receive literacy instruction in their native language.

The second body of literature, from Canada and the United States, focuses on native speakers of the community's prestige language (e.g., English in the United States) and shows that teaching literacy through the partner language does not place these students at risk in their development of the two languages. By third or fourth grade they usually score at least as high as native English speakers from monolingual classrooms on standardized tests of reading achievement (Genesee, 2008; Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2013). These results hold true for low- and middle-income African American students in French immersion programs and in dual language immersion programs (Haj-Broussard, 2005; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008; Thomas & Collier, 2012). Thus, the literature clearly supports early literacy instruction through the partner language.

There is another very important reason for promoting literacy in the partner language from the beginning. Experts in dual language programs note that dual language students will often read for pleasure in the partner language in first and second grade, but that once they are able to read in English, they tend to read for pleasure primarily in English. One reason may be that because English is the societal and prestigious language, there is considerably more literature to choose from in English. The lack of available literature in the partner language becomes more pronounced as the children move into the higher grades (Grades 5–12). If children do not begin reading in the partner language until second or third grade, after they have begun reading in English, they may never choose to read for pleasure in the partner language.

In studies of two-way students in 50:50 and 90:10 secondary school Spanish and Chinese programs, Lindholm-Leary and colleagues (Lindholm-Leary, 2016b) found that in the 50:50 program, while the majority of students said they read “well” and write “well” in the partner language for students at their grade level, few students said they love or like to read for pleasure in the partner language, and most said they hate or don't like to read for pleasure in the partner language. However, most of the students said they love or like to read for pleasure in English, although a few said they hate or don't like to read in English for pleasure. In contrast, in the 90:10 program, a similar percentage of students as in the 50:50 program say that they like or love to read for pleasure in English, but unlike the 50:50 students, most of students also say they love or like to read for pleasure in the partner language. Further, the performance of the 90:10 students on the Spanish and English reading achievement tests was associated with their attitudes toward reading for pleasure in the two languages. If students do not like to read for pleasure in the partner language, it will clearly impede any efforts to develop high levels of literacy in the partner language.

Unfortunately, there is little research comparing 50:50 two-way programs that teach literacy in both languages to 90:10 or 50:50 programs that provide reading instruction in the partner language for all students. Lindholm-Leary (2004) examined the reading achievement outcomes of Grade 5 and Grade 7 English learners in three types of dual language programs: 90:10, 50:50 successive literacy (reading taught first in the partner language, then later in English), and 50:50 simultaneous literacy (reading taught in both languages from kindergarten). Each program offered standards-based literacy instruction in both languages, engaged in considerable program planning, and provided professional development focused on reading and language arts. Results showed that by Grade 5, English learners from similar socioeconomic backgrounds scored equivalently, regardless of program type, on norm-referenced, standardized achievement tests in reading assessed in English. By Grade 7, students from the different models scored

similarly—and at grade level—in reading achievement assessed in English. Reading achievement in Spanish, however, was higher in the 90:10 program than in either 50:50 program.

Soltero-González, Sparrow, Butvilofsky, Escamilla, and Hopewell (2016) compared literacy outcomes for third-grade English learners in two 50:50 programs: one using a successive literacy approach that was actually a transitional bilingual model and one using the simultaneous Literacy Squared model (that is, providing literacy instruction through both languages simultaneously; see the authors for more details on this model). They found that Spanish and English reading and writing outcomes were significantly higher in the simultaneous paired literacy model than in the successive model. While these results are instructional, they are problematic in two regards: 1) Children in the successive model received less instruction in literacy than those in the simultaneous model, and 2) children in the successive model were switched to English only or to the Literacy Squared model. It is not clear whether the difference in results between the two groups of students is due to differences between simultaneous and successive instruction or to the different components used in the Literacy Squared approach. Nonetheless, the results certainly indicate that children receiving simultaneous literacy instruction are not confused by their instruction through two languages.

Student Demographics

Little research has been conducted to determine the best classroom composition for bilingual education programs in general or dual language programs in particular. To maintain an environment of educational and linguistic equity in the classroom and to promote interactions between native and nonnative English speakers, the most desirable ratio is 50% English speakers to 50% partner language speakers. To ensure that there are enough language models of each language to promote interactions between the two groups of students, there should be no more than two thirds speakers of one language to one third speakers of the other language.

The populations represented in the dual language education model vary considerably by school site. Many times the English-speaking and partner language populations are not comparable in important ways—briefly described below—and these differences must be addressed in the program structure and planning, curriculum, instruction, assessment, professional development, and home–school collaborations.

In many programs, there is diversity with respect to immigration status and socioeconomic status. English learners in some language groups (particularly Mandarin, Korean, and Japanese) are more likely than others (e.g., Spanish speakers) to be middle class and to come from homes with educated parents. However, it is important to note that there is variation within all groups. Most English learners in U.S. schools are U.S.-born, and some have parents who are highly educated and middle class, while others may be homeless or live in poverty conditions. Nonetheless, when achievement and language proficiency scores are disaggregated, the research shows that students in dual language programs tend to do as well as or better than their peers in English mainstream programs (e.g., Lindholm-Leary, 2001, 2011, 2016a; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008; U.S. Department of Education, 2012).

The native-English-speaking population in dual language programs is also diverse in socioeconomic status and parental education, as well as in ethnic composition and language variety. In some schools,

this population includes a diversity of economically advantaged and disadvantaged European Americans, African Americans, Hispanics, and Asian Americans. In other schools, most of the native English speakers are middle class and European American. In still other schools, the majority of native English speakers are economically disadvantaged African American or Hispanic students living in the inner city.

Some educators have questioned whether economically disadvantaged African American students should participate in dual language education programs because of the achievement gap that often exists for this group. While there is little research on the literacy and achievement of African American children in immersion programs, there is some research to indicate that these children are not negatively affected and may, in fact, realize positive outcomes in their achievement and attitudes (Haj-Broussard, 2005; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008; Thomas & Collier, 2012).

As is true with world language immersion programs, students with special education needs or learning disabilities are typically accepted into dual language programs (Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2013; Paradis, Genesee, Crago, & Leonard, 2010). The only caveat is for native English speakers who have serious language processing difficulties in their native language; in these cases, the decision for admittance is carefully considered on an individual basis. Further, according to members of the advisory panel that helped to develop *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education*, students are typically not moved from the dual language program because of special education or learning disability needs.

REFERENCES

- Alanís, I., & Rodríguez, M. A. (2008). Sustaining a dual language immersion program: Features of success. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 7(4), 305–319.
- August, D., McCardle, P., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2014). Developing literacy in English language learners: Findings from a review of the experimental research. *School Psychology Review*, 43(4), 490–498.
- August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2010). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (7th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.
- Barnett, W. S., Yarosz, D. J., Thomas, J. H., Jung, K., & Blanco, D. (2007). Two-way monolingual English immersion in preschool education: An experimental comparison. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 22, 277–293.
- Berman, P., Minicucci, C., McLaughlin, B., Nelson, B., & Woodworth, K. (1995). *School reform and student diversity: Case studies of exemplary practices for English language learner students*. Santa Cruz, CA, and Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, and B.W. Associates.
- Calderón, M. E., Slavin, R. E., & Sánchez, M. (2011). Effective instruction for English language learners. *The Future of Children*, 21(1), 103–128.
- Carroll, P. E., & Bailey, A. L. (2015). Do decision rules matter? A descriptive study of English language proficiency assessment classifications for English-language learners and native English speakers in fifth grade. *Language Testing*, 33(1), 23–52.

- Castellano, M., Stringfield, S., & Stone, J. R. (2002). *Helping disadvantaged youth succeed in school: Second-year findings from a longitudinal study of CTE-based whole-school reforms*. Columbus, OH: National Dissemination Center for Career and Technical Education.
- Cepeda, N. J., Pashler, H., Vul, E., Wixted, J. T., & Rohrer, D. (2006). Distributed practice in verbal recall tasks: A review and quantitative synthesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(3), 354–380.
- Corallo, C., & McDonald, D. H. (2002). *What works with low-performing schools: A review of research*. Charleston, WV: Appalachian Educational Laboratory.
- de Jong, E. J. (2011). *Foundations for multilingualism in education: From principles to practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- de Jong, E., & Bearse, C. (2011). The same outcomes for all? High school students reflect on their two-way immersion program experiences. In D. J. Tedick, D. Christian, & T. W. Fortune (Eds.), *Immersion education: Pathways to bilingualism and beyond* (pp. 104–122). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., Butvilofsky, S., Sparrow, W., Soltero-González, L., Ruiz-Figueroa, O., & Escamilla, M. (2014). *Biliteracy from the start: Literacy Squared in action*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2016). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Philadelphia: Caslon.
- Gathercole, V. C. M. (2016). Factors moderating proficiency in bilingual speakers. In E. Nicoladis & S. Montanari (Eds.), *Bilingualism across the lifespan: Factors moderating language proficiency* (pp. 123–140). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Genesee, F. (2004). What do we know about bilingual education for majority language students? In T. K. Bhatia & W. Ritchie (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingualism and multiculturalism* (pp. 547–576). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Genesee, F. (2008). Dual language in the global village. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to bilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 22–45). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Genesee, F., & Lindholm-Leary, K. (2013). Two case studies of content-based language education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1(1), 3–33. doi:10.1075/jicb.1.1.02gen
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English language learners*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Gomez, L., Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (2005). Dual language education: A promising 50–50 model. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(1), 145–164.
- Haj-Broussard, M. (2005). Comparison contexts: African-American students, immersion, and achievement. *ACIE Newsletter*, 8(3).
- Hamayan, E., Genesee, F., & Cloud, N. (2013). *Dual language instruction: From A to Z*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinle & Heinle.
- Hammer, C. S., Lawrence, F. R., & Miccio, A. W. (2008). Exposure to English before and after entry into Head Start: Bilingual children's receptive language growth in Spanish and English. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(1), 30–56. doi:10.2167/beb376.0
- Herman, R., Gates, S. M., Chavez-Herrerias, E., & Harris, M. (2016). *School leadership interventions under the Every Student Succeeds Act: Volume I—A review of the evidence*

- base, *initial findings*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1550.html
- Hill, L. E., Weston, M., & Hayes, J. (2014). *Reclassification of English learner students in California*. San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Howard, E. R., Christian, D., & Genesee, F. (2004). *The development of bilingualism and biliteracy from grades 3 to 5: A summary of findings from the CAL/CREDE study of two-way immersion education*. Santa Cruz, CA, and Washington, DC: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence, and Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Jepsen, C. (2009, January). *Bilingual education and English proficiency* (University of Kentucky Center for Poverty Research, Discussion Paper Series, DP2009-01). Retrieved from http://uknowledge.uky.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1067&context=ukcpr_papers
- Kang, S. H. K. (2016). Spaced repetition promotes efficient and effective learning: Policy implications for instruction. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 3(1), 12–19.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2004). New directions in multicultural education: Complexities, boundaries, and critical race theory. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 50–65). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2004). *Biliteracy issues and outcomes in different models of dual language programs*. Paper presented at the 13th annual Illinois Reading Recovery/DLL Institute, Chicago, IL.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2007, March). *Got bilingualism? Spanish and Chinese immersion students' perceptions of bilingualism and biculturalism*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the California Association for Bilingual Education, Long Beach.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2011). Student outcomes in Chinese two-way immersion programs: Language proficiency, academic achievement, and student attitudes. In D. Tedick, D. Christian, & T. Fortune (Eds.), *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities* (pp. 81–103). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2014). Bilingual and biliteracy skills in young Spanish-speaking low-SES children: Impact of instructional language and primary language proficiency. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 17(2), 144–159. doi:10.1080/13670050.2013.866625
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2016a). Bilingualism and academic achievement in children in dual language programs. In E. Nicoladis & S. Montanari (Eds.), *Bilingualism across the lifespan: Factors moderating language proficiency* (pp. 203–223). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2016b). Students' perceptions of bilingualism in Spanish and Mandarin dual language programs. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 10(1), 59–70.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2017, April). Educational trajectories of Latino ELL students in dual language programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Antonio, TX.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Block, N. (2010). Achievement in predominantly low-SES Hispanic dual language schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(1), 1–18.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Borsato, G. (2006). Academic achievement. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.), *Educating English language learners* (pp. 157–179). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Lindholm-Leary, K., & Genesee, F. (2010). Alternative educational programs for English language learners. In California Department of Education (Eds.), *Improving education for English learners: Research-based approaches* (pp. 323–382). Sacramento: CDE Press.
- Lindholm-Leary, K., & Hernández, A. (2011). Achievement and language proficiency of Latino students in dual language programmes: Native English speakers, fluent English/previous ELLs, and current ELLs. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 32(6), 531–545.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Howard, E. (2008). Language and academic achievement in two-way immersion programs. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to bilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 177–200). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- MacSwan, J., & Pray, L. (2005). Learning English bilingually: Age of onset of exposure and rate of acquisition among English language learners in a bilingual education program. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(3), 653–678. doi:10.1080/15235882.2005.10162857
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Menken, K., Kleyn, T., & Chae, N. (2012). Spotlight on “long-term English language learners”: Characteristics and prior schooling experiences of an invisible population. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 6(2), 121–142.
- Montecel, M. R., & Cortez, J. D. (2002). Successful bilingual education programs: Development and the dissemination of criteria to identify promising and exemplary practices in bilingual education at the national level. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26, 1–21.
- Montrul, S. (2016). Age of onset of bilingualism effects and availability of input in first language attrition. In E. Nicoladis & S. Montanari (Eds.), *Bilingualism across the lifespan: Factors moderating language proficiency* (pp. 141–162). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2017). *Promoting the educational success of children and youth learning English: Promising futures*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. doi:10.17226/24677
- Paez, M. M., Tabors, P. O., & Lopez, L. M. (2007). Dual language and literacy development of Spanish-speaking preschool children. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 28(2), 85–102.
- Paradis, J., Genesee, F., Crago, M., & Leonard, L. (2010). *Dual language development and disorders: A handbook on bilingualism and second language development* (2nd ed.). Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
- Parrish, T., Linqunti, R., Merickel, A., Quick, H., Laird, J., & Esra, P. (2006). *Effects of the implementation of Proposition 227 on the education of English learners, K–12: Final report*. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.
- Potowski, K. (2007). *Language and identity in a dual immersion school*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Slavin, R. E., & Calderón, M. (2001). *Effective programs for Latino students*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Soltero-González, L., Sparrow, W., Butvilofsky, S., Escamilla, K., & Hopewell, S. (2016). Effects of a Paired Literacy program on emerging bilingual children’s biliteracy outcomes in third grade. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 48(1), 80–104.

- Steele, J. L., Slater, R. O., Zamarro, G., Miller, T., Li, J., Burkhauser, S., & Bacon, M. (2017). Effects of dual-language immersion programs on student achievement: Evidence from lottery data. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(1), 282S–306S. doi:10.3102/0002831216634463
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2012). *Dual language education for a transformed world*. Albuquerque, NM: Dual Language Education of New Mexico/Fuente Press.
- Thompson, K. (2015). English learners' time to reclassification: An analysis. *Educational Policy*, 31(3), 330–363. doi:10.1177/0895904815598394
- Umansky, I. M., & Reardon, S. F. (2014). Reclassification patterns among Latino English learner students in bilingual, dual immersion, and English immersion classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(5), 879–912.
- U.S. Department of Education; Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development; Policy and Program Studies Service. (2012). *Language instruction educational programs (LIEPs): A review of the foundational literature*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Williams, T., Hakuta, K., Haertel, E., et al. (2007). *Similar English learner students, different results: Why do some schools do better? A follow-up analysis, based on a large-scale survey of California elementary schools serving low-income and EL students*. Mountain View, CA: EdSource.

1 Program Structure

Principle 1

1 All aspects of the program work together to achieve the three core goals of dual language education: grade-level academic achievement, bilingualism and biliteracy, and sociocultural competence.

Key Point A

The program design is aligned with program mission and goals.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
It is not clear that the program design is aligned with the mission (e.g., through length of program, language allocation, language of initial literacy instruction, recruitment of students) or will enable students to attain the goals of the program.	The program design is somewhat aligned with the mission (e.g., through length of program, language allocation, language of initial literacy instruction, recruitment of students) and will enable students to attain some but not all goals of the program.	The program design is fully aligned with the program mission (e.g., through length of program, language allocation, language of initial literacy instruction, recruitment of students) and will enable students to attain all program goals.	The program design is fully aligned with the program mission (e.g., through length of program, language allocation, language of initial literacy instruction, recruitment of students) and will enable students to attain all program goals. The mission and goals are supported by district leadership and community members in addition to program personnel, and there are systems in place to ensure that alignment continues as the program mission or goals evolve.

Key Point B

The development of bilingualism and biliteracy is part of the program design.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Efforts at promoting additive bilingualism and biliteracy are uncoordinated and unsystematic.	There is some plan for promoting additive bilingualism and biliteracy, but knowledge or resources are insufficient to fully accomplish this objective.	There is a program-wide plan for promoting additive bilingualism and biliteracy that takes home language profiles into consideration and is grounded in proficiency standards or a scope-and-sequence document. Implementation is consistent at all grade levels. Students are given opportunities to develop social and academic registers in both languages.	There is a program-wide plan for promoting additive bilingualism and biliteracy that takes home language profiles into consideration, is grounded in proficiency standards or a scope-and-sequence document, and is coordinated at the district level. Implementation is consistent at all grade levels, and the program successfully prepares students to obtain Advanced Placement credit or the Seal of Biliteracy. The program communicates and advocates for these goals at the district, state, and national levels.

<p>Key Point C The development of sociocultural competence is part of the program design.</p>			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Efforts at promoting sociocultural competence are uncoordinated and unsystematic.	There is some plan for promoting sociocultural competence, but knowledge or resources are insufficient to fully accomplish this objective.	There is a program-wide plan for promoting sociocultural competence that involves school personnel, students, and families, and implementation is consistent at all grade levels.	There is a program-wide plan for promoting sociocultural competence that involves school personnel, students, and families and that is coordinated at the district level. Implementation is consistent at all grade levels. The program communicates and advocates for these goals at the district, state, and national levels.
<p>Key Point D Appropriate grade-level academic expectations are clearly identified in the program design.</p>			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Efforts at promoting appropriate grade-level academic achievement in both languages of instruction are uncoordinated and unsystematic.	There is some plan for promoting appropriate grade-level academic achievement in both languages of instruction, but knowledge or resources are insufficient to fully accomplish this objective.	There is a program-wide plan for promoting appropriate grade-level academic achievement in both languages of instruction that is grounded in standards, and implementation is consistent at all grade levels.	There is a program-wide plan for promoting appropriate grade-level academic achievement in both languages of instruction that is grounded in standards and that meets or exceeds district-level expectations. Implementation is consistent at all grade levels. The program communicates and advocates for these goals at the district, state, and national levels.
<p>Key Point E The program is articulated across grades.</p>			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There is little or no articulation across grade levels.	There is a plan for articulation across grade levels but it is not systematic or well implemented (e.g., it may exist only for the primary grades or may be left to the teachers to develop from one year to the next).	There is a plan for articulation across all grade levels that is comprehensive and well implemented.	There is a comprehensive and well-implemented plan for articulation across all grade levels that is coordinated at the district level and that is reviewed periodically and revised as needed.

Key Point F

There is deliberate planning and coordination of curriculum, instruction, and assessment across the two languages of instruction.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Planning is carried out independently for each language of instruction, with little to no coordination.	There is some coordination across languages of instruction, but it is not comprehensive or ongoing (e.g., in only one content area or only for some units).	Instruction in one language consistently supports and extends instruction in the other language, and regular planning time is provided to teachers and other instructional staff to ensure that this coordination occurs.	Instruction in one language consistently supports and extends instruction in the other language, and regular planning time is provided to teachers and other instructional staff to ensure that this coordination occurs. Systems are in place to help teachers coordinate instruction (e.g., shared online folders or curriculum planning software). Instructional staff engage in outreach within and beyond the district to share strategies for coordinating instruction.

2**Principle 2**

The program ensures equity for all groups.

Key Point A

All students and staff have appropriate access to resources.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
One program within the school or one population within the program has greater access to resources than the other.	Some steps have been taken to make the distribution of resources across programs and student populations more equitable, but one group or program still benefits from greater resources.	Resources are distributed equitably among all student groups and programs within the school, according to their needs.	School-level and district-level resources are distributed equitably among all student groups and programs within the school, and there is a process in place to ensure ongoing resource equity. The dual language program leadership has clearly communicated the needs of the program to all stakeholders.

Key Point B The program promotes linguistic equity.			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
One language is afforded higher status than the other (e.g., is used more often in meetings or announcements, is the sole language of assessment). In addition, the home varieties of the two program languages may not be valued or used as a resource for instruction or for family and community engagement.	Some steps have been taken to equalize the status of the two program languages, but one language continues to be more highly valued in some domains. The home varieties of the two program languages are valued, but only in limited contexts (e.g., at extracurricular events).	Both languages are equally valued throughout the program, and particular consideration is given to elevating the status of the partner language. The home varieties of the two program languages are valued and used as a resource for instruction and for family and community engagement.	Both languages are equally valued throughout the program and the district, and the home varieties of the two program languages are valued and used as a resource for instruction and for family and community engagement. Issues of language status are discussed and revisited as needed, and particular consideration is given to elevating the status of the partner language.
Key Point C The program promotes cultural equity.			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
One cultural group is given more status than others in the program.	Some steps have been taken to promote equity, but one cultural group enjoys higher status in the program and in program communications.	All cultural groups are equally valued and have equal participation in all facets of the program.	All cultural groups are equally valued throughout the program and the district, and are empowered to participate in and make decisions about all facets of the program. The program systematically gathers feedback to ensure continuous cultural equity.

Key Point D

High-quality instruction in both program languages is provided to all students in all grades in a way that is consistent with the program model.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Instructional quality is not comparable in the two languages of instruction (e.g., curricular materials are more robust in one language than the other, expectations are higher in one language than the other, teacher preparation is more comprehensive for teachers of one language than the other) or instruction may be inconsistent with the program model (e.g., frequent use of English during content instruction in the partner language, absence of a high-quality, content-based English language development block in the primary grades of a 90/10 program).	Instruction is consistent with the program model; instructional quality is comparable in the two languages of instruction at some but not all grade levels (e.g., curricular materials are equally robust in both program languages, expectations are equally high in both program languages, teacher preparation is equally comprehensive for teachers of both program languages).	Instruction is consistent with the program model and instructional quality is comparable in the two languages of instruction at all grade levels (e.g., curricular materials are equally robust in both program languages, expectations are equally high in both program languages, teacher preparation is equally comprehensive for teachers of both program languages).	Instruction is consistent with the program model and instructional quality is comparable in the two languages of instruction at all grade levels (e.g., curricular materials are equally robust in both program languages, expectations are equally high in both program languages, teacher preparation is equally comprehensive for teachers of both program languages). Internal audits take place on a regular basis to ensure ongoing comparability of high-quality instruction in both program languages in a way that is aligned with the program model.

3**Principle 3**

The program has strong, effective, and knowledgeable leadership.

Key Point A

The program has robust, shared leadership.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There is insufficient leadership for the program (e.g., the designated administrative leader lacks sufficient time, knowledge, or resources to lead the program; a founding teacher has the knowledge but not the authority to lead the program).	There is a knowledgeable administrative leader but no development of leadership in the rest of the staff.	There is a knowledgeable administrative leader as well as a strong leadership team whose roles and responsibilities are well defined (e.g., staff recruitment and training, program planning, budget management).	There is a knowledgeable administrative leader as well as a strong leadership team, and both are supported by the district. Roles and responsibilities with regard to program processes and procedures are clearly defined (e.g., staff recruitment and training, program planning, budget management), and a district-level plan is in place for training new leaders.

<p>Key Point B Decision-making is aligned to the program mission and includes communication with stakeholders.</p>			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Decision-making does not align with or is counter to the program mission.	Decision-making is loosely aligned to the program mission. Decisions may not be communicated to stakeholders in a timely fashion.	Decision-making is clearly aligned to and respectful of the program mission, and decisions are communicated to stakeholders in a timely fashion.	Decision-making is clearly aligned to and respectful of the program mission. Decisions are made in consultation with key stakeholders in the district and the larger community and are communicated in a timely fashion.
<p>Key Point C Leaders are advocates for the program.</p>			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
No advocacy work is conducted by program leaders, or work is conducted only on an ad hoc basis.	Leaders advocate proactively for the program but not with all stakeholders (e.g., with parents but not with district administration, or with the district but not the community at large).	Leaders advocate proactively for the program with a variety of stakeholders at school, district, and community levels.	Leaders advocate proactively for the program with stakeholders at all levels, including state-level policymakers. In addition, leaders support teachers, staff, and families in carrying out advocacy work.
<p>4 Principle 4 An effective process is in place for continual program planning, implementation, and evaluation.</p>			
<p>Key Point A The program is adaptable and engages in ongoing self-reflection and evaluation to promote continual improvement.</p>			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
The program rarely engages in self-evaluation (e.g., the program is prescriptive and rigid and is unresponsive to signs that changes are needed; or, conversely, the program undergoes constant readjustment, with little attention to data-driven decision-making).	The program sporadically engages in self-evaluation without reaching the level of a full internal review (e.g., the program solicits input from stakeholders about needed changes in the program as issues arise). There is no clear process for addressing needed changes.	The program engages in regular self-evaluation and internal review every 1 to 3 years and has defined processes for soliciting input from stakeholders about changes that may be needed. The program also seeks out and engages in external review at regular intervals and uses the results to guide program change.	The program engages in regular self-evaluation and internal review every 1 to 3 years and has defined processes for soliciting input from stakeholders about changes that may be needed. The program also seeks out and engages in external review at regular intervals and uses the results to guide program change. The program addresses needed changes through a data cycle process that includes the identification of issues, the implementation of potential solutions, and evaluation of the effectiveness of those solutions. Program evaluation processes and ensuing program changes are fully supported at the district level.

Key Point B

There is a clear preK–12 pathway for students in the program.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There is no preK–12 pathway for students in the program.	There is a loosely defined preK–12 pathway, but it may not span all grade levels, support all program goals, or be appropriate for all students.	There is a clear, well-articulated preK–12 pathway that provides sustained instructional opportunities in English and the partner language for all students to ensure the achievement of all program goals.	There is a clear, well-articulated preK–12 pathway that provides sustained instructional opportunities in English and the partner language to ensure the achievement of all program goals for all students and that promotes college and career enhancement through the Seal of Biliteracy, Advanced Placement credit, or other similar measures.

STRAND

2



Curriculum

2 Curriculum

ALIGNMENT WITH STANDARDS, ASSESSMENT, AND THE VISION OF BILINGUALISM AND BILITERACY

Several reform movements over the past decades have considerably impacted curricula for all students, but particularly for linguistically and culturally diverse students (Hakuta, 2011; Heritage, Walqui, & Linqunti, 2015; Valdés, Menken, & Castro, 2015). Many of these reforms have focused on standards-based curricula, though the types of standards have varied from national (e.g., Common Core) to state (individual state-based standards as a part of No Child Left Behind, Race to the Top, or Common Core) to organizational (e.g., World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment Consortium, or WIDA), and from content (e.g., Next Generation Science) to language development (e.g., English language, world language). Furthermore, newer standards place much higher demands on academic language proficiency than previous standards or curricula, which has significant impacts on second language learners (Hakuta & Castellon, 2016; National Academies, 2017).

