

Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education



Elizabeth R. Howard, Julie Sugarman, Donna Christian
Center for Applied Linguistics

Kathryn J. Lindholm-Leary
San José State University

David Rogers
Dual Language Education of New Mexico

Second Edition



Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education

Second Edition

*Elizabeth R. Howard, Julie Sugarman, Donna Christian
Center for Applied Linguistics*

*Kathryn J. Lindholm-Leary
San José State University*

*David Rogers
Dual Language Education of New Mexico*

© 2007 by the Center for Applied Linguistics. All rights reserved.

Prepared by the Center for Applied Linguistics
with support from the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition at
The George Washington University
Washington, DC

The contents of this document were prepared by the authors 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 you should not assume endorsement by the federal government.

Suggested APA citation:

Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., Christian, D., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Rogers, D. (2007). *Guiding principles for dual language education* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

This document and supporting materials can be accessed at www.cal.org/twi/guidingprinciples.htm.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|------------|
| Acknowledgments | iv |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Effective Features of Dual Language Education Programs: A Review of Research and Best Practices | 5 |
| Methods for Selecting the Literature..... | 6 |
| Strand 1: Assessment and Accountability | 8 |
| Strand 2: Curriculum | 10 |
| Strand 3: Instruction | 12 |
| Strand 4: Staff Quality and Professional Development | 18 |
| Strand 5: Program Structure | 23 |
| Strand 6: Family and Community | 36 |
| Strand 7: Support and Resources..... | 38 |
| Conclusions..... | 40 |
| References..... | 41 |
| Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education | 51 |
| Strand 1: Assessment and Accountability | 52 |
| Strand 2: Curriculum | 62 |
| Strand 3: Instruction | 68 |
| Strand 4: Staff Quality and Professional Development | 76 |
| Strand 5: Program Structure | 83 |
| Strand 6: Family and Community | 91 |
| Strand 7: Support and Resources..... | 95 |
| Appendix: Rating Templates | 101 |

Acknowledgments

The individuals involved in the development of this document are listed below. In addition to these individuals, the authors are very grateful to those who provided support for the project, particularly those involved in the development of the New Mexico Dual Language Standards, as they provided a strong point of departure for this document. We want to thank Marcia Vargas of 2-Way CABE, who very generously provided meeting time and space to discuss the principles during the 2003 Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Program Summer Conference.

We are also grateful to Liz Peterson and Leo Vizcarra of the Center for Applied Linguistics and Vincent Sagart of Sagart Design for their support during the preparation of the first edition, and to Susan Gilson, Hanta Ralay, and Jeannie Rennie of the Center for Applied Linguistics for their help with the second edition.

ADVISORY PANEL

Mary Cazabon, Cambridge, MA, Public Schools
Ester de Jong, University of Florida
Bernadette Ellis, Albuquerque, NM, Public Schools
Else Hamayan, Illinois Resource Center
Linda Hardman, South Bay Union School District, CA
Nancy Nichols, Houston, TX, Independent School District
Marleny Perdomo, Arlington, VA, Public Schools
Delia Pompea, National Association for Bilingual Education

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Rosa Molina, San José, CA, Public Schools
Natalie Olague, Albuquerque, NM, Public Schools
Craig Merrill, University of California, Los Angeles

NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Kris Anstrom
Nancy Zelasko
Minerva Gorena

OFFICE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Kathleen Leos
Tim D'Emilio

The following document is designed to be used by dual language programs as a tool for planning, self-reflection, and growth. The guiding principles described here are based in large part on the Dual Language Program Standards developed by Dual Language Education of New Mexico (www.dlenm.org).

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 multicultural competence for all students. The student population in such a program can vary, resulting in models such as these:

- Developmental bilingual programs, where all students are native speakers of the partner language, such as Spanish
- Two-way immersion programs, where approximately half of the students are native speakers of the partner language and approximately half of the students are native speakers of English
- Foreign language immersion programs, where all of the students are native speakers of English, though some may be heritage language learners

However, it is important to note that foreign language immersion educators and researchers were not involved in the development of the principles. Thus, while the principles are likely to apply in general to all three program types, the applicability to foreign language immersion programs has not yet been fully explored.

It is also important to note that the principles target elementary school programs. While there is evidence of growth in the number of dual language programs at the secondary level, the majority of programs to date function at the elementary level. Secondary programs may find this document useful, but may need to adapt some of the guiding principles to fit their situation.

Like all educational programs, dual language programs today are strongly influenced by the provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, U.S. Department of Education, 2001). The key components of this legislation were taken into consideration during the creation of this document. The *Guiding Principles* reflect NCLB requirements such as annual achievement objectives for all students, including English language learners; annual testing of all students in Grades 3 through 8; alignment of curriculum with state standards; research-based teaching practices; whole-school reform driven by student outcome data; and whole-staff commitment to the continuous improvement of student outcomes. By helping English language learners and native English speakers achieve high standards in English and another language, dual language programs can be an effective tool for schools and districts seeking to achieve NCLB goals. However, programs should ensure that all federal, state, and local policies and regulations are considered in their planning process and should not rely on the principles in this publication as the final word.

The *Guiding Principles* are organized into seven strands, reflecting the major dimensions of program planning and implementation:

- Assessment and Accountability
- Curriculum
- Instruction
- Staff Quality and Professional Development
- Program Structure
- Family and Community
- Support and Resources

Each strand is then composed of a number of guiding principles, which, in turn, have one or more key points associated with them. 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 in the Assessment and Accountability strand deals with the need for an infrastructure to support the accountability process. This principle contains key points that relate to such dimensions as the creation of a data management system to track student performance over time, the integration of assessment and accountability into curriculum and program planning, the need for ongoing professional development regarding assessment and accountability, and other relevant features.

In order to make this document useful for reflection and planning, each key point within the principles includes progress indicators—descriptions of four possible levels of alignment with that key point: minimal alignment, partial alignment, full alignment, and exemplary practice. For example, the key point on the need for a data management system, mentioned above, has the following indicators:

- Minimal alignment: No data management system exists for tracking student data over time.
- Partial alignment: A data management system exists for tracking student data over time, but it is only partially developed or is not well used.
- Full alignment: A comprehensive data management system has been developed and is used for tracking student demographic and performance data as long as students are in the program.
- Exemplary practice: A comprehensive data management system has been developed and is used for tracking student demographic data and data on multiple measures of performance for the students' entire K–12 school attendance in the district.

The 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. In the tables of principles, the indicators of full alignment are shaded. By

following the shaded column across principles, the characteristics of programs that adhere to the principles can be easily traced.

As readers work through the guiding principles, a fair amount of repetition will be noticeable. This repetition is intentional, as our goal is to allow each strand to be comprehensive in its own right, allowing a program to work with all guiding principles, a select strand, or a group of strands at a time.

The appendix of this publication contains blank templates that can be used as a tool for self-reflection. Programs are encouraged to copy the templates and fill them in on a periodic basis in order to chart their progress on moving toward adherence to the principles.

The guiding principles, as noted above, are grounded in evidence from research and best practices. Hence, this publication begins with a review of the literature on research and best practices in dual language education by Kathryn Lindholm-Leary. Each section of the literature review corresponds to one strand of the guiding principles.



Effective Features of Dual Language Education Programs: A Review of Research and Best Practices

Kathryn J. Lindholm-Leary

There is a considerable amount of scientifically based and sound research on the education of English language learners. This research should be examined in discussions of programs, instructional approaches and strategies, assessment, professional development, and literacy instruction appropriate for the education of linguistically diverse students (see Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006). In particular, a substantial body of literature has been created about school or program effectiveness in regular mainstream education and in various types of dual language programs. Effective programs are defined as programs that are successful in promoting academic achievement or other academic outcomes (e.g., language proficiency, school attendance, motivation). This review includes all relevant reporting of research and studies that would inform dual language programs; that is, it reviews research on effective schools, studies of particularly effective schools that serve at-risk or low-performing students and English language learners, and studies of effective dual language or other bilingual programs.

Most of this review is based on research focusing on the characteristics of programs or schools that are considered effective in promoting the language proficiency and academic achievement of English language learners. The review also includes research and program evaluations that have linked certain features, such as teacher quality or professional development, to higher student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Doherty, Hilberg, Pinal, & Tharp, 2003; Wenglinsky, 2000; Willig, 1985). Also included in the review are data obtained from one focus group meeting that was held with experts in dual language education. This panel of experts consisted of experienced classroom teachers, resource teachers, program coordinators, principals, district administrators, and researchers. Some of the panelists were also parents of students in dual language programs. Further sources include articles published in peer-reviewed journals, research-based reviews of literature, studies written in published chapters and books, and reports prepared for the U.S. Department of Education.

There is tremendous consistency between the factors that define exemplary dual language programs and practices that are found in effective mainstream schools, although different labels may be used. For example, Marzano (2003) categorizes features according to school-level factors (e.g., collegiality and professionalism, viable curriculum, parent involvement), student-level factors (e.g., background knowledge, home environment), and teacher-level factors (e.g., instructional strategies, classroom curriculum design). Though Corallo and McDonald (2002) present some of the same characteristics, they talk about “collegiality” and “professionalism” with respect to what Marzano would call teacher-level factors. This review will categorize the characteristics in a way that seems appropriate for dual language education programs, but the particular way of labeling the features is not as important as the features themselves.

An examination of the investigations reviewed here points to a set of consistent factors that tend to contribute to successful student outcomes in schools in general and dual language education programs in particular. The importance of these factors is evident from the frequency and consistency with which they are found in programs that produce successful student outcomes. In this review, these factors are organized into seven categories: assessment and accountability, curriculum, instructional practices, staff quality and professional development, program structure, family and community involvement, and support and resources.

One point that was made by the panel of experts in the focus group meeting for this review and that is important in understanding and implementing the guiding principles is that context is an important lens through which to understand 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 (Christian, Montone, Lindholm, & Carranza, 1997). Program administrators must keep context in mind as they think about the design, implementation, or refinement of their own program.

One of the tenets of the standards-based reform movement is that all children, including English language learners (ELLs), are expected to attain high standards. In particular, Title I of the Improving America's Schools Act (U.S. Department of Education, 1994) mandates that assessments that determine the yearly performance of each school must provide for the inclusion of ELLs. In addition, the No Child Left Behind Act (U.S. Department of Education, 2001) establishes annual achievement objectives for ELLs and enforces accountability requirements. The rationale for including these students in high-stakes tests is to hold them to the same high standards as their peers and to ensure that their needs are not overlooked (Coltrane, 2002).

Most research on effective schools, including effective bilingual and dual language programs, discusses the important role of assessment and accountability. A substantial number of studies have converged on the significance of using student achievement data to shape and/or monitor their instructional program (August & Hakuta, 1997; Berman, Minicucci, McLaughlin, Nelson, & Woodworth, 1995; Corallo & McDonald, 2002; Reyes, Scribner, & Paredes Scribner, 1999; Slavin & Calderón, 2001). Effective schools use assessment measures that are aligned with the school's vision and goals and with appropriate curriculum and related standards (Lindholm-Leary & Molina, 2000; Montecel & Cortez, 2002). Dual language programs require the use of multiple measures in both languages to assess students' progress toward meeting bilingual and biliteracy goals along with the curricular and content-related goals. Solano-Flores and Trumbull (2003) argue that new research and assessment practices need to be developed that include providing the same items in English and the native language, and that this will lead to more valid and reliable assessment outcomes. Further, studies show that it is important to disaggregate the data to identify and solve issues of curriculum, assessment, and instructional alignment (Corallo & McDonald, 2002; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; U.S. Department of Education, 1998; WestEd, 2000) and for accountability purposes (U.S. Department of Education, 2001).

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 interpret data appropriately, they must receive professional development that is focused on assessment, including the interpretation of data (Levine & Lezotte, 1995; Montecel & Cortez, 2002). 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. According to Lindholm-Leary and Hargett (2007), this requires the development of an infrastructure that ensures that

- assessment is carried out in consistent and systematic ways and is aligned with appropriate standards and goals;

- assessment outcomes are interpreted correctly and disseminated to appropriate constituents; and
- 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 multicultural competence.

Effective Features of Assessment and Accountability

Assessment is

- *Used to shape and monitor program effectiveness*
- *Aligned with curriculum and appropriate standards*
- *Aligned with the vision and goals of the program*
- *Conducted in both of the languages used for instruction*
- *Used to track the progress of a variety of groups in the program over time using disaggregated data*
- *A topic for professional development for teachers and administrators*
- *Interpreted accurately*
- *Carried out in consistent and systematic ways*
- *Supported by an appropriate infrastructure and budget*
- *Disseminated to appropriate audiences*

Studies show that successful schools and programs have a curriculum that is clearly aligned with standards and assessment (Corallo & McDonald, 2002; Levine & Lezotte, 1995; Montecel & Cortez, 2002); is meaningful, academically challenging, and incorporates higher order thinking; and is thematically integrated (Berman et al., 1995; Doherty et al., 2003; Montecel & Cortez, 2002; Ramirez, 1992). Research on effective schools has also shown that successful outcomes result from a curriculum associated with an enriched (see Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000), not remedial, instructional model (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 2000; Montecel & Cortez, 2002). A high quality and enriching curriculum is critical in dual language programs, as Garcia and Gopal (2003) have pointed out that remedial programs have led to high failure rates on high school exit exams among English language learners.

Because of the vision and goals associated with bilingualism and biliteracy, language instruction is integrated within the curriculum (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, 1996; Cloud et al., 2000; Genesee, 1987; Short, 2002; Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 1997). Language objectives should be incorporated into the curriculum planning (Lyster, 1990, 1994, 1998) and language and literature should be developed across the curriculum (Doherty et al., 2003) to ensure that students learn the content as well as the academic language associated with the content. Further, since the vision and goals of dual language education also include multicultural competence and equity, the curriculum needs to reflect and value the students' cultures (Berman et al., 1995; Corallo & McDonald, 2002; Lucas, Henze, & Donato, 1990; Montecel & Cortez, 2002; Reyes et al., 1999).

As mentioned previously, a clear vertical and horizontal alignment in the curriculum is typically associated with effective programs (Corallo & McDonald, 2002; Education Trust, 1996; U.S. Department of Education, 1998). Guerrero and Sloan (2001), in looking at high-performing Spanish reading programs, noted that student performance was better when the Spanish (bilingual) and English (mainstream) reading programs were aligned with one set of literacy expectations for all students, regardless of the language of literacy instruction.

Bilingual books of many genres and a variety of types of materials (e.g., visual, audiovisual, art) are required to meet the goals of bilingualism and biliteracy (Montecel & Cortez, 2002). Also, effective programs integrate technology into curriculum and instruction (Berman et al., 1995; Castellano, Stringfield, & Stone, 2002) in both languages. Dixon (1995) reported that English language learners and native-English-speaking middle school students could work together effectively using computers in spatial visualization tasks. Further, in some of the exam tasks, English language learners who received instruction that integrated technology scored higher than students who experienced the traditional textbook approach, and their performance was equivalent to that of the English-proficient students.

Effective Features of Curriculum

The curriculum

- *Is aligned with standards and assessment*
- *Is meaningful and academically challenging and integrates higher order thinking*
- *Is thematically integrated*
- *Is enriching, not remedial*
- *Is aligned with the vision and goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, and multiculturalism, and includes language and literature across the curriculum*
- *Reflects and values students' cultures*
- *Is horizontally and vertically aligned*
- *Incorporates a variety of materials*
- *Integrates technology*

Good instruction is associated with higher student outcomes, regardless of the type of educational model that is used (Levine & Lezotte, 1995; Marzano, 2003; Wenglinsky, 2000). This is clearly evident in studies with English language learners and other high-risk students (Berman et al., 1995; Corallo & McDonald, 2002; Doherty et al., 2003; Echevarria, Short, & Powers, 2003; Goldenberg & Gallimore, 1991; Guerrero & Sloan, 2001; Ramirez, 1992). In fact, Wenglinsky (2000) found that features related to classroom practice had the strongest effect on eighth-grade math achievement, after taking into consideration students' social class. However, good instruction is even more complicated in dual language programs because of the added goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, and multicultural competence, and, in two-way immersion programs, because of the constant need to integrate and balance the needs of the two student groups. Thus it is even more important to use a variety of techniques that respond to different learning styles (Berman et al., 1995; Doherty et al., 2003; Guerrero & Sloan, 2001) and language proficiency levels (Berman et al., 1995; Echevarria et al., 2003; Montecel & Cortez, 2002).