There is a substantial and consistent body of research over the past several decades indicating that successful schools and programs have a curriculum that is clearly aligned with standards and assessment and is meaningful, academically challenging, and incorporates higher order thinking (e.g., Hakuta, 2011; Montecel & Cortez, 2002; National Academies, 2017; Valdés et al., 2015; Williams et al., 2007). In terms of curriculum-aligned standards, it is important to note that most of these standards have not been designed with English learners in mind and therefore curriculum adjustments may need to be made to reflect contextualized funds of knowledge of students and their families.

Research and standards-based reforms point to the critical importance of a curriculum associated with an assets-based, rather than a remedial, instructional model (e.g., Bunch & Kibler, 2015; Bunch, Kibler, & Pimentel, 2012; Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013; Valdés et al., 2015). In fact, as Heritage et al. (2015) note, a thorough investigation of the new college and career ready standards (e.g., Common Core, Next Generation Science Standards, new English language development standards and frameworks) “reveals their emphasis on extensive language use to engage in deep and transferable content learning and analytical practices” (p. 2).

The importance of language in content instruction is also seen in the movement within language education toward greater integration of language and content instruction (e.g., Coyle & Baetens-Beardsmore, 2007; Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Fortune, Tedick, & Walker, 2008; Heritage et al., 2015; Lyster, 2007; Valdés et al., 2015). It is clear from the research that language and language objectives should be incorporated into curriculum planning and that oral and written language and literacy should be developed across the curriculum to ensure that students can learn the academic language associated with the content and build knowledge across the curriculum (Bunch et al., 2012).

As noted in the Program Structure section of this publication, but also applicable to curriculum, a commitment to a vision and goals focused on bilingualism, biliteracy, and sociocultural competence has been demonstrated in studies and advocated by dual language education teachers and administrators (Berman, Minicucci, McLaughlin, Nelson, & Woodworth, 1995; de Jong, 2011; Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Montecel & Cortez, 2002). This is important because most curriculum and curriculum-based assessments are not designed for dual language programs or students. Thus, adaptations may need to be made to the curriculum and associated assessments. For example, the curriculum should provide a scope and sequence for initial literacy development (e.g., phonemic/phonetic awareness, decoding, encoding) in the partner language that specifically addresses the literacy skills needed to read and write in that language rather than simply mirroring the teaching of English literacy. This scope and sequence should also include biliteracy development, not simply literacy development for each language individually.

INCLUSION OF THEMATIC OR CROSS-DISCIPLINARY APPROACHES

Another consideration related to curriculum is the use of thematic, cross-disciplinary, or project-based learning approaches. These approaches organize instruction and material across traditional subject-matter lines, typically involve projects that integrate learning across these subject areas, and are usually student centered. Research has demonstrated the effectiveness of these curricular approaches (e.g., Halvorsen et al., 2014). According to a review of effective practices for English learners, “cross-disciplinary endeavors in planning and integrating instruction were critical in supporting language and literacy development across the curriculum” (National Academies, 2017, p. 7–20).

Unfortunately, current standards-based curricula often segregate instruction and learning by subject matter, which may create challenges for program leaders and teachers to incorporate and follow these evidence-based approaches.

ALIGNMENT AND ARTICULATION

Clear vertical and horizontal alignment is critical to a successful curriculum (Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement, 2009; Drake & Burns, 2004) and is usually associated with higher student achievement (Drake & Burns, 2004). Articulation involves three vital processes. First, it is important to link the content and language curriculum across languages. Second, it is critical to articulate content and language across the different grade levels. Third, teachers need to engage in joint curriculum development and planning; otherwise “curriculum integration is more piecemeal and dependent on individual teacher initiative” (Castellano, Stringfield, & Stone, 2002, p. 35).

In fact, there has been increased attention to articulating curriculum from preK to Grade 3. The aim of this articulation “is to create a seamless, continuous educational experience for children from birth to age 8, to sustain learning gains made in effective early education programs, and to continue to build on these gains in the K–3 grades and beyond” (National Academies, 2017, p. 2–9).

The curriculum should also be coordinated with support services. Research indicates that English learners who receive instruction through two languages should receive literacy interventions in their first language (National Academies, 2017). Evidence also demonstrates that the impacts for younger English learners (Grades K–1) were greater when the interventions targeted foundational reading skills and were tailored to student needs (Richards-Tutor, Baker, Gersten, Baker, & Smith, 2016). This research was largely limited to Spanish speakers at the early elementary grades, but nonetheless the results are very instructive and indicate that there needs to be coordination between curriculum and any additional support services that at-risk students may require.

PROMOTION OF MULTICULTURALISM, LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY, AND EQUITY

Another important issue that should impact dual language curricula is the “third goal”—that is, the goal of sociocultural competence (e.g., Feinauer & Howard, 2014). The research in this area is consistent with the body of child development research, which demonstrates that programs that promote socio-emotional learning have a significant impact on student success at all grade levels (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011). This includes students’ behavioral, attitudinal, and academic development. Thus, curricula need to include multiple opportunities for students to develop positive attitudes about themselves and others, and to develop cultural knowledge and a sense of their and others’ identities—ethnic, linguistic, and cultural—in a non-stereotyped fashion.

Furthermore, since the vision and goals of dual language education also include sociocultural competence and equity, the curriculum needs to reflect and value students’ languages and cultures (Sleeter, 2016). Thus, books of many genres, including culturally authentic literature, and a variety of other materials (e.g., visual, audiovisual, art) *in both languages* are required to meet the goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, and multiculturalism.

Having curriculum and materials in both languages is an absolute necessity so that students have the opportunity to develop a full range of proficiency, both linguistic and cultural, in both languages. In addition, such materials provide an opportunity for enhanced sociocultural development. That is, students have the chance to see themselves in literary characters and are afforded an opportunity and space to do the necessary exploration of self (Phinney, 1993) in relation to the other, which supports the development of socioculturally and interculturally flexible identities. This area of sociocultural development is as critical as language development in dual language programs.

INFUSION OF TECHNOLOGY

The uses of technology in our lives and the implications and applications for the classroom have increased dramatically over the past decade (e.g., Gee & Hayes, 2011) and can be used to effectively support curriculum. Technology is included in more recent standards, and research shows effective digital integration into curriculum, instruction, and assessment (International Society for Technology in Education, 2016; Purcell, Heaps, Buchanan, & Friedrich, 2013).

There are so many digital tools available that we need to consider how to use them most effectively in the classroom, especially as they apply to the partner language. In addition, while most students have access to digital tools in school, most teachers feel that there is a clear digital divide concerning access to such tools at home (Purcell et al., 2013).

REFERENCES

- Berman, P., Minicucci, C., McLaughlin, B., Nelson, B., & Woodworth, K. (1995). *School reform and student diversity: Case studies of exemplary practices for English language learner students*. Santa Cruz, CA, and Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, and B.W. Associates.
- Bunch, G. C., & Kibler, A. K. (2015). Integrating language, literacy, and academic development: Alternatives to traditional English as a second language and remedial English for language minority students in community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 39(1), 20–33.
- Bunch, G., Kibler, A., & Pimentel, S. (2012, January). Realizing opportunities for English learners in the Common Core English Language Arts and Disciplinary Literacy Standards. Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford, CA. Retrieved from http://ell.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/pdf/academic-papers/01_Bunch_Kibler_Pimentel_RealizingOpp%20in%20ELA_FINAL_0.pdf
- Castellano, M., Stringfield, S., & Stone, J. R. (2002). *Helping disadvantaged youth succeed in school: Second-year findings from a longitudinal study of CTE-based whole-school reforms*. Columbus, OH: National Dissemination Center for Career and Technical Education.
- Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. (2009). *Vertical alignment: Ensuring opportunity to learn in a standards-based system*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Coyle, D., & Baetens-Beardsmore, H. (Eds.). (2007). Research on content and language integrated learning [Special issue]. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5).
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: From practice to principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 182–204.
- de Jong, E. J. (2011). *Foundations for multilingualism in education: From principles to practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Drake, S. M., & Burns, R. C. (2004). *Meeting standards through integrated curriculum*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*, 82, 405–432. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x
- Feinauer, E., & Howard, E. R. (2014). Attending to the third goal: Cross-cultural competence and identity development in two-way immersion programs. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 2(2), 257–272.
- Fortune, T. W., Tedick, D. J., & Walker, C. L. (2008). Integrated language and content teaching: Insights from the language immersion classroom. In T. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 71–96). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

- Gee, J. P., & Hayes, E. R. (2011). *Language and learning in the digital world*. Oxford, England: Routledge.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English language learners*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Hakuta, K. (2011). Educating language minority students and affirming their equal rights: Research and practical perspectives. *Educational Researcher*, 40(4), 163–174.
- Hakuta, K., & Castellon, M. (2016, October). Understanding language. *Language Magazine*. Retrieved from http://languagemagazine.com/?page_id=6018
- Halvorsen, A., Duke, N. K., Brugar, K. A., Block, M. K., Strachan, S. L., Berka, M. B., & Brown, J. M. (2014). Narrowing the achievement gap in second-grade social studies and content area literacy: The promise of a project-based approach. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 40, 198–229.
- Hamayan, E., Genesee, F., & Cloud, N. (2013). *Dual language instruction: From A to Z*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Heritage, M., Walqui, A., & Linqianti, R. (2015). *English language learners and the new standards*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE). (2016). *Redefining learning in a technology-driven world: A report to support adoption of the ISTE Standards for Students*. Retrieved from http://www.iste.org/docs/Standards-Resources/iste-standards_students-2016_research-validity-report_final.pdf
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Lindholm-Leary, K., & Genesee, F. (2010). Alternative educational programs for English language learners. In California Department of Education (Eds.), *Improving education for English learners: Research-based approaches* (pp. 323–382). Sacramento: CDE Press.
- Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Montecel, M. R., & Cortez, J. D. (2002). Successful bilingual education programs: Development and the dissemination of criteria to identify promising and exemplary practices in bilingual education at the national level. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26, 1–21.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2017). *Promoting the educational success of children and youth learning English: Promising futures*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. doi:10.17226/24677
- Phinney, J. S. (1993). A three-stage model of ethnic identity development in adolescence. In M. E. Bernal & G. P. Knight (Eds.), *Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities* (pp. 61–79). New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Purcell, K., Heaps, A., Buchanan, J., & Friedrich, L. (2013). *How teachers are using technology at home and in their classrooms*. Retrieved from Pew Research Center website: <http://www.pewinternet.org/2013/02/28/how-teachers-are-using-technology-at-home-and-in-their-classrooms>
- Richards-Tutor, C., Baker, D. L., Gersten, R., Baker, S. K., & Smith, J. M. (2016). The effectiveness of reading interventions for English learners: A research synthesis. *Exceptional Children*, 82(2), 144–169.
- Sleeter, C. (2016). Ethnicity and the curriculum. In D. Wyse, L. Hayward, & J. Pandya (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment* (pp. 231–246). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

- Valdés, G., Menken, K., & Castro, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Common Core bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Williams, T., Hakuta, K., Haertel, E., et al. (2007). *Similar English learner students, different results: Why do some schools do better? A follow-up analysis, based on a large-scale survey of California elementary schools serving low-income and EL students*. Mountain View, CA: EdSource.

2 Curriculum

1

Principle 1

The program has a process for developing and revising a high-quality curriculum.

Key Point A

There is a curriculum development and implementation plan.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There is no plan for curriculum development and implementation.	There is a plan for curriculum development, but it is implemented sporadically.	There is a plan for curriculum development that was developed with buy-in from all stakeholders and is followed in all classrooms.	There is a plan for curriculum development that was developed with buy-in from all stakeholders, is followed in all classrooms, and is aligned with district guidance as appropriate for dual language programs. There is a systematic process to continually develop and improve the curriculum and its implementation.

Key Point B

The curriculum is based on general education research and research on bilingual learners.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There was no consideration of the research base during curriculum development.	Certain components of the curriculum (e.g., reading or math) are based on general education research but may not be adapted for bilingual learners.	The curriculum is based on principles derived from relevant general education research and research on bilingual learners, and it incorporates published materials that are aligned with that research base.	The curriculum is based on principles derived from relevant general education research and research on bilingual learners, and it incorporates published materials that are aligned with that research base. The curriculum is regularly monitored and updated for research alignment.

Key Point C

The curriculum is adaptable to student, program, and community needs.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
No processes are established to adapt to new curricular mandates or to change the curriculum according to students' needs.	Processes are in place to adapt curriculum materials for some content areas or for some grades.	The program or curriculum coordinator works with teachers to monitor new curriculum mandates and changing student and community needs. The team adapts the curriculum for dual language classrooms as needed and ensures articulation of the new curriculum within and across grade levels. When curriculum material adoptions are district-wide, dual language teachers are represented on selection committees.	The program or curriculum coordinator works with teachers and district-level experts to monitor new curriculum mandates and changing student and community needs. The team adapts the curriculum for dual language classrooms as needed and ensures articulation of the new curriculum within and across grade levels. When curriculum material adoptions are district-wide, dual language teachers are represented on selection committees. At both the school and district level, the curriculum is regularly monitored and updated to ensure that it meets student, program, and community needs.

Key Point D

The curriculum is coordinated with support services such as English as a second language, Spanish as a second language, special education, Title I, and gifted & talented.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There is no coordination with support services.	Individual teachers coordinate with support services.	There is a structured process of curriculum coordination across support services, and this informs the curriculum development and implementation plan. Time is allocated for this purpose.	There is a structured process of curriculum coordination across support services, and this informs the curriculum development and implementation plan. Time is allocated for this purpose. At both the school and district level, the process of curriculum coordination is regularly monitored and updated to ensure that it results in appropriate coordination with all support services.

<p>Key Point E The curriculum is coordinated within and across grade levels.</p>			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There is no coordination across grade levels.	Individual teachers coordinate with other teachers in grade levels directly above or below them.	There is a structured process of curriculum coordination within and across all grade levels, and this informs the curriculum development and implementation plan. Personnel and time are allocated for this purpose.	There is a structured process of curriculum coordination within and across all grade levels, and this informs the curriculum development and implementation plan. Personnel and time are allocated for this purpose. At both the school and district level, the process of curriculum coordination is regularly monitored and updated to ensure that it results in appropriate articulation across all grade levels.

2

Principle 2

The curriculum is standards-based and promotes attainment of the three core goals of dual language education.

Key Point A

The curriculum in both languages of instruction meets or exceeds district, state, or national content standards.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
District, state, and national content standards are not taken into consideration during curriculum development in one or both languages of instruction, or the curriculum is based on a remedial instructional approach.	District, state, or national content standards are used inconsistently in curriculum development in one or both languages, and the curriculum may be based on a remedial instructional approach.	District, state, or national content standards are used to guide curriculum development in both languages of instruction, and the curriculum is based on an enriched instructional approach that is meaningful, academically challenging, and promotes higher order thinking skills.	District, state, or national content standards are used to guide curriculum development in both languages of instruction, and the curriculum is based on an enriched instructional approach that is meaningful, academically challenging, and promotes higher order thinking skills. At both the school and district level, the curriculum is regularly monitored and updated to ensure that it aligns with standards.

Key Point B

The curriculum includes a standards-based scope and sequence for language and literacy development in English and the partner language for all students.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There is no scope and sequence for literacy and language development for either of the program languages.	There is a scope and sequence for literacy and language development for one language but not the other (or it is not differentiated for each language), or the scope and sequence is not based on relevant standards.	There is a scope and sequence for literacy and language development in each language that is based on relevant standards (e.g., WIDA, CCSS) as appropriate for the program model; it is differentiated for a variety of bilingual learner profiles and for students identified as gifted or eligible for special education services, with high expectations for all students. Areas of cross-linguistic commonalities and differences for language and literacy expectations are noted and used to inform instruction.	There is a scope and sequence for literacy and language development in each language that is based on standards (e.g., WIDA, CCSS) as appropriate for the program model; it is differentiated for a variety of bilingual learner profiles and for students identified as gifted or eligible for special education services, with high expectations for all students. Areas of cross-linguistic commonalities and differences for language and literacy expectations are noted and used to inform instruction. At both the school and district level, the scope and sequence for language and literacy development in both languages is regularly reviewed and improved as needed.

Key Point C

The curriculum promotes and maintains equal status of both languages.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Across all grade levels, academic subjects such as math, science, and language arts are taught in one language, and all specials (e.g., art, music) are taught in the other. There are insufficient opportunities to develop academic language in English or the partner language.	Some attempts are made to balance academic instruction between the two languages, but across all grade levels, most academic subjects are taught in one language, and most specials (e.g., art, music) are taught in the other. There are some opportunities to develop academic language in English and the partner language.	Over the course of the program, as is appropriate for the program model, instruction in academic subjects and specials is evenly allocated across the two languages of instruction, and standards-based language arts instruction is provided in both languages. All students are provided with sufficient opportunities to develop academic language in English and the partner language.	Over the course of the program, as is appropriate for the program model, instruction in academic subjects and specials is evenly allocated across the two languages of instruction, and standards-based language arts instruction is provided in both languages. All students are provided with sufficient opportunities to develop academic language in English and the partner language. Collaborations with external partners (e.g., community members, international organizations) are created to extend the development of academic skills and language to real-world contexts in both English and the partner language.

<p>Key Point D The curriculum promotes appreciation of multiculturalism and linguistic diversity.</p>			
<p>Minimal alignment</p>	<p>Partial alignment</p>	<p>Full alignment</p>	<p>Exemplary practice</p>
<p>The curriculum provides minimal opportunities for students to develop positive attitudes about themselves and others in a non-stereotyped fashion. Multicultural resources are scarce in both languages and may not be authentic. Only standard language varieties are used in curricular materials.</p>	<p>The curriculum provides some opportunities for students to develop positive attitudes about themselves and others in a non-stereotyped fashion. Multicultural resources are used to some extent (e.g., in one language or content area only) and may not be authentic. Multiple language varieties and registers are sometimes used in curricular materials.</p>	<p>The curriculum provides multiple opportunities for students to develop positive attitudes about themselves and others in a non-stereotyped fashion. Authentic multicultural resources are used for instruction in both languages. Multiple language varieties and registers are regularly used in curricular materials.</p>	<p>The curriculum provides multiple opportunities for students to develop positive attitudes about themselves and others in a non-stereotyped fashion. Authentic multicultural resources are used for instruction in both languages. Multiple language varieties and registers are regularly used in curricular materials. Collaborations with external partners (e.g., community members, international organizations) are created to extend the appreciation of multiculturalism and linguistic diversity to real-world contexts.</p>
<p>Key Point E The curriculum is culturally responsive and representative of the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of all students.</p>			
<p>Minimal alignment</p>	<p>Partial alignment</p>	<p>Full alignment</p>	<p>Exemplary practice</p>
<p>There is little indication that the curriculum is culturally relevant or supports students' prior knowledge and home language. Teachers demonstrate little to no knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, interests, or special needs. Regional language varieties are not valued or represented in curricular materials.</p>	<p>The curriculum incorporates some culturally relevant materials and some consideration is given to students' prior knowledge and home language. Teachers demonstrate some knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, interests, and special needs. Regional language varieties are represented in curricular materials to a limited extent.</p>	<p>The curriculum incorporates culturally relevant materials in both program languages and consideration is given to students' prior knowledge and home language. Teachers demonstrate knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, interests, and special needs and ground their lessons in such knowledge. Regional language varieties are represented in curricular materials as appropriate for the lesson objectives.</p>	<p>The curriculum incorporates culturally relevant materials in both program languages and consideration is given to students' prior knowledge and home language. Teachers demonstrate ample knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, interests, and special needs and ground their lessons in such knowledge. Regional language varieties are represented in curricular materials as appropriate for the lesson objectives. Opportunities are provided for students to engage in community-based projects that address local concerns and deepen home/community/school connections.</p>

Key Point F The curriculum articulates measurable learning outcomes.			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Only a few learning expectations and outcomes of the curriculum are clear, and they may not permit viable methods of assessment in either language of instruction.	Many learning expectations and outcomes of the curriculum are clear. They are explicitly stated as measurable and observable, address the language demands of the content, include differentiated language demands, contain modifications as required for students with IEPs and students identified as gifted, and permit viable methods of assessment in at least one language of instruction.	All learning expectations and outcomes of the curriculum are clear. They are explicitly stated as measurable and observable, address the language demands of the content, include differentiated language demands, contain modifications as required for students with IEPs and students identified as gifted, and permit viable methods of assessment in both languages of instruction.	All learning expectations and outcomes of the curriculum are clear. They are explicitly stated as measurable and observable, address the language demands of the content, include differentiated language demands, contain modifications as required for students with IEPs and students identified as gifted, and permit viable methods of assessment in both languages of instruction. At both the school and district level, the curriculum is regularly monitored and updated to ensure that it articulates measurable learning objectives.

3

Principle 3

The curriculum effectively integrates technology to deepen and enhance learning.

Key Point A The curriculum effectively incorporates technology to enhance the available instructional resources in both languages.			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Technology is rarely used as a curriculum resource in either language. If it is used, resources are of limited quality or are only used in one language of instruction.	Technology is sometimes used as a curriculum resource (e.g., photos, videos, virtual field trips, primary source materials). Quality and variety may be limited. Use may be inconsistent across grade levels and languages of instruction.	Technology is regularly used to provide high-quality, interesting, diverse, and current curriculum resources (e.g., photos, videos, virtual field trips, primary source materials) in both program languages at all grade levels.	Technology is regularly used to provide high-quality, interesting, diverse, and current curriculum resources (e.g., photos, videos, virtual field trips, primary source materials) in both program languages at all grade levels. Program staff create new, innovative, technology-based lessons that can be shared with other programs and schools in the district. At both the school and district level, the curriculum is regularly monitored and updated to ensure that it stays current with technological innovations.

Key Point B

The curriculum effectively integrates technology tools to meet district, state, and national content standards in both program languages.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Technology tools are rarely used to meet content, language, or literacy standards in either language of instruction.	Technology tools (e.g., online learning, game-based learning, Google Docs, interactive whiteboards, student response systems) are sometimes used to meet content, language, or literacy standards. Quality and variety may be limited. Use may be inconsistent across grade levels and languages of instruction.	High-quality technology tools (e.g., online learning, game-based learning, Google Docs, interactive whiteboards, student response systems) are regularly used to meet content, language, and literacy standards in both program languages at all grade levels.	High-quality technology tools (e.g., online learning, game-based learning, Google Docs, interactive whiteboards, student response systems) are regularly used to meet content, language, and literacy standards in both program languages at all grade levels. These efforts result in the creation of new, innovative dual language curricula that can be shared with other programs and schools. At both the school and district level, the curriculum is regularly monitored and updated to ensure that it stays current with technological innovations and changes in standards.

STRAND

3



Instruction

3

Instruction

Effective instruction is associated with higher student outcomes, regardless of the educational model used (Hightower et al., 2011; Marzano, 2003; O’Day, 2009), and the effects of quality teaching are cumulative and long-lasting (Hightower et al., 2011). However, the definition of effective instruction has become more complex with the advent of standards-based reforms and the need for 21st century skills that require students to develop rigorous and demanding cognitive and linguistic proficiencies.

Research demonstrates that instruction that is effective for English learners looks similar to instruction that is effective for native English speakers. Likewise, many instructional programs that have been reported to benefit native English speakers are also effective with English learners, although they are more effective when the instruction is tailored to the language needs of English learners (August, McCardle, & Shanahan, 2014; August & Shanahan, 2006; de Jong & Harper, 2005; Faulkner-Bond et al., 2012; O’Day, 2009).

In effect, good instruction is even more complicated in dual language programs because of the need to address the goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, and sociocultural competence; balance the needs of diverse student groups; and meet the needs of second language learners. Furthermore, instruction is more complex because learning differs in bilingual students; they are able to draw on skills and knowledge from one language during instruction in the other (August et al., 2014; Riches & Genesee, 2006). Thus, it is especially important to use a variety of techniques that respond to different language proficiency levels (Cisco & Padrón, 2014; Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2011) and various learning styles, which may differ among the ethnic groups represented in a particular dual language program (Park, 2002).

Research on good instruction also shows the importance of positive teacher–student interactions in learner-centered environments (Cornelius-White, 2007; O’Day, 2009; Reznitskaya, 2012). In these environments, teachers participate in genuine dialogue with pupils and facilitate rather than control student learning, which encourages the development of higher level cognitive skills over factual recall (Cornelius-White, 2007; Klingelhofer & Schleppegrell, 2016; O’Day, 2009; Reznitskaya, 2012). In addition, when teachers use positive social and instructional interactions equitably with both English learners and native English speakers, both groups perform better academically (Doherty, Hilberg, Pinal, & Tharp, 2003).

LANGUAGE AND LITERACY DEVELOPMENT

Research and pedagogy in second language development have evidenced considerable change in the past decade. This change has resulted from a better understanding of several issues:

- The language performance of bilinguals, especially the ways in which they process information across languages and in cross-linguistic relationships

- Ways to define, measure, and teach academic language to ensure high-level academic language proficiency
- The importance and complexity of language learning and teaching during content instruction

Immersion and bilingual methodologies were developed based on the notion that students would learn language by being exposed to it during meaningful interactions and content instruction. More current research shows that students do not develop high levels of academic proficiency from these approaches alone (Ballinger, 2013; Lyster, 2007; Swain & Lapkin, 2013). Research has consistently demonstrated that it takes 5 to 7 years or longer for students to become academically proficient in a second language (e.g., Hakuta, 2011; Hill, Weston, & Hayes, 2014; Hopkins, Thompson, Linquanti, August, & Hakuta, 2015; National Academies, 2017; Thompson, 2015). In fact, language development is not linear but is much more rapid at early stages and slows as students approach advanced levels of proficiency (Linquanti & Cook, 2015). These findings would suggest that a number of instructional strategies are necessary for students to become fully proficient in a second language. What follows are a number of evidence-based practices for promoting higher levels of second language development.

Language Input

In the early stages of second language acquisition, input is made more comprehensible through use of the following (see Larsen-Freeman & Tedick, 2016):

- Slower, more expanded, simplified, and repetitive speech oriented to the here and now
- Highly contextualized language and gestures
- Comprehension and confirmation checks
- Communication that provides scaffolding for the negotiation of meaning by constraining possible interpretations of sequence, role, and intent

A specific way to incorporate these features of language input into classroom instruction is through sheltered instruction. Echevarria, Vogt, and Short (2016) built on research on sheltered instruction to develop the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), which provides a lesson planning and delivery approach. The SIOP Model comprises 30 features that are grouped into eight components for making content comprehensible for language learners. These sheltering techniques occur in the context of a reciprocal interactive exchange and include various activities as alternatives to the traditional transmission approach to instruction. Sheltered techniques include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Using visual aids such as pictures, charts, graphs, and semantic mapping
- Modeling instruction, allowing students to negotiate meaning and make connections between course content and prior knowledge
- Allowing students to act as mediators and facilitators
- Using alternative assessments, such as portfolios, to check comprehension
- Providing comprehensible speech, scaffolding, and supplemental materials
- Using a wide range of presentation strategies

Short, Echevarria, and Richards-Tutor (2011) reported that students who were provided with sheltered instruction using the SIOP Model scored significantly higher and made greater gains on an English

writing task than English learners who had not been exposed to instruction via the SIOP Model. While this model was developed for use with English learners, the concepts are clearly applicable to other second language learners. (For an adaptation of the SIOP Model for two-way dual language contexts, see Howard, Sugarman, & Coburn, 2006.)