Promotion of positive interactions between teachers and students is an important instructional objective (Levine & Lezotte, 1995). When teachers use positive social and instructional interactions equitably with both English language learners and native English speakers, both groups perform better academically (California State Department of Education, 1982; Doherty et al., 2003). In addition, research suggests that a reciprocal interaction model of teaching is more beneficial to students than the traditional teacher-centered transmission model of teaching (Cummins, 2000; Doherty et al., 2003; Tikunoff, 1983). The basic premise of the transmission model is that the teacher's task is to impart knowledge or skills to students who do not yet have them. In the reciprocal interaction approach, teachers participate in genuine dialogue with pupils and facilitate, rather than control, student learning. This model encourages the development of higher level cognitive skills rather than just factual recall (Berman et al., 1995; Cummins, 1986; Doherty et al., 2003; Wenglinsky, 2000) and is associated with higher student achievement in more effective schools (Levine & Lezotte, 1995).

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, 1994). Studies suggest that when ethnically and linguistically diverse students work interdependently on school tasks with common objectives, students' expectations and attitudes toward each other become more positive, and their academic achievement improves (Berman et al., 1995; Cohen, 1994; Johnson & Johnson, 1990; Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 1986; Qin, Johnson, & Johnson, 1995; Slavin, 1994). Also, language development is facilitated by extensive interactions among native and nonnative speakers (Long & Porter, 1985). However, in a review of the literature on the English language development of English language learners, Saunders and O'Brien (2006) reported that merely having these students interact or work in groups with English proficient students does not necessarily enhance language development. Rather, the authors 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 English proficient students in working with and promoting the language development of English language learners, and the language proficiency level of the English language learners.

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 activities, but the grouping may not follow the necessary preconditions for successful cooperative learning. Perhaps this is why the literature on effective schools does not point to any specific grouping arrangement that is particularly effective (Levine & Lezotte, 1995). 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 (Cohen & Lotan, 1995; Cohen, Lotan, Abram, Scarloss, & Schultz, 2002; Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 1986; Qin, Johnson, & Johnson, 1995; Slavin, 1994).

Language Input

Lindholm-Leary (2001) points out that optimal language input has four characteristics: it is adjusted to the comprehension level of the learner, it is interesting and relevant, there is sufficient quantity, and it is challenging. Providing optimal input requires careful planning in the integration of language instruction and subject matter presentation to ensure that English language learners have access to the core curriculum (Berman et al., 1995).

In the early stages of second language acquisition, input is made more comprehensible through use of the following:

- Slower, expanded, simplified, and repetitive speech oriented to the “here and now” (Krashen, 1981; Long, 1981)
- Highly contextualized language and gestures (Long, 1981; Saville-Troike, 1987)
- Comprehension and confirmation checks (Long, 1981)
- Communication that provides scaffolding for the negotiation of meaning by constraining possible interpretations of sequence, role, and intent (Saville-Troike, 1987)

A specific way to incorporate these features of language input into classroom instruction is through sheltered instruction. Echevarria and Short and their colleagues (e.g., Echevarria et al., 2003; Short, 2002; Short & Echevarria, 1999) 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 items 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. Sheltered techniques include

- 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

Echevarria et al. (2003) 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 language learners who had not been exposed to instruction via the SIOP Model. While this model was developed for use by ESL teachers with English language learners, the concepts are clearly applicable to second language development for all students.

Balanced with the need to make the second language more comprehensible is the necessity of providing stimulating language input (Kowal & Swain, 1997; Swain, 1987), particularly for the native speakers of each language (Valdés, 1997). There are two main reasons why students need stimulating language input. First, it facilitates continued development of language structures and skills. Second, when students are instructed in their first language, the content of their lessons becomes more comprehensible when similar content is later presented in the second language.

Immersion and other foreign language students often have difficulty producing native-like speech in the second language. Part of this difficulty stems from a lack of opportunity to speak with fluent speakers of the language they are learning. According to classroom research, immersion students get few opportunities to produce extended discourse in which they are forced to make their language coherent, accurate, and sociolinguistically appropriate (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Swain, 1985, 1987). This is even true in dual language programs in which teachers do not 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). It also requires a strong language policy in the classroom that encourages students to use the instructional language and discourages students from speaking the non-instructional language (Lindholm-Leary & Molina, 2000; personal communication, panel of experts, June 16, 2003).

Considerable controversy exists about the importance of explicit second language instruction in the process of second language learning (Long, 1983; Swain, 1987). Because many 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 simply learn the language through 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 (see Swain, 1987).

As some immersion researchers have discovered (e.g., Harley, 1984, 1986; Lyster, 1987; Swain, 1985; Swain & Lapkin, 1986), 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 utilize 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 subject matter, and conditional, future, and subjunctive tenses of verbs in mathematics and science content).

Monolingual lesson delivery (i.e., different periods of time devoted to instruction in and through each of the two languages) seems to be superior to designs that rely on language mixing during a single lesson or time frame (Dulay & Burt, 1978; Legaretta, 1979, 1981; Swain, 1983). This is not to say that language mixing itself is harmful; clearly, the sociolinguistic skill of language mixing or code switching is important in bilingual communities. Rather, it appears that sustained periods of monolingual instruction in each language help to promote adequate language development. Because teachers need to refrain from language switching, they must have high levels of academic language proficiency in the language they use for instruction. Teachers, instructional assistants, and others who help in the classroom should not translate for children. Some children in immersion programs have developed the strategy of looking confused when they have to respond in the second language because it results in some well-meaning adult translating for them. Instructors who react in this manner discourage students from developing listening strategies in the second language.

Balancing the Needs of Both Language Groups During Instruction

There is considerable variation in how the English time is used in 90:10 dual language programs. Unfortunately, not enough attention has been paid to English time in many school sites where it has been used only for assemblies, physical education, or other activities that do not provide a good basis for the development of academic language proficiency. It is important that teachers understand what language skills they need to cultivate at each grade level so that students develop the academic English language skills

necessary for literacy. This is particularly important for language minority students who do not receive literacy training in the home. This is one clear example that requires cross-grade coordination in planning, which will be described in Strand 5, Program Structure.

Heterogeneous or homogeneous grouping for literacy instruction also becomes a major consideration in two-way immersion programs, where native speakers and second language learners can be at very different levels of language proficiency. The argument in favor of heterogeneous grouping is that it is consistent with the remainder of the day, wherein students receive all of their instruction in heterogeneous groups and can serve as language models for each other. The counter argument, in favor of homogeneous grouping by language background, is that each group's needs can be better met, particularly providing second language learning activities and approaches for the language learners. There is no research suggesting that one grouping strategy is more effective than the other. However, in successful dual language programs, there is often a combination of strategies, including some times when students are separated by native language or proficiency and others when students are integrated (Howard & Sugarman, 2007).

Effective Features of Instruction

The program features

- *A variety of instructional techniques responding to different learning styles and language proficiency levels*
- *Positive interactions between teachers and students and among students*
- *A reciprocal interaction model of teaching, featuring genuine dialog*
- *Cooperative learning or group work situations, including*
 - *Students working interdependently on tasks with common objectives*
 - *Individual accountability and social equity in groups and in the classroom*
 - *Extensive interactions among students to develop bilingualism*
- *Language input that*
 - *Uses sheltering strategies to promote comprehension*
 - *Uses visual aids and modeling instruction, allowing students to negotiate meaning*
 - *Is interesting, relevant, and of sufficient quantity*
 - *Is challenging enough to promote high levels of language proficiency and critical thinking*
- *Language objectives that are integrated into the curriculum*
- *Structured tasks and unstructured opportunities for students to use language*
- *Language policies that encourage students to use the language of instruction*

- *Monolingual lesson delivery*
- *Balanced consideration of the needs of all students*
- *Integration of students (in two-way programs) for the majority of instruction*

Staff Quality

Teachers in language education programs, like those in mainstream classrooms, should possess high levels of knowledge relating to the subject matter, curriculum and technology, instructional strategies, and assessment. They must also have the ability to reflect on their own teaching (Darling-Hammond, 1998). These teacher characteristics have been linked to higher student outcomes (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Montecel & Cortez, 2002; Wenglinsky, 2000). Darling-Hammond (2000) found that the proportion of well-qualified teachers was by far the most important determinant of student achievement at all grade levels, even after taking into consideration the special needs of English language learners and students in poverty situations.

Effective dual language education programs require additional teaching and staff characteristics (Cloud et al., 2000; Day & Shapson, 1996; Met & Lorenz, 1997; Montecel & Cortez, 2002). These characteristics are important to consider in recruitment and professional development. Montecel and Cortez 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 (Cloud et al., 2000; Lindholm-Leary & Molina, 2000; Met & Lorenz, 1997). Montecel and Cortez found 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. Similarly, Lindholm-Leary (2001) found that 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, valued the participation of families from both language communities, and provided an integrated approach to multicultural education.

These results are important in developing a successful program because they demonstrate the significance of teachers understanding bilingual theory, second language development, and strategies 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 (Clark, Flores, Riojas-Cortez, & Smith, 2002). However, one cannot assume that all teachers who have a bilingual credential have current knowledge of, understand, or support the dual language program.

Teachers in dual language education programs need native or native-like ability in the language(s) in which they teach in order to provide cognitively stimulating instruction and

to promote high levels of bilingual proficiency in students. Research on language use in classrooms demonstrates that many children do not receive cognitively stimulating instruction from their teacher (e.g., Doherty et al., 2003; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Ramirez, 1992). 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. In contrast, Montecel and Cortez (2002) reported that successful bilingual programs used screening measures to select staff with full written and oral proficiency in both program languages.

Because of the shortage of bilingual teachers, some English model teachers (providing English instruction only) are not proficient in the partner language. But it is important that these teachers be able to at least understand the child's mother tongue in the initial stages of language learning. A teacher who does not understand the native language cannot respond appropriately to the children's utterances in their native language. In this case, comprehensible input, as well as linguistic equity in the classroom, may be severely impaired (Swain, 1985).

Professional Development

The No Child Left Behind Act stipulates that children are to be educated by high-quality teachers. Yet, only one out of every three English language learners in California is taught by a teacher trained in second language acquisition methods, and four out of five are taught by monolingual teachers (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 (Levine & Lezotte, 1995; Met & Lorenz, 1997; National Staff Development Council, 2001; U.S. Department of Education, 1998, 2001). Effective programs tend to align the professional development needs of faculty to the goals and strategies of the instructional program (Corallo & McDonald, 2002; Elmore, 2000). Researchers and educators have discussed the importance of specialized training in language education pedagogy and curriculum, materials and resources (Cloud et al., 2000; Day & Shapson, 1996; Met & Lorenz, 1997), and assessment (Cloud et al., 2000). Guerrero & Sloan (2001) report that bilingual teachers need professional development delivered in Spanish to help them know how to deliver instruction in ways that will help students develop higher levels of language proficiency.

Educational equity is an important point on which to provide professional development as well (Darling-Hammond, 1995; Wenglinsky, 2000), given the large amount of literature showing that teacher expectations influence student achievement (Levine & Lezotte, 1995). This is especially important because students who are ethnic or cultural minorities, language minorities, immigrants, or of lower socioeconomic backgrounds are more likely

to suffer from lower expectations for achievement (Darling-Hammond, 1995; Olneck, 1995), and because children as young as first grade are able to distinguish between perceived “smart” and “dumb” kids in the classroom by noting how the teacher responds to various children (Weinstein, Marshall, Sharp, & Botkin, 1987).

Participants in the panel of experts (personal communication, June 16, 2003) felt that essential training—that is, training that is important for any teacher—should cover educational 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. If teachers are not trained and do not understand the philosophy behind dual language education, the program cannot succeed. Likewise, if teachers in a dual language program are opposed to the dual language model, the program cannot succeed.

When asked to rank the needs for professional development, the panel of experts stated that program participants must first understand the bilingual education, immersion, and bilingualism theories underlying dual language programs. In adhering to these beliefs, they can develop appropriate instructional strategies that meet the diverse needs of the students in their classrooms. Each teacher’s own beliefs and goals need to be examined and unified with the school vision of dual language programs.

The panel of experts stressed that 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 certain 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 carried out with a dual language education focus. Panelists noted examples of schools in the Ysleta and San Antonio school districts in Texas that talked about motivation theory as it relates to second language theory. This discussion aided teachers in understanding how to apply motivation theory within the context of the dual language education experience.

For preservice training, panelists recommended that program leaders start a dialogue with university teacher training institutions to help them incorporate discussion of dual

language education programs in their courses and to provide internships for their students (Clark et al., 2002). This pre-service training would enable new teachers to enter dual language programs with a much better understanding of the theories and philosophies underlying bilingualism and biliteracy in dual language programs. Several dual language schools known to the panel members have had interns who learned about the model 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.

For inservice training, one idea proposed was to create teacher study groups. Teachers at the same grade levels can benefit from working together to develop language and content objectives. Some experienced teachers added that an effective method is to go on a retreat together and collaborate to formulate curricula and make decisions regarding implementation of a model. 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 was 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 speak only English if a significant number of parents do not speak English. Several participants in the panel of experts noted that 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 one individual summarized, "You need to be inclusive with the front line."

As a particularly effective vehicle for integrating professional development and articulation, Castellano et al. (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.

Effective Features of Staff Quality

The program selects and trains high quality teachers who

- *Have appropriate teaching certification and knowledge of subject matter, curriculum and technology, instructional strategies, and classroom management*

- *Have appropriate academic background and experience*
- *Are fully credentialed bilingual or ESL teachers and have knowledge of bilingual education and second language acquisition*
- *Have native or native-like ability in the language(s) of instruction (monolingual English speakers who provide English model MUST understand the partner language in early grades)*

Effective Features of Professional Development

Professional development is aligned with goals and strategies of the program, specifically focusing on

- *Language education pedagogy and curriculum*
- *Materials and resources*
- *Assessment*
- *Development of professional language skills in the partner language*
- *Educational equity (particularly with regard to high expectations for all students)*
- *Dual language theory and models*
- *Second language acquisition and biliteracy development*

Staff are encouraged to

- *Examine their own beliefs and practices in light of theory and the school's vision and goals*
- *Conduct teacher research to reflect on instructional strengths and shortcomings and to consider how strategies work in some contexts but not others*

A variety of types of professional development are provided, including

- *Mentoring and teacher trainers*
- *Partnerships with university teacher training institutions to align coursework and provide internships*
- *Teacher study groups*
- *Retreats to make decisions about the model or curriculum*
- *Training for non-teaching staff*
- *Professional development collaborations with district middle and high schools*

The significance and consequence of the organizational work involved in establishing an effective program that promotes student achievement cannot be understated. As Chubb and Moe (1990) note:

All things being equal, a [high school] student in an effectively organized school achieves at least a half-year more than a student in an ineffectively organized school over the last two years of high school. If this difference can be extrapolated to the normal four-year high school experience, an effectively organized school may increase the achievement of its students by more than one full year. That is a substantial effect indeed. (p. 140)

If this reasoning is carried over to kindergarten through eighth grade, the effect of a more organized program structure is even more substantial.

Several characteristics associated with high-quality schools and programs emerge from the literature. These characteristics, addressed in this section, include vision and goals, equity, leadership, and processes for model design, including planning, implementation, and refinement.

Vision and Goals Focused on Bilingualism, Biliteracy, and Multiculturalism

Studies of effective schools consistently and conclusively demonstrate that high-quality programs exist when schools have a cohesive, school-wide shared vision; 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 et al., 1995; Corallo & McDonald, 2002; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Gándara, 1995; Levine & Lezotte, 1995; Marzano, 2003; Montecel & Cortez, 2002; Reyes et al., 1999; Slavin & Calderón, 2001; Teddle & Reynolds, 2000; U.S. Department of Education, 1998; WestEd, 2000). The importance of these shared values is reinforced in studies of mainstream schools (e.g., Levine & Lezotte, 1995; Marzano, 2003), low-performing schools (Corallo & McDonald, 2002; Reyes et al., 1999), and dual language and other bilingual programs serving English language learners (e.g., Berman et al., 1995; Montecel & Cortez, 2002; Slavin & Calderón, 2001).