Balanced with the need to make the second language more comprehensible is the necessity of providing stimulating academic language input (Heritage, Walqui, & Linqianti, 2015; Swain & Lapkin, 2013; Valdés, Menken, & Castro, 2015), particularly in the partner language for students who enter school already proficient in that language (Valdés, 1997). This is especially necessary, as mentioned previously, because standards-based reforms require higher levels of academic language proficiency across the various content areas.

Oral Language Development and Instruction

Considerable debate has existed about the importance of explicit second language instruction in the process of second language learning (Larsen-Freeman & Tedick, 2016; Lyster, 2007). Because many foreign language immersion programs were grounded in the Natural Approach, which eschews formal skills instruction in the immersion language, two important but incorrect assumptions were made. The first assumption was that students would learn the language through its use in subject matter instruction, and the second was that students would achieve more native-like proficiency if they received the kind of language exposure that is similar to first language learning. However, as some language education practitioners and researchers have discovered, the fluency and grammar ability of most immersion students is not native-like, and there is a need for formal instruction in the second language. However, this does not mean traditional translation and memorization of grammar and phrases. It is important to use a language arts curriculum that specifies which linguistic structures should be mastered (e.g., conditional verb forms) and how these linguistic structures should be incorporated into the academic content (e.g., including preterit and imperfect forms of verbs in history instruction and conditional and future verb tenses in mathematics and science).

National and state policies stipulate the need for English language development instruction for English learners. Saunders, Goldenberg, and Marcelletti (2013) proposed some guidelines on providing this instruction, based on their summary of six major syntheses and meta-analyses of oral language development. Many of these guidelines are likely applicable to second languages other than English as well.

Providing instruction in English language development is better than not providing it; that is, research shows that focused second language instruction that is designed to teach a particular aspect of the language is more effective than mere exposure or minimally focused instruction. This is consistent with research mentioned previously (e.g., Ballinger, 2013; Lyster, 2007; Swain & Lapkin, 2013).

Instruction needs to explicitly teach forms of linguistic complexity (e.g., vocabulary, syntax, morphology, functions, conventions). Though there is no research with English learners that demonstrates this practice to be effective, it is consistent with other research cited previously.

Instruction in English language development should continue until learners achieve advanced English language proficiency; that is, English learners should continue to receive instruction after they reach intermediate levels of proficiency so that they develop higher levels of proficiency rather than get stuck at an intermediate level.

Saunders, Goldenberg, and Marcelletti (2013) also address two other issues based on typical instruction of English learners in mainstream, English-only, or transitional bilingual programs. They suggest that English language development be provided in a separate block of time to groups of students separated by language proficiency. Because most dual language programs keep native speakers and language learners integrated 100% of the time, this is not always feasible in dual language; instead, dual language teachers typically integrate language development consistently into language arts and other content area lessons.

Several studies point out the importance of using metalanguage strategies to promote language and literacy development (e.g., Klingelhofer & Schleppegrell, 2016; Schleppegrell, 2013). Metalanguage strategies provide students the skills to talk about language as a system and help them understand more about how language functions. Schleppegrell (2013) provides an example of a second grade study of understanding how the same speech function (e.g., command) can be realized in three grammatical moods:

- Declarative – I'd like you to close the door.
- Interrogative – Would you please close the door?
- Imperative – Close the door!

Students often have difficulty producing native-like speech in the second language. Part of this difficulty stems from a lack of opportunity to speak the language with fluent speakers. According to classroom research, second language learners get few opportunities to produce extended discourse in which they are forced to make their language coherent, accurate, and sociolinguistically appropriate (Lyster, 2007). This is even true when teachers require students to use the language of instruction during group work. Thus, promoting highly developed oral language skills requires providing both structured and unstructured opportunities for oral production (Saunders & O'Brien, 2006; Schleppegrell, 2013; Wright, 2016).

Literacy Development and Instruction

In a review of experimental research on effective instruction, August et al. (2014) note that there has been increased attention to the teaching of the component skills of reading and that more current research with English learners shows the advantages of the strategies described below. Many of these may be applicable to learners of second languages other than English as well.

- *Explicit instruction, particularly in the areas of “phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, oral reading fluency, reading comprehension, and writing” (p. 491).*
- *Frequent and varied repetition.*
- Scaffolding such as acting out meanings of words, using visual aids to illustrate words in different contexts than those in which they were initially presented, aligning reading material to reading level with supports during reading, promoting teacher–student interaction about

books that make the material more comprehensible, previewing reading material before questioning students about it, and using graphic organizers.

- *Multiple opportunities for practice and cumulative review.*
- *Differentiating instruction to take into account students with diverse needs.*
- *Explicit vocabulary instruction* to address concepts that are particularly confusing in the text; use of visual aids and motor activities to strengthen word meaning. In addition, Baker et al. (2014) recommend that academic vocabulary words be taught “intensively across several days using a variety of instructional activities”(p. 3).
- *Meaning-oriented approaches to reading comprehension* to provide greater impact on reading comprehension than decoding-oriented approaches; development of background knowledge, especially by introducing key vocabulary through definitions and sentences; brief story introductions with details; and questions posed to students throughout the reading.
- *Effective writing practices* such as explicit instruction on how to revise; use of a computer rather than paper and pencil for writing assignments to improve writing quality. Baker et al. (2014) also recommend providing “regular, structured opportunities to develop written language skills” (p. 3).

Language of Instruction/Separation of Languages

This is a topic that has generated some debate in the past few years. Prior editions of the *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education*, while stating the need to promote metalinguistic awareness and foster cross-linguistic connections, recommended monolingual lesson delivery: that is, instruction in only one language at a time. This recommendation was supported by considerable research on both bilingual education and immersion programs. Currently, there is some debate about strict language separation. This debate will be described briefly here along with recommendations based on existing research. (For further information, see Ballinger, Lyster, Sterzuk, & Genesee, 2017, for a review of the research; also refer to other research cited here.)

An important premise of language education is that of cross-language transfer, in which content that is learned through one language is also available in the other languages spoken by the learner (Cummins, 2005; Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006). Cummins (2000) theorized that there is a common underlying proficiency beneath the surface of both languages, consisting of a set of cognitive, language, and metalinguistic skills that the learner can draw upon in both languages. There is considerable research demonstrating that a strong first language can serve as an important foundation for the second language and can lead to stronger achievement and English language development at the preschool, elementary, and secondary levels (e.g., August & Shanahan, 2006, 2010; Genesee et al., 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2016; National Academies, 2017; Riches & Genesee, 2006).

Over the past couple of decades, more has been learned about how bilinguals process their two languages. More recently, research has shown that bilinguals activate both languages in parallel when they

process or produce language (Kroll & Bialystok, 2013), regardless of whether the two languages use the same writing system (Hoshino & Kroll, 2008). Because the activation is automatic, emergent bilinguals must use more cognitive resources to manage the activation of the currently irrelevant language, which they do by using inhibitory control of the irrelevant language while they process information related to the relevant language, making them a “mental juggler” in the two languages (Freeman, Shook, & Marian, 2016). So, for example, as Cameron (as cited in Lyster, 2007) points out, children who are read a story in their second language may process it in their dominant language.

Another important point to consider is that language use and language development occur in sociocultural contexts. Several educators and researchers have focused on a cognitive-sociocultural perspective of language in developing the concept of *translanguaging* (García, 2015; García & Wei, 2014; Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012), which refers to bilinguals’ use of all the linguistic resources available to them with no artificial separation of languages. This term first emerged in the context of Welsh/English bilingualism, in which the use of Welsh was at risk, and there was a push to promote its use as much as possible. The concurrent use of Welsh and English in the classroom began, which provided for the emergence of translanguaging as a pedagogy (Lewis et al., 2012). García, Johnson, and Seltzer (2016) propose four purposes for translanguaging: 1) to provide support for students to engage and comprehend academic content; 2) to give students opportunities to engage in language practice while reading academic content; 3) to provide a space for students to further develop their bilingualism; and 4) to promote the socio-emotional development of students, especially their bilingual identities. Thus, according to this translanguaging perspective, emergent bilinguals use all their cognitive and linguistic resources during interactions, such that the content on which they draw may be distributed across languages (Hopewell & Escamilla, 2015). Instructionally, this perspective means that there is not a strict separation of languages at all times, but there can be a more fluid use of both languages strategically in the same lesson (Lewis et al., 2012).

However, important for native English speakers in immersion and two-way contexts, Williams (as cited in Lewis et al., 2012) cautioned “that translanguaging is more appropriate for children who have a reasonably good grasp of both languages, and may not be valuable in a classroom when children are in the early stages of learning and developing their second language. It is a strategy for retaining and developing bilingualism rather than for the initial teaching of the second language” (p. 644). In a review of the research on translanguaging and what they term crosslinguistic pedagogy, Ballinger et al. (2017) also caution that “when learners are encouraged to draw on features from the majority language during class time allocated to the minority language, this practice can replicate, rather than resolve, an existing societal language imbalance. In effect, it can create a subtractive learning environment for learners from minoritized language backgrounds because it reinforces the dominance of the majority language. . . . The question of what role the majority language should play in immersion classrooms must be considered carefully as part of a broader discussion of how to manage differences in the societal status of languages in bilingual programs” (pp. 46–47). They go on to suggest that “the majority language play only a minor role, if any, during instructional time allocated to the minority immersion language” and that “providing minority-language instruction without recourse to the majority language, avoiding concurrent translation, and maintaining a separation between languages should be deployed in ways that serve to avoid the very societal language imbalance that immersion programs are often designed to redress” (p. 47).

In summary, translanguaging pedagogies are consistent with ways in which bilinguals process language and enable bilingual students to access all of their linguistic resources to use language and to comprehend

language and content. A number of educators have provided strategies that use these translanguaging pedagogies for literacy, language, and content instruction (e.g., García et al., 2016; Hopewell & Escamilla, 2015). However, it needs to be emphasized that if the two languages are used concurrently, the use of both languages should be strategic. In addition, these are strategies for maintaining and further developing bilingualism in children who already have at least some knowledge of both languages and are not optimal for immersion or two-way students who are new learners of a second language. Thus, widespread use of English during partner language time should be discouraged so that students have maximal opportunities to further develop the partner language.

GROUPING PRACTICES

Heterogeneous or homogeneous grouping for instruction becomes a major consideration in programs where student background characteristics can influence students' language proficiency, academic achievement, and other outcomes. The argument in favor of homogeneous grouping by language proficiency is that each group's needs can be better met, particularly by providing second language learning activities and approaches for the second language learners or struggling students. In contrast, heterogeneous grouping provides opportunities for diverse groups of students to interact in ways that do not segregate by ability. There is no research suggesting that one grouping strategy is more effective than the other. In successful dual language programs, there is often a combination of strategies, with only occasional and strategic separation of students by language proficiency levels for instruction (Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013; Howard & Sugarman, 2007).

A number of strategies under the rubric of cooperative learning have been developed that appear to optimize student interactions and shared work experiences (see, e.g., Cohen, 1998; Johnson & Johnson, 2009; Kagan, 1994). Studies suggest that when diverse students work interdependently on school tasks with common objectives, students' expectations and attitudes toward each other become more positive, their academic achievement improves, and language development is facilitated by extensive interactions among native and nonnative speakers.

It is important to point out that many years of research show that for cooperative learning to produce positive outcomes, the grouping must be based on particular operating principles. Many schools and teachers purport to use cooperative learning, but the grouping may not follow the necessary preconditions for success. Considerable empirical evidence and meta-analysis studies demonstrate the success of cooperative learning in promoting positive student outcomes. However, researchers caution that successful grouping requires students to work interdependently, with clearly conceived individual and group accountability for all group members and with social equity in the group and in the classroom (Johnson & Johnson, 2009).

Likewise, in a review of the literature on the English language development of English language learners, Saunders and O'Brien (2006) reported that merely having students work together does not necessarily enhance language development. Rather, they state that activities in which the two groups of students are interacting require that teachers consider the design of the task, the training of the native speakers in working with and promoting the language development of language learners, and the language proficiency level of the language learners. Furthermore, as Bailey (2015) notes, "Moving forward, students will need to

acquire the linguistic acumen to take part in classroom interactions that support deeper content learning presumably afforded by CCSS [Common Core State Standards] and NGSS [Next Generation Science Standards]. For example, when partnered with others, students will need familiarity with language practices and routines to negotiate their involvement in activities, solve problems cooperatively and discuss and support one another's ideas" (p. 52).

REFERENCES

- August, D., McCardle, P., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2014). Developing literacy in English language learners: Findings from a review of the experimental research. *School Psychology Review*, 43(4), 490–498.
- August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2010). Response to a review and update on “Developing Literacy in Second-language Learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language Minority Children and Youth.” *Journal of Literacy Research*, 42(3), 341–348.
- Bailey, A. L. (2015). How have the language expectations for students and teachers at school changed with the adoption of the Common Core State Standards? In G. Valdés, K. Menken, & M. Castro (Eds.), *Common Core bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators* (pp. 50–51). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., . . . Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). *Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school* (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. Retrieved from the NCEE website: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx
- Ballinger, S. (2013). Towards a cross-linguistic pedagogy: Biliteracy and reciprocal learning strategies in French immersion. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1(1), 131–148.
- Ballinger, S., Lyster, R., Sterzuk, A., & Genesee, F. (2017). Context-appropriate crosslinguistic pedagogy: Considering the role of language status in immersion. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 5(1), 30–57. doi:10.1075/jicb.5.1.02bal
- Cisco, B. K., & Padrón, Y. (2014). Investigating vocabulary and reading strategies with middle grades English language learners: A research synthesis. *Research in Middle Level Education Online*, 36(4), 1–23.
- Cohen, E. G. (1998). Making cooperative learning equitable. *Educational Leadership*, 56, 18–22.
- Cornelius-White, J. (2007). Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 77, 113–143. doi.org/10.3102/003465430298563
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2005, September). *Teaching for cross-language transfer in dual language education*. Paper presented at the TESOL Symposium on Dual Language Education: Teaching and Learning Two Languages in the EFL Setting, Istanbul, Turkey.

- de Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(5), 101–124.
- Doherty, R. W., Hilberg, R. S., Pinal, A., & Tharp, R. G. (2003). Five standards and student achievement. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 1, 1–24.
- Echevarría, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. J. (2016). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (5th ed.) Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Faulkner-Bond, M., Waring, S., Forte, E., Crenshaw, R. L., Tindle, K., & Belknap, B. (2012). *Language instruction educational programs (LIEPs): A review of the foundational literature*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education; Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development; Policy and Program Studies Service.
- Freeman, M. R., Shook, A., & Marian, V. (2016). Cognitive and emotional effects of bilingualism in adulthood. In E. Nicoladis & S. Montanari (Eds.), *Bilingualism across the lifespan: Factors moderating language proficiency* (pp. 285–303). Washington DC: American Psychological Association. doi.org/10.1037/14939-016
- García, O. (2015). What do educators need to know about language as they make decisions about Common Core State Standards implementation? In G. Valdés, K. Menken, & M. Castro (Eds.). *Common Core bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators* (pp. 47–49). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2016). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. Hampshire, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Genesee, F., & Lindholm-Leary, K. (2011). The education of English language learners. In K. Harris, S. Graham, & T. Urdan (Eds.), *APA Educational Psychology Handbook: Vol. 3. Application to learning and teaching* (pp. 499–526). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English language learners*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Hakuta, K. (2011). Educating language minority students and affirming their equal rights: Research and practical perspectives. *Educational Researcher*, 40(4), 163–174.
- Hamayan, E., Genesee, F., & Cloud, N. (2013). *Dual language instruction: From A to Z*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Heritage, M., Walqui, A., & Linqunti, R. (2015). *English language learners and the new standards*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Hightower, A. M., Delgado, R. C., Lloyd, S. C., Wittenstein, R., Sellers, K., & Swanson, C. B. (2011). *Improving student learning by supporting quality teaching: Key issues, effective strategies*. Bethesda, MD: Editorial Projects in Education.
- Hill, L. E., Weston, M., & Hayes, J. (2014). *Reclassification of English learner students in California*. San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Hopewell, S., & Escamilla, K. (2015). How does a holistic perspective on (bi/multi)literacy help educators address the demands of the Common Core State Standards for English language learners/emergent bilinguals? In G. Valdés, K. Menken, & M. Castro (Eds.), *Common Core bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators* (pp. 39–40). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.

- Hopkins, M., Thompson, K., Linqunti, R., August, D., & Hakuta, K. (2013). Fully accounting for English learner performance: A key issue in ESEA reauthorization. *Educational Researcher*, 42(2), 101–108.
- Hoshino N, & Kroll, J. F. (2008). Cognate effects in picture naming: Does cross-language activation survive a change of script? *Cognition*, 106, 501–511.
- Howard, E. R., & Sugarman, J. (2007). *Realizing the vision of two-way immersion: Fostering effective programs and classrooms*. Washington, DC, and McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., & Coburn, C. (2006). *Adapting the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) for two-way immersion education: An introduction to the TWIOP*. Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/twi/TWIOP.pdf>
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2009). An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. *Educational Researcher*, 38(5), 365–379.
- Kagan, S. (1994). *Cooperative learning*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan.
- Klingelhofer, R. R., & Schleppegrell, M. (2016) Functional grammar analysis in support of dialogic instruction with text: Scaffolding purposeful, cumulative dialogue with English learners, *Research Papers in Education*, 31(1), 70–88. doi:10.1080/02671522.2016.1106701
- Kroll, J. F., & Bialystok, E. (2013). Understanding the consequences of bilingualism for language processing and cognition. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 25, 497–514.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Tedick, D. J. (2016). Teaching world languages: Thinking differently. In D. H. Gitomer & C. A. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 1335–1388). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond, *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice*, 18(7), 641–654. doi:10.1080/13803611.2012.718488
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2016). Bilingualism and academic achievement in children in dual language programs. In E. Nicoladis & S. Montanari (Eds.), *Bilingualism across the lifespan: Factors moderating language proficiency* (pp. 203–223). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Linqunti, R., & Cook, H. G. (2015). *Re-examining reclassification: Guidance from a national working session on policies and practices for exiting students from English learner status*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Benjamins.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2017). *Promoting the educational success of children and youth learning English: Promising futures*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. doi:10.17226/24677
- O'Day, J. (2009). Good instruction is good for everyone—or is it? English language learners in a balanced literacy approach. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 14, 97–119.
- Park, C. C. (2002) Crosscultural differences in learning styles of secondary English learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26, 443–459. doi:10.1080/15235882.2002.10668720
- Reznitskaya, A. (2012). Dialogic teaching: Rethinking language use during literature discussions. *The Reading Teacher*, 65(7), 446–456.

- Riches, C., & Genesee, F. (2006). Literacy: Crosslinguistic and crossmodal issues. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.), *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence* (pp. 64–108). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Saunders, W., Goldenberg, C., & Marcelletti, D. (2013). English language development: Guidelines for instruction. *American Educator*, 37(2), 13–25, 38–39.
- Saunders, W., & O'Brien, G. (2006). Oral language. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.), *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence* (pp. 14–63). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2013). The role of metalanguage in supporting academic language development. *Language Learning*, 63(Suppl 1), 153–170.
- Short, D., Echevarria, J., & Richards-Tutor, C. (2011). Research on academic literacy development in sheltered instruction classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(3), 363–380.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2013). A Vygotskian sociocultural perspective on immersion education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 2(2), 165–180. doi:10.1075/jicb.1.1.05swa
- Thompson, K. (2015). English learners' time to reclassification: An analysis. *Educational Policy*, 31(3), 330–363. doi:10.1177/0895904815598394
- Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67, 391–429.
- Valdés, G., Menken, K., & Castro, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Common Core bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Wright, W. (2016). Let them talk! *Educational Leadership*, 73(5), 24–29.

3 Instruction

Principle 1

1

Instructional methods are derived from research-based principles of dual language education and ensure fidelity to the model.

Key Point A

The program model and corresponding curriculum are implemented with fidelity.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>A few teachers align instruction with the program model (e.g., providing the appropriate percentage of instruction in each language, sequencing literacy instruction as indicated by the model) and develop and implement the corresponding curriculum with fidelity.</p>	<p>Many teachers align instruction with the program model (e.g., providing the appropriate percentage of instruction in each language, sequencing literacy instruction as indicated by the model) and develop and implement the corresponding curriculum with fidelity.</p>	<p>All teachers are held accountable by the program to align instruction with the program model (e.g., providing the appropriate percentage of instruction in each language, sequencing literacy instruction as indicated by the model) and to develop and implement the corresponding curriculum with fidelity.</p>	<p>All teachers are held accountable by the program and the district to align instruction with the program model (e.g., providing the appropriate percentage of instruction in each language, sequencing literacy instruction as indicated by the model) and to develop and implement the corresponding curriculum with fidelity. There is an explicit plan for ensuring that teachers who are new to the program understand the program model and its implications for curriculum implementation.</p>

Key Point B

Instruction incorporates appropriate separation of languages to promote high levels of language acquisition.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There is no separation of languages for instruction. Teachers use both languages as they choose or continually translate from one to the other. Or there is an overly rigid separation of languages, and teachers do not allow students to use any language other than the language of instruction for any purpose.	There is an attempt at separation of languages, but it is adhered to more strictly in one language than the other. Or students or the teacher use both languages on occasion, but without a clear purpose.	There is a consistent separation of languages for instruction, with high expectations for teachers and students to use the language of instruction and with scaffolds provided to encourage language production. However, in the classroom and throughout the school, opportunities exist for students and teachers to use both languages concurrently for clear academic, linguistic, or social purposes, either through brief teachable moments or through extended activities.	There is a consistent separation of languages for instruction, with high expectations for teachers and students to use the language of instruction and with scaffolds provided to encourage language production. However, in the classroom and throughout the school, opportunities exist for students and teachers to use both languages concurrently for clear academic, linguistic, or social purposes, either through brief teachable moments or through extended activities. Teachers and students regularly engage in self-reflection to identify when and why they are maintaining separation of languages vs. using both languages, and adjust language choices as needed to ensure that program goals and learning objectives are being met.

Key Point C

Standards-based academic content instruction is provided in both program languages in a coordinated way.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>Each program language is used to provide standards-based instruction for at least one content area (math, science, or social studies), but that instruction is not coordinated across program languages through strategies such as thematic instruction, cross-disciplinary learning, shared curriculum, or project-based learning.</p>	<p>Each program language is used to provide standards-based instruction for at least one content area (math, science, or social studies) in a way that is consistent with the program model, and is coordinated across program languages at some grade levels through a limited number of strategies (e.g., thematic instruction, cross-disciplinary learning, shared curriculum, project-based learning) to support language and concept development in both languages.</p>	<p>Each program language is used to provide standards-based instruction for at least one content area (math, science, or social studies) in a way that is consistent with the program model, and is coordinated across program languages through a variety of strategies (e.g., thematic instruction, cross-disciplinary learning, shared curriculum, project-based learning) to support language and concept development in both languages. Over the course of the program, academic instruction is balanced between the two program languages (i.e., equal numbers of core content courses and specials are taught in each language).</p>	<p>Each program language is used to provide standards-based instruction for at least one content area (math, science, or social studies) in a way that is consistent with the program model, and is coordinated across program languages through a variety of strategies (e.g., thematic instruction, cross-disciplinary learning, shared curriculum, project-based learning) to support language and concept development in both languages. Over the course of the program, academic instruction is balanced between the two program languages (i.e., equal numbers of core content courses and specials are taught in each language). Program staff engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding the development and coordination of content area instruction in the two program languages.</p>

Key Point D
 Explicit language arts instruction is provided in both program languages, is based on language-specific standards, and is coordinated across languages to ensure biliteracy development.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Explicit language arts instruction is provided only in one language for the duration of the program.	Explicit language arts instruction is offered in both languages over the course of the program, but for one language the instruction is minimal, only takes place sporadically in response to specific student errors, or is based on translating English language arts standards into the partner language, which results in inappropriate instruction (e.g., teaching Spanish at the phoneme level instead of the syllable level).	Explicit language arts instruction based on language-specific standards is provided in both languages in a way that is consistent with the program model. Language arts instruction is coordinated between the two languages at all grade levels.	Explicit language arts instruction based on language-specific standards is provided in both languages in a way that is consistent with the program model. Language arts instruction is coordinated between the two languages at all grade levels. Program staff engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding the development and coordination of language arts instruction in the two program languages.

Key Point E
 Instruction that promotes sociocultural competence is provided in both program languages in a coordinated way.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Little to no instructional time is dedicated to the development of sociocultural competence (e.g., identity development, cross-cultural awareness, multicultural appreciation, conflict-resolution strategies).	Some instructional time is dedicated to the development of sociocultural competence (e.g., identity development, cross-cultural awareness, multicultural appreciation, conflict-resolution strategies), but it may be more prominent during instructional time in one language than the other. Instruction may be coordinated across the two program languages at some but not all grade levels.	Instruction that promotes the development of sociocultural competence (e.g., identity development, cross-cultural awareness, multicultural appreciation, conflict-resolution strategies) is consistently provided in both languages and is coordinated across program languages at all grade levels through a variety of strategies (e.g., team teaching, thematic instruction, cross-disciplinary learning, shared curriculum, flexible grouping, project-based learning).	Instruction that promotes the development of sociocultural competence (e.g., identity development, cross-cultural awareness, multicultural appreciation, conflict-resolution strategies) is consistently provided in both languages and is coordinated across program languages at all grade levels through a variety of strategies (e.g., team teaching, thematic instruction, cross-disciplinary learning, shared curriculum, flexible grouping, project-based learning). Program staff engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding the development and coordination of instruction to promote sociocultural competence in the two program languages.

Key Point F

Teachers who provide support services (e.g., special education, gifted education, ESL) and specials (e.g., art, music) align their instruction with the dual language model.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>Specials teachers and teachers in the support areas have little knowledge of dual language instructional strategies, and their classes do not align with the goals or philosophy of the program. There is no coordination with classroom teachers.</p>	<p>Some specials teachers and teachers in the support areas use dual language instructional strategies, but this is not consistent across the whole school. Individual classroom teachers coordinate with support services.</p>	<p>All specials teachers and teachers in the support areas are fully trained in and use dual language instructional strategies, and their instruction is aligned with dual language instructional methods and themes. Support services are available in both English and the partner language. There is a structured process of coordination between classroom teachers and support services.</p>	<p>All specials teachers and teachers of support services are fully trained in and use dual language instructional strategies, and their instruction is aligned with dual language instructional methods and themes. Support services are available in both English and the partner language. There is a structured process of coordination between classroom teachers and support services that is continually monitored and improved at both the school and district level.</p>

Key Point G

When delivering instruction, teachers take into consideration the varying needs of students with different language learner profiles (e.g., native speakers, second language learners, new arrivals, students who are already bilingual in English and the partner language).