Further, in dual language programs, the need for a clear commitment to a vision and goals focused on bilingualism, biliteracy, and multicultural competence has been demonstrated in studies and advocated by dual language education teachers and administrators (Berman et al., 1995; Lindholm, 1990b; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; 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., Darling-Hammond, 2000; Levine & Lezotte, 1995; Montecel & Cortez, 2002). Ramirez (1992) and Willig (1985) reported that the better the implementation of the dual language education model, the stronger the results favoring

primary language instruction over English-only instruction. Téllez (1998) found that English language learners who participated in a hodgepodge of different programs had the lowest outcomes of all. Thus, a consistent sustained program of dual language education is important.

Ensuring Equity and a Positive School Environment

Research on effective schools has consistently pointed out that students are more successful when they are engaged in a positive school environment (Battistich, Solomon, Watson, & Schaps, 1997; Darling-Hammond, 1995; Gándara, 1995; Levine & Lezotte, 1995; Marzano, 2003; Reyes et al., 1999)—that is, one that is orderly and safe, has a warm and caring community, and facilitates learning. Research shows that students and teachers benefit when the school (and classroom) is a caring community, particularly in schools with a large number of low-income, ethnic-minority, or English language learners (Battistich et al., 1997).

An environment that facilitates learning requires equity among all groups (Darling-Hammond, 1995; Levine & Lezotte, 1995). Equity—which means the treatment of all participants with justice, fairness, and lack of prejudice—must be incorporated at the district, school, and classroom levels and with respect to the treatment of students, families, and teachers. Establishing a vision of bilingualism and multicultural competence requires a clear understanding of and equitable treatment directed toward the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students, as well as integration of multicultural themes into instruction (Cloud et al., 2000; Howard & Sugarman, 2007; Lindholm, 1990a; Lindholm-Leary, 2001). While important in other schools, equity is crucial in the two-way immersion program model with its emphasis on integrating students of different ethnic, language, and social class backgrounds. Thus, effective schools have faculty who share the commitment to “breaking down institutional and community barriers to equality” (Stedman, 1987, p. 219); they demonstrate awareness of the diverse needs of English language learners, have staff trained in multicultural understanding, use multiethnic materials and curriculum, integrate students’ cultural values into the classroom, and celebrate and encourage non-English languages. In addition, the shared belief that “all children can learn” is a central operating principle that empowers students, especially English language learners (Garcia, 1988, 1991; Lucas et al., 1990; Tikunoff, 1983).

This vision of bilingualism and multiculturalism for a dual language program necessitates the concept of *additive bilingualism*—that all students are provided the opportunity to acquire a second language at no cost to their home language (Cloud et al., 2000). Additive bilingual programs are associated with content area achievement and proficiency in the second language and the home language (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Ramirez, 1992; Thomas & Collier, 2002) and improved self-esteem and cross-cultural attitudes (Cazabon, Nicoladis, & Lambert, 1998; Kirk Senesac, 2002; Lindholm, 1994; Lindholm-Leary,

2001; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2001; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2006). Conversely, subtractive bilingual contexts—meaning that a second language replaces the native language—have negative effects on the school performance of many English language learners. That is, research shows that native language loss is associated with lower levels of second language attainment, scholastic underachievement, and psychosocial disorders (Hernandez-Chavez, 1984; Lambert, 1984). Thus, there are more positive outcomes for English language learners associated with developing both the home language and the second language simultaneously (see Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2006). Successful language development programs not only prevent the negative consequences of subtractive bilingualism but also effectively promote the beneficial aspects of additive bilingualism.

In many two-way immersion schools, research shows that a social class gap exists, with the native English speakers coming from middle class and educated families, and the English language learners coming from working class and undereducated (by U.S. standards) families (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). These differences, if they exist, must be acknowledged and addressed to ensure equal educational opportunities in the classroom for all students. These differences must also be recognized and addressed in professional development, parent training, assessment, and interpretations of evaluation results (Corallo & McDonald, 2002; Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

Effective Leadership

Most studies that have looked at the issue of leadership have demonstrated that successful schools have effective leadership (e.g., Berman et al., 1995; Castellano et al., 2002; Levine & Lezotte, 1995; Reyes et al., 1999; Tikunoff et al., 1980). As Castellano et al. point out in a study of whole-school reforms: “Strong principals and other leaders did not and possibly cannot force change; but they have been critical in setting an agenda and the tone for change” (p. 36). This point was reiterated in a review of research on the principal’s role in creating inclusive schools for diverse students (Riehl, 2000), in the panel of experts discussion, and by Clark et al. (2002):

Before Mrs. Lozano came to our school we had several leaders who made it very obvious that they were not interested in the bilingual program. We didn’t have support. . . . We lacked a lot of things in comparison to the monolingual classrooms. Our students didn’t have the materials that they needed. We [teachers] had to scrounge for things. We had to buy a lot of our own materials, out of pocket. . . . Even in reference to dictionaries, our dictionaries would date back to 1964, and this was 1992. (p. 7)

The principal must be the main advocate for the program, providing guidance for an equitable program (Riehl, 2000) that is of high quality and has school-wide support. However, the principal may be too busy with the needs of the whole school to provide the necessary instructional leadership for the language education program. If the principal cannot fulfill a prominent role for a program, the responsibility may come from a vice

principal, program coordinator, resource teacher, or a management team composed of teachers. In fact, it is probably most advantageous to have a team with a designated leader coordinate the program, rather than one person. As Castellano et al. (2002) point out, effective principals are usually “strong leaders and agents of change” and thus are often lured away by new challenges. Or, some particularly effective principals are moved to a new post by a district administration. If a program relies on one person for leadership, even the most successful program can collapse if that leader is drawn away.

There are various titles for a program’s support person or group, but the responsibilities are quite similar regardless of the job title. At least three major tasks are required for program leaders: They must act as program advocate and liaison; supervisor of model development, planning, and coordination; and facilitator of staff cohesion, collegiality, and development. To carry out these responsibilities, it is important that this individual or group have extensive knowledge of second language development, bilingual and immersion education theory and research, instructional methodologies, effective classroom practices, and the language education model being implemented at the site along with the belief that the selected language education model can work.

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. In addition, an effective leader takes responsibility for developing, planning, implementing, and evaluating the model at the school site. This role necessitates 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 in the capacity of model development, as research shows that a higher level of planning and coordination across grades is almost always a feature of more successful programs (Levine & Lezotte, 1995; Met & Lorenz, 1997). A key factor in planning any major reform in the curriculum and school structure involves the leadership’s ability to acquire the necessary financial and instructional resources for the program (Castellano et al., 2002).

Effective leaders ensure that there is a high degree of faculty cohesion, collaboration, and collegiality (Castellano et al., 2002; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Marzano, 2003; Montecel & Cortez, 2002; Reyes et al., 1999; Troike, 1986). This means that in schools with a dual language education strand and one or more other strands, all teachers and staff are engaged in promoting achievement for all students. Teachers are integrated for school-wide planning and coordination, and the teachers from other strands are supportive of and knowledgeable about the dual language education program. In addition, effective leadership oversees staff training (Levine & Lezotte, 1995; Montecel & Cortez, 2002; Reyes et al., 1999; Tikunoff, 1983); the leader does not simply send teachers off to various unrelated inservice training courses, but focuses training on the topics most necessary for the success of the teachers and students in the program. The leader also ensures that

the training is strongly aligned with the goals and strategies of the program (Corallo & McDonald, 2002; Elmore, 2000; see also sections on Curriculum and Instructional Practices).

Ongoing Program Planning

The amount of planning within and across grade levels varies by school site, but a higher level of planning and articulation is associated with more successful programs (Corallo & McDonald, 2002; Education Trust, 1996; Levine & Lezotte, 1995; Met & Lorenz, 1997; Montecel & Cortez, 2002; U.S. Department of Education, 1998). Strong planning processes should be in place that focus on meeting the goals of the program (in dual language, this means promoting the students' bilingualism, biliteracy, and multicultural competence) and on improving all students' achievement (Corallo & McDonald, 2002; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Levine & Lezotte, 1995). 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, rather than dabbling with whatever new and unproven curricular or instructional approach emerges.

Program articulation should be both vertical across grade levels and horizontal within grade levels and should include proper scope, sequence, and alignment with developmentally appropriate practices and language proficiency levels in both languages (Montecel & Cortez, 2002). If the dual language program is a strand within the school, the program planning should be school-wide and not only include the dual language program teachers (Berman et al., 1995). As Castellano et al. (2002) point out with remarks concerning school-wide reform, if teachers do not engage in joint curriculum development and planning, then "curriculum integration is more piecemeal and dependent on individual teacher initiative" (p. 35).

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 (Corallo & McDonald, 2002; Kotter, 1990) that support successful student outcomes. Once the data from the needs assessment are analyzed and interpreted, a realistic plan can be developed (Chrispeels, Strait, & Brown, 1999; Corallo & McDonald, 2002). Montecel and Cortez (2002) found that in successful bilingual programs, teachers and parents participated in the selection and design of a bilingual program that was consistent with the characteristics of the student population.

Key Features of Dual Language Programs

- *Sustained instruction in the partner language for at least 6 years*
- *At least 50% of instruction in the partner language throughout the program*
- *Language arts and literacy instruction in both program languages by the upper elementary grades*

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

Research to date shows that the duration of the program is a significant factor in student outcomes. It is important to point out, however,

that this research does not include evaluations of dual language programs that have followed the principles recommended here—that is, programs that are standards-based or that systematically integrate language and content instruction for the duration of the students' participation. Current research suggests that dual language programs lead to higher student outcomes when they are provided to the participating students for at least 6 years. This is the average amount of time required to reach native-like proficiency and grade-level achievement, as confirmed by a number of evaluation studies on immersion and bilingual programs (Collier, 1989; Cummins, 1981; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2006; Saunders & O'Brien, 2006; Swain, 1984; Troike, 1978). In its review of foreign language programs, the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) concluded that achieving academic language proficiency ordinarily demands from 4 to 6 years of study. A study of 1.3 million English language learners in California showed that after 7 years of instruction (Grade K–6), only half of the students had been reclassified from English Learner to English Proficient (Hill, 2004).

In a review of the research on bilingual education, Lindholm-Leary and Borsato (2006) reported that the most successful outcomes in English achievement, as measured by norm-referenced standardized tests, occurred among students who received primary language instructional support over a longer period of time; that is, the longer the English language learners had participated in bilingual education instruction, the more positive were the results in English when compared to matched groups who were in English mainstream programs (Collier, 1992; Curiel, Rosenthal, & Richek, 1986; Ramirez, 1992; Thomas & Collier, 2002).

In designing a dual language program model, another consideration is the ratio of instruction in English to instruction in the partner language. There are only three investigations, summarized below, that assess whether the amount of primary language instruction is a significant factor in promoting achievement for English language learners. These studies have compared student outcomes from different variations of the same

Research consistently demonstrates the advantage of a dual language education program that is sustained and consistent (e.g., August & Hakuta, 1997; Cazabon, Lambert, & Hall, 1993; Christian & Genesee, 2001; Christian et al., 1997; de Jong, 2002; Howard, Christian, & Genesee, 2003; Howard, Sugarman, & Christian, 2003; Kirk Senesac, 2002; Lambert & Cazabon, 1994; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2001, 2006; Ramirez, 1992; Ramirez, Yuen, & Ramey, 1991; Thomas & Collier, 2002; Willig, 1985). For example, in a review of the peer-reviewed, empirical research on effective programs for English language learners by Lindholm-Leary and Borsato (2006), the studies converged on the conclusion that educational success is positively influenced by sustained instruction through the student's primary language. In both the descriptive and comparative program evaluation studies, almost all results showed that by the end of elementary school and into middle and high school, the educational outcomes of bilingually educated students (in late-exit programs and dual language programs) were at least comparable to, and usually higher than, their comparison peers who did not participate in bilingual education. No study that included middle school or high school students found that bilingually educated students were less successful than comparison students. In addition, most long-term studies reported that the longer the students stayed in the bilingual program, the more positive the outcomes. These results were true whether the outcomes included reading achievement, mathematics achievement, grade point average, attendance, school completion, or attitudes toward school and self.

program model. 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 primary language instruction. However, the results are still helpful as they provide evidence that is consistent with results presented in other parts of this section.

The first of these three studies, reported by Ramirez (1992), compared a group of late-exit bilingual programs to determine whether outcomes were better for programs that used more Spanish or more English in the later grades. Results showed that students in schools with the most use of Spanish and those in the school with the most use of English ended sixth grade with comparable skill levels in English language and reading. However, in mathematics achievement, though the students' scores were comparable in Grade 1, by Grade 6, students in the two late-exit schools that used more Spanish had higher levels of growth than students who had more instruction in English; they also caught up to the norming group more rapidly. At the late-exit school that moved abruptly into English (similar to early-exit bilingual programs), the students showed a marked decline in their growth in mathematics skills over time relative to the norming population. In contrast, in the late-exit program that was most faithful to the late-exit instructional model, the growth curves for students from first grade to third grade and from third grade to sixth grade showed “continued acceleration in the rate of growth, which is as fast or faster than the norming population. That is, late-exit students appear to be gaining on students in the general population” (p. 25).

In a follow-up to Ramirez's study, Collier (1992) conducted a synthesis of studies that assessed the academic achievement of English language learners over a period of 4 or more years for early-exit, late-exit, and two-way programs. Collier concluded that students who received higher amounts of primary language instructional support achieved superior levels on achievement tests in English compared to matched groups who were in English mainstream programs.

In two studies of two-way programs, Christian et al. (1997) and Lindholm-Leary (2001) compared the achievement of students in 90:10 two-way immersion programs with the achievement of students in 50:50 programs. (In a 90:10 model, 90% of instruction in the primary grades is in the partner language, and 10% is English, with a gradual increase in English to 50% in the upper elementary grades. In a 50:50 model, instruction in English and the partner language is divided evenly at all grade levels.) Lindholm-Leary's (2001) results showed that students in 90:10 programs were more likely to be fully proficient bilinguals, and their scores in English reading and mathematics were similar to those of students in 50:50 programs. Christian et al. (1997) reported that the student outcomes of 90:10 and 50:50 programs did not differ substantially with respect to language proficiency or academic achievement in English or Spanish, although the results were not disaggregated by students' language background, which might have impacted the outcome.

Although there is no research to date to determine the ratio of English to the partner language that will best promote bilingual proficiency and grade-level achievement in dual language programs, we can draw on expert recommendations and on the research discussed above. These sources agree that students need significant exposure to the partner language to promote high levels of proficiency and achievement in that language. We define significant exposure as half of the students' instructional day, a percentage that is neither refuted nor specifically supported by research, but is agreed upon by experts. With respect to the amount of English that is necessary to promote bilingualism and achievement, again, based on program evaluations of effective programs and on opinions of experts in dual language education, students need at least 10% but no more than 50% of their instructional day devoted to English. However, for programs that offer students 10% of their instructional day in English, there must be incremental increases over the students' elementary school years to a 50% level in English to allow for the effective integration of language and content.

In developing a dual language program, another issue to consider is whether children should be taught literacy in their native language first. Can children be taught literacy simultaneously in two languages, or will they be confused? These questions have not received much empirical attention. However, there is considerable evaluation research and experience to draw on concerning this issue. (See Calderón & Minaya-Rowe, 2003, and Cloud et al., 2000, for a discussion of these issues and helpful implementation guidelines.)

Research demonstrates that the less socially prestigious and powerful language in a society is the one most subject to language loss (Pease-Alvarez, 1993; Portes & Hao, 1998; Veltman, 1988). To promote the prestige of the partner language and counteract the dominant status of English, the partner language must receive more focus in the early stages of an immersion program. For 90:10 dual language education 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 students 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 (Ramirez et al., 1991; Willig, 1985; for a literature review on the empirical research in this area, see Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2006). Furthermore, some English language learners do exceptionally well in English because their parents can provide the necessary literacy-related experiences in the home. Such assistance may not be available for other English language learners. For these students, research suggests that they should first receive literacy instruction in their native language (Cloud et al., 2000; Escamilla, 2000; Goldenberg, 2000; Howard et al., 2003; Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

The second body of literature, from Canada and the United States, focuses on language majority students and shows that teaching literacy through the second language does not place language majority 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, 1987; Lambert, Genesee, Holobow, & Chartrand, 1993; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Lindholm-Leary & Molina, 2000). These results hold true for low- and middle-income African American students in French immersion, and in Spanish and Korean dual language immersion programs (Holobow, Genesee, & Lambert, 1991; Lindholm-Leary, 2001). Thus, the literature on bilingual and immersion education programs clearly supports early literacy instruction through the partner language (Cloud et al., 2000).

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 English is the societal and prestigious language; thus, there is considerably more literature to choose from in English (Lambson, 2002). 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 immersion students in 50:50 and 90:10 middle school programs, Lindholm-Leary and Ferrante (2003) found that in the 50:50 program, although 69% of students said they read *well* in Spanish and 75% said they write *well* in Spanish for their grade level, only 35% said they *love* or *like* to read for pleasure in Spanish, and 65% said they *don't like* or *hate* to read for pleasure in Spanish. In the same study, 77% of the students said they *love* or *like* to read for pleasure in English; 21% said they *don't like* or *hate* to read in English for pleasure. In the 90:10 program, a similar percentage of students (75%) said that they *like* or *love* to read for pleasure in English, but unlike the 50:50 students, 73% of 90:10 students said they also *love* or *like* to read for pleasure in Spanish. 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 that language.

Unfortunately, there is little research comparing 50:50 programs that teach initial literacy in both languages to 90:10 programs that provide reading instruction in the partner language for all students. Lindholm-Leary (2004a) examined the reading achievement outcomes of Grade 5 and Grade 7 English language learners in three types of dual language programs: 90:10, 50:50 successive literacy (reading taught first in L1, then adding L2 reading instruction after L1 literacy is established), and 50:50 simultaneous literacy (reading taught in both languages from kindergarten). In each program, there was standards-based literacy instruction in both languages, considerable program planning, and professional development focused on reading and language arts. Results showed that by Grade 5, English language 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, though, was higher in the 90:10 program than in either 50:50 program.

Only one other study described three different programs and their varying approaches to literacy instruction (Christian et al., 1997). However, because relevant comparable assessment results between 50:50 and 90:10 models at the three sites were not available, it could not be determined whether particular approaches to literacy resulted in better outcomes than others. Christian et al. (1997) concluded that “These variations in program models reflect both differences in community needs as well as the distinctive populations served by the schools. . . . Understanding the population to be served is certainly an important prerequisite for a site in determining which model may be most effective at a particular school site” (p. 116).

Little research has been conducted to determine the best classroom composition for bilingual education programs in general or dual language programs in particular. In two-

way immersion programs, to maintain an environment of educational and linguistic equity in the classroom and to promote interactions between native speakers of the two languages, the most desirable ratio is 50% English speakers to 50% English language learners. 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 speakers of one language to one speaker of the other language.

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

There is often more socioeconomic diversity among English language learners from Asian and European backgrounds than among those from Hispanic backgrounds (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). English language learners from Asia and Europe are more likely to be middle class and to come from homes with educated parents (Lindholm-Leary, 2003, 2004b). As a group, Spanish-speaking children in dual language programs in the Southwest can be characterized as largely immigrant and with parents who are working class and have 5 to 6 years of formal education (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2001; Lindholm-Leary & Ferrante, 2003). It is important to note that there is variation within this group as well. Some Spanish-speaking students are U.S.-born or have parents who are highly educated and middle class, while others live in poverty conditions. Some of these students' parents are very involved in their children's education and understand how to promote achievement in their children; other parents are not involved for various reasons or have no formal education that would enable them to help their children with their schoolwork (Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

The English-speaking population, like the Spanish-speaking population, is also diverse in social class and parental education, as well as in ethnic composition. In some schools, the English-speaking population includes middle class and working class European Americans, African Americans, Hispanics, and Asian Americans. In other schools, most of the English speakers are middle class and European American. In still other schools, the majority of English speakers are African American or Hispanic students living in the inner city.

Some educators have questioned whether low-income African American students should participate in dual language education programs because of the achievement gap that often exists between this group and European Americans. 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 (Holobow et al., 1991; Lindholm, 1994; Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

As is true in immersion education (Genesee, 1987), students with special education needs or learning disabilities are typically accepted into dual language programs (Cloud et al., 2000; Lindholm-Leary, 2001). The only caveat is the scenario in which students have a serious speech delay in their native language; in these cases, the decision for admittance is carefully conducted on an individual basis. Further, according to the panel of experts (personal communication, June 16, 2003), students are typically not moved out of the dual language program because of special education or learning disability needs that are diagnosed after the student enrolls.

Effective Features of Program Structure

The program has a cohesive, shared vision and set of goals that

- *Provide commitment to and instructional focus on bilingualism, biliteracy, and multiculturalism*
- *Establish high expectations for achievement for all students*

With respect to the treatment of all program participants at the district, school, and classroom level, the program ensures

- *A safe and orderly environment*
- *A warm and caring community*
- *Ample support and resources*
- *Additive bilingualism for all students*
- *Awareness of the diverse needs of students of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds*

Effective leadership is provided by the principal, program coordinator, and management team, including

- *Program advocacy and communication with central administration*
- *Oversight of model development, planning, and coordination*
- *Professional development, including the fostering of staff cohesion and collegiality*
- *Appropriate allocation of funding*

The program engages in ongoing planning, including

- *A focus on the vision and goals of the program*
- *School-wide vertical and horizontal articulation*
- *Proper scope, sequence, and alignment with standards that are developmentally, linguistically, and culturally appropriate*

A language education model is in place that upholds

- *Principles of second language development*
- *Bilingual and immersion theory and research*
- *Effective instructional methodologies and classroom practices*
- *Belief in and commitment to the dual language education model*

Another important feature of effective programs is the incorporation of parent and community involvement and collaboration with the school (Berman et al., 1995; Marzano, 2003; Reyes et al., 1999). When parents are involved, they often develop a sense of efficacy that is communicated to children with positive academic consequences—especially in the case of language minority children (Cloud et al., 2000; Met & Lorenz, 1997; Tizard, Schofield, & Hewison, 1982). In fact, most parents of ethnically and linguistically diverse students have high aspirations for their children and want to be involved in promoting their academic success (Julian, McKenry, & McKelvey, 1994; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Stevenson, Chen, & Uttal, 1990; Wong Fillmore, 1985). Activities such as reading and listening to children read are both feasible and practical and contribute to improved scholastic achievement (Bus, van Ijzendoorn, & Pellegrini, 1995; Goldenberg, 2000). Effective programs tend to incorporate a variety of home/school collaboration activities. The general outcomes on the part of students are heightened interest in schoolwork and improved achievement and behavior (Berman et al., 1995; Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

In two-way immersion programs, Lindholm-Leary (2001) found that parents perceived medium levels of support from the district. Parents with lower levels of education and with children at schools that enrolled mostly ethnic minority and low socioeconomic level students perceived lower levels of district support but gave school staff higher marks for promoting diversity than did parents at more middle class sites and parents with a college-level education. This lower level of district support is consistent with literature reporting that low-income parents and minority parents feel alienation, distrust and discrimination from school personnel (Hidalgo, Bright, Siu, Swap, & Epstein, 1995; Kozol, 1995). Thus, effective programs make the school environment a welcoming and warm one for parents of all language and cultural groups, where bilingualism is valued and there is a sense of belonging for students and their families (Berman et al., 1995; Reyes et al., 1999). Parents of all ethno-linguistic groups are treated equitably, and, in two-way programs, English-speaking parents do not dominate the advisory committees to the exclusion of the non-English-speaking parents (Lindholm-Leary & Molina, 2000). In addition, according to the panel of experts (personal communication, June 16, 2003), when parents come to the school, they must see a reflection of the vision and goals associated with bilingualism and biliteracy—for example, signs are in both languages and front office staff members are bilingual.

As the panel of experts pointed out, one way of providing a warm and welcoming environment is to provide a parent liaison who speaks the languages of the program and understands the needs of the parents in the community. A parent liaison plans for parent education based on the parents' needs (e.g., to help their students with homework) and the model, so that they can become advocates for the program and school.

Effective Features of Family and Community

The program

- *Incorporates a variety of home/school collaboration activities*
- *Maintains a welcoming environment for parents and community*
- *Values bilingualism and biliteracy*
- *Hires office staff who speak the partner language*
- *Makes announcements in both languages*
- *Posts signs in both languages*
- *Values multiculturalism*
- *Fosters a sense of belonging*
- *Establishes parent liaisons who*
 - *Are bilingual and reach out to parents and community in both languages*
 - *Arrange parent training to assume advocacy and support for the dual language program*
 - *Know dual language education theory and model*
 - *Contribute to other parent topics as determined by needs assessment*

Support is important to schools in any community. The support a school receives influences its funding, materials, teacher training, program model, planning, and parent involvement, and thus ultimately student achievement. For dual language and other language education programs, research has shown that administrative support includes strong support for the program by the school district and the local Board of Education (Troike, 1986). State and local policies can support or hinder implementation (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). This support is demonstrated in the structural and functional integration of the program within the total school system, the vision that the program is not temporary—even if there is only temporary funding from an outside source (business or government)—and equitable allocation of resources for training of staff and for purchase and development of materials in each language (Montecel & Cortez, 2002; Troike, 1986).

When the 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, the programs may receive fewer resources, untrained and inexperienced teachers, and the expectation for success may be minimal. This configuration of factors will tend to result in lower levels of academic achievement and language proficiency on the part of program participants (Troike, 1986; Willig, 1985).

In schools with successful programs, the district administration does not regard bilingual education as remedial or as merely a temporary program, but rather makes a commitment to providing an equal education for English language learners even beyond any external funding and ensures that the program is an integral part of the basic program in the school system (Troike, 1986).

At the school site level, a supportive principal assures that the language education program is integrated within the total school, that all teachers and staff understand the language education program, and that an appropriate and equitable amount of financial and instructional resources are allocated to the program to meet the content standards, vision, and goals (Levine & Lezotte, 1995; Troike, 1986). In addition, the principal understands the language education model, truly supports the vision and goals and the program's implementation at the school site, and understands the program well enough to explain it to others. The principal also devotes attention and resources to promoting acceptance of the program within the central administration and the community and among other school staff and parents. As a part of this support, the principal 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). In effective schools, the principal shows support, respect, and concern for the teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Levine & Lezotte, 1995; Reyes et al., 1999). That is, the principal promotes acceptance of the bilingual program staff as part of the regular staff by insisting on comparable standards of certification and competence and by facilitating

interaction among the staff. Finally, there is a serious effort to obtain high quality materials in the partner language for the students. Resources are allocated for the purchase and development of appropriate instructional, resource, and library materials that support the vision and goals of the program.

Supportive families and communities also provide buoyancy to the program in good times and critical advocacy that may keep the program functioning in bad times when the state or district may want to shut it down (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). They may also help in fundraising to provide additional support for the program. In order to provide advocacy, as mentioned in the Family and Community Involvement section, there must be training so that parents and the community are knowledgeable about the program and can assume leadership on its behalf.

Effective Features of Support and Resources

The program is supported by the community, the local Board of Education, and the district, in that

- *Resources are allocated equitably*
- *The program is seen by all stakeholders as a permanent and enriching part of the school and district*

School and program administrators

- *Understand, support, and advocate for the program*
- *Facilitate integration of the program across the school*
- *Ensure equitable access to resources for all students and in both program languages*

Families and communities are knowledgeable about the program and can advocate on its behalf.

In summary, a variety of features related to assessment and accountability, curriculum, instructional practices, staff quality and professional development, program structure, family and community involvement, and support and resources are associated with effective dual language education programs. These factors serve as a framework for effective programs, regardless of the type of language education program or its location. Not all features will necessarily be appropriate in the same way for all programs, particularly for programs serving more homogeneous student populations. However, the results of extant research clearly show that a successful program requires careful consideration of many effective features to attain success. Understanding these features can help young programs to mature and more experienced programs to promote more successful outcomes in students.

- August, D., & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (1997). *Improving schooling for language minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Battistich, V., Solomon, D., Watson, M., & Schaps, E. (1997). Caring school communities. *Educational Psychologist, 32*, 137-151.
- Berman, P., Minicucci, C., McLaughlin, B., Nelson, B., & Woodworth, K. (1995). *School reform and student diversity: Case studies of exemplary practices for LEP students*. Santa Cruz, CA: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, and B.W. Associates.
- Bus, A. G., Van Ijzendoorn, M. H., & Pellegrini, A. (1995). Joint book reading makes for success in learning to read: A meta-analysis on intergenerational transmission of literacy. *Review of Educational Research, 65*, 1-21.
- Calderón, M. E., & Minaya-Rowe, L. (2003). *Designing and implementing two-way bilingual programs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- California State Department of Education. (1982). *Basic principles for the education of language minority students. An overview*. Sacramento: Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education.
- 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.
- Cazabon, M., Lambert, W. E., & Hall, G. (1993). *Two-way bilingual education: A progress report on the Amigos program* (Research Rep. No. 7). Santa Cruz, CA, and Washington, DC: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.
- Cazabon, M., Nicoladis, E., & Lambert, W. E. (1998). *Becoming bilingual in the Amigos two-way immersion program* (Research Rep. No. 3). Santa Cruz, CA, and Washington, DC: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.
- Chrispeels, J., Strait, J., & Brown, J. (1999). The paradoxes of collaboration: What works. *Thrust for Educational Leadership, 29*, 16-19.
- Christian, D., & Genesee, F. (Eds.). (2001). *Bilingual education*. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.
- Christian, D., Montone, C., Lindholm, K., & Carranza, I. (1997). *Profiles in two-way bilingual education*. Washington, DC, and McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Chubb, J., & Moe, T. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America's schools*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- 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.

- Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Cohen, E. G. (1994). *Designing groupwork: Strategies for the heterogeneous classroom* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cohen, E. G., & Lotan, R. A. (1995). Producing equal-status interaction in the heterogeneous classroom. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, 99-120.
- Cohen, E. G., Lotan, R. A., Abram, P. L., Scarloss, B. A., & Schultz, S. E. (2002). Can groups learn? *Teachers College Record*, 104, 1045-1068.
- Collier, V. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 509-531.
- Collier, V. (1992). A synthesis of studies examining long-term language minority student data on academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16, 187-212.
- Coltrane, B. (2002). *English-language learners and high-stakes tests: An overview of the issues*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Corallo, C., & McDonald, D. H. (2002). *What works with low-performing schools: A review of research literature on low-performing schools*. Charleston, WV: Appalachian Educational Laboratory.
- Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles: California State University; Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center.
- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 18-36
- Cummins, J. (2000). Bilingualism, empowerment, and transformative pedagogy. In J. V. Tinajero & R. A. DeVillar (Eds.), *The power of two languages 2000: Effective dual-language use across the curriculum* (pp. 9-19). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Curiel, H., Rosenthal, J., & Richek, H. (1986). Impacts of bilingual education on secondary school grades, attendance, retentions and drop-out. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 8, 357-367.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1995). Inequality and access to knowledge. In J. A. Banks & C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 465-483). New York: Macmillan.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teacher learning that supports student learning. *Educational Leadership*, 55, 6-11.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8, 1-50.
- Day, E. M., & Shapson, S. M. (1996). *Studies in immersion education*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

- de Jong, E. J. (2002). Effective bilingual education: From theory to academic achievement in a two-way bilingual program. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26.
- Dixon, J. K. (1995). Limited English proficiency and spatial visualization in middle school students' construction of the concepts of reflection and rotation. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 19, 221-247.
- 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.
- Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1978). From research to method in bilingual education. In J. Alatis (Ed.), *International dimensions in bilingual education*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Echevarria, J., Short, D., & Powers, K. (2003). *School reform and standards-based education: How do teachers help English language learners?* (Technical Report). Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.
- Education Trust. (1996). *Education watch: The 1996 education trust state and national data book*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Building a structure for school leadership*. New York: The Albert Shanker Institute.
- Escamilla, K. (2000). Teaching literacy in Spanish. In J. V. Tinajero & R. A. DeVillar (Eds.), *The power of two languages 2000: Effective dual-language use across the curriculum* (pp. 126-141). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Fullan, M., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gándara, P. (1995). *Over the ivy walls: The educational mobility of low-income Chicanos*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- 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), 1-52.
- Garcia, E. E. (1988). Effective schooling for Hispanics. *Urban Education Review*, 67, 462-473.
- Garcia, E. E. (1991). Effective instruction for language minority students: The teacher. *Journal of Education*, 173, 130-141.
- Garcia, P. A., & Gopal, M. (2003). The relationship to achievement on the California High School Exit Exam for language minority students. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 1, 123-137.
- Genesee, F. (1985). Second language learning through immersion: A review of U.S. programs. *Review of Educational Research*, 55, 541-561.
- Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning through two languages*. Cambridge: Newbury House.

- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (Eds.) (2006). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldenberg, C. (2000). Promoting early literacy development among Spanish-speaking children: Lessons from two studies. In J. V. Tinajero & R. A. DeVillar (Eds.), *The power of two languages 2000: Effective dual-language use across the curriculum* (pp. 83-101). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Goldenberg, C. N., & Gallimore, R. (1991). Local knowledge, research knowledge, and educational change: A case study of early Spanish reading improvement. *Educational Researcher*, 20, 2-14.
- Guerrero, M., & Sloan, K. (2001). When exemplary gets blurry: A descriptive analysis of four exemplary K-3 Spanish reading programs in Texas. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 25, 253-280.
- Harley, B. (1984). How good is their French? *Language and Society*, 10, 55-60.
- Harley, B. (1986). *Age in second language acquisition*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Hernandez-Chavez, E. (1984). The inadequacy of English immersion education as an educational approach for language minority students in the United States. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Studies on immersion education: A collection for U.S. educators*. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.
- Hidalgo, N. M., Bright, J. A., Siu, S., Swap, S. M., & Epstein, J. L. (1995). Research on families, schools, and communities: A multicultural perspective. In J. A. Banks & C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 631-655). New York: Macmillan.
- Hill, E. G. (2004). *A look at the progress of English learner students*. Sacramento, CA: Legislative Analyst Office.
- Holobow, N., Genesee, F., & Lambert, W. E. (1991). The effectiveness of a foreign language immersion program for children from different ethnic and social class backgrounds: Report 2. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 12, 179-198.
- Howard, E. R., Christian, D., & Genesee, F. (2003). The development of bilingualism and biliteracy from Grade 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.
- 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., & Christian, D. (2003). *Trends in two-way immersion education: A review of the research*. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk.

- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1990). Social skills for successful group work: Interpersonal and small-group skills are vital to the success of cooperative learning. *Educational Leadership, 47*, 29-33.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. J. (1986). *Circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.
- Julian, T. W., McKenry, P. C., & McKelvey, M. W. (1994). Cultural variations in parenting: Perceptions of Caucasian, African-American, Hispanic and Asian-American parents. *Family Relations, 43*, 30-37.
- Kirk Senesac, B. V. (2002). Two-way bilingual immersion: A portrait of quality schooling. *Bilingual Research Journal, 26*, 85-101.
- Kotter, J. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: Free Press.
- Kowal, M., & Swain, M. (1997). From semantic to syntactic processing: How can we promote it in the immersion classroom? In R. K. Johnson & M. Swain (Eds.), *Immersion education: International perspectives* (pp. 284-310). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kozol, J. (1995). *Amazing grace: The lives of children and the conscience of a nation*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Krashen, S. (1981). Bilingual education and second language acquisition theory. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles: California State University; Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center.
- Lambert, W. E. (1984). An overview of issues in immersion education. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Studies on immersion education: A collection for U.S. educators* (pp. 8-30). Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.
- Lambert, W. E., & Cazabon, M. (1994). *Students' views of the Amigos program* (Research Rep. No. 11). Santa Cruz, CA, and Washington, DC: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.
- Lambert, W. E., Genesee, F., Holobow, N., & Chartrand, L. (1993). Bilingual education for majority English-speaking children. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 8*, 3-22.
- Lambson, D. (2002). The availability of Spanish heritage language materials in public and school libraries. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 5*, 233-243.
- Legaretta, D. (1979). The effects of program models on language acquisition by Spanish speaking children. *TESOL Quarterly, 13*, 521-534.
- Legaretta, D. (1981). Effective use of the primary language in the classroom. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 83-116). Los Angeles: California State University; Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center.

- Levine, D. U., & Lezotte, L. W. (1995). Effective schools research. In J. A. Banks & C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 525-547). New York: Macmillan.
- Lindholm, K. J. (1990a). Bilingual immersion education: Criteria for program development. In A. M. Padilla, H. H. Fairchild, & C. Valadez (Eds.), *Bilingual education: Issues and strategies* (pp. 91-105). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lindholm, K. J. (1990b). Bilingual immersion education: Educational equity for language-minority students. In A. Barona & E. Garcia (Eds.), *Children at risk: Poverty, minority status and other issues in educational equity*. Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Lindholm, K. J. (1994). Promoting positive cross-cultural attitudes and perceived competence in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. In R. A. Devillar, C. J. Faltis, & J. P. Cummins (Eds.), *Cultural diversity in schools: From rhetoric to practice* (pp. 189-206). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Lindholm, K. J., & Molina, R. (2000). Two-way bilingual education: The power of two languages in promoting educational success. In J. V. Tinajero & R. A. DeVillar (Eds.), *The power of two languages 2000: Effective dual-language use across the curriculum* (pp. 163-174). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education*. Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2003). *Language and education issues affecting Asian Pacific American students*. Keynote speech presented at the California Association for Asian and Pacific American Education and National Association for the Education and Advancement of Cambodian, Laotian, and Vietnamese Americans, Woodland Hills, CA.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2004a). *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. J. (2004b). *Dual language education issues: Implications for students in Korean/English dual language programs*. Invited presentation to Korean dual language teachers, Los Angeles, CA.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Borsato, G. (2001). *Impact of two-way bilingual elementary programs on students' attitudes toward school and college* (Research Rep. No. 10). Santa Cruz, CA, and Washington, DC: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Borsato, G. (2006). Academic achievement. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.), *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence* (pp. 176-222). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Ferrante, A. (2003). *Middle school students' attitudes toward school and college: Influence of two-way immersion* (Final report). Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Hargett, G. (2007). *The evaluator's toolkit for dual language programs*. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education. Retrieved July 1, 2007, from www.cal.org/twi/evaltoolkit
- Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction and second language acquisition. In H. Winitz (Ed.), *Native language and foreign language acquisition* (pp. 259-278). New York: Annals of The New York Academy of Sciences.
- Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/nonnative speaker conversation in the second language classroom. In M. Clarke & J. Handscombe (Eds.), *On TESOL 82: Pacific perspectives on language, learning and teaching* (pp. 207-225). Washington, DC: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.
- Long, M. H., & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, *19*, 207-228.
- Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (1990). Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools. *Harvard Educational Review*, *60*, 315-340.
- Lyster, R. (1987). Speaking immersion. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *43*, 701-17.
- Lyster, R. (1990). The role of analytic language teaching in French immersion programs. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *47*, 159-75.
- Lyster, R. (1994). The effect of functional-analytic teaching on aspects of French immersion students' sociolinguistic competence. *Applied Linguistics*, *15*, 263-287.
- Lyster, R. (1998). Focus on form in immersion classrooms: How focused is it? In J. Arnau & J. M. Artigal (Eds.), *Immersion programmes: A European perspective*. Barcelona, Spain: Publicacions de la Universitat de Barcelona.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Met, M., & Lorenz, E. B. (1997). Lessons from U.S. immersion programs: Two decades of experience. In R. K. Johnson & M. Swain (Eds.), *Immersion education: International perspectives* (pp. 243-264). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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).
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

- National Staff Development Council. (2001). *Standards for staff development*. Oxford, OH: Author. Retrieved July 27, 2007, from www.nsdc.org/standards/index.cfm
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (1996). *Standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the 21st century*. Yonkers, NY: Author.
- Olneck, M. R. (1995). Immigrants and education. In J. A. Banks & C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 310-327). New York: Macmillan.
- Pease-Alvarez, L. (1993). *Moving in and out of bilingualism: Investigating native language maintenance and shift in Mexican-descent children* (Research Rep. No. 6). Santa Cruz, CA, and Washington, DC: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.
- Portes, A., & Hao, L. (1998). *E pluribus unum: Bilingualism and loss of language in the second generation*. *Sociology of Education*, 71, 269-294.
- Qin, Z., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. G. (1995). Cooperative versus competitive efforts and problem solving. *Review of Educational Research*, 65, 129-144.
- Ramirez, J. D. (1992). Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language minority children (Executive summary). *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16, 1-62.
- Ramirez, J. D., Yuen, S. D., & Ramey, D. R. (1991). *Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit programs for language-minority children* (Report submitted to the U.S. Department of Education). San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.
- Reyes, P., Scribner, J. D., & Paredes Scribner, A. (Eds.). (1999). *Lessons from high-performing Hispanic schools: Creating learning communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Riehl, C. J. (2000). The principal's role in creating inclusive schools for diverse students: A review of normative, empirical, and critical literature on the practice of educational administration. *Review of Educational Research*, 70, 55-81.
- 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.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1987). Bilingual discourse: The negotiation of meaning without a common code. *Linguistics*, 25, 81-106.
- Short, D. (2002). Language learning in sheltered social studies classes. *TESOL Journal*, 11, 18-24.

- Short, D., & Echevarria, J. (1999). *The sheltered instruction observation protocol: A tool for teacher-researcher collaboration and professional development* (Educational Practice Rep. No. 3). Santa Cruz, CA, and Washington, DC: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.
- Slavin, R. (1994). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research and practice* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Slavin, R. E., & Calderón, M. (2001). *Effective programs for Latino students*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- 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, 3-13.
- Stedman, L. C. (1987). It's time we changed the effective schools formula. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69, 215-24.
- Stevenson, H. W., Chen, C., & Uttal, D. H. (1990). Beliefs and achievement: A study of black, white, and Hispanic children. *Child Development*, 61, 508-523.
- Swain, M. (1983). Bilingualism without tears. In M. A. Clarke & J. Handscombe (Eds.), *On TESOL 82: Pacific perspectives on language, learning, and teaching* (pp. 35-46). Washington, DC: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Swain, M. (1984). A review of immersion education in Canada: Research and evaluation studies. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Studies on immersion education: A collection for U.S. educators* (pp. 87-112). Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1987). *The case for focused input: Contrived but authentic—Or, how content teaching needs to be manipulated and complemented to maximize second language learning*. Plenary paper presented at the annual conference of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Vancouver, BC, Canada.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1986). Immersion French in secondary schools: "The goods" and "the bads." *Contact*, 5, 2-9
- Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. (1997). *ESL standards for pre-K–12 students*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Teddlé, C., & Reynolds, D. (2000). *The international handbook of school effectiveness research*. London: Falmer Press.
- Téllez, K. (1998). Class placement of elementary school emerging bilingual students. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 22, 279-95.

- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement*. Santa Cruz, CA, and Washington, DC: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.
- Tikunoff, W. J. (1983). *Significant bilingual instructional features study*. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
- Tikunoff, W. J., Ward, B. A., Fisher, C. A., Armendariz, J. C., Parker, L., Dominguez Vasquez, J. A., et al. (1980). *Review of the literature for a descriptive study of significant bilingual instructional features*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
- Tizard, J., Schofield, W. N., & Hewison, J. (1982). Collaboration between teachers and parents in assisting children's reading. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 52, 1-15.
- Troike, R. C. (1978). Research evidence for the effectiveness of bilingual education. *NABE Journal*, 3, 13-24.
- Troike, R. C. (1986). *Improving conditions for success in bilingual education programs*. Prepared for Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). *The Asian population: 2000*. Retrieved July 27, 2007, from www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/c2kbr01-16.pdf
- U.S. Department of Education. (1994). *Improving America's Schools Act*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1998). *Turning around low-performing schools: A guide for state and local leaders*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *No Child Left Behind Act*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67, 391-429.
- Veltman, C. (1988). *The future of the Spanish language in the United States*. New York and Washington, DC: Hispanic Policy Development Project.
- Weinstein, R. S., Marshall, H. H., Sharp, L., & Botkin, M. (1987). Pygmalion and the student: Age and classroom differences in children's awareness of teacher expectations. *Child Development*, 58, 1079-1093.
- Wenglinsky, H. (2000). *How teaching matters: Bringing the classroom back into discussions of teacher quality*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- WestEd. (2000). *Teachers who learn, kids who achieve*. San Francisco: Author.
- Willig, A. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. *Review of Educational Research*, 55, 269-317.
- Wong Fillmore, L. (1985). When does teacher talk work as input? In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 17-50). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.



Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education

Elizabeth R. Howard

Julie Sugarman

Donna Christian

Kathryn J. Lindholm-Leary

David Rogers

STRAND 1

Assessment and Accountability

Principle 1

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

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|---|--|---|----------|
| A | The program has developed a data management system for tracking student data over time. | | | | A |
| | No data management system exists for tracking student data over time. | A data management system exists for tracking student data over time, but it is only partially developed or is not well used. | A comprehensive data management system has been developed and is used for tracking student demographic and performance data as long as students are in the program. | A comprehensive data management system has been developed and is used for tracking student demographic data and data on multiple measures of performance for the students' entire K–12 school attendance in the district. | |
| B | Assessment and accountability action plans are developed and integrated into program and curriculum planning and professional development. | | | | B |
| | There is no plan for reaching accountability and assessment goals. | A plan for reaching accountability and assessment goals exists but is not integrated into program and curriculum planning and professional development. | An articulated plan for reaching accountability and assessment goals exists and is integrated into program and curriculum planning and professional development. | The program has developed an ongoing, integrated, and articulated plan for assessment and accountability that informs all aspects of the program and is routinely reviewed and revised as necessary. | |
| C | Personnel are assigned to assessment and accountability activities. | | | | C |
| | No personnel are given specific assessment and accountability responsibility. | Personnel volunteer or are assigned on an ad hoc basis to carry out assessment and accountability activities, or devoted personnel are available only while the program is funded with grant money. | School- or district-provided personnel have specific responsibility for assessment and accountability activities, and sufficient personnel are assigned to assessment and accountability activities. | The district supports the program's assessment and accountability plan and activities with appropriate budget and personnel. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|---|---|--|----------|
| D | Staff are provided ongoing professional development opportunities in assessment and accountability. | | | | D |
| | No professional development in assessment and accountability is available to teachers and other staff. | Professional development experiences are available on isolated topics (e.g., a workshop on how to interpret test scores). | Ongoing professional development experiences are available on assessment topics that will help teachers and administrators understand and interpret their data. | Professional development experiences related to assessment are ongoing and aligned with program goals. Time is also built into planning meetings to discuss assessment and accountability issues and outcomes. | |
| E | The program has an adequate budget for assessment and accountability. | | | | E |
| | No budget exists for assessment and accountability activities beyond the state/local requirements. | Non-mandated assessment and accountability activities are paid for through other areas of the dual language program's budget. | A budget line exists in the dual language program for assessment and accountability activities but may not fully fund all activities. | The district provides a budget line to fund the dual language program's assessment and accountability activities. | |