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>Instruction is delivered with little or no differentiation to meet the varied needs of language learners (e.g., as if all students were native speakers of the language of instruction or as if all students were second language learners with little to no proficiency in the language of instruction).</p>	<p>Some modifications are made to address the varied needs of language learners, but instruction is still geared toward one end of the proficiency continuum or the other.</p>	<p>A variety of instructional techniques, including cooperative learning and flexible grouping, are consistently used to challenge and support all students as needed.</p>	<p>A variety of instructional techniques, including cooperative learning and flexible grouping, are consistently used to challenge and support all students as needed. Teachers engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding the differentiation of instruction for varying language learner profiles.</p>

2**Principle 2**

Instructional strategies support the attainment of the three core goals of dual language education.

Key Point A

Teachers integrate language and content instruction.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Language and content area instruction are entirely separate, and each type of lesson has its own objectives.	There is an attempt at language and content integration, and some teachers work together on their own initiative to discuss possible ways to create lessons with both content and language objectives.	There is consistent integration of language and content in all content area lessons, and there is a program resource that identifies compatible language objectives for many of the common content units (e.g., plants, solar system, measurement). Language arts instruction in both program languages is increasingly content-based to allow for greater language and content integration, possibly incorporating thematic instruction.	There is consistent integration of language and content in all content area lessons, and there is a program resource that identifies compatible language objectives for many of the common content units (e.g., plants, solar system, measurement). Language arts instruction in both program languages is increasingly content based to allow for greater language and content integration, possibly incorporating thematic instruction. Teachers engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding the integration of content and language objectives.

Key Point B

Teachers use sheltered instruction and other pedagogical strategies for bilingual learners to facilitate comprehension and promote language and literacy development.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>Teachers rarely use instructional strategies that facilitate students' understanding of academic language and concepts or that help them produce oral or written language (e.g., visual aids, choral repetition, Point and Say, gestures, sound effects, sentence frames, cooperative learning structures, graphic organizers).</p>	<p>Teachers often use instructional strategies that facilitate students' understanding of academic language and concepts and that help them produce oral or written language. Scaffolding is unbalanced between the two program languages (e.g., too much scaffolding for English-dominant students during instructional time in the partner language and insufficient scaffolding for students dominant in the partner language during instructional time in English).</p>	<p>Teachers consistently use a variety of complementary instructional strategies that facilitate students' understanding of academic language and concepts and that help them produce oral or written language. Teachers also consistently monitor students' understanding of academic language and concepts in a variety of ways (e.g., learning logs, exit tickets, kinesthetic assessments, technology-based student response systems, targeted questioning and discussion techniques). Scaffolding is balanced between the two program languages.</p>	<p>Teachers consistently use a variety of complementary instructional strategies that facilitate students' understanding of academic language and concepts and that help them produce oral or written language. Teachers also consistently monitor students' understanding of academic language and concepts in a variety of ways (e.g., learning logs, exit tickets, kinesthetic assessments, technology-based student response systems, targeted questioning and discussion techniques). Scaffolding is balanced between the two program languages. Teachers engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding the use of sheltered instruction and other pedagogical approaches for bilingual learners.</p>

Key Point C Instruction in one language builds on concepts learned in the other language.			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Instruction in one program language does not connect to or build on instruction in the other language, or instruction in one language repeats or translates content already covered in the other language.	There are attempts to make instructional connections from one program language to the other (e.g., carrying over a discussion of a subject taught in one language to the other language or using complementary resources in each language), but they are unsystematic and insufficient.	Clear, purposeful instructional connections are made across program languages in a systematic and ongoing way so that instruction builds over time across languages. There is ongoing communication among teachers through a variety of channels, including meetings, email, and online planning documents.	Clear, purposeful instructional connections are made across program languages in a systematic and ongoing way so that instruction builds over time across languages. There is ongoing communication among teachers through a variety of channels, including meetings, email, and online planning documents. Program staff engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding the purposeful coordination of instruction across program languages.
Key Point D Instruction promotes metalinguistic awareness and metacognitive skills.			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
No attention is paid to the development of metalinguistic or metacognitive skills.	Some attention is given to the development of metalinguistic and metacognitive skills but in an inconsistent or unsystematic way.	Metalinguistic and metacognitive skills are systematically developed through lessons that facilitate comparative analysis of the two program languages.	Metalinguistic and metacognitive skills are systematically developed through lessons that facilitate comparative analysis of the two program languages. Program staff engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding the promotion of metalinguistic awareness and metacognitive skills.

Key Point E Instruction leverages students' bilingualism by strategically incorporating cross-linguistic strategies.			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Teachers rarely create targeted and purposeful opportunities to foster cross-linguistic connections through strategies such as cognate awareness, bridging, and translanguaging.	Teachers sometimes create targeted and purposeful opportunities to foster cross-linguistic connections through strategies such as cognate awareness, bridging, and translanguaging.	Teachers consistently create targeted and purposeful opportunities to foster cross-linguistic connections through strategies such as cognate awareness, bridging, and translanguaging. These opportunities are strategically planned in advance to further program goals and instructional objectives, and they are tailored to the needs of the student population.	Teachers consistently create targeted and purposeful opportunities to foster cross-linguistic connections through strategies such as cognate awareness, bridging, and translanguaging. These opportunities are strategically planned in advance to further program goals and instructional objectives, and they are tailored to the needs of the student population. Program staff engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding the use of cross-linguistic instructional strategies.

Key Point F
Instruction promotes an awareness of language variation.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There is no discussion of language varieties within or across program languages, or only standard varieties are considered acceptable in the classroom, regardless of the context or goal of the activity.	There is some discussion of language varieties within and across program languages, but it does not include any critical analysis of the differential power and status of language varieties at the local or national level, and no distinction is made about which variety may be most appropriate in a given situation.	There are frequent discussions about language varieties within and across program languages that include a critical analysis of the differential power and status of language varieties at the local and national level. Discussions also include the implications of language choices in a given situation (e.g., why you would likely use a standard variety or a more formal register with the principal than with your peers). Teachers respect language variation and make space for it in the classroom to support academic, linguistic, and sociocultural goals.	There are frequent discussions about language varieties within and across program languages that include a critical analysis of the differential power and status of language varieties at the local and national level. Discussions also include the implications of language choices in a given situation. Teachers respect language variation and make space for it in the classroom to support academic, linguistic, and sociocultural goals. Instructional activities include community-based projects that incorporate language varieties in a meaningful way.

Key Point G

Teachers use a variety of strategies to ensure equitable participation among all students.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>Few or no strategies are used to ensure equitable participation among all students. Participation patterns are left to chance or determined by individual students' willingness to volunteer.</p>	<p>Teachers sometimes use strategies to ensure equitable participation among all students (e.g., random calling, Accountable Talk, Pair-Share Sentence Stems, Socratic Seminar, Number Talks, Talk Moves). The use of these strategies may be unbalanced between the two program languages (e.g., random calling is used during instructional time in the partner language to encourage English-dominant students to participate but is not used during English instructional time to encourage English learners to participate).</p>	<p>Teachers consistently use a variety of strategies (e.g., random calling, Accountable Talk, Pair-Share Sentence Stems, Socratic Seminar, Number Talks, Talk Moves) to ensure equitable participation patterns among all students during instructional time in both program languages.</p>	<p>Teachers consistently use a variety of strategies (e.g., random calling, Accountable Talk, Pair-Share Sentence Stems, Socratic Seminar, Number Talks, Talk Moves) to ensure equitable participation patterns among all students during instructional time in both program languages. Teachers are cognizant of social interactions within and beyond the classroom, and brainstorm and practice strategies and structures that students can use on their own to promote equitable participation. Teachers engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding the use of strategies to promote equitable participation.</p>

Key Point H

Teachers use a variety of strategies to promote the sociocultural competence of all students.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>Few or no strategies are used to promote sociocultural competence.</p>	<p>Teachers sometimes use strategies (e.g., conflict resolution, perspective-taking, empathy development, cross-grade buddies) to promote sociocultural competence. The use of these strategies may be unbalanced across program languages or may not equally serve all groups of students. The strategies may be integrated into content learning (e.g., perspective-taking during a unit on Spanish explorers).</p>	<p>Teachers consistently use a variety of strategies (e.g., conflict resolution, perspective-taking, empathy development, cross-grade buddies) to promote the sociocultural competence of all students during instructional time in both program languages. The strategies are frequently integrated into content learning and there is a program resource that identifies compatible sociocultural objectives for many of the common content units (e.g., perspective-taking during a Spanish explorers unit).</p>	<p>Teachers consistently use a variety of strategies (e.g., conflict resolution, perspective-taking, empathy development, cross-grade buddies) to promote the sociocultural competence of all students during instructional time in both program languages. The strategies are frequently integrated into content learning and there is a program resource that identifies compatible sociocultural objectives for many of the common content units (e.g., perspective-taking during a Spanish explorers unit). Teachers engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding the use of strategies to promote sociocultural competence.</p>

3

Principle 3
Instruction is student-centered.

Key Point A

Teachers use active learning strategies in order to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Instruction is teacher-centered, and there is little active learning.	Some active learning strategies such as learning centers or cooperative groups are used in an attempt to vary instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners. However, logistical and design issues become barriers to successful implementation (e.g., learning centers are not set up for student independence and success, cooperative learning group tasks are not designed for positive interdependence).	With input from students, a variety of active learning strategies are used (e.g., learning centers, cooperative groups, project-based learning, Think-Pair-Share, Quick Write, Polling, Jigsaws, Sorting Strips, Gallery Walk, Fish Bowl) to meet the needs of diverse learners. Ongoing formative assessment is strategically incorporated to determine ways that instruction may need to be altered.	With input from students, a variety of active learning strategies are used (e.g., learning centers, cooperative groups, project-based learning, Think-Pair-Share, Quick Write, Polling, Jigsaws, Sorting Strips, Gallery Walk, Fish Bowl) to meet the needs of diverse learners. Ongoing formative assessment is strategically incorporated to determine ways that instruction may need to be altered. Teachers engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding the implementation of active learning strategies.

Key Point B

Teachers create meaningful opportunities for sustained language use.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Students are rarely engaged in meaningful activities that require sustained language use in either or both program languages (e.g., project-based learning, place-based learning, debates, cooperative activities to generate solutions to complex problems).	Students are sometimes engaged in meaningful activities that require sustained language use in one or both program languages (e.g., project-based learning, place-based learning, debates, cooperative activities to generate solutions to complex problems). There may be more opportunities in one language than the other to engage in meaningful activities that require sustained language use.	Students are routinely engaged in meaningful activities that require sustained language use in one or both program languages (e.g., project-based learning, place-based learning, debates, cooperative activities to generate solutions to complex problems) to ensure high levels of oral and written language ensure high levels of oral and written language development and growth of academic vocabulary.	Students are routinely engaged in meaningful activities that require sustained language use in one or both program languages (e.g., project-based learning, place-based learning, debates, cooperative activities to generate solutions to complex problems) to ensure high levels of oral and written language development and growth of academic vocabulary. Teachers and students create opportunities for students to showcase their knowledge and skills through performances or presentations to the wider school community, such as drama productions, a class or school newspaper, classroom museums, etc.

Key Point C Student grouping maximizes opportunities for students to benefit from peer models.			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Students rarely have the opportunity to work cooperatively with students who have different language learner profiles (e.g., English-dominant students work together, Spanish-dominant students work together).	Students sometimes have the opportunity to work cooperatively with students who have different language learner profiles, but such opportunities are infrequent or lack instructional purpose.	Students have ample opportunities to be both language models and language learners when interacting with their peers in both academic and social situations. Teachers purposefully group students with diverse backgrounds and proficiency levels in order to promote linguistic turn-taking and reciprocal teaching and learning among peers.	Students have ample opportunities to be both language models and language learners when interacting with their peers in both academic and social situations. Teachers purposefully group students with diverse backgrounds and proficiency levels in order to promote linguistic turn-taking and reciprocal teaching and learning among peers. Program staff engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding the purposeful grouping of students to promote peer learning.
Key Point D Instructional strategies build independence and ownership of the learning process.			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Students are highly dependent on their teachers for both the content and format of learning.	Students are able to exercise some autonomy and independence, such as through learning centers or research projects, but there is little connection of the independent work to the rest of the curriculum or limited guidance on expected outcomes.	A variety of differentiated instructional strategies are implemented so students become independent learners, and students are encouraged to pursue topics of their own interest. Classroom management supports students' independence.	A variety of differentiated instructional strategies are implemented so students become independent learners, and students are encouraged to pursue topics of their own interest using approaches of their own design. Classroom management supports students' independence. Program staff engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding approaches for building student independence.

4

Principle 4

Instructional staff effectively integrate technology to deepen and enhance the learning process.

Key Point A

Instructional staff use technology tools to engage all learners.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Technology tools are rarely used in instruction.	Technology tools (e.g., online learning, game-based learning, Google Docs, interactive whiteboards, student response systems, social media) are sometimes used to engage learners, but they may be of low quality or be used more in one program language than in the other.	High-quality technology tools (e.g., online learning, game-based learning, Google Docs, interactive whiteboards, student response systems, social media) are frequently and appropriately used to engage all learners in both program languages.	High-quality technology tools (e.g., online learning, game-based learning, Google Docs, interactive whiteboards, student response systems, social media) are frequently and appropriately used to engage all learners in both program languages. Program staff engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding the use of technology to engage students.

Key Point B

Students use technology to display their understanding of content and to further develop their language and literacy skills in both program languages.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Students rarely use technology to display their understanding of content or to develop their language and literacy skills.	Students sometimes use technology (e.g., podcasts, videos, slideshows) to display their understanding of content and to develop their language and literacy skills. There may be more opportunities to use technology in one program language than in the other.	Students frequently use technology (e.g., podcasts, videos, slideshows) to display their understanding of content and to develop their language and literacy skills in both program languages.	Students frequently use technology (e.g., podcasts, videos, slideshows) to display their understanding of content and to develop their language and literacy skills in both program languages. Program staff engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding students' use of technology to display content knowledge and further language and literacy development.

STRAND

4

.....
**Assessment
and
Accountability**

4

Assessment and Accountability

ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY CONCERNS

Most research on effective schools, including effective bilingual and dual language programs, discusses the important role of assessment and accountability, and a substantial number of studies have converged on the significance of using student achievement data to shape and monitor instructional programs (Corallo & McDonald, 2002; Lindholm-Leary, Hargett, & Lambert, 2007). However, with passage of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, which required every student to be assessed in reading and math every year in Grades 3–8, assessment became more high stakes and widespread. As discussed subsequently, this high-stakes assessment can impact the viability of dual language programs.

Serious concerns have been raised by researchers and national professional groups about using mandatory large-scale standardized tests to assess English learners (see Abedi & Gándara, 2006; Abedi & Linquanti, 2012; Duran, 2008; and Kopriva, 2008). There are questions about whether and how English language proficiency affects English learners' performance on academic achievement tests given in English (e.g., Abedi & Gándara, 2006; Abedi, Leon, & Mirocha, 2003; Duran, 2008; Kopriva, 2008). It has been argued that if students cannot demonstrate academic knowledge due to limited proficiency in English, then test results are not valid because they reflect students' language skills rather than what the students actually know and can do in academic domains. For example, assessment prompts in English that include complex or idiomatic language penalize English learners who do not understand the prompts even though they may have mastered the concepts being tested. If they do not correctly interpret test instructions or the text of an assessment task, they may misunderstand the problem to be solved and thus fail to solve it correctly (Abedi, Courtney, Leon, Kao, & Azzam, 2006). Even when they understand what they are being asked to do, their ability to access and demonstrate knowledge of the concept in English may be limited, so their test results do not accurately reflect what they know.

Concerns about the validity of standardized test results for English learners have been expressed by the Educational Testing Service in *Guidelines for the Assessment of English Language Learners* (Pitoniak et al., 2009) and by the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education (2014) in *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*. As the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine noted: “At the heart of all assessment is the need for reliable and valid tools” (2017, p. 10-21). This is true of assessment in any language and with any population.

Similar concerns have been expressed about assessments aligned with the Common Core State Standards (Abedi & Linquanti, 2012; Linquanti & Hakuta, 2012; Wiley & Rolstad, 2014). These concerns mirror those presented above, especially with respect to the rigorous, language-rich academic standards. Further, some newer assessments require familiarity with technology and experience with computer-based testing. From research on the digital divide, it is not clear that most English learners or other low-income students have acquired this familiarity or experience at home or school, creating an additional barrier for these students.

There are other concerns related to dual language programs that must be considered as well. As Lindholm-Leary (2012) notes,

One accountability problem for DLE programs relates to the amount of time that DLE programs have to demonstrate grade-level competence in their participants. Research indicates that [native English speaking] NES students in a DLE program may need 1 or 2 years to catch up to their NES peers on achievement tests in English. . . . More problematic is that studies show that 5 to 7 years may be necessary for ELs to close the gap between their test scores and those of their NES peers. . . . Evaluations conducted in the early years of a program (kindergarten through grade three) typically reveal that students in DLE programs scored below grade level (and sometimes very low), or either lower than or equivalent to comparison group peers. This apparent lack of progress in grades 2–3 can lead administrators to put pressure on the DLE program administrators and teachers to add more English or to eliminate the DLE program altogether. . . . DLE administrators and teachers need to prepare for this accountability concern and use accountability data to ensure that their NES and EL participants are making expected progress. That way, they can argue that their students are on track to show similar or higher achievement compared to their peers in English mainstream programs. (p. 259)

FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Teachers use many informal assessment strategies to gather information on student learning. The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2017) reported on the two most common curriculum-based measures used for formative assessment and their Spanish counterparts: the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills Next (Indicadores Dinámicos del Exito en la Lectura) and AIMSweb (Medidas Incrementales de Destrezas Esenciales). Their review of the research showed that curriculum-based measures are good predictors of reading performance for both native English speakers and English learners (Klingner, Artiles, & Barletta, 2006; Vanderwood & Nam, 2007). Thus, they concluded that available evidence suggests that curriculum-based measures are valid and reliable predictors of reading outcomes in English among English learners (Leafstedt, Richards, & Gerber, 2004; Quirk & Beem, 2012).

However, some research suggests that language proficiency impacts performance on these measures. A major concern is that curriculum-based measures often are administered only in English, even when students are receiving some instruction in a partner language. Brown and Sanford (2011) provide recommendations for more appropriate use of these measures with English learners, which could likely be applicable with native English speakers as well:

1. Use tools with demonstrated reliability and validity to identify and monitor students' need for instructional support in reading in both L1 and L2.
2. Assess students' language skills in L1 and L2 to provide an appropriate context regarding evaluation of current levels of performance.
3. Evaluate the potential effect of the process of L1 and L2 acquisition on current performance.
4. Plan instruction based on what is known about the student's current level of performance and his or her literacy experiences in L1 and L2.

(pp. 10–11)

ASSESSMENT IN DUAL LANGUAGE

Effective schools use assessment measures that are aligned with the school’s vision and goals and with appropriate curriculum and related standards (Lindholm-Leary et al., 2007; Montecel & Cortez, 2002). Further, in terms of the ability to use assessment data for program evaluation, research shows that it is important to disaggregate the data to identify and solve issues of curriculum, assessment, and instructional alignment and for accountability purposes (Lindholm-Leary et al., 2007).

Dual language programs require the use of multiple measures in both languages to assess students’ progress toward meeting bilingualism and biliteracy goals as well as curricular and content-related goals. This is particularly true for oral language proficiency and literacy skills in the partner language, since these areas may slip under the radar if a plan to assess these skills is not fully developed and implemented. Furthermore, this assessment should be aligned with the goals and expectations of the program; that is, it should test content and literacy in the partner language rather than testing world language curriculum objectives. It is also important to ensure that assessments in the partner language are not simply translations of assessments in English.

“When teachers of ELs fail to understand the nuances of general language assessment and the intersection of language and content assessment, the specialized assessment strategies required for ELs, and the assessment of bi- or multilingual learners, classroom misplacement, lowered expectations, inappropriate curriculum . . . interact to diminish the academic performance of ELs. . . . Teachers who lack sufficient knowledge of EL assessment (i.e., efficiency) are likely to have their EL students doing work that is either too difficult or too easy and thus inefficient. On the other hand, a teacher who holds expert knowledge and skills with respect to EL assessment will know students’ language levels and have them work at their instructional capacity, which results in efficient teaching and learning.” (Téllez & Mosqueda, 2015, p. 88)

Some dual language educators argue that new research and assessment practices and approaches need to be developed that provide more holistic bilingual assessment, which may lead to more valid and reliable assessment outcomes (e.g., Escamilla, Chávez, & Vigil, 2005; Solano-Flores & Trumbull, 2003; Téllez & Mosqueda, 2015). For example, some educators advocate assessing academic achievement by looking at students’ performance in both languages, instead of in English only, which may yield higher performance levels overall (Escamilla, Chávez, & Vigil, 2005). Others recommend side-by-side assessments that include both languages simultaneously.

Diagnosis of language impairment in students in dual language programs is another important issue. Research shows that this diagnosis can be complicated by the fact that language proficiency can differ in the student’s two languages and from the norming samples of monolinguals. There is general agreement among researchers and clinicians that dual language students (including native English speakers and English learners) with language impairments show the impairments in both languages (Kohnert, 2010; Paradis, Genesee, Crago, & Leonard, 2010). Bilingual students with language impairments often show language deficits in the areas of verb inflection, verbal fluency, phonological awareness, and phonological working memory in both languages (National Academies, 2017). In addition, it is important to note that slower development than normal in only one language probably reflects the quality and quantity of opportunities to learn that language, whereas difficulties in both languages generally implicate underlying impairment (National Academies, 2017; Paradis et al., 2010). In order to determine how to best meet the

needs of students who demonstrate language deficits, it is imperative to assess them in both languages (National Academies, 2017).

Assessment plans should also include ways to measure students' sociocultural competencies and development, since this is one of the three core goals of dual language programs.

ASSESSMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Clearly, it is important to analyze and interpret assessment data in scientifically rigorous ways to achieve program accountability and improvement. In order for administrators and teachers to appropriately interpret data, they must receive professional development focused on assessment, including the interpretation of assessment data (Télliez & Mosqueda, 2015). Correct interpretation of assessment outcomes involves understanding research in dual language education and establishing appropriate expectations for students who are taught and tested in two languages.

In addition, because of the significance of assessment for both accountability and program evaluation purposes, it is important to establish a data management system that tracks students over time (Lindholm-Leary et al., 2007). This requires the development of an infrastructure that ensures that 1) assessment is carried out in consistent and systematic ways and is aligned with appropriate standards and goals; 2) assessment outcomes are interpreted correctly and disseminated to appropriate constituents; and 3) professional development is provided to enable teachers to develop, collect, and interpret assessment data appropriately and accurately.

Obviously, with the need for an infrastructure focused on assessment, a budget is required to allow staff to align the assessment component with the vision and goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, academic achievement, and sociocultural competence.

REFERENCES

- Abedi, J., Courtney, M., Leon, S., Kao, J., & Azzam, T. (2006). *English language learners and math achievement: A study of opportunity to learn and language accommodation* (CSE Rep. No. 702). Los Angeles: University of California, Center for the Study of Evaluation/National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- Abedi, J., & Gándara, P. (2006). Performance of English language learners as a subgroup in large-scale assessment: Interaction of research and policy. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 25(4), 36–46.
- Abedi, J., Leon, S., Mirocha, J. (2003). *Impact of students' language background on content-based data: Analyses of extant data* (CSE Tech. Rep. No. 603). Los Angeles: University of California, Center for the Study of Evaluation/National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- Abedi, J., & Linqunti, D. R. (2012). *Issues and opportunities in improving the quality of large scale assessment systems for English language learners*. Paper presented at the Understanding Language

- conference, Stanford, CA. Retrieved from <http://ell.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/pdf/academic-papers/07-Abedi%20Linguanti%20Issues%20and%20Opportunities%20FINAL.pdf>
- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: Authors.
- Brown, J. E., & Sanford, A. (2011). *RTI for English language learners: Appropriately using screening and progress monitoring tools to improve instructional outcomes*. Washington, DC: National Center on Response to Intervention. Retrieved from <http://www.rti4success.org/sites/default/files/rtiforells.pdf>
- Corallo, C., & McDonald, D. H. (2002). *What works with low-performing schools: A review of research*. Charleston, WV: Appalachian Educational Laboratory.
- Duran, R. P. (2008). Assessing English-language learners' achievement. *Review of Research in Education*, 32, 292–327.
- Escamilla, K., Chávez, L., & Vigil, P. (2005). Rethinking the gap: High-stakes testing and Spanish-speaking students in Colorado. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(2), 1–13.
- Klingner, J. K., Artiles, A. J., & Barletta, L. M. (2006). English language learners who struggle with reading: Language acquisition or learning disabilities? *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 39(2), 108–128.
- Kohnert, K. (2010). Bilingual children with primary language impairment: Issues, evidence and implications for clinical actions. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 43, 456–473.
- Kopriva, R. (Ed.). (2008). *Improving testing for English Language learners*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Leafstedt, J. M., Richards, C. R., & Gerber, M. M. (2004). Effectiveness of explicit phonological-awareness instruction for at-risk English learners. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 19, 252–261.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2012). Success and challenges in dual language education. *Theory Into Practice*, 51(4), 256–262. doi:10.1080/00405841.2012.726053
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Hargett, G., & Lambert, J. (2007). How to evaluate your dual language program: A beginner's toolkit. *Multilingual Educator*, 26–27.
- Linguanti, R., & Hakuta, K. (2012). *How next-generation standards and assessments can foster success for California's English learners* (Policy Brief No. 12-1). Stanford, CA: Policy Analysis for California Education. Retrieved from http://www.wested.org/online_pubs/resource1264.pdf
- Montecel, M. R., & Cortez, J. D. (2002). Successful bilingual education programs: Development and the dissemination of criteria to identify promising and exemplary practices in bilingual education at the national level. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26(1), 1–21.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2017). *Promoting the educational success of children and youth learning English: Promising futures*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. doi:10.17226/24677
- Paradis, J., Genesee, F., Crago, M., & Leonard, L. (2010). *Dual language development and disorders: A handbook on bilingualism and second language development* (2nd ed.). Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
- Pitoniak, M. J., Young, J. W., Martiniello, M., King, T. C., Buteux, A., & Ginsburgh, M. (2009). *Guidelines for the assessment of English language learners*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Quirk, M., & Beem, S. (2012). Examining the relations between reading fluency and reading comprehension for English language learners. *Psychology in the School*, 49(6), 539–553.
- Solano-Flores, G., & Trumbull, E. (2003). Examining language in context: The need for new research and practice paradigms in the testing of English-language learners. *Educational Researcher*, 32(2), 3–13.
- Téllez, K., & Mosqueda, E. (2015). Developing teachers' knowledge and skills at the intersection of English language learners and language assessment. *Review of Research in Education*, 39, 87–121. doi:10.3102/0091732X14554552

- Vanderwood, M. L., & Nam, J. (2007). Response to intervention for English language learners: Current developments and future directions. In S. R. Jimmerson, M. K. Burns, & A. M. VanDerHeyden (Eds.), *The handbook of response to intervention: The science and practice of assessment and intervention* (pp. 408–417). New York, NY: Springer.
- Wiley, T., & Rolstad, K. (2014). The Common Core State Standards and the great divide. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 8(1), 38–55.