STRAND 1

Assessment and Accountability

Principle 2

Student assessment is aligned with state content and language standards, as well as with program goals, and is used for evaluation of the program and instruction.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|--|--|----------|
| A | The program engages in ongoing evaluation. | | | | A |
| | 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. | The program conducts annual reviews and self-evaluations or external evaluations using standards appropriate for dual language, and the evaluation findings inform program change. | The program conducts regular self-evaluations and external evaluations using standards appropriate for dual language and conducts annual reviews to refine and improve goals and outcomes. | |
| B | Student assessment is aligned with classroom and program goals as well as with state standards. | | | | B |
| | Assessments are conducted only in response to state or district requirements, and there is no clear relationship to classroom and program goals. | Plans exist to align assessments with classroom and program goals, or this alignment may occur sporadically in the program. | Assessments are fully aligned with classroom and program goals as well as with state standards across the program. | Assessments are fully aligned with classroom and program goals as well as with state standards across the program. | |
| C | Assessment data are integrated into planning related to program development. | | | | C |
| | Data are not used in program evaluation and development. | Data have marginal impact on program evaluation and development. | Interpreting data is a central part of program evaluation and development. | Interpreting data is a central part of program evaluation and development, and program planning includes discussion of existing data and the potential need for modifying or expanding data collection efforts to better inform the program. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|---|--|--|----------|
| D | Assessment data are integrated into planning related to instructional practices and curriculum. | | | | D |
| | Data do not impact classroom activities. | Data are occasionally used for classroom decision-making, both for district and state requirements and for more specific program goals. | Data are routinely used for classroom decision-making, both for district and state requirements and for more specific program goals. | Teachers regularly use assessment and accountability information in their classroom planning, and classroom assessment informs program-level planning. | |

The program collects a variety of data, using multiple measures, that are used for program accountability and evaluation.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|--|---|---|----------|
| A | The program systematically collects data to determine whether academic, linguistic, and cultural goals are met. | | | | A |
| | No testing is administered beyond state- and district-mandated tests and subjects. | Limited standardized testing is administered beyond state- and district-mandated tests and subjects. | In addition to the required district, state, and national assessments, other standardized and non-standardized assessments are administered on a limited basis to measure progress toward program goals such as bilingualism, biliteracy, and multiculturalism. | Systematic data on academic performance, language and literacy development, and cross-cultural competence are collected program-wide from all students on a regular basis. | |
| B | The program systematically collects demographic data (ethnicity, home language, time in the United States, types of programs student has attended, mobility, etc.) from program participants. | | | | B |
| | Demographic data (on students, teachers, and other personnel) are not collected or are collected in unsystematic ways. | Basic demographic data are collected program-wide. | Extended demographic data are collected program-wide. | Extended demographic data are collected program-wide. The data are maintained in a secure and central database that allows for timely disaggregation of the data necessary for decision-making. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|---|--|----------|
| C | Assessment is consistently conducted in the two languages of the program. | | | | C |
| | The program assesses students only in English. | The program assesses students in both English and the partner language, but only uses English scores for program evaluation. | The program assesses students in one or both languages depending on the program design, the grade level, and the native language of the students, and reports achievement scores accordingly. | The program assesses students in both English and the partner language and includes both sets of scores in program evaluation reports. | |

Data are analyzed and interpreted in methodologically appropriate ways for program accountability and improvement.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|--|--|--|----------|
| A | Data are purposefully collected and subject to methodologically appropriate analysis. | | | | A |
| | 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 question of central importance. | 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. | |
| B | Achievement data are disaggregated by student and program variables (native language, grade level, student background, program, etc.). | | | | B |
| | Existing data are not disaggregated. | Some of the data are disaggregated on one or two variables, including native language. | All data are disaggregated on one or two key variables, including native language. | All data are disaggregated and cross-tabulated by a number of meaningful and useful demographic variables, including native language. | |

Assessment and Accountability

STRAND 1

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

Principle 5

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|---|--|---|----------|
| A | Progress is documented in both program languages for oral proficiency, literacy, and academic achievement. | | | | A |
| | There is limited and sporadic evidence of student progress. | There is systematic measurement of student progress, but only in one language or for only one goal or achievement objective. | There is systematic measurement of student progress in both languages for all achievement objectives and program goals. | There is systematic measurement of student progress in both languages and for all achievement objectives and program goals, as well as comparison to benchmarks of expected student performance at each grade level. | |
| B | Student progress is measured on a variety of indicators. | | | | B |
| | 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. | 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. The program advocates for these definitions to be included in state and district performance guidelines. | |
| C | Progress can be documented for all students through indicators such as retention rates and placement in special education and gifted/talented classes. | | | | C |
| | No statistics are maintained on these factors. | Statistics are maintained on these factors, but data collection is inconsistent or data are not disaggregated by native language group. | Statistics are maintained on these factors and are disaggregated by native language group. | Statistics are maintained on these factors, are disaggregated by native language group, and are monitored relative to district and state norms. | |

The program communicates with appropriate stakeholders about program outcomes.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|---|---|--|----------|
| A | Data are communicated publicly in transparent ways that prevent misinterpretations. | | | | A |
| | Data about the program are not publicly available. | Data about the program are publicly available (e.g., on a school Web site) but without explanations about data collection, methodology, or data interpretation. | Data about the program are publicly available with transparent information about data collection and methodology and with a clear and correct explanation about the interpretation of the data. | Data about the program from sources within and outside the program are publicly available with transparent information about data collection and methodology and with a clear and correct explanation about the interpretation of the data. | |
| B | Data are communicated to stakeholders. | | | | B |
| | 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 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. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|--|--|---|----------|
| C | Data are used to educate and mobilize supporters. | | | | C |
| | Data are not used to educate and mobilize program supporters. | Data are rarely used to educate and mobilize program supporters. | Data are occasionally used to educate and mobilize program supporters. | Data are routinely used to educate and mobilize program supporters. | |

The curriculum is standards-based and promotes the development of bilingual, biliterate, and multicultural competencies for all students.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|--|--|----------|
| A | The curriculum meets or exceeds district and state content standards regardless of the language of instruction. | | | | A |
| | District and state content standards are not taken into consideration during curriculum development for one or both languages of instruction. | District and state content standards are used inconsistently in curriculum development for one or both languages of instruction. | District and state content standards are used in a systematic manner to guide curriculum development for both languages of instruction. | District and state content standards are used in a systematic manner to guide curriculum development for both languages of instruction. The standards are refined and extended to reflect the needs of the school's population. | |
| B | The curriculum includes standards for first and second language development for all students. | | | | B |
| | There is no scope and sequence for language and literacy development for each of the program languages for either native speakers or second language learners. | There is a scope and sequence for language and literacy development for only one program language or one language group. | There is a scope and sequence for language and literacy development in both languages that is differentiated for native speakers and second language learners, with high expectations for both groups. | There is a scope and sequence for language and literacy development in both languages that is differentiated for native speakers and second language learners with high expectations for both groups. This scope and sequence is revisited on a regular basis and revised as needed. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|--|---|----------|
| C | The curriculum promotes equal status of both languages. | | | | C |
| | There is no indication of sufficient opportunities to develop social and academic registers in both languages. | Some attempts are made to equalize the cognitive load in both languages, but academic subjects such as math, science, and language arts are taught in one language, while specials (art, music, etc.) are taught in the other. | There is a fairly even divide between academic subjects and specials taught in each language. Language arts instruction is provided in both languages over the course of the program. Issues of linguistic diversity and language status are addressed sporadically. | There is an even divide between academic subjects and specials taught in each language. Language arts instruction is provided in both languages and students are provided opportunities to develop academic and social language and cognitive skills in both languages. Students are made aware of linguistic diversity and language status issues as is developmentally appropriate. | |
| D | The curriculum is sensitive to the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of all students. | | | | D |
| | There is little indication that the curriculum is culturally relevant or supports students' prior knowledge and home language. | The curriculum incorporates some culturally relevant materials and some consideration is given to students' prior knowledge and home language. | The curriculum incorporates lessons and materials that are culturally relevant to the students' home backgrounds. Teachers know about some of their students' backgrounds and try to use such knowledge in lessons. | The curriculum is systematically developed to be culturally relevant to the students' home backgrounds and communities, and teachers are well informed of the backgrounds of all of their students and know how to ground their lessons in such knowledge. | |

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

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|--|---|--|----------|
| A | There is a curriculum development and implementation plan that is connected to state and local standards. | | | | A |
| | There is no plan for curriculum development and implementation. | There is a plan, but it was developed by a single person and most staff members are either not familiar with it or not in agreement with it. | There is a plan that was developed by a representative committee, and staff members are in agreement with it and follow it. | There is a plan that was developed by a representative committee with buy-in from all stakeholders. The plan includes an articulated process for review and revision of the plan in a systematic manner. | |
| B | The curriculum is based on general education research and research on language learners. | | | | B |
| | There was no consideration of the research base during curriculum development. | Certain components of the curriculum (e.g., reading program or math) are based on research but may not be adapted for language learners. | The curriculum is structured around principles derived from research and incorporates published curricula and materials that are selected based on evaluation of the research base. | Published curricula and materials as well as the overall structure of the curriculum are explicitly research-based, and the program or curriculum coordinator stays abreast of current research. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|---|--|--|----------|
| C | The curriculum is adaptable. | | | | C |
| | No processes are established to adapt new curricular mandates or 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 needs. The team reviews new materials and adapts them for dual language classrooms as necessary. | The program or curriculum coordinator works with teachers to monitor new curriculum mandates and changing student needs. The team reviews new materials and adapts them for dual language classrooms as necessary and ensures articulation of the new curriculum within and across grade levels. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|--|---|--|----------|
| A | The curriculum builds on linguistic skills learned in each language to promote bilingualism. | | | | A |
| | No connections are made between the two languages. | Some connections between the two languages are made, although unsystematically. | Teachers plan together to coordinate linguistic skills learned in each language. Areas of potential transfer are explored. | Teachers plan together and systematically coordinate the development of linguistic skills in both languages for all students. | |
| B | Instruction in one language builds on concepts learned in the other language. | | | | B |
| | There is no connection between subjects or topics taught in each language, or there is direct translation of subjects or topics from one language to the other. | There is limited connection between subjects or topics taught in each language (e.g., continuing a discussion of a subject or topic in the second language, or using complementary resources in both languages). | There are systematic connections between subjects or topics taught in each language through the use of thematic instruction that links topics across content areas and languages. | There are systematic and ongoing connections between subjects or topics taught in each language, as well as continual communication among teachers through a variety of strategies such as team teaching, shared curriculum, and flexible grouping. Subsequent lessons in both languages build on and refine prior lessons taught in both languages. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|---|---|----------|
| C | The curriculum is coordinated within and across grade levels. | | | | C |
| | 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 plan. Planning time is allocated for this purpose. | There is a curriculum coordinator or instructional coach for the program who oversees the coordination of the curriculum within and across grade levels. Planning time is allocated for the teachers and coordinator to articulate curriculum development within and across grade levels. | |
| D | The curriculum is coordinated with support services such as English as a second language, Spanish as a second language, special education, and Title I. | | | | D |
| | There is no coordination with support services. | Individual teachers coordinate with support services. | There is a structured process of coordination of curriculum with support services, and this informs the curriculum development plan. Planning time is allocated for this purpose. | There is a curriculum coordinator for the program who oversees the coordination of the curriculum with support services. Processes are in place for program teachers to collaborate and articulate efforts with support service staff. | |

Instructional methods are derived from research-based principles of dual language education and from research on the development of bilingualism and biliteracy in children.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|--|--|--|----------|
| A | Explicit language arts instruction is provided in both program languages. | | | | A |
| | Explicit language arts instruction is provided only in one language for the duration of the program. Second language acquisition may or may not take place through exposure to the language in content lessons. | Explicit language arts instruction is offered in both languages over the course of the program, but for one language instruction is minimal or only takes place sporadically in response to specific student errors. | Explicit language arts instruction is systematically provided in both languages over the course of the program. In addition, language instruction is provided through content lessons. | Explicit language arts instruction is systematically provided in both languages over the course of the program. In addition, language instruction is provided through content lessons. Language arts instruction is coordinated between the two languages and across grade levels according to student progress. | |
| B | Academic content instruction is provided in both program languages. | | | | B |
| | All areas of content instruction are taught in one language for the duration of the program, with the other language being used only for language arts and/or specials. | Content instruction is provided in both languages but is not systematically coordinated within or across grades. | Content instruction is systematically provided in both languages. Over the course of the program, the cognitive load is balanced between the two program languages. | Content instruction is systematically provided in both languages, incorporating thematic instruction to support vocabulary and concept development in both languages, especially in programs where the subjects are divided by language (e.g., science in Spanish and math in English). | |
| C | The program design and curriculum are faithfully implemented in the classroom. | | | | C |
| | Teachers independently decide what aspects of the program and curriculum to follow in their classroom. | Most teachers adhere to the model design, program features, and curriculum. | All teachers adhere to the model design, program features, and curriculum. | All teachers adhere to the model design, program features, and curriculum, and their instructional experiences inform continuous evaluation and revision of program design and curriculum. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|--|--|----------|
| D | Instruction incorporates appropriate separation of languages according to program design. | | | | D |
| | There is no separation of languages for instruction: Teachers use both languages as they choose or constantly translate from one to the other. | There is an attempt at separation of languages, but it is adhered to more strictly in one language than the other. | There is a consistent separation of languages, with high expectations for students and teachers to use the language of instruction. | Students and teachers systematically use both program languages in a variety of academic and social contexts. | |
| E | Teachers use a variety of strategies to ensure student comprehension. | | | | E |
| | Few or no strategies are used to ensure that students understand academic language and concepts. | Some consideration is given to ensuring that students understand academic language and concepts by use of various instructional strategies (e.g., sheltered instruction, cooperative learning, flexible grouping). | Teachers consistently use instructional strategies to ensure that all students understand academic language and concepts. | Teachers use a variety of complementary instructional strategies for each lesson and constantly monitor student understanding of language and academic concepts. | |
| F | Instruction promotes metalinguistic awareness and metacognitive skills. | | | | F |
| | No attention is paid to metalinguistic or metacognitive skills. | Some attention is given to the development of metalinguistic and metacognitive skills but in an unsystematic way. | Metalinguistic and metacognitive skills are addressed in developmentally appropriate ways. Students are encouraged to think about language and compare the languages that they are learning. | Metalinguistic and metacognitive skills are systematically developed through developmentally appropriate classroom activities and discussions, and this is incorporated into curriculum and lesson planning. | |

Instructional strategies enhance the development of bilingualism, biliteracy, and academic achievement.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|--|--|---|----------|
| A | Teachers integrate language and content instruction. | | | | A |
| | Language arts and content area instruction are entirely separate, and each type of lesson has its own objectives. | There is an attempt at language/content integration and some teachers work together on their own initiative to discuss possible ways to combine objectives in lessons. | There is consistent language/content integration in most lessons, and teachers work in grade level teams to brainstorm ways to combine objectives in lessons. | There is consistent language/content integration in most lessons, and there is a resource manual for the program that lists compatible language objectives for many of the common content area units (e.g., plants, solar system, measurement, etc.). | |
| B | Teachers use sheltered instruction strategies, such as building on prior knowledge and using routines and structures, to facilitate comprehension and promote second language development. | | | | B |
| | Teachers do not use sheltered instruction strategies. | Teachers sporadically use sheltered instruction strategies. | All program teachers use sheltered instruction strategies in both languages. | All program teachers use sheltered instruction strategies in both languages, and training in the use of these strategies is part of ongoing professional development. | |
| C | Instruction is geared toward the needs of both native speakers and second language learners when they are integrated for instruction. | | | | C |
| | Instruction is delivered with no attention to the varied needs of native speakers and second language learners. | Some modifications are made for addressing native speakers and second language learners at once, but instruction is still geared to one group or the other. | Various instructional techniques such as cooperative learning and flexible grouping are used to challenge native speakers while supporting second language learners. | Various instructional techniques, such as cooperative learning and flexible grouping are used in every lesson to push all students to higher levels of language use and cognition. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|---|--|----------|
| D | Instructional staff incorporate technology such as multimedia presentations and the Internet into their instruction. | | | | D |
| | Students rarely use multimedia technology or computers beyond passive video watching or Web surfing. | Some classes are given opportunities to use media and technology for linguistic and academic growth. | The use of media and technology is systematically incorporated into instruction across the program. | Teachers and administrators regularly attend seminars or bring in specialists to help them choose appropriate multimedia and Internet resources to target specific language and content skills. | |
| E | Support staff and specials teachers coordinate their instruction with the dual language model and approaches. | | | | E |
| | Support staff and specials teachers have no knowledge of dual language instruction strategies, and their classes do not align with the goals or philosophy of the program. | Some support staff and specials teachers utilize dual language instructional strategies, but this is not consistent across the whole school. | Most support staff and specials teachers utilize dual language instructional strategies and align their curriculum with that of the grade-level teachers. | All support staff and specials teachers are fully trained in and utilize dual language instruction strategies, and non-classroom-based instruction is aligned with classroom instructional methods and themes. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|--|--|----------|
| A | Teachers use active learning strategies such as thematic instruction, cooperative learning, and learning centers in order to meet the needs of diverse learners. | | | | A |
| | Instruction is teacher-centered, and there is little cooperative learning or hands-on learning. | Instruction is somewhat student-centered, and there is an attempt to vary instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners. | Instruction is strongly student-centered, and a variety of techniques are used to meet the needs of diverse learners. | Instruction is strongly student-centered, and ongoing assessments are conducted to determine ways that instruction may need to be altered to meet the needs of diverse learners. | |
| B | Teachers create opportunities for meaningful language use. | | | | B |
| | Few opportunities are provided to students for using either language actively in language arts or content lessons. | Students are provided some opportunities for using both languages actively in language arts and/or content lessons. | Students are provided meaningful opportunities for using both languages to ensure oral and written language development and growth of academic vocabulary. | Students are provided meaningful and ample opportunities for using both languages actively in academic and social settings to ensure oral and written language development and growth of academic vocabulary. | |
| C | Student grouping maximizes opportunities for students to benefit from peer models. | | | | C |
| | Students in the dual language program rarely have the opportunity to work cooperatively with students who do not share their native language. | In integrated classrooms, teachers sporadically use cooperative learning strategies in cross-linguistic groups. | In integrated classrooms, teachers use appropriate and flexible grouping strategies to maximize the benefits of peer interaction. | In integrated classrooms, students have ample opportunities to be both language models and language learners when interacting with their peers in both academic and social situations. Students in non-integrated classrooms are provided opportunities to interact with peers who speak the partner language. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|---|---|--|----------|
| D | Instructional strategies build independence and ownership of the learning process. | | | | D |
| | 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 independent work to the rest of the curriculum or limited guidance on expected outcomes. | Students are able to exercise a great deal of independence in their learning environment and are taught strategies to enhance their independence by learning how to answer their own questions, use classroom resources, and revise their own work. | A variety of differentiated instructional strategies are implemented so students become independent learners. Classroom management supports student academic independence, and students are encouraged to pursue topics of their own interest. | |

Teachers create a multilingual and multicultural learning environment.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|---|--|----------|
| A | There is cultural and linguistic equity in the classroom. | | | | A |
| | One linguistic or cultural group is more highly valued than others in the classroom. | There is an attempt at equality, but one linguistic or cultural group may be more highly valued in subtle and symbolic ways. | Teachers create a learning environment where all linguistic and cultural groups are equally valued and respected. | Teachers and students work together to create a learning environment where all linguistic and cultural groups are equally valued and respected. Issues of linguistic and cultural equality are discussed on a regular basis as is developmentally appropriate. | |
| B | Instruction takes language varieties into consideration. | | | | B |
| | There is no discussion of language varieties within or across languages. | There is some discussion of language varieties within and across languages, but there is no distinction made about which variety may be most appropriate in a given situation or how cultures associate different status with different varieties. | There is a fair amount of discussion of language varieties within and across languages, including the situational and cultural meanings of the varieties used by the students and in the community. Teachers respect dialectal variation. | There is a lot of discussion of language variety within and across languages, including the situational and cultural meanings of the varieties used by the students and in the community. Teachers respect dialectal variation. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|---|---|--|----------|
| C | <p>Instructional materials in both languages reflect the student population in the program and encourage cross-cultural appreciation.</p> | | | | C |
| | <p>The materials are not reflective of the student population or multiculturalism.</p> | <p>Some diverse and multicultural materials are used, but not systematically or across both languages and all grades.</p> | <p>There is a sufficient diversity of materials that reflect the various subgroups of the student population and that explicitly encourage cross-cultural appreciation.</p> | <p>There is a great deal of diversity of student materials that reflect the various subgroups of the student population, and these are supplemented by drawing on community resources and students' home experiences. Instructional materials incorporate themes that address respect and appreciation for all cultures.</p> | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|--|---|--|----------|
| A | A recruiting plan exists. | | | | A |
| | No defined recruitment plan exists. | A recruitment plan exists, but teachers and other staff are frequently hired on an emergency basis and without considering long-term program needs. | A recruitment plan exists, it is well-coordinated with the district-level human resources department, and teachers and other staff are hired appropriately, considering long-term program goals. | There is an integrated process of recruitment, hiring, and retention that is systematically coordinated with district-level staff and takes long-term program goals into account. The program works with local universities to train dual language teachers who can work in their program. | |
| B | Selection of new instructional, administrative, and support staff takes into consideration credentials and language proficiency. | | | | B |
| | Staff members are hired with little consideration given to matching their credentials and language proficiency to their assignment. | Staff members with a commitment to the program design and goals are hired, but there is frequently a mismatch between the skills and credentials of the staff and their job assignments. | The majority of staff members have the appropriate commitment, skills, and credentials for their position. Opportunities are provided for staff members to sharpen skills and obtain credentials. | All staff have the appropriate skills and credentials for their position. Opportunities are provided for staff members to sharpen skills and develop professionally. | |
| C | Staff members receive support. | | | | C |
| | Teachers and other staff receive little or no support. | Orientation meetings are held at the beginning of the year for new staff, but there is little or no follow-up during the school year. | Frequent meetings, which may include activities for team building and mentoring of new staff, provide support for teachers, administrators, and support staff. Teachers and other staff are given time for collaborative planning and reflection. | Support for staff includes compensation, regular meetings, and time for co-planning, co-teaching, reflection, and feedback. Veteran teachers and other staff are given the opportunity for renewal training. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|---|--|----------|
| D | Retaining quality staff is a priority. | | | | D |
| | There are no incentives for teacher retention. | There are some incentives for teacher retention. | Plans for encouraging teacher retention are explicit and include educator-centered professional development and leadership opportunities, including mentoring and peer coaching. | A plan exists for high-quality, experienced staff to participate in educator-centered professional development and leadership opportunities. Staff are compensated financially for high-level work, or they are compensated with higher education opportunities, special recognition, or other incentives. | |
| E | Staff evaluations are performed by personnel who are familiar with dual language education. | | | | E |
| | Administrators who evaluate staff have no knowledge of dual language education. | Administrators who evaluate staff are familiar with dual language education, but program standards are not linked to the evaluation criteria or instruments. | Administrators who evaluate staff are knowledgeable about dual language education, and evaluation criteria include adherence to the relevant program standards for dual language education. | Administrators who evaluate staff are knowledgeable about dual language education, and evaluation criteria and instruments used with dual language program staff explicitly incorporate the relevant program standards. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|---|---|---|----------|
| A | A long-term professional development plan exists that is inclusive, focused, and intensive. | | | | A |
| | There is no plan, and professional development activities are sporadic and incidental. | A plan is in place, but the activities are generic and do not include all program staff. | A professional development plan is in place, is well implemented, and takes into account the varying needs of different staff members in the school (including dual language and non-dual-language program staff, new and veteran staff, etc.). | A comprehensive plan for professional development is created annually and is implemented systematically. It reflects issues of importance to the staff and the school, including the specific requirements of teaching in a dual language environment. | |
| B | Action plans for professional development are needs-based, and individual staff plans are aligned with the program plan. | | | | B |
| | Professional development activities are not based on staff needs. | Staff surveys are conducted, but results are not regularly used to plan professional development. | The professional development plan is based on the results of staff surveys and regular re-evaluations of program strengths and weaknesses, includes the entire staff, and allows for individual plans. | The professional development plan is formulated to respond to regularly collected information on staff needs and program strengths and weaknesses. In its implementation, the overall plan is aligned with individual plans, and feedback leads to revisions as needed. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|---|--|---|----------|
| C | Professional development is aligned with competencies needed to meet dual language program standards. | | | | C |
| | Professional development activities do not address the theoretical underpinnings, useful strategies, or necessary skills for working in a dual language program. | Professional development activities address theories, strategies, and skills that are useful in dual language programs (e.g., thematic teaching, cooperative learning, sheltered instruction), but no explicit connection is made to how they work in dual language environments. | Professional development activities address theories, strategies, and skills that are the foundation of dual language programs, and explicit connections are drawn to using these techniques in dual language classrooms. Meeting dual language program standards is a goal of professional development. | Professional development activities are designed to give teachers and other staff a comprehensive understanding of the theories, strategies, and skills that are essential in dual language programs, with explicit connections to dual language classrooms. The needs of staff in relation to meeting dual language standards are taken into consideration when planning professional development activities. | |
| D | All staff are developed as advocates for dual language programs. | | | | D |
| | No attention is paid to the importance of advocacy for the program. | There is some attention to advocacy for the program at the school level (e.g., school committees, working with the local community) but not beyond the level of the school. | Professional development incorporates a support network of staff to advocate on behalf of dual language programs at the community and school-district levels. Guidance is provided on how to use program data in advocacy activities, and these data are readily available. | Professional development incorporates a support network of staff and community members to advocate on behalf of dual language programs at the community, school-district, and state levels. Attention is given regularly to how the program can be better represented and understood, and staff members have opportunities to gain experience in communicating on behalf of the program to various audiences using program data from the school and district. | |

Staff Quality and Professional Development

The program provides adequate resource support for professional development.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|---|--|----------|
| A | Professional development is supported financially. | | | | A |
| | Financial support is not provided for professional development activities. Staff members are not compensated for participating in activities to fulfill their individual professional development plans. | Financial support exists for sporadic professional development activities. Staff members may received limited compensation for individual professional development activities. | The program-wide professional development plan has adequate funding, and staff receive reasonable compensation for supplemental professional development activities. | There is a comprehensive professional development plan with sufficient financial support for staff planning and participation, meeting expenses, and assistance from specialists as needed. Staff members can rely on full compensation for professional development outside of school hours, including payment of tuition. | |
| B | Time is allocated for professional development. | | | | B |
| | Staff members are allowed to attend short (one-day) workshops when they find the information about the workshop themselves and make a request to attend. | Staff members are allowed to attend occasional workshops and conferences, with substitute teachers provided and registration costs covered. | Staff members prepare individual professional development plans, and they are provided with release time to attend the activities that are given priority within that plan. Teachers and other staff are also provided with time to meet for planning and reflection. | The program provides time for professional development in the form of retreats, time built into the schedule for peer observation, coaching, and collaboration. Staff are encouraged and supported to participate in a wide variety of professional development activities, including conferences, peer observations, university courses, study groups, summer institutes, and others. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|---|--|--|----------|
| C | There are adequate human resources designated for professional development. | | | | C |
| | There is no program coordinator or professional development coordinator to oversee professional development activities. | There is a part-time program coordinator or professional development coordinator, who may be able to mentor dual language staff in some professional development areas. | There is an experienced, full-time program coordinator or professional development coordinator to organize ongoing professional development activities tailored to the needs of the staff. | There is an experienced full-time program coordinator or professional development coordinator who organizes ongoing professional development activities, coaches program teachers, and mentors new staff. There is a coordinator at the district or state level who promotes systematic professional development as well as collaboration and sharing of ideas across programs in the district or state. | |

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

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|--|--|---|----------|
| A | The program collaborates with teacher and staff training programs at local universities. | | | | A |
| | There is no partnering with teacher and staff preparation institutions. | Occasional dialogue takes place between the dual language program and local teacher preparation program(s). | There is a plan for a partnership between a university or teacher/staff preparation program and the dual language program, with some on-site classes offered for teachers and staff and student-teacher placements in the dual language program. | There is a formal partnership between a teacher/staff preparation program and the dual language program, with clear goals and expectations that include on-site classes and advancement plans, student teaching placements, and co-planning of courses for prospective teachers. | |
| B | Program staff partner with professional organizations. | | | | B |
| | There is no partnering with professional organizations. | Participation in professional organizations is limited to the initiative of individual teachers. Individual requests from staff members to attend conferences or meetings may be granted. | Partnerships are actively sought with professional organizations, and individuals are encouraged and supported in participating in such organizations. | The program takes an active role in professional organizations, encouraging staff members to attend conferences and meetings, seek office, give presentations, host site visits, etc. | |
| C | Program staff engage in networking with staff from other programs. | | | | C |
| | There is no communication with other schools, or communication is incidental based on personal relationships. | Teacher, staff, and administrators occasionally attend professional development activities initiated and planned by staff from other dual language programs, but with little time to interact or exchange ideas. | Staff members, including administrators, regularly contact staff in other programs to plan professional development activities and share costs for professional development and resources where possible. | The program supports teachers to be proactive in planning professional development activities and other types of collaboration with other schools (and districts), serving on planning committees for cross-school/cross-district professional development activities, and participating in district-wide study or interest groups. | |

Program Structure

STRAND **5**

Principle **1**

All aspects of the program work together to achieve the goals of additive bilingualism, biliteracy, and cross-cultural competence, while meeting grade-level academic expectations.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|---|---|----------|
| A | There is a coordinated plan for promoting bilingualism and biliteracy. | | | | A |
| | Efforts at promoting bilingualism and biliteracy are uncoordinated and unsystematic. | There is some plan for promoting bilingualism and biliteracy, but there is insufficient coordination with other competency areas or lack of knowledge of how to accomplish this objective. | There is a program-wide plan for promoting bilingualism and biliteracy, and implementation is consistent at all grade levels. | There is a program-wide plan for promoting bilingualism and biliteracy, and implementation is consistent at all grade levels. The program communicates and advocates these goals beyond the school at the district, state, and national levels. | |
| B | There is a coordinated plan for promoting cross-cultural competence. | | | | B |
| | Efforts at promoting cross-cultural competence are uncoordinated and unsystematic. | There is some plan for promoting cross-cultural competence, but there is insufficient coordination with other competency areas or lack of knowledge of how to accomplish this objective. | There is a program-wide plan for promoting cross-cultural competence, and implementation is consistent at all grade levels. | There is a program-wide plan for promoting cross-cultural competence, and implementation is consistent at all grade levels. The program communicates and advocates these goals beyond the school at the district, state, and national levels. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|--|--|---|----------|
| A | All students and staff have appropriate access to resources. | | | | A |
| | One program within the school (i.e., the dual language program or the mainstream program) or one population within the program has greater access to resources than others. | 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. The dual language program leadership has communicated with administrators, teachers, parents, and community members outside the program to explain their needs. | 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 communicated with administrators, teachers, parents, and community outside the program to explain their needs. | |
| B | The program promotes linguistic equity. | | | | B |
| | One language is afforded higher status in the program than the other (e.g., is used more often in communication in the program). | Some steps have been taken to equalize the status of the two program languages, but one language is devalued in some domains. | Both languages are equally valued throughout the program, and particular consideration is given to elevating the status of the partner language. | Both languages are equally valued throughout the program. Issues of language status are frequently discussed, and particular consideration is given to elevating the status of the partner language. | |
| C | The program promotes cultural equity. | | | | C |
| | 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 program communications. | All cultural groups are equally valued and have equal participation in all facets of the program. | All cultural groups are equally valued and are empowered to participate in and make decisions about all facets of the program. The program has processes in place to ensure continuous cultural equity. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|---|---|--|----------|
| D | The program promotes additive bilingualism. | | | | D |
| | The program does not provide adequate time and resources to develop both program languages because of the duration of the program or limited amount of time devoted to instruction in the partner language. | The program’s duration is adequate, but the quality of instruction in one of the program languages is not sufficient to promote additive bilingualism. | The program promotes oral language and literacy development through students’ extended exposure to and practice in both languages over the course of the program. | The program’s language and literacy development plan is sufficiently flexible to meet the language acquisition needs of the two language groups and to exploit the additional cognitive benefits of bilingualism. Students are given opportunities to fully develop social and academic registers in both languages. | |
| E | Whether the dual language program is a whole-school program or a strand within a school, signs and daily routines (e.g., announcements) reflect bilingualism and multiculturalism. | | | | E |
| | All school-wide activities and print are solely in English. Little attention is paid to incorporating minority cultures. | Environmental print around the school is posted in both program languages, but announcements, assemblies, and other whole-school events are conducted entirely in English. Some attention is paid to incorporating minority cultures. | The majority of school-wide activities and print are in both program languages, and it is obvious that the development of bilingualism and cross-cultural awareness are important features of the school. | The majority of school-wide activities and print are in both program languages, and it is obvious that the development of bilingualism and cross-cultural awareness are important features of the school. When applicable, students not enrolled in the dual language program are provided with opportunities for second language learning and cross-cultural awareness (e.g., buddy classes, afterschool language classes). | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|--|--|----------|
| A | The program has leadership. | | | | A |
| | There is no clear leadership for the program. | There is an administrative leader but no development of leadership in the rest of the staff. | There is an administrative leader as well as a leadership team whose roles and responsibilities are well defined. | There is an administrative leader as well as a leadership team. Roles and responsibilities with regard to program processes and procedures are clearly defined, and a plan is in place for training new leaders. | |
| B | Day-to-day decision making is aligned to the overall program vision and mission, and includes communication with stakeholders. | | | | B |
| | Leadership decision-making processes are random and do not align with or are counter to an overall program vision and mission. Processes and decisions are not communicated to stakeholders in a timely fashion. | Leadership decision-making processes align to the overall program vision and mission. Processes and decisions are communicated sporadically. | Leadership decision-making processes are aligned to and respectful of the overall program vision and mission. Decisions are made in consultation with key stakeholders and are communicated in a timely fashion. | Leadership decision-making processes are aligned to and respectful of the overall program vision and mission. Leadership decision-making processes and outcomes involve two-way communication with all stakeholders. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|---|--|--|----------|
| C | Leaders are advocates for the program. | | | | C |
| | No advocacy work is conducted by program leaders, or work is conducted only on an ad hoc basis when a crisis occurs. | Leaders advocate proactively for the program, but only with limited stakeholders (e.g., only 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, and there is a long-term advocacy plan in place that includes collaborations with other programs, school and district administrators, and state policy makers. | |