4 Assessment and Accountability

Principle 1

1

The program creates and maintains an infrastructure that supports an assessment and accountability process.

Key Point A

There is a comprehensive data management system for tracking student data over time.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>No data management system exists for tracking student data over time.</p>	<p>A data management system exists for tracking student data over time, but it may not include multiple measures in both program languages, have the capacity to disaggregate student data, or be available to all personnel who need it.</p>	<p>A comprehensive data management system has been developed and is consistently used by the program for tracking student demographic and performance data using multiple measures in both program languages for the duration of students' enrollment in the program. The system has the capacity to disaggregate student data by years in the program, home language profile, and, for English learners, by reclassification status. The system is accessible to all personnel who need it (e.g., classroom teachers, specialists, administrators).</p>	<p>A comprehensive data management system has been developed and is consistently used by the district for tracking student demographic and performance data using multiple measures in both program languages for the duration of students' enrollment in the district. The system has the capacity to disaggregate student data by years in the program, home language profile, and, for English learners, by reclassification status. The system is accessible to all personnel who need it (e.g., classroom teachers, specialists, administrators). The system is regularly reviewed and updated to ensure that it stays current with technological, methodological, and policy changes.</p>

<p>Key Point B Assessment and accountability action plans are developed and used to inform all aspects of the program.</p>			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There is no plan for reaching assessment and accountability goals.	The program has developed a plan for assessment and accountability that informs some aspects of the program (e.g., curriculum, instruction, professional development, family and community outreach, and program development).	The program has developed an articulated plan for assessment and accountability that informs all aspects of the program (e.g., curriculum, instruction, professional development, family and community outreach, and program development).	In coordination with the district's assessment office, the program has developed an ongoing, integrated, and articulated plan for assessment and accountability that informs all aspects of the program (e.g., curriculum, instruction, professional development, family and community outreach, and program development) and that is routinely reviewed and revised by district and program staff.
<p>Key Point C Personnel are assigned to assessment and accountability activities.</p>			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
No personnel are given specific assessment and accountability responsibility.	Personnel either volunteer or are assigned on an ad hoc basis to carry out assessment and accountability activities without specific responsibilities. Or dedicated personnel with specific responsibilities are supported through grants or other temporary funding sources and are no longer available once this funding ends.	Specific school- or district-provided personnel are assigned to assessment and accountability activities and have specific responsibilities.	Specific school- or district-provided personnel are assigned to assessment and accountability activities and have specific responsibilities. The district supports the program's assessment and accountability plan and activities with an appropriate budget in a permanent line item to fund and support personnel.

<p>Key Point D Staff are provided ongoing professional development opportunities in assessment and accountability.</p>			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
No professional development in assessment and accountability is provided to teachers or other staff.	Professional development experiences are provided on isolated topics (e.g., a workshop on how to interpret test scores).	Ongoing professional development experiences (e.g., workshops, data team meetings, professional learning communities) are coordinated at the program level, and are provided on assessment topics aligned with program goals to help teachers and administrators inform instruction, identify and communicate program outcomes, and plan for continual improvement.	Ongoing professional development experiences (e.g., workshops, data team meetings, professional learning communities) are coordinated at the program and district levels, and are provided on assessment topics aligned with program goals to help teachers and administrators inform instruction, identify and communicate program outcomes, and plan for continual improvement. There is a systematic process to continually update and improve professional development activities.
<p>Key Point E The program has an adequate budget for assessment and accountability.</p>			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
No budget exists for assessment and accountability activities beyond the mandated state or local requirements.	Non-mandated assessment and accountability activities are paid for through temporary grants or through other areas of the school's budget in an ad hoc fashion.	A budget line that fully funds all assessment and accountability activities exists in the dual language program budget.	The district provides a permanent budget line that fully funds the dual language program's assessment and accountability activities on an ongoing basis. The budget is regularly reviewed and updated to reflect changing needs.

2

Principle 2

Student assessment is aligned with program goals and with state content and language standards, and the results are used to guide and inform instruction.

Key Point A

Student assessment is aligned with program goals, instructional objectives, and language and literacy standards for both languages of instruction.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Formative and summative assessments are conducted only in response to state or district requirements, and there is no clear relationship to program goals, instructional objectives, and/or language and literacy standards for both languages of instruction.	In addition to complying with state and/or district requirements, formative and summative assessments are partially aligned with program goals, instructional objectives, and language and literacy standards for both languages of instruction.	In addition to complying with state and/or district requirements, formative and summative assessments are fully aligned with program goals, instructional objectives, and language and literacy standards for both languages of instruction.	In addition to complying with state and/or district requirements, formative and summative assessments are fully aligned with program goals, instructional objectives, and language and literacy standards for both languages of instruction. There is a systematic process in place for ongoing review and modifications as program goals, instructional objectives, and/or standards evolve.

Key Point B

Formative and summative assessment data inform curriculum development and instructional practices.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Assessment data do not impact classroom activities.	Teachers occasionally use assessment data to inform instructional practices and curriculum development, both for district and state requirements and for more specific program goals.	Teachers regularly use assessment data to inform instructional practices and curriculum development, both for district and state requirements and for more specific program goals.	Teachers regularly use assessment data to inform instructional practices and curriculum development, both for district and state requirements and for more specific program goals. Time and structures (such as data teams, grade-level teams, professional learning communities, etc.) are systematically built into the schedule to ensure ongoing review and application of data with colleagues within the school and throughout the district.

Key Point C Formative and summative assessments are valid and reliable for bilingual learners.			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Formative and summative assessments are not valid and/or reliable for bilingual learners.	Some formative and/or summative assessments are valid and reliable for bilingual learners (e.g., providing scaffolding to increase comprehensibility and limit the influence of language proficiency on content assessments, incorporating features of regional language varieties, incorporating culturally relevant examples, using a bilingual approach that allows students to demonstrate their full competence in a domain across the two program languages). This may be limited to one program language and/or to certain grade levels.	The majority of formative and/or summative assessments in both program languages are valid and reliable for bilingual learners (e.g., providing scaffolding to increase comprehensibility and limit the influence of language proficiency on content assessments, incorporating features of regional language varieties, incorporating culturally relevant examples, using a bilingual approach that allows students to demonstrate their full competence in a domain across the two program languages).	The majority of formative and/or summative assessments in both program languages are valid and reliable for bilingual learners (e.g., providing scaffolding to increase comprehensibility and limit the influence of language proficiency on content assessments, incorporating features of regional language varieties, incorporating culturally relevant examples, using a bilingual approach that allows students to demonstrate their full competence in a domain across the two program languages). There are assessment personnel at the district level who stay informed about new developments in the assessment of bilingual learners and ensure that the assessments used are as appropriate and useful as possible.
Key Point D Referrals for individualized education plans (IEPs) are made on the basis of assessment in both program languages.			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Students are referred for IEPs based solely on results from assessments in one program language.	Students are referred for IEPs based on results from assessments in both program languages, but assessments in one language may not be valid or reliable (e.g., tests in the partner language are translations of tests in English, or tests are administered by someone who is not trained to administer them).	Students are referred for IEPs based on results from valid and reliable assessments in both program languages. There is a program-level system in place for making referrals, and trained personnel who speak the program languages (and the home language, if it is a third language) are responsible for test administration and interpretation.	Students are referred for IEPs based on results from valid and reliable assessments in both program languages. There is a system in place for making referrals that is coordinated at the district level, and the district ensures that trained personnel who speak the program languages (and the home language, if it is a third language) are responsible for test administration and interpretation.

3

Principle 3

Using multiple measures in both languages of instruction, the program collects and analyzes a variety of data that are used for program accountability, program evaluation, and program improvement.

Key Point A

The program systematically collects and analyzes data to determine whether academic, linguistic, and sociocultural goals have been met.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There is no systematic plan for data collection, so data are collected inconsistently or haphazardly.	Data are collected systematically but without consideration of the aims of analysis.	Data are collected and analyzed using one or two basic methods (e.g., pre/post comparisons, action research) to answer a variety of questions related to program effectiveness.	Data are collected and analyzed using a variety of appropriate methods (e.g., quasi-experimental quantitative studies, longitudinal studies, participant observation, action research, discourse analysis) to answer a variety of questions related to program effectiveness. District personnel are tasked with identifying new measures and procedures for collecting and analyzing data to inform the dual language program, and for providing support with data collection and analysis as required.

Key Point B

The program engages in ongoing evaluation.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
The program does not engage in ongoing evaluation—neither self-evaluation nor external evaluation.	The program does initial self-evaluation or external evaluation using standards appropriate for dual language and writes an action plan, but there is no follow-through.	The program conducts regular self-evaluations every 1 to 3 years and also engages in external evaluations at regular intervals using standards appropriate for dual language, and routinely reviews evaluation results to refine and improve goals and outcomes.	In coordination with district and state policies and procedures, the program engages in a data cycle process for self-evaluation and external evaluation that includes the identification of issues, the implementation of potential solutions, and evaluation of the effectiveness of those solutions. Program evaluation processes and ensuing program changes are fully supported at the district level.

<p>Key Point C Assessment data are integrated into planning related to ongoing program improvement.</p>			
<p>Minimal alignment</p>	<p>Partial alignment</p>	<p>Full alignment</p>	<p>Exemplary practice</p>
<p>Formative and summative data are not used in program evaluation or program development.</p>	<p>Formative and summative data have a marginal impact on program evaluation and program development.</p>	<p>Formative and summative assessment data are core components of program evaluation and program improvement.</p>	<p>Formative and summative data are core components of program evaluation and program improvement. There is a system for sharing data collection processes and data outcomes, and program planning includes discussion of existing formative and summative data and the potential need for modifying or expanding data collection efforts to better inform the program and the district.</p>
<p>Key Point D The program systematically collects demographic data (e.g., home language, English learner status, eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch) from program participants that allow for disaggregated data analysis in order to effectively monitor and serve different student subgroups.</p>			
<p>Minimal alignment</p>	<p>Partial alignment</p>	<p>Full alignment</p>	<p>Exemplary practice</p>
<p>Demographic data are not collected or are collected in unsystematic ways.</p>	<p>Some demographic data are collected, but they are insufficient for carrying out disaggregated analyses for key variables of interest, such as home language or English learner status.</p>	<p>Demographic data that are sufficient for carrying out disaggregated analyses for key variables of interest, such as home language or English learner status, are collected program-wide and can be linked with outcome data by school personnel for timely disaggregation of the data necessary for decision-making at the program level.</p>	<p>Demographic data that are sufficient for carrying out disaggregated analyses for key variables of interest, such as home language or English learner status, are collected program-wide and can be linked with outcome data by school personnel. The data are maintained in the school district's secure and central database that allows for timely disaggregation of the data necessary for decision-making at the program and district levels.</p>

Key Point E

Assessment is consistently conducted in the two languages of the program.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>The program assesses students in both English and the partner language, but uses only English scores for program evaluation.</p>	<p>The program assesses students in one or both languages depending on the program design, the grade level, the language of content instruction, and the dominant language of the students, and reports achievement scores accordingly. However, assessments in the partner language may just be translations of English assessments, and assessments in English may not be valid or reliable for bilingual learners.</p>	<p>The program assesses students in both English and the partner language and includes both sets of scores in program evaluation reports. Assessments in the partner language are valid and reliable in that language and are not merely translations of English assessments. Assessments in English are likewise valid and reliable for bilingual students.</p>	<p>The program assesses students in both English and the partner language and includes both sets of scores in program evaluation reports. Assessments in the partner language are valid and reliable in that language and not merely translations of English assessments. Assessments in English are likewise valid and reliable for bilingual students. The district has systems for monitoring students' outcomes over time in both languages of instruction, and provides opportunities for this information to be used for program improvement.</p>

4

Principle 4

Student progress toward program goals and state achievement objectives is systematically measured and reported.

Key Point A

Progress is documented in both program languages for the three core goals of dual language education.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There is limited and sporadic evidence of student progress.	There is systematic measurement of student progress, but only in one language or not for all three goals. Benchmarks for students in monolingual programs are used as targets.	There is systematic measurement of student progress in both languages for all three goals using research-based benchmarks specifically designed for dual language students at each grade level in the given model.	There is systematic measurement of student progress in both languages for all three goals using research-based benchmarks specifically designed for dual language students at each grade level in the given model. The program advocates for these benchmarks to be part of state and district performance guidelines.

Key Point B

Student progress is measured on a variety of indicators.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Progress is defined and reported using only state and district performance guidelines.	Progress is defined and reported using state and district performance guidelines, but in the context of the program’s mission, vision, and goals.	Progress is defined by state and district performance guidelines, as well as by locally relevant definitions that are reflected in the program’s mission, vision, and goals, which are included in the official school report to the district and the state.	Progress is defined by state and district performance guidelines, as well as by locally relevant definitions that are reflected in the program’s mission, vision, and goals, which are included in the official school report to the district and the state. The program advocates for these definitions to be included in state and district performance guidelines.

Key Point C
Achievement data are disaggregated by student and program variables (e.g., home language, English learner status, eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch).

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Existing data are not disaggregated.	Some achievement data are disaggregated on one or two variables, including home language.	All data are disaggregated on one or two key variables, including home language.	All data are disaggregated and cross-tabulated by a number of meaningful and useful demographic variables, including home language.

Key Point D
Statistics on retention rates and placement in special education and gifted & talented classes are monitored to ensure equitable representation among subgroups.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
No statistics are maintained on retention rates or placement in special education or gifted & talented classes.	Statistics are maintained on retention rates and placement in special education and gifted & talented classes, but data collection is inconsistent or data are not disaggregated by key student variables (e.g., home language, English learner status, or eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch).	Statistics are maintained on retention rates and placement in special education and gifted & talented classes and are disaggregated by key student variables (e.g., home language, English learner status, or eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch).	Statistics are maintained on retention rates and placement in special education and gifted & talented classes, are disaggregated by key student variables (e.g., home language, English learner status, or eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch), and are monitored relative to district and state norms.

5

Principle 5

The program communicates with appropriate stakeholders about program outcomes.

Key Point A
Data are communicated publicly in transparent ways that prevent misinterpretations.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Data about the program are not publicly available.	Data about the program are publicly available (e.g., on a school website) but without explanations about data collection, methodology, or data interpretation.	Data about the program are publicly available with transparent information about how they were collected and analyzed and with a clear and correct explanation of what the findings mean.	Data about the program from sources within and outside the program are publicly available with transparent information about how they were collected and analyzed and with a clear and correct explanation of what the findings mean.

<p>Key Point B Data are communicated to stakeholders.</p>			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
No data are communicated to the district, state, or parents beyond what is mandated.	Mandated and additional test data are communicated to stakeholders who ask for them.	The program is proactive in communicating student outcomes using progress reports and demographic information to all stakeholders.	The program is proactive in communicating student outcomes and demographic information to all stakeholders and uses this information to advocate for changes to district and state policies toward assessment and accountability, including using partner language tests in school reports and for student accountability.
<p>Key Point C Data are used to educate and mobilize supporters.</p>			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Data are not used to educate and mobilize program supporters.	Data are occasionally used to educate and mobilize program supporters (e.g., to retain the program, to expand the program, or to provide additional supports such as special education teachers who speak the partner language).	Data are routinely used to educate and mobilize program supporters (e.g., to retain the program, to expand the program, or to provide additional supports such as special education teachers who speak the partner language).	Data are routinely used to educate and mobilize program supporters (e.g., to retain the program, to expand the program, or to provide additional supports such as special education teachers who speak the partner language), and a system is in place to ensure that this happens.

STRAND

5

.....
**Staff Quality
and
Professional
Development**

5

Staff Quality and Professional Development

STAFF QUALITY

Teacher quality is a critical factor in student achievement, though little research has examined the impact of teacher quality for English learners or for dual language students (Master, Loeb, Whitney, & Wyckoff, 2016). In highly effective schools serving English learners, effective staff had the following characteristics (Howard & Sugarman, 2007; López, Scanlan, & Gundrum, 2013; Williams et al., 2007):

- Certification to work with English learners and dual language students, especially coursework in English language development and assessment
- High levels of partner language proficiency (in dual language programs)
- Demonstrated ability to use assessment data to raise student achievement
- Familiarity with state standards, ability to align instruction to curriculum standards, strong content knowledge, and training in curriculum
- Supportive attitude for collegial atmosphere for learning and improvement
- Familiarity with the school community
- Excitement about teaching

There is general consensus that teachers in language education programs, like those in mainstream classrooms, should possess high levels of knowledge relating to the subject matter as well as to curriculum and technology, instructional strategies, and assessment. Effective dual language education programs require additional teaching and staff characteristics. These characteristics are important to consider in recruitment and continued professional development. Montecel and Cortez (2002) reported that successful bilingual programs selected staff based on their academic background and experience. Teachers in language education programs need appropriate teaching certificates or credentials, good content knowledge and classroom management skills, and training with respect to the language education model and appropriate instructional strategies (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy, 2008; Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013). Research shows that fully credentialed bilingual and ESL teachers continually acquired knowledge regarding best practices in bilingual education and ESL, and best practices in curriculum and instruction (Ballantyne et al., 2008). Similarly, Lindholm-Leary (2001) found that dual language teachers with both bilingual and ESL credentials had more positive self-assessment ratings of their language instruction, classroom environment, and teaching efficacy. In addition, teachers with more teaching experience and more types of teaching certifications (e.g., ESL, bilingual) were more likely to perceive that the model at their site was equitable, was effective for both groups of students, encouraged the participation of families from both language communities, and provided an integrated approach to multicultural education.

These results are important in developing a successful dual language program because they demonstrate the significance of teachers understanding bilingual theory, second language development and theory, and

strategies for establishing a positive classroom environment, including appropriate language strategies. When teachers do not have a background in bilingual theory or bilingual education, they risk making poor choices in program structure, curriculum, and instructional strategy, which can lead to low student performance and the perception that bilingual education does not work (Ballantyne et al., 2008; Clark, Flores, Riojas-Cortez, & Smith, 2002).

Teachers in dual language education programs need native or native-like proficiency in the language(s) in which they teach. Montecel and Cortez (2002) reported that successful bilingual programs selected staff using screening measures to ensure full written and oral proficiency in both languages. Native or native-like proficiency is critical for two reasons. First, research on language use in classrooms demonstrates that many children do not receive cognitively stimulating instruction from their teacher. To provide cognitively stimulating instruction and to promote high levels of bilingual proficiency in students, teachers need a high level of language proficiency in both languages. Clark et al. (2002) reported that many of the teachers in bilingual programs did not have sufficient Spanish proficiency to participate in college-level courses conducted in Spanish. However, other educators have also noted that even when teachers possess sufficient partner language proficiency, they may not have the specific language features, discourse practices, and communicative skills in the partner language necessary for content area teaching (Aquino-Sterling & Rodriguez-Valls, 2016; Hyland, 2009).

Also, because of the shortage of bilingual teachers, some teachers providing only English instruction are not proficient in the partner language. But it is important that these teachers be able to at least understand their students' mother tongue in the initial stages of language learning. A teacher who does not understand the students' native language cannot respond appropriately to the children's utterances in that language. In this case, comprehensible input, as well as linguistic equity in the classroom, may be severely impaired.

STAFF RECRUITMENT, AVAILABILITY OF BILINGUAL TEACHERS, AND CREDENTIALING

As the popularity of dual language education rises, so does demand for teachers, while the pool remains relatively stable (Kennedy, 2013). The bilingual teacher shortage is a significant challenge to successful program implementation. This shortage is one of both quantity of appropriately trained and credentialed teachers and quality of the teachers (Kennedy, 2013). The shortage of bilingual teachers is recognized in the research as an area of true shortage and not just one of poor distribution of teachers across states (Darling-Hammond, 2000).

According to Kennedy (2013), dual language programs need a two-pronged approach to recruitment of bilingual staff: (1) a clearly articulated and implemented recruiting plan that relies on a variety of sources (e.g., international recruits, partnerships with local colleges and universities, grow-your-own programs, high school dual language student pipeline projects) and (2) a recruiting process that is conducted through a collaboration of school leadership staff and district administration staff (human resources) to ensure that appropriate strategies for outreach, screening, and incentivizing (e.g., bilingual teacher stipends) are utilized.

State policy is another important factor influencing dual language teacher competencies and standards, teacher preparation programs, and certificates and licenses. Many states do not have licensure for dual

language or bilingual teachers, thus calling into question the preparedness of dual language teachers in those states and increasing the need for targeted professional development for dual language teachers to be successful. Several studies have shown that teachers in schools with a higher percentage of economically disadvantaged students or English learners were more likely to have provisional, emergency, or temporary certification, and new teachers are more likely to be uncertified (Rumberger & Gándara, 2005). Program leaders should be aware of state requirements for certification when recruiting and screening applicants. Furthermore, program leaders should be aware of the specific needs of newly hired dual language teachers and provide targeted professional development, as support of these teachers is associated with teacher retention.

There is also a need for school districts and teacher preparation programs to ensure that preparation matches classroom responsibilities (Kennedy, 2013). Commins and Nguyen (2015) stated that for students, especially English learners, to meet increasingly complex challenges, preservice programs must produce linguistically and culturally competent teachers who can do the following:

- Promote equity and a climate of belonging
- Plan collaboratively so they can share the responsibility for instruction and grouping
- Develop familiarity with each student’s home language and literacy opportunities and experiences
- Use assessments that provide the capability to monitor a student’s growth
- Prepare and implement lesson plans that incorporate language within content goals

It would be helpful for dual language program leaders to start a dialogue with university teacher training programs to help them incorporate discussion of dual language education in their courses. The dual language programs could then provide internships for the university students. This preservice training would enable new teachers to enter dual language programs with a much better understanding of the theories and philosophies underlying bilingualism, biliteracy, and sociocultural competencies in dual language programs. Several dual language schools have had interns who first learned about dual language education during their internship and were later hired by the school as new teachers. These new teachers already understood and were partially trained in the dual language model.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

While educational policy stipulates that children are to be educated by high-quality teachers, according to a Policy Analysis for California Education report, only one out of every three English learners in California is taught by a teacher trained in second language acquisition methods (Gándara, Rumberger, Maxwell-Jolly, & Callahan, 2003). The research literature is replete with studies demonstrating the importance of training to promote more successful administrators, teachers, and staff (Ballantyne et al., 2008; Epstein et al., 2016; Master et al., 2016; Valdés, Menken, & Castro, 2015) as well as higher student achievement (Master et al., 2016; Valdés et al., 2015). Moreover, training is most successful when it is sustained and embedded in the daily routines and practices of teachers (Coleman & Goldenberg, 2011; Dana, 2010).

Effective programs tend to align the professional development needs of faculty to the goals and strategies of the instructional program (Ballantyne et al., 2008; Corallo & McDonald, 2002). Researchers

and educators have discussed the importance of specialized training in language education pedagogy and curriculum, materials and resources, and assessment (Genesee & Hamayan, 2016; Hamayan et al., 2013), and this is especially true with the stringent academic language requirements in current educational policy (Valdés et al., 2015). Furthermore, with rigorous standards and high-level vocabulary creating ever greater linguistic demands, teachers need additional professional development on instructional strategies to ensure access (Hernández, 2011). Other research indicates that teachers need professional development in the partner language to develop higher levels of teaching-specific proficiency (Aquino-Sterling & Rodriguez-Valls, 2016; Hyland, 2009).

Educational equity is an important point on which to provide professional development as well (de Jong, 2011; de Jong & Harper, 2005; Moll & Arnot-Hopffer, 2005). As de Jong points out, educational equity is revealed through respect and fairness. It is reflected in how leadership, teachers, and students interact with one another. Further, respect for cultural differences and bilingualism is inherent in the understanding that diversity—linguistic, cultural, and socioeconomic—positively contributes to the classroom and can be used as a resource for student learning (de Jong, 2011).

As Alfaro and Hernandez (2016) note, “if we are serious about leveling the education playing field, it is imperative that dual language educators, who teach students from the economically poorest populations, intentionally resist and interrupt persistent hegemonic pedagogies” (p. 9). Thus, equity is at the core of social justice in the dual language classroom, including how dual language educators define the sociolinguistic and sociocultural goals for students. “Equity provides a lens for DLE teachers to exert their ideological clarity for safe democratic spaces, examining group membership, and balancing language status” in classroom practice (Alfaro & Hernandez, 2016, p. 10). Since classroom research, especially at the higher grade levels, clearly shows the greater power and use of English over the partner language (Palmer, 2008; Potowski, 2007), these issues of equity and social justice are critical themes that need to be addressed in professional development.

Research thus suggests that essential training—that is, training that is important for any teacher—should cover educational pedagogy, equity pedagogy, standards-based teaching, literacy instruction, sheltered instruction, high standards for all students, and parental and community involvement. To effectively administer and teach in a dual language program, administrators and teachers also need professional development related to the definition of the dual language education model and to the theories and philosophies underlying the model. Teachers must be trained in second language and biliteracy development so they understand and incorporate knowledge of how languages are learned into their teaching. To support the acquisition of language and literacy, teachers need to use content pedagogy methods and choose strategies that fit with the goals and needs of dual language students. Furthermore, dual language teachers need a deep understanding of how to provide authentic primary literacy instruction in the partner language, particularly in the primary grades (preK–2), so that their instruction reflects the specific features of the partner language. Teaching partner language literacy using strategies that are successful in English—for example, a focus on sight words and phoneme-level phonics instruction—may not be appropriate in the partner language. Similarly, teachers need to have a deep understanding of how to teach primary English literacy to students who are not yet proficient in English. For example, they should focus on oral language development, vocabulary development, and meaning-based phonemic and phonetic work rather than on isolated and decontextualized skills work focused on decoding and fluency, as is common in English reading instruction for English-fluent students.

If teachers are not trained in and do not understand the various philosophies behind dual language education, the program cannot succeed. Thus, if teachers are not aware of the different behaviors and attitudes that reflect equity and social justice in the classroom, the classroom may provide a setting that continues, perhaps inadvertently, to mirror bias that is often perpetuated outside the dual language classroom.

Professional development should also include critical thinking and reflective practice. Teachers must work as teacher–researchers in their classrooms to analyze data collected during lessons and to reflect on their successes and shortcomings. Teachers must understand how to develop a repertoire of strategies and recognize that certain strategies may work in some contexts but not in others.

It is the role of onsite leadership to make professional development manageable and to support both new and experienced teachers. This must be done with a dual language education focus. One way to make this training more manageable is to create teacher study groups where teachers at the same grade levels benefit from working together to develop language and content objectives. Other schools have used a retreat format, which can provide a setting and time for teachers to collaborate on making decisions or enhancing curricula or other implementation issues. This affords opportunities to recommit to and maintain the integrity of the program and set the direction of the school.

Another suggestion for inservice training is to assign more advanced teachers as teacher trainers—in-house experts who teach about, for example, the writing process and reading strategies. Veteran teachers mentoring novice teachers is very effective in helping new teachers with model implementation.

Training of non-teaching staff is another important component of a successful program. An effective program cannot have office staff who only speak English if a significant number of parents do not speak English. Office staff often are the first contact a parent has with a program. These staff must understand the model so that they can answer parents’ and other community members’ questions accurately.

As a particularly effective vehicle for integrating professional development and articulation, Castellano, Stringfield, and Stone (2002) reported that some effective schoolwide reform sites shared professional development activities with their feeder middle schools. That way, the middle school teachers could assist their students in making connections between what they were learning in middle school and what they would be required to learn in high school.

REFERENCES

- Alfaro, C., & Hernandez, A. M. (2016, March). Ideology, pedagogy, access and equity: A critical examination. *Multilingual Educator*, 8–11.
- Aquino-Sterling, C. R., & Rodríguez-Valls, F. (2016) Developing teaching-specific Spanish competencies in bilingual teacher education: Toward a culturally, linguistically, and professionally relevant approach. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 18(2), 73–81. doi:10.1080/15210960.2016.1152894
- Ballantyne, K. G., Sanderman, A. R., Levy, J. (2008). *Educating English language learners: Building teacher capacity*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. Retrieved from <http://www.ncele.us/files/uploads/3/EducatingELLsBuildingTeacherCapacityVol1.pdf>
- Castellano, M., Stringfield, S., & Stone, J. R. (2002). *Helping disadvantaged youth succeed in school: Second-year findings from a longitudinal study of CTE-based whole-school reforms*. Columbus, OH: National Dissemination Center for Career and Technical Education.

- Clark, E. R., Flores, B. B., Riojas-Cortez, M., & Smith, H. (2002). You can't have a rainbow without a tormenta: A description of an IHE's response to a community need for a dual-language school. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26, 123–148.
- Coleman, R., & Goldenberg, C. (2011). Promoting literacy development. *Education Digest*, 76(6), 14–18.
- Commins, N., & Nguyen, D. (2015). How should pre-service education programs prepare educators to meet the needs of English language learners/emergent bilinguals relative to Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards curricula? In G. Valdés, K. Menken, & M. Castro (Eds.), *Common Core bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators* (pp. 231–232). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Corallo, C., & McDonald, D. H. (2002). *What works with low-performing schools: A review of research*. Charleston, WV: Appalachian Educational Laboratory.
- Dana, N. F. (2010). Teacher quality, job-embedded professional development, and school-university partnerships. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 23, 321–325.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8, 1–50.
- de Jong, E. (2011). *Foundations for multilingualism in education: From principles to practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- de Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32, 101–124.
- Epstein, R. H., Gates, S. M., Arifkhanova, A., Bega, A., Chavez-Herrerias, E., Han, E., . . . Wrabel, S. (2016). *School leadership interventions under the Every Student Succeeds Act: Evidence review: Updated and expanded*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND. doi: 10.7249/RR1550-1
- Gándara, P., Rumberger, R., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Callahan, R. (2003). English learners in California schools: Unequal resources, unequal outcomes. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 11(36). doi:10.14507/epaa.v11n36.2003
- Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2016). *CLIL in context: Practical guidance for educators*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Hamayan, E., Genesee, F., & Cloud, N. (2013). *Dual language instruction: From A to Z*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hernandez, A.M. (2011). *Success and challenges of instructional strategies in two-way bilingual immersion* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). California State University, San Marcos.
- Howard, E., & Sugarman, J. (2007). *Realizing the vision of two-way immersion: Fostering effective programs and classrooms*. Washington, DC, and McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Hyland, K. (2009). Specific purpose programs. In M. Long & C. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching* (pp. 201–217). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kennedy, B. (2013). *A qualitative case study of the bilingual teacher shortage in one Texas school district* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3606445)
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- López, F., Scanlan, M., & Gundrum, B. (2013). Preparing teachers of English language learners: Empirical evidence and policy implications. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 21(20), 1–35.
- Master, B., Loeb, S., Whitney, C., & Wyckoff, J. (2016). Different skills?: Identifying differentially effective teachers of English language learners. *The Elementary School Journal*, 117(2), 261–284. doi:10.1086/688871

- Moll, L., & Arnot-Hopffer, E. (2005). Sociocultural competence in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(3), 242–247.
- Montecel, M. R., & Cortez, J. D. (2002). Successful bilingual education programs: Development and the dissemination of criteria to identify promising and exemplary practices in bilingual education at the national level. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26, 1–21.
- Palmer, D. (2008). Building and destroying students' 'academic identities': The power of discourse in a two-way immersion classroom. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 21(6), 1–24. doi:10.1080/09518390701470537
- Potowski, K. (2007). *Language and identity in a dual immersion school*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Rumberger, R. W., & Gandara, P. (2005). How well are California's English learners mastering English? Educational outcomes and opportunities for English language learners. *University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute Newsletter*, 13(1), 1–2.
- Valdés, G., Menken, K., & Castro, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Common Core bilingual and English language learners*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Williams, T., Hakuta, K., Haertel, E., et al. (2007). *Similar English learner students, different results: Why do some schools do better? A follow-up analysis, based on a large-scale survey of California elementary schools serving low-income and EL students*. Mountain View, CA: EdSource.

5 Staff Quality and Professional Development

1 Principle 1
The program recruits and retains high-quality dual language staff.

Key Point A
There is a teacher recruitment and retention plan that is aligned with program goals and long-term needs.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
No defined teacher recruitment and retention plan exists.	A teacher recruitment plan exists, but teachers are frequently hired on an emergency basis and without consideration for program goals or long-term needs (e.g., staff is hired without appropriate training, certifications, or language proficiency; or the program relies heavily on short-term international teacher exchanges to provide instruction through the partner language). There are no systematic retention efforts.	There is a plan for recruitment and retention that is aligned with program goals and takes program sustainability and longevity into account. Teachers are hired through a targeted screening and interview process that includes dual language experts (e.g., program leaders, veteran dual language teachers) and is based on criteria that align fully with program requirements and best practices in dual language education. Short-term international teacher exchanges supplement the partner language teaching staff but are not the primary source. The plan addresses retention through support for new teachers (e.g., mentoring, peer observation), opportunities for long-term professional growth and leadership development, and financial incentives, which may include annual stipends or hiring bonuses.	There is a plan for recruitment and retention that is aligned with program goals, takes program sustainability and longevity into account, and is systematically coordinated with district-level staff. Teachers are hired through a targeted screening and interview process that includes dual language experts (e.g., program leaders, veteran dual language teachers) and is based on criteria that align fully with program requirements and best practices in dual language education. Short-term international teacher exchanges supplement the partner language teaching staff but are not the primary source. The district and program partner with local universities to create or strengthen teacher workforce pipelines, or to sponsor in-house “grow your own” alternative certification programs targeting paraprofessionals, thus creating a sustained supply of well-prepared teachers. The plan addresses retention through support for new teachers (e.g., mentoring, peer observation), opportunities for long-term professional growth and leadership development, and financial incentives, which may include annual stipends or hiring bonuses.

<p>Key Point B Selection of new instructional, administrative, and support staff is based on credentials, language proficiency, and demonstrated commitment to program goals.</p>			
<p>Minimal alignment</p> <p>Staff members are hired with little to no consideration of the degree to which their credentials, language proficiency, and commitment to program goals are appropriate for their assignment.</p>	<p>Partial alignment</p> <p>Staff members are hired with some consideration of the degree to which their credentials, language proficiency, and commitment to program goals are appropriate for their assignment, but at times there is a mismatch between skills and job assignments.</p>	<p>Full alignment</p> <p>Staff members are hired with careful consideration of the degree to which their credentials, language proficiency, and commitment to program goals are appropriate for their assignment, and the majority of staff members have the appropriate commitment, skills, and credentials for their position.</p>	<p>Exemplary practice</p> <p>Staff members are hired with careful consideration of the degree to which their credentials, language proficiency, and commitment to program goals are appropriate for their assignment, and all staff members have the appropriate commitment, skills, and credentials for their position. In programs where instruction in the two languages is provided by different teachers, English-component teachers have at least basic proficiency in the partner language.</p>
<p>Key Point C There is a positive workplace climate and all staff are valued and appropriately supported in carrying out their work.</p>			
<p>Minimal alignment</p> <p>Few staff report feeling valued or having appropriate support for carrying out their work (e.g., necessary supplies, sufficient individual and joint planning time, administrative support in navigating professional challenges and conflicts, requested professional development opportunities, professional respect and autonomy).</p>	<p>Partial alignment</p> <p>Some staff report feeling valued and have appropriate support at the program level for carrying out their work (e.g., necessary supplies, sufficient individual and joint planning time, administrative support in navigating professional challenges and conflicts, requested professional development opportunities, professional respect and autonomy). One subgroup of staff (e.g., teachers, paraprofessionals, support staff, specialists) may feel more valued and supported than others.</p>	<p>Full alignment</p> <p>All staff report feeling valued and have appropriate support at the program level for carrying out their work (e.g., necessary supplies, sufficient individual and joint planning time, administrative support in navigating professional challenges and conflicts, requested professional development opportunities, professional respect and autonomy).</p>	<p>Exemplary practice</p> <p>All staff report feeling valued and have appropriate support at the program and district levels for carrying out their work (e.g., necessary supplies, sufficient individual and joint planning time, administrative support in navigating professional challenges and conflicts, requested professional development opportunities, professional respect and autonomy). The school is considered a highly desirable work site and staff at other schools in the district actively seek employment in the program. The school shares its expertise in promoting a positive workplace climate with other schools in the district.</p>

Key Point D

Staff evaluations are performed by personnel who are knowledgeable about and committed to dual language education.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>Administrators who evaluate staff have little to no knowledge of or commitment to dual language education. Administrators who are not proficient in the partner language do not take any steps to address any challenges this may present.</p>	<p>Administrators who evaluate staff have a basic knowledge of and commitment to dual language education but the evaluation criteria or instruments used are not aligned to program standards. Administrators who are not proficient in the partner language may take some steps to address challenges this may present in conducting evaluations, but the steps are not particularly effective (e.g., using voice recognition software and Google Translate to provide an English translation of classroom discourse).</p>	<p>Administrators who evaluate staff have a deep knowledge of dual language education and a high level of commitment to program goals, and the evaluation criteria and instruments generally support dual language program standards and lead to improved instruction. Administrators who are not proficient in the partner language take sufficient steps to address this issue (e.g., being accompanied by a translator, having English captions added to videotaped lessons conducted in the partner language, videotaping the lesson and viewing it jointly afterward with the staff member being evaluated).</p>	<p>Administrators who evaluate staff have a deep knowledge of dual language education and a high level of commitment to program goals, and the evaluation criteria and instruments are specifically designed for dual language programs and lead to improved instruction. Administrators who are not proficient in the partner language take sufficient steps to address this issue (e.g., being accompanied by a translator, English captions added to a videotaped lesson conducted in the partner language, videotaping the lesson and viewing it afterward with the staff member being evaluated). The program shares its evaluation criteria, tools, and processes with other dual language programs in the district or state.</p>

Principle 2**2**

The program provides high-quality professional development that is tailored to the needs of dual language educators and support staff.

Key Point A

There is a long-term professional development plan that is comprehensive, inclusive, and differentiated.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>There is no plan for professional development, and professional development activities are sporadic, incidental, or misaligned with program goals.</p>	<p>A professional development plan is in place at the school level, but the activities are generic (not specific to dual language education) or do not include all program staff.</p>	<p>A well-implemented professional development plan is in place at the school level and takes into account the varying needs of different staff members (e.g., dual language and non-dual language staff; subgroups of instructional staff and support staff). Professional development specific to dual language is not optional or an add-on, but is seamlessly incorporated into the general professional development plan. The plan reflects issues of importance to the staff, school, and district; and considers student needs as indicated by outcome data; and targets the specific requirements of teaching in a dual language environment.</p>	<p>A comprehensive professional development plan is created with district support and alignment that accounts for short-term as well as long-term program goals. There is sufficient infrastructure at the school and district levels so that professional development that is specific to dual language is not optional or an add-on, but is seamlessly incorporated into the general professional development plan. The plan reflects issues of importance to the staff, school, and district; considers student needs as indicated by outcome data; and targets the specific requirements of teaching in a dual language environment. If there is more than one partner language served through dual language programs in the district, professional development is differentiated to address both the common concerns of all dual language staff and language-specific concerns. The professional development plan is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that it stays current with best practices and addresses needs as they emerge.</p>

Key Point B

Approaches to professional development respect individual interests and learning styles and foster autonomy and ownership of the learning process.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Administrators or instructional leaders are responsible for both the content and format of professional development activities, with little to no input from staff, and staff are not given a choice about participation.	Staff are able to exercise some autonomy and independence (e.g., selecting from a menu of district-sponsored workshops, being supported to attend a local conference) but administrators or instructional leaders take primary responsibility for the content and format of professional development activities.	With staff input and leadership, a variety of professional development opportunities are available (e.g., workshops, conferences, peer mentoring, peer observations, critical friends groups, book study groups, teacher research), and staff are encouraged to pursue topics of their own interest that will support them in working more effectively with students. Program-level administration fosters staff autonomy.	With staff input and leadership, a variety of professional development opportunities are available (e.g., workshops, conferences, peer mentoring, peer observations, critical friends groups, book study groups), and staff are encouraged to pursue topics of their own interest that will support them in working more effectively with students. Program- and district-level administration foster staff autonomy. Program staff engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding approaches for fostering staff learning and autonomy.

Key Point C

Professional development is aligned with competencies needed to meet dual language program standards.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Professional development activities do not address the knowledge, dispositions, or skills needed to work with bilingual learners in a dual language program.	Professional development activities address the knowledge, dispositions, and skills needed to work with bilingual learners (e.g., second language acquisition, funds of knowledge, sheltered instruction), but no explicit connection is made to how they apply to dual language programs.	Professional development activities address the knowledge, dispositions, and skills needed to work with bilingual learners (e.g., second language acquisition, funds of knowledge, sheltered instruction), and explicit connections are made to how they apply to dual language programs.	Professional development activities address the knowledge, dispositions, and skills needed to work with bilingual learners (e.g., second language acquisition, funds of knowledge, sheltered instruction), and explicit connections are made to how they apply to dual language programs. Program staff engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding approaches for aligning professional development activities with required competencies for dual language instruction.

Key Point D All staff are given opportunities to develop dual language advocacy skills.			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
No attention is paid to the importance of advocacy for the program, and staff are not given opportunities to develop advocacy skills.	There is some attention to advocacy for the program at the school level (e.g., school committees, school/family partnerships, community initiatives), but it is unsystematic and depends on the existing skills and initiative of staff rather than being purposely cultivated or systematized. Advocacy efforts are coordinated at the school level only.	Explicit, systematic attention is paid to advocacy for the program at the school level (e.g., through vision and mission statements, written policies, and documented outreach activities). Staff are invited to lead or participate in these activities and are provided with appropriate training and guidance to do so effectively.	Explicit, systematic attention is paid to advocacy for the program at the school, community, district, and possibly state levels (e.g., through committee work, letters to the editor, testimony for relevant legislation). Staff are invited to lead or participate in these activities and are provided with appropriate training and guidance to do so effectively, resulting in multiple opportunities to advocate on behalf of the program to various audiences. Program staff engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding approaches for supporting staff in developing advocacy skills.
Key Point E There is an infrastructure to support professional development that includes adequate funding, time, and human resources.			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There is little to no infrastructure to support professional development, and inadequate funding, time, and human resources are dedicated to professional development activities.	There is a basic infrastructure to support professional development, with moderate funding, time, and human resources (such as a professional development coordinator) dedicated to professional development activities. It is likely that one aspect of the infrastructure is stronger than the others (e.g., sufficient time allocated to professional development, but insufficient funds or human resources).	There is a strong infrastructure to support professional development at the school level, with sufficient funding, time, and human resources (such as a professional development coordinator) dedicated to professional development activities. Specifically, at the school level, there is a clear budget line item to support professional development, specific blocks of time set aside each month for staff to engage in professional development, and a person or committee responsible for coordinating professional development activities.	There is a strong infrastructure to support professional development at the school and district levels, with sufficient funding, time, and human resources (such as a professional development coordinator) dedicated to professional development activities. Specifically, at the school and district levels, there is a clear budget line item to support professional development, specific blocks of time set aside each month for staff to engage in professional development, and a person or committee responsible for coordinating professional development activities. Program and district administrators engage in outreach opportunities within and beyond the district to learn from and support other dual language programs regarding approaches for providing a strong infrastructure for professional development.

3

Principle 3

The program collaborates with other groups and institutions to ensure staff quality.

Key Point A

The program has a partnership with one or more teacher or administrator preparation programs.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There are no partnerships with teacher or administrator preparation programs.	The program engages in sporadic collaborations with teacher or administrative preparation programs (e.g., occasional student teaching placements, ad hoc connections when staff take university courses or individual faculty members provide on-site workshops).	There is a partnership between one or more preparation programs and the dual language program, which may include onsite courses, short-term workshops, student-teacher placements, collaborative research opportunities, and so forth.	With district oversight and approval, there is a formal, sustained partnership between one or more preparation programs and the dual language program, which may include district-funded onsite courses, short-term workshops, student-teacher placements, collaborative research opportunities, and so forth. The partnership is regularly reviewed and modified as needed by district and program personnel and outside partners.

Key Point B

Program staff partner with professional organizations.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There are no partnerships with professional organizations.	Participation in professional organizations is limited to the initiative of individual staff members whose requests to attend conferences or meetings may be granted.	The program encourages staff members to take active roles in professional organizations by attending conferences and meetings, making presentations, seeking office, hosting site visits, and so forth.	The program encourages staff members to take active roles in professional organizations by attending conferences and meetings, making presentations, seeking office, hosting site visits, and so forth. There are dedicated funds at the program and district levels to support these activities.

Key Point C

Program staff engage in dual language program networking.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There is no exchange of ideas with other dual language programs, or exchanges are incidental and based on personal relationships.	Staff occasionally attend professional development activities initiated and planned by staff from other dual language programs, but with little time to interact, exchange ideas, or engage in follow-up activities.	Sharing of best practices is the norm, and the program supports all staff in participating in and hosting professional development activities and other types of collaboration (e.g., identifying or creating curricular materials, hosting a community engagement event, engaging in advocacy work) with dual language programs within and outside of the district.	Sharing of best practices is the norm, and the program and district support all staff in participating in and hosting professional development activities and other types of collaboration (e.g., identifying or creating curricular materials, participating in family/community outreach, engaging in advocacy work) with other dual language programs within and outside of the district. Program staff are provided with adequate resources to successfully carry out these initiatives. Program staff reflect on the impact of these networking activities and create annual goals to focus future efforts.

STRAND

6



Family and Community

6

Family and Community

A significant feature of effective programs is the incorporation of family and community engagement and collaboration with the school (National Academies, 2017). Research shows that most parents of ethnically and linguistically diverse students have high aspirations for their children and want to be involved in promoting their academic success (Glick & White, 2004; Ji & Koblinsky, 2009; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Sibley & Dearing, 2014).

Studies also demonstrate that students demonstrate more school success when their families are engaged. More specifically, family engagement is associated with higher student grades, higher achievement, higher language proficiency, better social skills, and higher graduation rates and enrollment in postsecondary education (Ferguson, 2008; Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Lindholm-Leary, 2015).

EFFECTIVE PRACTICES

Effective schools tend to incorporate a variety of home–school collaboration activities. The general outcomes for students are heightened interest in schoolwork and improved achievement and behavior. Activities such as reading to children and listening to children read are both feasible and practical and contribute to improved scholastic achievement (August & Shanahan, 2006; Ji & Koblinsky, 2009; Vera et al., 2012).

Research shows that schools can encourage a positive relationship between the family and the school, which can lead to a higher level of engagement (Ferguson, 2008; Loeb & York, 2016; Mapp & Kuttner, 2013; National Academies, 2017). These are some strategies used by effective programs:

- Approaching families from a strength-based perspective; that is, understand that all families have many strengths to help their children
- Providing a welcoming environment
- Implementing culturally and linguistically responsive services
- Providing adult education programs including English language classes
- Giving parents guidance about how to navigate the school system
- Hiring bilingual staff, including in the front office
- Showing respect for parents' cultural and linguistic practices and customs
- Translating materials and information into the languages spoken by families
- Being flexible in scheduling school meetings and events
- Recognizing that families' language and culture are strengths that should be shared at school and home
- Helping families to support their children's development at home
- Using technology such as texting to send families regular tips on supporting the language development of young children in their home languages

School–family connections may also be more permeable when schools embrace a “funds of knowledge” perspective to better understand the contributions of all parents to children’s knowledge acquisition and sociocultural development. For example, Moll and colleagues (e.g., Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005) have studied how family members use their funds of knowledge in their lives and their children’s lives. These funds of knowledge include “historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well being” (p. 73), such as those needed for ranching and farming, construction, repair, business, medicine, religion, or household management. The idea is that the teacher–student relationship can be enhanced when teachers understand the multiple layers of relationships and ways in which students gain information from their social networks.

In addition, parents of English learners can be encouraged to establish a sense of community by socializing their children in ways that preserve important features of their culture of origin (National Academies, 2017). For example, families can attend cultural celebrations to help children gain knowledge of and positive perceptions toward culture. Parents of native-English-speaking children can utilize these approaches as well to promote cultural knowledge and identity.

According to a 50-state study by the Education Commission of States (as cited in National Academies, 2017, p. 7-23), states use a variety of effective practices to engage the families of English learners, including the following:

- Establishing parent advisory committees at the district or school levels
- Providing orientation session on state standards, school expectations, and general program requirements
- Creating school support teams that include parents of English learners, so parents can discuss their educational or language concerns
- Using district-level language proficiency committees that include a bilingual educator, a transitional language coordinator, a parent of an English learner, and a campus administrator to review all pertinent information on each English learner, make recommendations for program placement and advancement, monitor the progress of former English learners, and determine the appropriateness of programs that extend beyond the school year

BARRIERS

Barriers to the involvement in American schools of English learners’ families include a sense of alienation, distrust, and, for some families, a perception that their low educational skills or proficiency in English are not sufficient to assist in the classroom (Arias & Morillo-Campbell, 2008; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Smith, 2001; Valdés, Menken, & Castro, 2015; Xiong & Obiakor, 2013). Further, many ethnic minority and low-income families do not understand the school system. In addition, families of English learners may be less well-informed about school-related events and procedures given research showing that they are less likely to receive communication from the school than families of native-English-speaking children (Noel, Stark, & Redford, 2015). Smith (2001) reported that the knowledge and perspectives of parents of English learners—regardless of the parents’ English proficiency or length of residency in the United States—were less likely than those of native-English-speaking families to be incorporated into the curriculum and other school information.

Another barrier is that some staff attitudes may reflect the commonly held societal perspective that low-income, ethnic minority, and language minority families do not care about the education of their children, despite research demonstrating that such families want their children to succeed in school, understand the importance of school, and support their children’s school experience (Shim, 2013; Tobin, Arzubiaga, & Adair, 2013; Xiong & Obiakor, 2013).

As Valdés et al. (2015) note, “Schools employ cultural assimilation approaches or use culturally inappropriate practices in the name of parent ‘involvement’ programs. While these types of activities are well intentioned, the one-way information they provide reflects an assumption that parents come as blank slates or that they must leave their own cultural norms at the door and assume new cultural ways of parenting that, at times, conflict with their own. As educators, we have the opportunity to create meaningful partnerships that focus on the children and their education and that disturb the unequal power relations between home, school, and community” (pp. 77–78).

Families with children in dual language programs have been surveyed to learn about their reasons for enrolling their children in the program, their involvement in the school, and their attitudes toward the program and their children’s progress (e.g., Giacchino-Baker & Piller, 2006; Lao, 2004; Leung & Uchikoshi, 2012; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Parkes & Tenley, 2011; Ramos, 2007). The results of these studies provide three important and consistent findings:

- Most parents of students at all grade levels, whether their children are native English speakers or English learners, are very satisfied with the dual language program and would recommend it to other parents.
- Parent attitudes, as revealed in studies of speakers of Spanish, Cantonese, and Mandarin, are very favorable toward bilingualism, and parents agree that it is important that their children receive instruction in their native language.
- Most parents of native English speakers and English learners also perceive that studying the partner language will be an asset for their children for career and intellectual benefits.

Thus, effective programs make the school environment a welcoming and warm one for families of all language and cultural groups, where bilingualism is valued and there is a sense of belonging for students and their families. Parents of all ethnolinguistic groups are treated equitably, and, in two-way programs, English-speaking parents do not dominate the advisory committees. In addition, according to the advisory panel that helped to develop these guiding principles for dual language education, when parents come to school, they should see a reflection of the vision and goals associated with bilingualism and biliteracy—for example, signs that are in both languages and front office staff who are bilingual.

The *Guiding Principles* advisory panel also pointed out that one way of providing a warm and welcoming environment is to provide a family liaison who speaks the languages of the program and understands the needs of the families in the community. A family liaison plans for family education based on the families’ needs (e.g., to help their students with homework) and the model, so that families can become advocates for the program and school.

REFERENCES

- Arias, M. B., & Morillo-Campbell, M. (2008). *Promoting ELL parent involvement: Challenges in contested times*. Tempe, AZ, and Boulder, CO: Education Policy Research Unit and Education and the Public Interest Center. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED506652)
- August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ferguson, C. (2008). *The school–family connection: Looking at the larger picture: A review of current literature*. Austin, TX: National Center for Family and Community Connections with Schools.
- Giacchino-Baker, R., & Piller, B. (2006). Parental motivation, attitudes, support, and commitment in a southern Californian two-way immersion program. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 5, 5–28.
- Glick, J. E., & White, M. J. (2004). Post-secondary school participation of immigrant and native youth: The role of familial resources and educational expectations. *Social Science Research*, 33(2), 272–299.
- Gonzalez, N., Moll, L., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Oxford, England: Routledge.
- Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement*. Austin, TX: National Center for Family and Community Connections with Schools.
- Ji, C. S., & Koblinsky, S. A. (2009). Parent involvement in children’s education: An exploratory study of urban, Chinese immigrant families. *Urban Education*, 44(6), 687–709.
- Lao, C. (2004) Parents’ attitudes toward Chinese–English bilingual education and Chinese–language use. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 28, 99–117.
- Leung, G., & Uchikoshi, Y. (2012). Relationships among language ideologies, family language policies, and children’s language achievement: A look at Cantonese–English bilinguals in the U.S. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 35, 294–313.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2015). *Sobrato Family Foundation Early Academic and Literacy Project after five full years of implementation: Final research report*. Cupertino, CA: Sobrato Family Foundation.
- Loeb, S., & York, B. (2016). *Helping parents help their children*. Retrieved from Brookings Institution website: <https://www.brookings.edu/research/helping-parents-help-their-children>
- Mapp, K. L., & Kuttner, P. J. (2013). *Partners in education: A dual capacity-building framework for family–school partnerships*. Austin, TX: SEDL. Retrieved from <http://www.sedl.org/pubs/framework/FE-Cap-Building.pdf>
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2017). *Promoting the educational success of children and youth learning English: Promising futures*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. doi:10.17226/24677
- Noel, A., Stark, P., & Redford, J. (2015). *Parent and family involvement in education, from the National Household Education Surveys Program of 2012: First look* (NCES 2013-028.REV2). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2013/2013028rev.pdf>
- Parkes, J., & Tenley, R. (2011). How satisfied are parents of students in dual language education programs?: “Me parece maravillosa la gran oportunidad que le están dando a estos niños”. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14(6), 701–718.
- Ramos, F. 2007. What do parents think of two-way bilingual education? An analysis of responses. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 6(2), 139–150.

- Shim, J. M. (2013). Involving the parents of English language learners in a rural area: Focus on the dynamics of teacher–parent interactions. *Rural Educator*, 34(3), 18–26.
- Sibley, E., & Dearing, E. (2014). Family educational involvement and child achievement in early elementary school for American-born and immigrant families. *Psychology in the Schools*, 51(8), 814–831.
- Smith, P. (2001). Community language resources in dual language schooling. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 25, 375–404.
- Tobin, J., Arzubiaga, A., & Adair, J. K. (2013). *Children crossing borders: Immigrant parent and teacher perspectives on preschool*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Valdés, G., Menken, K., & Castro, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Common Core bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Vera, E. M., Israel, M. S., Coyle, L., Cross, J., Knight-Lynn, L., Moallem, I., Bartucci, G., & Goldberger, N. (2012). Exploring the educational involvement of parents of English learners. *School Community Journal*, 22(2), 183–202.
- Xiong, T. T., & Obiakor, F. E. (2013). Cultural connections and disconnections between non-Hmong principals and Hmong parents. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 15(1), 39–45.

6 Family and Community

Principle 1

1 The program has a responsive infrastructure for positive, active, and ongoing relations with students’ families and the community.

Key Point A

There is a staff member designated as a family liaison.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>The program does not have a designated family liaison.</p>	<p>The program has a designated family liaison, but this individual may not be proficient in both program languages or possess strong sociocultural competence, or have sufficient time or resources to fully meet identified needs. Funding for the position may also be temporary, such as through a grant or other short-term revenue stream.</p>	<p>The program has a designated family liaison who is proficient in both program languages and has strong sociocultural competence, and who has sufficient time and resources to meet identified needs. The liaison’s primary responsibility is to ensure that students and families have the needed information and resources to actively and successfully participate in the dual language program. The program has a budget line item to ensure continuous funding for the position.</p>	<p>The program has a designated family liaison who is proficient in both program languages and has strong sociocultural competence, and who has sufficient time and resources to meet identified needs. The liaison’s primary responsibility is to ensure that students and families have the needed information and resources to actively and successfully participate in the dual language program. The district has a budget line item to ensure continuous funding for the position, and activities of the liaison are supported and coordinated at the district level.</p>

<p>Key Point B Office staff members are bilingual and demonstrate sociocultural competence to effectively serve all families.</p>			
<p>Minimal alignment</p>	<p>Partial alignment</p>	<p>Full alignment</p>	<p>Exemplary practice</p>
<p>No office staff members are bilingual or demonstrate sociocultural competence. The needs of some families are better addressed than those of others.</p>	<p>Some office staff members are bilingual or demonstrate sociocultural competence. There is an effort to serve all families, but the needs of some families are likely to be better addressed than those of others.</p>	<p>Many office staff members are bilingual and all demonstrate sociocultural competence and actively work to meet the needs of all families. Ongoing training is provided at the program level to strengthen these skills.</p>	<p>Many office staff members are bilingual and all demonstrate sociocultural competence and actively work to meet the needs of all families. Ongoing training is provided at the program and district levels to strengthen these skills, and office staff engage in outreach with staff at other schools in the district to share best practices.</p>
<p>Key Point C Professional development addresses the importance of equity, access, and social justice for effective outreach with families and the community.</p>			
<p>Minimal alignment</p>	<p>Partial alignment</p>	<p>Full alignment</p>	<p>Exemplary practice</p>
<p>The program's professional development plan does not include training on equity, access, and social justice as they relate to outreach activities with families and the community, and these issues are rarely, if ever, discussed informally among staff.</p>	<p>Staff occasionally discuss the importance of equity, access, and social justice in promoting effective outreach with families and the community and work together on an as-needed basis to consider ways to address these issues (e.g., at the beginning of the year, grade-level teams may take it upon themselves to brainstorm inclusive practices for promoting participation from all families). However, the topic is still not integrated into the program-wide professional development plan.</p>	<p>The program's professional development plan includes training on equity, access, and social justice as they relate to outreach activities with families and the community. The plan includes systematic and ongoing attention to the socioeconomic, racial, cultural, linguistic, and political issues that impact the community and thus family engagement and student performance patterns. There is a program-wide focus on valuing and strengthening communication and relationships with families to deepen levels of family involvement.</p>	<p>The program's professional development plan is created with district support and alignment and includes training on equity, access, and social justice as they relate to outreach activities with families and the community. The plan includes systematic and ongoing attention to the socioeconomic, racial, cultural, linguistic, and political issues that impact the community and thus family engagement and student performance patterns. There is a program-wide focus on valuing and strengthening communication and relationships with families to deepen levels of family involvement. This component of the professional development plan is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that it stays current with best practices and addresses needs as they emerge.</p>

Key Point D

There is a positive school climate and all families are valued and welcomed into the school community.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>Few families report feeling valued or welcomed into the school community.</p>	<p>Some families report feeling valued or welcomed into the school community (e.g., regularly receiving positive, informational communications in the home language through a variety of channels, being invited to volunteer in the classroom, being asked to serve on school committees and feeling that contributions are appreciated). It is possible that one group of families (e.g., families of native English speakers, families with higher incomes or educational levels) feels more valued and supported than others.</p>	<p>Most or all families report feeling valued and welcomed into the school community (e.g., regularly receiving positive, informational communications in the home language through a variety of channels, being invited to volunteer in the classroom, being asked to serve on school committees and feeling that contributions are appreciated).</p>	<p>Most or all families report feeling valued and welcomed into the school community (e.g., regularly receiving positive, informational communications in the home language through a variety of channels, being invited to volunteer in the classroom, being asked to serve on school committees and feeling that contributions are appreciated). The school is considered highly desirable, and if possible, families throughout the district actively seek enrollment in the program for their children. The school shares its expertise in promoting a positive climate for families with other schools in the district.</p>

2

Principle 2

The program promotes family and community engagement and advocacy through outreach activities and support services that are aligned with the three core goals of dual language education.

Key Point A

The program incorporates ongoing learning activities that are designed to help families understand, support, and advocate for the program.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>There are few or no family learning activities related to the goals of the program.</p>	<p>There are occasional family learning activities related to the goals of the program, but some goals are more likely to be highlighted than others (e.g., many activities related to academic performance but few related to biliteracy development or sociocultural competence). Or activities may not support equitable participation by all families (e.g., always held during school hours when some family members are working, no childcare provided, all activities carried out in a single program language).</p>	<p>The program regularly facilitates meaningful family learning activities that systematically develop understanding of and support for all of the program's goals. The learning activities address dual language research and best practices as well as specific program features, such as the language allocation plan, so that families are informed and can better advocate for their children and the program. Activities are designed to support equitable participation by all families (e.g., varying the time and possibly the location, providing childcare, and using both program languages as well as providing translation for families who speak other languages). Parents are empowered to work with administration and staff to support the academic, linguistic, and cultural goals of the program and to become agents of change and champions of equity and social justice for their own families and communities.</p>	<p>With support and coordination from the district, the program regularly facilitates meaningful family learning activities that systematically develop understanding of and support for all of the program's goals. The learning activities address dual language research and best practices as well as specific program features, such as the language allocation plan, so that families are informed and can better advocate for their children and the program. Activities are designed to support equitable participation by all families (e.g., varying the time and possibly the location, providing childcare, and using both program languages as well as providing translation for families who speak other languages). The activities are reviewed and updated annually to ensure that they stay current with best practices and address needs as they emerge. Parents are empowered to work with administration and staff to support the academic, linguistic, and cultural goals of the program and to become agents of change and champions of equity and social justice for their own families and communities.</p>

Key Point B The program actively refers families to resources in the community.			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
Families are given little to no assistance in identifying community partners that can provide personal and professional support (e.g., legal services, health care, job training and employment placement services, educational programs, housing).	Families are given some assistance in identifying community partners that can provide personal and professional support (e.g., legal services, health care, job training and employment placement services, educational programs, housing), but not on an ongoing basis, and assistance is not differentiated to meet the needs of various groups of families.	Families are given adequate, sustained assistance in identifying community partners that can provide personal and professional support (e.g., legal services, health care, job training and employment placement services, educational programs, housing), and assistance is differentiated to meet the needs of various groups of families (e.g., English as a second language classes for some families, job training support for others).	Families are given adequate, sustained assistance in identifying community partners that can provide personal and professional support (e.g., legal services, health care, job training and employment placement services, educational programs, housing), and assistance is differentiated to meet the needs of varying groups of families. (e.g., English as a second language classes for some families, job training support for others). Needs assessments are regularly administered to families and community partners to help the program identify new resources and differentiate the assistance it offers to meet the needs of various groups of families.
Key Point C The program plans for and engages in community-building activities with families to promote close relationships, collaboration, and other forms of sociocultural competence.			
Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
The program rarely if ever plans for or engages in community-building activities with families.	Individuals within the program (e.g., a grade-level team of teachers, the parent liaison) sometimes plan for and engage in community-building activities with families, but these efforts are unsystematic and uncoordinated or may only involve certain groups of families.	The program systematically plans for and engages in a coordinated sequence of community-building activities with families to reinforce the sociocultural goals of the program, and all groups of families are involved. Some conversations regarding cultural proficiency, prejudice, bias, and various forms of privilege are taking place.	The program systematically plans for and engages in a coordinated sequence of community-building activities with families to reinforce the sociocultural goals of the program, and all groups of families are involved. Ongoing conversations regarding cultural proficiency, prejudice, bias, and various forms of privilege are the norm. The activities are reviewed and updated annually to ensure that they stay current with best practices and address needs as they emerge.

Key Point D

Communication with families and the community is in the appropriate language.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>Communication with families and community members is mostly or entirely in English.</p>	<p>Communication with families and community members is in both program languages, but the partner language is not used consistently.</p>	<p>Communication with families and community members, including all materials available to the public (e.g., through a website, teacher portals, social media), is of high quality and available in both program languages, whether the communication is oral or written. Steps are taken to provide communication in other home languages beyond the two program languages to the extent possible. Attention is paid to issues of linguistic and cultural equity and status (e.g., messages are made available through a variety of channels and consider differences in technology access, social media use, and literacy levels; information is intentionally presented in the partner language first; the same font size is used for each language).</p>	<p>Communication with families and community members, including all materials available to the public (e.g., through a website, teacher portals, social media), is of high quality and available in both program languages, whether the communication is oral or written. Steps are taken to provide communication in other home languages beyond the two program languages to the extent possible. Attention is paid to issues of linguistic and cultural equity and status (e.g., messages are made available through a variety of channels and consider differences in technology access, social media use, and literacy levels; information is intentionally presented in the partner language first; the same font size is used for each language). The district supports the program’s bilingual communication efforts by providing all district-level communication in both program languages and securing translators as needed for other home languages.</p>

Key Point E

The program partners with families to promote home–school connections.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>The program provides little or no guidance to families about how to support or extend their children's learning at home in either program language.</p>	<p>Individual family members, possibly in conjunction with individual teachers or support staff, find ways to help one another support their children's learning in both program languages (e.g., through family mentoring, sharing of online resources, informal homework help networks), but these efforts are sporadic, unsystematic, or uncoordinated.</p>	<p>With the support of the family liaison or other staff, the program provides a variety of ongoing, systematic, coordinated approaches for fostering home–school connections to further student learning (e.g., establishing formal cross-linguistic homework help networks with family members who sign up to respond in either program language to questions during specific hours, establishing family-level bilingual buddies to help monolingual parents navigate instructional questions in the other program language, sending educational materials such as books, games, and dictionaries home with students).</p>	<p>With the support of the family liaison or other staff and with support and coordination from the district, the program provides a variety of ongoing, systematic, coordinated approaches for fostering home–school connections to further student learning (e.g., establishing formal cross-linguistic homework help networks with family members who sign up to respond in either program language to questions during specific hours, establishing family-level bilingual buddies to help monolingual parents navigate instructional questions in the other program language, sending educational materials such as books, games, and dictionaries home with students). Needs assessments are regularly administered to families to help the program stay informed about concerns and suggestions for strengthening home–school connections within and across families.</p>

3

Principle 3

The program views and involves families and community members as strategic partners.

Key Point A

The program establishes an advisory structure for input from family members and community members.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
No input is solicited from students' families or community members.	Input from students' families and community members is solicited only for specific issues, such as grade reporting or continuation of the program to the secondary level.	There is a process in place at the program level to solicit and incorporate input about the program from families and community members in an ongoing way. Input is solicited on issues such as the hiring of staff, modifications to program structure, implementation of specific instructional practices, and use of program resources.	There is a process in place at the program and district levels to solicit and incorporate input about the program from families and community members in an ongoing way. Input is solicited on issues such as the hiring of staff, modifications to program structure, implementation of specific instructional practices, and use of program resources. This process is evaluated regularly and improved as needed. Family members are recruited to become integral members of the advisory groups tasked with moving the dual language program forward. When opinions differ, there is a structure in place to ensure that decisions are made as a result of principle, not by power of one group over another.

Key Point B

The program capitalizes on the varied linguistic and cultural resources in the community.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>There is little or no evidence that the program capitalizes on the linguistic or cultural resources in the community.</p>	<p>The program capitalizes on some linguistic and cultural resources, for example, by inviting local community members to facilitate school activities in the partner language, but these efforts are sporadic, unsystematic, or unrelated to program goals.</p>	<p>The program capitalizes on the multilingual nature of the local community in an ongoing, systematic way by involving community members who model multiple varieties of one or both program languages and who serve as bilingual mentors. School activities incorporate authentic use of regional varieties of the two program languages, such as through field trips that provide authentic opportunities to use the two program languages and highlight the importance of sociocultural competence.</p>	<p>The program capitalizes on the multilingual nature of the local community by involving community members who model multiple varieties of one or both program languages and serve as bilingual mentors. School activities incorporate authentic use of regional varieties of the two program languages, such as through field trips that provide authentic opportunities to use the two program languages and highlight the importance of sociocultural competence. The program encourages community members to use the partner language with students when they are outside of school, including through festivals, performances, shopping, jobs or internships, and other activities that highlight the importance of multilingualism and sociocultural competence.</p>

Key Point C

The program welcomes and accommodates varying forms of family support, taking into consideration the talents and schedules of various family and community members.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>There are few opportunities for family members to support the program.</p>	<p>There are some opportunities for family members to support the program, but all require certain skills (e.g., computer skills, literacy in either program language) or must be carried out at the school during school hours.</p>	<p>There are many opportunities for family members to support the program, and they allow for varied skills, interests, and availability (e.g., leading or participating in parent organizations, including school governance committees; preparing classroom materials at the school or at home; creating a class website; reading with students). All of these activities are valued and recognized by program staff.</p>	<p>There are many opportunities for family members to support the program, and they allow for varied skills, interests, and availability (e.g., leading or participating in parent organizations, including school governance committees; preparing classroom materials at the school or at home; creating a class website; reading with students). All of these activities are valued and recognized by program staff. Families are surveyed on a regular basis to learn about program needs they have observed, their suggestions for addressing those needs, and activities they would like to participate in to support the program.</p>

STRAND

7



Support and Resources

7 Support and Resources

SUPPORT

Support is important to schools in any community. The support a school receives influences its funding, staffing, materials, teacher training, program model, planning, parent engagement, and thus, ultimately, student achievement (Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006; Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013; Lindholm-Leary, Martinez, & Molina, in press; Valdés, Menken, & Castro, 2015).

For dual language education programs, strong administrative support needs to come from the school district, the local board of education, and state policies, as these entities and policies can facilitate or hinder program implementation. Strong support is demonstrated by structural and functional integration of the program into the school system, by long-term planning even if there is only temporary funding from an outside source (e.g., business, government), and by equitable allocation of resources—for staff training, for the purchase and development of materials in each language, and so forth (Genesee et al., 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Montecel & Cortez, 2002).

When community and administrative attitudes toward bilingualism and language minority students are negative, it is unlikely that language education programs will be implemented unless laws require it. If language education programs are developed only because they are required, they may not be properly designed to include the essential requirements for success (Valdés et al., 2015). Thus, programs may receive insufficient resources, teachers may have inadequate training and experience, and expectations for student success may be minimal. This confluence of factors may result in low levels of academic achievement and language proficiency on the part of program participants and a lack of equity in the classroom (Alfaro & Hernandez, 2016; de Jong, 2011; Genesee et al., 2006).

In schools with successful programs, the district-level administration does not regard dual language education as remedial or as merely a temporary program. Rather, as noted in the Program Structure strand, there should be a clear commitment to continued language development in the dual language program at the district level. Thus, district administration makes a commitment to providing an equal education for students in the dual language program and ensures that the program is an integral part of the school system (de Jong, 2011; Genesee et al., 2006; Hamayan et al., 2013). This commitment includes developing a K–12 pathway across elementary, middle school, and high school sites (Lindholm-Leary et al., in press) as well as school-board-approved graduation incentives for students who have achieved bilingual and biliteracy goals at elementary, middle, and high school levels, such as the Seal of Biliteracy.

Field and Menken (2015) also point out that the commitment includes developing a language policy that addresses all the decisions about which languages will be used in instruction and how they will be taught: “A

strong language policy will act as an umbrella to protect the educational priorities of a given district or school, rather than leaving them vulnerable to top-down mandates that oppose or undermine their vision” (p. 121).

SUPPORT AT THE SCHOOL SITE

At the school site level, a supportive principal or leadership team is critical in several ways (Aguila, 2010; Alanís & Rodríguez, 2008; Castellano, Stringfield, & Stone, 2002; Genesee et al., 2006; Herman, Gates, Chavez-Herrerias, & Harris, 2016; Kennedy, 2013; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Sugarman, 2012):

- They understand the dual language education model. This means that they have engaged in professional development to understand the model and how to support its implementation at the school site.
- They support the vision and goals of the program. Thus, they advocate for the program and devote attention and resources to promoting acceptance of the program by the central administration, community members, school staff, and parents.
- They show support, respect, and concern for the teachers; they promote integration of dual language program staff with staff from other strands in the school and ensure transparency when there are differences between the strands in resources or operations.
- They endeavor to provide appropriate professional development for teachers; they provide time for teachers to plan, develop materials and assessments, and engage with parents during parent–teacher conferences.
- They recruit teachers and other staff with appropriate competencies for the dual language program.
- They ensure that appropriate and equitable financial and instructional resources are allocated to the program to meet the content standards, vision, goals, and assessment needs in each language; there is a serious effort to obtain high-quality materials in the partner language for the students; and resources are allocated for the purchase and development of appropriate instructional, resource, and library materials that support the bilingualism and biliteracy vision and goals of the program.
- They can explain that successful results require patience and can show how school results compare with findings obtained in other studies (and if they are not as good, what the school is doing to improve their results).

REFERENCES

- Aguila, V. (2010). Schooling English learners: Contexts and challenges. In California Department of Education (Eds.), *Improving education for English learners: Research-based approaches* (pp. 1–18). Sacramento, CA: CDE Press.
- Alanís, I., & Rodríguez, M. A. (2008). Sustaining a dual language immersion program: Features of success. *Journal of Latinos and education*, 7(4), 305–319.
- Alfaro, C., & Hernandez, A. M. (March, 2016). Ideology, pedagogy, access and equity: A critical examination. *The Multilingual Educator*, 8–11. Retrieved from <http://www.gocabe.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/ME2016.pdf>
- Castellano, M., Stringfield, S., & Stone, J. R. (2002). *Helping disadvantaged youth succeed in school: Second-year findings from a longitudinal study of CTE-based whole-school reforms*. Columbus, OH: National Dissemination Center for Career and Technical Education.
- de Jong, E. J. (2011). *Foundations for multilingualism in education: From principles to practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Field, R., & Menken, K. (2015). What might the process of language education policy development look like at the district and school levels relative to the Common Core State Standards? In G. Valdés, K. Menken, & M. Castro. (Eds.), *Common Core bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators* (pp. 121–122). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English language learners*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Hamayan, E., Genesee, F., & Cloud, N. (2013). *Dual language instruction from A to Z*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Herman, R., Gates, S. M., Chavez-Herrerias, E., & Harris, M. (2016). *School leadership interventions under the Every Student Succeeds Act: Volume I — A review of the evidence base, initial findings*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Kennedy, B. (2013). *A qualitative case study of the bilingual teacher shortage in one Texas school district* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3606445)
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Lindholm-Leary, K., Martinez, M., & Molina, R. (in press). Dual language education as a state equity strategy. In N. Avineri, L. R. Graham, E. J. Johnson, R. Riner, & J. D. Rosa (Eds.), *Language and social justice: Case studies on communication and the creation of just societies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Montecel, M. R., & Cortez, J. D. (2002). Successful bilingual education programs: Development and the dissemination of criteria to identify promising and exemplary practices in bilingual education at the national level. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26, 1–21.
- Sugarman, J. S. (2012). *Equity in Spanish/English dual language education: Practitioners' perspectives*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3517707)
- Valdés, G., Menken, K., & Castro, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Common Core bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.

7 Support and Resources

1 Principle 1
The program is supported by all key stakeholders.

Key Point A

Program and district administrators have adequate knowledge to support and lead the program.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
<p>Administrators at the program level have very limited knowledge about dual language education, and may have negative perceptions of it. Administrators at the program level rarely, if ever, engage in professional development activities to increase their knowledge of dual language education.</p>	<p>Administrators at the program level are somewhat knowledgeable about dual language education and generally support the program, but have insufficient knowledge or understanding to provide leadership for it. Administrators at the program level occasionally engage in professional development activities to increase their knowledge of dual language education.</p>	<p>Administrators at the program level are highly knowledgeable about dual language education, fully support the program, and provide strong leadership for it, including advocacy within the district and the state. Administrators at the program level regularly engage in professional development activities to deepen and extend their knowledge of dual language education.</p>	<p>Administrators at the program and district levels are highly knowledgeable about dual language education, fully support the program, and provide strong leadership for it, including advocacy within the district and the state. Administrators at the program and district levels regularly engage in professional development activities to deepen and extend their knowledge of dual language education, and serve as mentors to district- and school-level administrators who are new to dual language education.</p>

<p>Key Point B Instructional and support staff have adequate knowledge to support and lead the program.</p>			
<p>Minimal alignment</p>	<p>Partial alignment</p>	<p>Full alignment</p>	<p>Exemplary practice</p>
<p>Instructional and support staff have very limited knowledge about dual language education and may have negative perceptions of it. Instructional and support staff rarely, if ever, engage in professional development activities to increase their knowledge of dual language education.</p>	<p>Instructional and support staff are somewhat knowledgeable about dual language education and generally support the program, but have insufficient knowledge or understanding to provide leadership for it. Instructional and support staff occasionally engage in professional development activities to increase their knowledge of dual language education.</p>	<p>Instructional and support staff are highly knowledgeable about dual language education, fully support the program, and provide strong leadership for it, including advocacy within the district and the state. Instructional and support staff regularly engage in professional development activities to deepen and extend their knowledge of dual language education.</p>	<p>Instructional and support staff are highly knowledgeable about dual language education, fully support the program, and provide strong leadership for it, including advocacy within the district and the state. Instructional and support staff regularly engage in professional development activities to deepen and extend their knowledge of dual language education, and serve as mentors to their peers within the school and across the district who are new to dual language education.</p>
<p>Key Point C Families and community members have adequate knowledge to support and advocate for the program.</p>			
<p>Minimal alignment</p>	<p>Partial alignment</p>	<p>Full alignment</p>	<p>Exemplary practice</p>
<p>Families and community members have very limited knowledge about dual language education and may have negative perceptions of it. The program rarely, if ever, provides outreach activities to help families and community members increase their knowledge of dual language education.</p>	<p>Families and community members are somewhat knowledgeable about dual language education and generally support the program, but have insufficient knowledge or understanding to advocate for it. The program occasionally provides outreach activities to help families and community members increase their knowledge of dual language education.</p>	<p>Families and community members are highly knowledgeable about dual language education, fully support the program, and strongly advocate for it within the district. The program regularly provides outreach activities to help families and community members deepen and extend their knowledge of dual language education.</p>	<p>Families and community members are highly knowledgeable about dual language education, fully support the program, and strongly advocate for it within the district and the state. The program regularly provides outreach activities to help families and community members deepen and extend their knowledge of dual language education. Families and community members serve as mentors to their peers within the school and across the district who are new to dual language education.</p>

2

Principle 2

The program is equitably and adequately funded to meet program goals.

Key Point A

The dual language program has equitable access to school, district, and state resources.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
The dual language program does not have the same access to school, district, or state funds as other programs.	There is an attempt to allocate resources fairly across program models and schools in the district, but some models or schools have more resources than others.	All program models and schools in the district share resources equitably, responding directly to the needs of the students and the goals of the model.	All program models and schools in the district share resources equitably, responding directly to the needs of the students and the goals of the model. Funding formulas are reviewed on a regular basis and revised as needed to ensure ongoing equitable distribution across program models and schools.

Key Point B

Funding allocations within the program budget are aligned with program goals.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There is no alignment between funding allocations and the goals of the program.	Funding allocations at the program level are somewhat aligned with program goals, but one goal, such as academic achievement, may be more adequately funded than others.	Funding allocations at the program level are completely aligned with program goals, and adequate funding is provided for all goals.	Funding allocations at the program and district levels are completely aligned with program goals, and adequate funding is provided for all goals. Funding allocations are reviewed on a regular basis and revised as needed to ensure continued alignment with program goals.

Key Point C

Funding provides sufficient staff, equipment, and materials in both program languages to meet program goals.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
There is insufficient staff, equipment, and materials in both program languages to meet program goals.	There is sufficient staff, equipment, and materials in one program language but not the other; or there is sufficient staff or equipment or materials, but not all three, in both program languages. Regardless, there are insufficient resources to meet all program goals.	There is sufficient staff (e.g., classroom teachers, specials teachers, paraprofessionals, support staff), equipment (e.g., computers, lab equipment), and materials (e.g., books, software, consumables) in both program languages to meet program goals.	There is sufficient staff (e.g., classroom teachers, specials teachers, paraprofessionals, support staff), equipment (e.g., computers, lab equipment), and materials (e.g., books, software, consumables) in both program languages to meet program goals. Needs for staffing, equipment, and materials in both program languages are regularly assessed and additional resources are sought as needed.

3

Principle 3

The program advocates for support.

Key Point A

The program seeks the tangible support of the state, district, and local community.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
No support is sought.	Support is sought only by individuals acting independently in an uncoordinated manner.	Support is sought through a coordinated effort in which program leadership and staff communicate program needs to stakeholders in the community, district, and state (e.g., superintendent, school board members, mayor, business leaders, legislators).	Support is sought through a coordinated effort in which program leadership and staff communicate program needs to stakeholders in the community, district, and state (e.g., superintendent, school board members, mayor, business leaders, legislators). There is a process in place to communicate regularly with stakeholders and motivate them to be proactive in supporting the program. Program leadership and staff network with other dual language programs in the district and state to promote consistency in requests for support.

Key Point B

The program engages in public relations activities to promote the program to a variety of audiences.

Minimal alignment	Partial alignment	Full alignment	Exemplary practice
The program staff makes no attempt to publicize the program, and there is no designated person in the program responsible for engaging in public relations activities.	There may be a designated person or team in the program responsible for engaging in public relations activities. Performance data and other information are shared sporadically through a limited number of channels (e.g., websites, social media, newspapers, radio, television) in an uncoordinated and unsystematic way.	There is a designated person or team in the program responsible for engaging in public relations activities. Performance data and other information (e.g., school activities, awards, fundraisers) are regularly shared through a variety of channels (e.g., websites, social media, newspapers, radio, television) in a coordinated and systematic way in accordance with a program-level communication and public relations plan.	At both the program and district levels, there is a designated person or team responsible for engaging in public relations activities. Performance data and other information (e.g., school activities, awards, fundraisers) are regularly shared through a variety of channels (e.g., websites, social media, newspapers, radio, television) in a coordinated and systematic way in accordance with a district-level communication and public relations plan. The plan is regularly reviewed and updated to ensure that it continues to provide key information to a wide audience.

<p>Key Point C Program staff actively participate in formal and informal coalitions to strengthen support for dual language education.</p>			
<p>Minimal alignment</p>	<p>Partial alignment</p>	<p>Full alignment</p>	<p>Exemplary practice</p>
<p>Few if any staff are members of professional organizations (formal coalitions) or are involved in outreach or coalition building with allies in other dual language programs (informal coalitions).</p>	<p>Some individual staff members belong to professional organizations (formal coalitions) or are sporadically involved in outreach or coalition building with allies in other dual language programs in the district or state (informal coalitions), but the efforts are uncoordinated and unsystematic.</p>	<p>Many staff members belong to state or national professional organizations (formal coalitions) and are regularly involved in outreach or coalition building with allies in other dual language programs in the district or state (informal coalitions) in a coordinated and systematic way. Participation in coalitions is supported by program resources.</p>	<p>Many staff members belong to state or national professional organizations (formal coalitions) and are regularly involved in outreach or coalition building with allies in other dual language programs in the district, state, or nation (informal coalitions) in a coordinated and systematic way. Participation in coalitions is supported by program and district resources. Coalition goals are regularly reviewed and updated to ensure that they continue to be aligned with dual language program needs.</p>
<p>Key Point D The program advocates for funding based on its needs.</p>			
<p>Minimal alignment</p>	<p>Partial alignment</p>	<p>Full alignment</p>	<p>Exemplary practice</p>
<p>The program rarely communicates its needs to the district or state and makes do with the resources originally allocated by the district.</p>	<p>The program occasionally communicates its needs to the district or state but in an uncoordinated and unsystematic way.</p>	<p>The program regularly and systematically communicates its needs to the district and the state, and also actively pursues external funding from foundations and the federal government as well as internal fundraisers to meet program goals and expand its scope (e.g., articulation from preK through Grade 12, increasing the number of classes per grade level).</p>	<p>The program regularly and systematically communicates its needs to the district and the state, and also actively pursues external funding from foundations and the federal government as well as internal fundraisers to meet program goals and expand its scope (e.g., articulation from preK through Grade 12, increasing the number of classes per grade level). There is a process in place to regularly review funding requests, proposals, and initiatives to determine their efficacy and make adjustments as needed.</p>



Appendixes

A

Templates for Self-Evaluation Data Collection and Scoring

After reading through this publication, you should have a clear understanding of the guiding principles for dual language education, the research and practice base that support them, the key points that comprise them, and the indicators that describe minimal, partial, full, and exemplary alignment with each key point. To help you use this document as a tool for self-reflection, we are providing a set of blank templates for each of the principles. You are encouraged to photocopy the templates and use them to document evidence of your program's level of implementation for each principle and key point, to compare the varying perspectives of stakeholders on your current level of implementation, and to identify current strengths of your program and areas in need of improvement.

To undertake this process, you will likely want to convene a group of stakeholders that includes parents, community members, teachers, administrators, support staff, and perhaps students from the upper grades in order to ensure that you are making an informed assessment for each area. You may want to assess your current status in all of the domains, or you may find it most helpful to focus on one or two strands and investigate them in depth. For example, recently established programs or those that are expanding may want to focus on program structure, while stable, veteran programs might prefer a focus on assessment and accountability or staff quality. You can also use the templates to monitor changes in your program over time and to assess the extent to which you have addressed and made progress in areas identified as needing improvement.

STRAND 1: PROGRAM STRUCTURE

Principle 1					
All aspects of the program work together to achieve the three core goals of dual language education: grade-level academic achievement, bilingualism and biliteracy, and sociocultural competence.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A The program design is aligned with program mission and goals.					
Key Point B The development of bilingualism and biliteracy is part of the program design.					
Key Point C The development of sociocultural competence is part of the program design.					
Key Point D Appropriate grade-level academic expectations are clearly identified in the program design.					
Key Point E The program is articulated across grades.					
Key Point F There is deliberate planning and coordination of curriculum, instruction, and assessment across the two languages of instruction.					
Principle 2					
The program ensures equity for all groups.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A All students and staff have appropriate access to resources.					
Key Point B The program promotes linguistic equity.					
Key Point C The program promotes cultural equity.					
Key Point D High-quality instruction in both program languages is provided to all students in all grades in a way that is consistent with the program model.					

M: Minimal alignment **P:** Partial alignment **F:** Full alignment **E:** Exemplary practice

Principle 3 The program has strong, effective, and knowledgeable leadership.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A The program has robust, shared leadership.					
Key Point B Decision-making is aligned to the program mission and includes communication with stakeholders.					
Key Point C Leaders are advocates for the program.					
Principle 4 An effective process is in place for continual program planning, implementation, and evaluation.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A The program is adaptable and engages in ongoing self-reflection and evaluation to promote continual improvement.					
Key Point B There is a clear preK–12 pathway for students in the program.					

M: Minimal alignment **P:** Partial alignment **F:** Full alignment **E:** Exemplary practice

STRAND 2: CURRICULUM

Principle 1 The program has a process for developing and revising a high-quality curriculum.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A There is a curriculum development and implementation plan.					
Key Point B The curriculum is based on general education research and research on bilingual learners.					
Key Point C The curriculum is adaptable to student, program, and community needs.					
Key Point D The curriculum is coordinated with support services such as English as a second language, Spanish as a second language, special education, Title I, and gifted & talented.					
Key Point E The curriculum is coordinated within and across grade levels.					
Principle 2 The curriculum is standards-based and promotes attainment of the three core goals of dual language education.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A The curriculum in both languages of instruction meets or exceeds district, state, or national content standards.					
Key Point B The curriculum includes a standards-based scope and sequence for language and literacy development in English and the partner language for all students.					
Key Point C The curriculum promotes and maintains equal status of both languages.					
Key Point D The curriculum promotes appreciation of multiculturalism and linguistic diversity.					
Key Point E The curriculum is culturally responsive and representative of the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of all students.					

Key Point F The curriculum articulates measurable learning outcomes.					
Principle 3 The curriculum effectively integrates technology to deepen and enhance learning.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A The curriculum effectively incorporates technology to enhance the available instructional resources in both languages.					
Key Point B The curriculum effectively integrates technology tools to meet district, state, and national content standards in both program languages.					

M: Minimal alignment **P:** Partial alignment **F:** Full alignment **E:** Exemplary practice

STRAND 3: INSTRUCTION

Principle 1 Instructional methods are derived from research-based principles of dual language education and ensure fidelity to the model.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A The program model and corresponding curriculum are implemented with fidelity.					
Key Point B Instruction incorporates appropriate separation of languages to promote high levels of language acquisition.					
Key Point C Standards-based academic content instruction is provided in both program languages in a coordinated way.					
Key Point D Explicit language arts instruction is provided in both program languages, is based on language-specific standards, and is coordinated across languages to ensure biliteracy development.					
Key Point E Instruction that promotes sociocultural competence is provided in both program languages in a coordinated way.					
Key Point F Teachers who provide support services (e.g., special education, gifted education, ESL) and specials (e.g., art, music) align their instruction with the dual language model.					
Key Point G When delivering instruction, teachers take into consideration the varying needs of students with different language learner profiles (e.g., native speakers, second language learners, new arrivals, students who are already bilingual in English and the partner language).					
Principle 2 Instructional strategies support the attainment of the three core goals of dual language education.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A Teachers integrate language and content instruction.					
Key Point B Teachers use sheltered instruction and other pedagogical strategies for bilingual learners to facilitate comprehension and promote language and literacy development.					

Key Point C Instruction in one language builds on concepts learned in the other language.					
Key Point D Instruction promotes metalinguistic awareness and metacognitive skills.					
Key Point E Instruction leverages students' bilingualism by strategically incorporating cross-linguistic strategies.					
Key Point F Instruction promotes an awareness of language variation.					
Key Point G Teachers use a variety of strategies to ensure equitable participation among all students.					
Key Point H Teachers use a variety of strategies to promote the sociocultural competence of all students.					
Principle 3 Instruction is student-centered.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A Teachers use active learning strategies in order to meet the needs of diverse learners.					
Key Point B Teachers create meaningful opportunities for sustained language use.					
Key Point C Student grouping maximizes opportunities for students to benefit from peer models.					
Key Point D Instructional strategies build independence and ownership of the learning process.					
Principle 4 Instructional staff effectively integrate technology to deepen and enhance the learning process.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A Instructional staff use technology tools to engage all learners.					
Key Point B Students use technology to display their understanding of content and to further develop their language and literacy skills in both program languages.					

M: Minimal alignment **P:** Partial alignment **F:** Full alignment **E:** Exemplary practice

STRAND 4: ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Principle 1 The program creates and maintains an infrastructure that supports an assessment and accountability process.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A There is a comprehensive data management system for tracking student data over time.					
Key Point B Assessment and accountability action plans are developed and used to inform all aspects of the program.					
Key Point C Personnel are assigned to assessment and accountability activities.					
Key Point D Staff are provided ongoing professional development opportunities in assessment and accountability.					
Key Point E The program has an adequate budget for assessment and accountability.					
Principle 2 Student assessment is aligned with program goals and with state content and language standards, and the results are used to guide and inform instruction.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A Student assessment is aligned with program goals, instructional objectives, and language and literacy standards for both languages of instruction.					
Key Point B Formative and summative assessment data inform curriculum development and instructional practices.					
Key Point C Formative and summative assessments are valid and reliable for bilingual learners.					
Key Point D Referrals for individualized education plans (IEPs) are made on the basis of assessment in both program languages.					

Principle 3					
Using multiple measures in both languages of instruction, the program collects and analyzes a variety of data that are used for program accountability, program evaluation, and program improvement.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A The program systematically collects and analyzes data to determine whether academic, linguistic, and sociocultural goals have been met.					
Key Point B The program engages in ongoing evaluation.					
Key Point C Assessment data are integrated into planning related to ongoing program improvement.					
Key Point D The program systematically collects demographic data (e.g., home language, English learner status, eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch) from program participants that allow for disaggregated data analysis in order to effectively monitor and serve different student subgroups.					
Key Point E Assessment is consistently conducted in the two languages of the program.					
Principle 4					
Student progress toward program goals and state achievement objectives is systematically measured and reported.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A Progress is documented in both program languages for the three core goals of dual language education.					
Key Point B Student progress is measured on a variety of indicators.					
Key Point C Achievement data are disaggregated by student and program variables (e.g., home language, English learner status, eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch).					
Key Point D Statistics on retention rates and placement in special education and gifted & talented classes are monitored to ensure equitable representation among subgroups.					

Principle 5

The program communicates with appropriate stakeholders about program outcomes.

Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A Data are communicated publicly in transparent ways that prevent misinterpretations.					
Key Point B Data are communicated to stakeholders.					
Key Point C Data are used to educate and mobilize supporters.					

M: Minimal alignment **P:** Partial alignment **F:** Full alignment **E:** Exemplary practice

STRAND 5: STAFF QUALITY AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Principle 1 The program recruits and retains high-quality dual language staff.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A There is a teacher recruitment and retention plan that is aligned with program goals and long-term needs.					
Key Point B Selection of new instructional, administrative, and support staff is based on credentials, language proficiency, and demonstrated commitment to program goals.					
Key Point C There is a positive workplace climate and all staff are valued and appropriately supported in carrying out their work.					
Key Point D Staff evaluations are performed by personnel who are knowledgeable about and committed to dual language education.					
Principle 2 The program provides high-quality professional development that is tailored to the needs of dual language educators and support staff.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A There is a long-term professional development plan that is comprehensive, inclusive, and differentiated.					
Key Point B Approaches to professional development respect individual interests and learning styles and foster autonomy and ownership of the learning process.					
Key Point C Professional development is aligned with competencies needed to meet dual language program standards.					
Key Point D All staff are given opportunities to develop dual language advocacy skills.					
Key Point E There is an infrastructure to support professional development that includes adequate funding, time, and human resources.					

Principle 3

The program collaborates with other groups and institutions to ensure staff quality.

Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A The program has a partnership with one or more teacher or administrator preparation programs.					
Key Point B Program staff partner with professional organizations.					
Key Point C Program staff engage in dual language program networking.					

M: Minimal alignment **P:** Partial alignment **F:** Full alignment **E:** Exemplary practice

STRAND 6: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY

Principle 1 The program has a responsive infrastructure for positive, active, and ongoing relations with students' families and the community.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A There is a staff member designated as a family liaison.					
Key Point B Office staff members are bilingual and demonstrate sociocultural competence to effectively serve all families.					
Key Point C Professional development addresses the importance of equity, access, and social justice for effective outreach with families and the community.					
Key Point D There is a positive school climate and all families are valued and welcomed into the school community.					
Principle 2 The program promotes family and community engagement and advocacy through outreach activities and support services that are aligned with the three core goals of dual language education.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A The program incorporates ongoing learning activities that are designed to help families understand, support, and advocate for the program.					
Key Point B The program actively refers families to resources in the community.					
Key Point C The program plans for and engages in community-building activities with families to promote close relationships, collaboration, and other forms of sociocultural competence.					
Key Point D Communication with families and the community is in the appropriate language.					
Key Point E The program partners with families to promote home-school connections.					

Principle 3

The program views and involves families and community members as strategic partners.

Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A The program establishes an advisory structure for input from family members and community members.					
Key Point B The program capitalizes on the varied linguistic and cultural resources in the community.					
Key Point C The program welcomes and accommodates varying forms of family support, taking into consideration the talents and schedules of various family and community members.					

M: Minimal alignment **P:** Partial alignment **F:** Full alignment **E:** Exemplary practice

STRAND 7: SUPPORT AND RESOURCES

Principle 1 The program is supported by all key stakeholders.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A Program and district administrators have adequate knowledge to support and lead the program.					
Key Point B Instructional and support staff have adequate knowledge to support and lead the program.					
Key Point C Families and community members have adequate knowledge to support and advocate for the program.					
Principle 2 The program is equitably and adequately funded to meet program goals.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A The dual language program has equitable access to school, district, and state resources.					
Key Point B Funding allocations within the program budget are aligned with program goals.					
Key Point C Funding provides sufficient staff, equipment, and materials in both program languages to meet program goals.					
Principle 3 The program advocates for support.					
Key Points	Comments	M	P	F	E
Key Point A The program seeks the tangible support of the state, district, and local community.					
Key Point B The program engages in public relations activities to promote the program to a variety of audiences.					
Key Point C Program staff actively participate in formal and informal coalitions to strengthen support for dual language education.					
Key Point D The program advocates for funding based on its needs.					

M: Minimal alignment **P:** Partial alignment **F:** Full alignment **E:** Exemplary practice

B

Guiding Principles at a Glance

The chart on the following page lists all of the guiding principles on a single sheet. The idea for this Guiding Principles at a Glance chart came from dual language practitioners and professional developers who had created their own one-page versions of the principles to use as a handy reference tool. The authors extend their thanks to those whose work inspired the inclusion of a one-page Guiding Principles at a Glance chart in this volume.

Readers are encouraged to copy this chart for their individual use as a ready reference tool and to share copies with others who may find it useful. It may be particularly useful to share with stakeholders such as superintendents and other district-level personnel.

STRAND 1	PROGRAM STRUCTURE
Principle 1	All aspects of the program work together to achieve the three core goals of dual language education: grade-level academic achievement, bilingualism and biliteracy, and sociocultural competence.
Principle 2	The program ensures equity for all groups.
Principle 3	The program has strong, effective, and knowledgeable leadership.
Principle 4	An effective process is in place for continual program-planning, implementation, and evaluation.
STRAND 2	CURRICULUM
Principle 1	The program has a process for developing and revising a high-quality curriculum.
Principle 2	The curriculum is standards-based and promotes attainment of the three core goals of dual language education.
Principle 3	The curriculum effectively integrates technology to deepen and enhance learning.
STRAND 3	INSTRUCTION
Principle 1	Instructional methods are derived from research-based principles of dual language education and ensure fidelity to the model.
Principle 2	Instructional strategies support the attainment of the three core goals of dual language education.
Principle 3	Instruction is student-centered.
Principle 4	Instructional staff effectively integrate technology to deepen and enhance the learning process.
STRAND 4	ASSESSMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY
Principle 1	The program creates and maintains an infrastructure that supports an assessment and accountability process.
Principle 2	Student assessment is aligned with program goals and with state content and language standards, and the results are used to guide and inform instruction.
Principle 3	Using multiple measures in both languages of instruction, the program collects and analyzes a variety of data that are used for program accountability, program evaluation, and program improvement.
Principle 4	Student progress toward program goals and state achievement objectives is systematically measured and reported.
Principle 5	The program communicates with appropriate stakeholders about program outcomes.
STRAND 5	STAFF QUALITY & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Principle 1	The program recruits and retains high-quality dual language staff.
Principle 2	The program provides high-quality professional development that is tailored to the needs of dual language educators and support staff.
Principle 3	The program collaborates with other groups and institutions to ensure staff quality.
STRAND 6	FAMILY & COMMUNITY
Principle 1	The program has a responsive infrastructure for positive, active, and ongoing relations with students' families and the community.
Principle 2	The program promotes family and community engagement and advocacy through outreach activities and support services that are aligned with the three core goals of dual language education.
Principle 3	The program views and involves families and community members as strategic partners.
STRAND 7	SUPPORT & RESOURCES
Principle 1	The program is supported by all key stakeholders.
Principle 2	The program is equitably and adequately funded to meet program goals.
Principle 3	The program advocates for support.



About the Authors

Elizabeth R. Howard is an associate professor of bilingual education in the Neag School of Education at the University of Connecticut, where she teaches graduate courses on linguistic and cultural diversity and conducts research focusing on dual language education, biliteracy development, and the preparation of teachers to work with multilingual learners. Her books include *Realizing the Vision of Two-Way Immersion: Fostering Effective Programs and Classrooms* and *Preparing Classroom Teachers to Succeed With Second Language Learners*. Previously, she worked as a senior research associate at the Center for Applied Linguistics and as a bilingual teacher in California and Costa Rica.

Kathryn J. Lindholm-Leary is professor emerita of child and adolescent development at San Jose State University, where she taught for 30 years. She has worked with over 75 two-way and developmental bilingual programs from preK through Grade 12, written many books and journal articles, and given presentations to researchers, educators, and parents on dual language education and child bilingualism. More recently, she worked with the National Academy of Sciences on their report on the development of English/dual language learners.

David Rogers is the executive director for Dual Language Education of New Mexico (DLENM), where he oversees business development, human resource, and advocacy activities to realize DLENM's mission of supporting the effective design and implementation of dual language programs across the United States. Before co-founding DLENM, he spent many years as a dual language teacher, program coordinator, and school principal. His interest in bilingual education was sparked by his 4 years with the Peace Corps in Paraguay, where he taught school in Spanish to students whose native language was Guarani.

Natalie Olague is an instructional coach at Valle Vista Elementary School in Albuquerque Public Schools. She co-wrote the Title VII grant for Valle Vista to start its dual language program 18 years ago and has been a dual language practitioner ever since. She has also worked with Dual Language Education of New Mexico as a professional development coordinator, helping dual language educators improve their program design and implementation. More recently, she has become a certified trainer for Project GLAD (Guided Language Acquisition Design).

José Medina presently serves as acting associate director of the Language and Culture Division at the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL). He is also director of dual language at CAL, providing professional development and job-embedded support to educators serving emergent bilingual students. Prior to joining CAL, José was a director of dual language and ESL education and a dual language school principal in Texas. In over two decades as an educator, he has served as a teacher and administrator at the elementary, middle, and high school levels.

Barbara Kennedy is director of dual language and bilingual education sponsored projects at the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington, DC, where she leads program evaluations and technical assistance projects. Her dissertation, *A Qualitative Case Study of the Bilingual Teacher Shortage in One Texas School District*, earned a 2015 NABE Dissertation Award. She has forthcoming publications on the bilingual teacher shortage and on teacher preparation for dual language classrooms.

Julie Sugarman is a policy analyst at the Migration Policy Institute's National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy, where she focuses on issues related to immigrant and English learner students in elementary and secondary schools. Her areas of focus include state- and district-level policies that support effective programs for newcomer students and helping advocates understand key education policy issues. Previously, she was a senior research associate at the Center for Applied Linguistics, where she specialized in the evaluation of educational programs for language learners and in dual language/two-way immersion programs.

Donna Christian is a senior fellow at the Center for Applied Linguistics, where she previously served as president for 16 years. For over 30 years, she has been involved in research, professional development, and technical assistance related to two-way dual language education. She has authored and edited numerous books and journal articles on topics in linguistics and education, including a special issue of the *International Multilingual Research Journal* on dual language education in 2016.



About the Co-publishers

The three organizations described below are proud to collaborate on the publication of the third edition of *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education*. We invite you to visit the website of each organization to learn more about our work and resources. We also encourage you to visit the website of the National Dual Language Forum, which serves as a portal to information and resources from a growing cadre of organizations dedicated to dual language education.



CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS

The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) is a private, nonprofit organization founded in 1959. Headquartered in Washington, DC, CAL has earned an international reputation for its contributions to the education of linguistically and culturally diverse adults and children.

CAL's mission is to promote language learning and cultural understanding by serving as a trusted source for research, services, resources, and policy analysis. Through its work, CAL seeks solutions to issues involving language and culture as they relate to access and equity in education and society around the globe.

CAL specializes in connecting research to practice through its suite of valid and reliable assessments and its research-based professional development and technical assistance services. CAL's services are available face-to-face, online, or via a hybrid model designed to best meet client needs.

Visit www.cal.org to learn more.



DUAL LANGUAGE EDUCATION OF NEW MEXICO

Dual Language Education of New Mexico (DLeNM) is an educational nonprofit serving the professional and informational needs of dual language communities in New Mexico and beyond.

La misión de DLeNM es desarrollar, apoyar y abogar por una educación de lenguaje dual de la más alta calidad en Nuevo México y por los Estados Unidos.

DLeNM works with school communities to develop the linguistic and sociocultural capital of our students and families to ensure a future bilingual, multicultural citizenry that can effectively contribute and compete in local and world communities.

DLeNM offers a variety of high-quality program and professional development opportunities that focus on building instructional and leadership capacity to ensure effective design, implementation, and sustainability of dual language education programs at the school and district levels.

Each November, DLeNM convenes the annual La Cosecha conference where educators, students, parents, researchers, and other supporters convene to share promising practice and work to strengthen and expand K–12 dual language education.

Visit www.dlenm.org to learn more.



Santillana USA, based in Miami, Florida, is one of 22 subsidiaries of Grupo Santillana, the largest educational publisher in the Spanish-speaking world. Santillana offices throughout Europe and Latin America collaborate to offer the very best culture and creativity from the Hispanic world. Santillana's international presence has strengthened its expertise in and dedication to second language education.

Santillana USA's mission is to make learning and teaching English and Spanish an experience that is motivating, enriching, and effective for both teachers and students. In a collaborative effort with authors, editors, teachers, and students, Santillana USA creates instructional materials that meet the needs of modern-day students throughout the United States.

Santillana is dedicated to the diffusion of Spanish and English by offering quality second language instructional materials and children's literature for K–12 education. As part of its commitment to the educational community, Santillana USA offers educators professional development services through the Santillana PD division.

Visit <http://www.santillanausa.com/> to learn more.



The Center for Applied Linguistics, Dual Language Education of New Mexico, and Santillana USA are proud members of the National Dual Language Forum (NDLF). The mission of the NDLF is to promote the benefits of dual language education and foster collaboration among key organizations and individuals dedicated to dual language and bilingual education across the country.

The NDLF has two distinct activities: (1) hosting a dedicated website of information and resources and (2) convening experts to develop and present white papers at member conferences on important issues around dual language and bilingual education.

The NDLF website includes links to a wide range of resources from member organizations, including links to CAL's updated Dual Language Program Directory and to directories from other organizations tracking dual language programs across the country.

Visit www.cal.org/ndlf to learn more.

The third edition of *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* has been updated by a broad range of experts to reflect new knowledge, practices, and policies in the arena of dual language education. Designed for educators, researchers, policymakers, and all who are interested in effective dual language education, the new edition of this widely used resource includes enhancements to the principles that reflect learning from research and practice, updated literature reviews, and revised templates for program self-evaluation.

In the age of “self-help” and “how-to” resources, *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* should be the *obra principal* for dual language educators. Including detailed information about how to begin, refine, expand, and evaluate dual language programs utilizing 21st century theories and research, this comprehensive text is also practical and concrete. It can help dual language educators make informed decisions about how to build and implement the kind of dual language programs we covet for our children and grandchildren.

KATHY ESCAMILLA,
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
BOULDER

The third edition of *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* is must reading for anyone interested in dual language education. It provides a comprehensive and accessible discussion of current thinking about dual language teaching and learning based on up-to-date reviews of relevant research along with professional insights and experiences accumulated in the 10 years since the last edition. *Guiding Principles* provides practical guidance on what it takes to implement effective programs that enhance all students’ bilingual, academic, and sociocultural competencies.

FRED GENESEE, MCGILL
UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL,
QUEBEC

The revised *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* provides a vital roadmap for new program implementation as well as a refinement tool for established programs. The clear and concise format of the third edition highlights the most recent research and presents the “why” of crucial language development practices. This guide will help educators create an inclusive and engaging learning environment that has the potential to close the achievement gap and promote high academic success for all learners.

NICOLETTE GRANT, PRE-K-5
LEARNING AND TEACHING,
CHARLOTTE, NC

ISBN 978-0-87281-130-0



9 780872 811300