Program Structure

The program has used a well-defined, inclusive, and defensible process to select and refine a model design.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|--|--|----------|
| A | Sufficient time, resources, and research were devoted to the planning process. | | | | A |
| | Planners had or used limited knowledge of research on model design and of the resources available to the program, and did not allow sufficient time for planning and implementation. | Planners had knowledge of research and resources but did not use them to their fullest extent, or only used a few resources in a haphazard manner. | Planners followed a well-articulated plan for gathering and synthesizing information and resources, and spent 9-12 months in the planning process. | Planners followed a well-articulated plan of gathering information and resources, consulted relevant research and experts to aid in planning, continually self-evaluated during the process, and spent at least one year in the planning process. | |
| B | The planning process included all stakeholders (teachers, administrators, parents, community members). | | | | B |
| | The planning process mostly took place among a few administrators behind closed doors. | Some stakeholders were represented in the planning process, but little outreach or effort was made to be inclusive. | Stakeholders who would be directly involved in the program were represented in the planning process and their needs and concerns were thoughtfully considered. | Planners purposefully met with representatives of each of the stakeholder groups, including community members, parents, and teachers who would not be part of the dual language program but would be affected by it, and the vision, mission, and program design reflect all stakeholders. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|---|--|--|----------|
| C | The program meets the needs of the population. | | | | C |
| | The planners used limited knowledge of the student population and its needs to select the model and design the program. | The planners were aware of the student population and its needs and used this information to select a model and design the program. | The planners designed the program with a very clear sense of the student population and its needs. | The planners designed the program with a very clear sense of the student population and its needs and included a built-in process to re-evaluate the program design with changing needs of students. | |
| D | The program design is aligned with program philosophy, vision, and goals. | | | | D |
| | It is not clear that the program design will allow students to attain the goals of the program or that it promotes the vision and philosophy of the program. | The program design will clearly allow students to attain at least one goal of the program (e.g., bilingualism or cross-cultural awareness), but the possible attainment of other goals is less clear. | The program design has been aligned with the program philosophy and vision and with the goals that have been set for the students at each grade level. | The program design has been aligned with the program philosophy and vision and with all of the goals that have been set for the students at each grade level, and specific features of the model (e.g., scheduling, curriculum, teaching teams) have been aligned and clearly articulated with respect to the overall program goals. | |

Program Structure

An effective process exists for continual program planning, implementation, and evaluation.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|---|---|---|----------|
| A | The program is adaptable. | | | | A |
| | The program is very rigid and is unresponsive to necessary changes to better meet the needs of students and parents as well as district and state requirements. There are no articulated processes for dealing with change. | The program solicits input from stakeholders about needed changes in the program in a random manner as issues arise, but communication regarding the results of the input and subsequent implementation of changes is uncoordinated and unsystematic. | The program has defined processes for soliciting input from stakeholders about needed changes in the program. Communication regarding the results of those changes is timely and transparent. | The program has defined processes for soliciting input from stakeholders in an organized, ongoing, and consistent manner about needed changes in the program. Communication regarding the results of those changes is timely and transparent. | |
| B | The program is articulated within and across grades. | | | | B |
| | There is little or no systematic articulation of the model across grade levels. | There is a plan for articulation across grade levels but it is not well implemented. | There is a plan for articulation across grade levels and it is well implemented. | There is a well-implemented plan for articulation across grade levels that is revisited periodically and revised as needed. There is a plan in place for articulation to the secondary grades. | |

Family and Community

STRAND 6

Principle 1

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

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|---|---|---|----------|
| A | There is a staff member designated as liaison with families and communities associated with the program. | | | | A |
| | No person is designated as family/community liaison. | The program has a designated family/community liaison but without sufficient time or resources to fully meet family and community needs. | The program has a designated family/community liaison who is proficient in both program languages and who has sufficient time and resources to meet family and community needs. | The program has a family/community liaison who is fluent in both program languages and who has sufficient time and resources to meet family and community needs. A process is in place to ensure that all concerned parties feel comfortable with and are understood by the liaison. | |
| B | Office staff members have bilingual proficiency and cross-cultural awareness. | | | | B |
| | No office staff members have bilingual proficiency or cross-cultural awareness. | Some office staff members have bilingual proficiency and/or cross-cultural awareness. | The majority of office staff members have bilingual proficiency and most also possess adequate cross-cultural awareness. | The majority of office staff members have bilingual proficiency and cross-cultural awareness, and ongoing training is provided to strengthen these skills. | |
| C | Staff development topics include working equitably with families and the community. | | | | C |
| | The issue of working equitably with families and community members is rarely, if ever, discussed, and no staff development has occurred in this area. | Staff work together informally to address this issue (e.g., teachers brainstorm with each other about their individual strategies for working with and involving families in the classroom), but there is no program-wide plan. | The program provides ongoing staff development activities on this issue, and there is a program-wide plan in place (e.g., new teachers are paired with veterans to learn about successful practices for involving families, home visits are part of a teacher education/sensitization program). | The program provides systematic and ongoing staff development activities that follow and support a program-wide plan for this issue (e.g., staff learn about the socioeconomic and political issues facing the community, and about patterns of typical family involvement in the program, and they are given the support needed to help families move to deeper levels of involvement in the program). | |

The program has parent education and support services that are reflective of the bilingual and multicultural goals of the program.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|---|--|----------|
| A | <p>The program incorporates ongoing parent education that is designed to help parents understand, support, and advocate for the program.</p> | | | | A |
| | <p>Parent education is sparse and unrelated to the goals of the program.</p> | <p>Parent education is occasionally done at the individual, classroom, or grade level as needs are expressed, but without empowering the parents.</p> | <p>The program facilitates meaningful parent education that involves parents from all linguistic and cultural groups and that systematically develops understanding of and support for the program’s goals.</p> | <p>There is a program-wide plan for meaningful parent education that involves parents from all linguistic and cultural groups and that systematically develops understanding of and support for the program’s goals. Parents are empowered to work with administration and staff to support the academic, linguistic, and cultural goals of the program.</p> | |
| B | <p>The program meets parents’ needs in supporting their children’s education and living in the community.</p> | | | | B |
| | <p>Little parent support is evident beyond district-mandated handouts sent home with students.</p> | <p>Parents are given some assistance in finding community resources (e.g., social, legal, health services), but not in an ongoing manner, and assistance is not differentiated to meet the needs of the different linguistic and cultural groups in the program. Parents are mostly on their own for helping their children educationally.</p> | <p>The program assists parents in finding community resources in ways that are appropriate for the various linguistic and cultural groups in the program. Parents help each other support their children’s academic growth (e.g., through parent mentoring and homework help networks).</p> | <p>The program helps parents find and negotiate community resources as appropriate and provides parental support for students’ academic growth (e.g., facilitating cross-linguistic homework help networks and sending educational materials such as books and dictionaries home with the students). Regular parental needs assessments help the program develop new resources and differentiate the assistance they offer to the different linguistic and cultural groups in the program.</p> | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|---|---|---|----------|
| C | Activities are designed to bring parents together to promote cross-cultural awareness. | | | | C |
| | There are no parent activities beyond basic parent-teacher interaction. | A few parent activities are conducted that promote interaction between the different language and cultural groups, but they are unsystematic and uncoordinated. | There is a coordinated, systematic set of parent activities to reinforce the cross-cultural goals of the program. | Following a plan, there is a coordinated, systematic set of parent activities to reinforce the cross-cultural goals of the program. This plan is reviewed on an ongoing basis and revised if necessary. | |
| D | Communication with parents and the community is in the appropriate language. | | | | D |
| | Communication with parents and community members is mostly in English. | Communication with parents and community members is in both languages of the program, but not consistently. | Communication with parents and community members, including all materials available to the public (e.g., through a Web site) is always in both program languages. The two languages are used in oral communication according to the desires of the audience (either through translation, use of headsets, or separate meetings in each language). | Communication with parents is in both program languages, with translations to other languages as necessary. Communication outside the program is in both program languages. The two languages are used in oral communication according to the desires of the audience, and attention is paid to language status issues, for example, having equal information in both languages, equal symbolic use of the languages (e.g., font size, quality of paper, presentation of information) and alternating the order in which languages are used (English first, then the partner language first). | |
| E | The program allows for many different levels of participation, comfort, and talents of parents. | | | | E |
| | There are few opportunities for parent participation. | There are multiple opportunities for parent participation, but all require certain skills (e.g., computer skills, literacy) or occur during school hours. | There are multiple opportunities for parent participation that allow for varied skills, interests, and availability. | There are multiple opportunities for parent participation, and parents are surveyed on a regular basis to learn more about ways that they would like to participate in the program. | |

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

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|---|---|---|----------|
| A | The program establishes an advisory structure for input from parents and community members. | | | | A |
| | No input is solicited from parents and community members. | Input from parents and community members is solicited only for specific issues, such as the continuation of the program to the secondary level. | There is a process in place to solicit and use ongoing input about the program from parents and community members. | There is a process in place to solicit and use ongoing input from parents and community members, and this process is evaluated regularly and improved as needed. | |
| B | The program takes advantage of community language resources. | | | | B |
| | There is no evidence of community language resources in the program. | The program takes advantage of some language resources, such as inviting local community members to speak in their native language. | The program takes advantage of the multilingual nature of the local community by bringing in outside speakers and occasionally taking field trips that incorporate authentic use of the two program languages and multicultural appreciation. | The program makes students aware of the community’s language resources by bringing in speakers and bilingual mentors and taking field trips that incorporate authentic use of the two program languages and multicultural appreciation. The program encourages the community to use the partner language with students when they are outside of school. | |

The program is supported by all program and school staff.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|---|---|----------|
| A | Administrators are knowledgeable about and supportive of the program and provide leadership for the program. | | | | A |
| | Administrators know little about the program or have negative perceptions of the program. | Administrators know little about the program and are cautious, but publicly support the program. | Administrators are fully supportive of the program and have adequate knowledge of the program’s essential components. | Administrators are supportive, very knowledgeable, and demonstrate strong leadership and advocacy on behalf of the program. | |
| B | Teachers and staff are knowledgeable about and supportive of the program and provide leadership for the program. | | | | B |
| | Teachers and staff know little about the program or have negative perceptions of the program. | Teachers and staff know little about the program and are cautious, but publicly support the program. | Teachers and staff are fully supportive of the program and have adequate knowledge of the program’s essential components. | Teachers and staff are supportive, very knowledgeable, and demonstrate strong leadership and advocacy on behalf of the program. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|--|---|----------|
| A | The program communicates with families and the community. | | | | A |
| | There is little communication beyond what is mandated. | Communication is inconsistent or one-way. Family and community meetings are sporadic. | There are regular meetings and ongoing communication with families and community members about on student participation, family support, and relevant assessment and evaluation information. | Program staff seek opportunities to attend community functions to communicate with the public about the program. Media coverage is encouraged in order to educate the public and promote the program. | |
| B | Families and community members are knowledgeable about and supportive of the program and provide leadership and advocacy for the program. | | | | B |
| | Families and community members know little about the program and may have negative perceptions of the program. | Families and community members know little about the program and are cautious, but publicly support the program's existence. | Families and community members are fully supportive of the program and have sufficient knowledge to begin to advocate and provide leadership for the program. | Families and community members are supportive, knowledgeable, and consistently demonstrate strong leadership and advocacy for the program. | |

Support and Resources

STRAND 7

The program is adequately funded.

Principle 3

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|--|---|---|----------|
| A | Funding allocations match the goals and objectives of the program. | | | | A |
| | There is no match between funding allocations and the goals and objectives of the program. | Some goals and objectives of the program are adequately funded, but many are not. | There is sufficient funding to support the key goals and objectives of the program. | There is sufficient funding to support all goals and objectives of the program. A plan exists to research and secure additional resources to ensure full support of the program. | |
| B | Funding provides sufficient staff, equipment, and materials to meet program goals and objectives. | | | | B |
| | There is a lack of qualified staff or appropriate equipment and materials. | Some staff, equipment, and materials are in place to support the program, but not in sufficient quantity to ensure full development and implementation of the program. | There is sufficient staff, equipment, and materials to ensure that program goals and objectives are realized. | Staff are well trained and materials are up-to-date, appropriate for dual language, culturally sensitive, oriented to the literacy and language needs of dual language students, and suitable for diverse learning styles. A plan exists to research and secure additional resources to ensure full support of the program. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|--|--|---|---|----------|
| A | The program seeks the tangible support of the state, district, school board, and local business community. | | | | A |
| | No support is sought. | Support is sought only by individuals acting independently. | The leadership team communicates information and requests directly to stakeholders outside the program, with the input and assistance of staff and teachers who are aware of the program’s needs. | There is a process in place to communicate regularly with stakeholders and motivate them to be pro-active in supporting the program. | |
| B | The program engages in public relations activities to promote the program to a variety of audiences (e.g., publicizing assessment results or outside recognition). | | | | B |
| | The program staff make no attempts to publicize the program. | Data and information are shared with the district and local community on a sporadic basis or in an ineffective format. | A staff member or volunteer is designated to publicize the successes of the program and coordinate other public relations activities in the district, the community, and beyond. | A plan for data-sharing and community outreach is continuously evaluated and refined. Data and presentations of information are user-friendly for a variety of audiences and are bilingual (as appropriate). Information is made public through multiple means, such as reports, press releases, journal articles, and Web sites. | |

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|---|--|--|----------|
| C | The program participates in coalitions of similar programs. | | | | C |
| | There is no participation in coalitions. | Individual teachers may communicate with staff at similar programs on their own initiative. | The program works with other programs toward the development and realization of common goals. | The program takes an active role in beginning and nurturing relationships with new and established programs, with whom they work toward the development and realization of common goals. | |
| D | Program staff network to strengthen support for dual language education. | | | | D |
| | Staff are not involved in professional organizations and do not have a defined network of allies. | Staff have limited membership in regional, state, and national organizations, and individual staff members are networking with allies informally. | Program teachers and staff are members of regional, state, and national organizations and have ongoing conversations with allies to identify and strengthen support. | Program representatives are active members of regional, state, and national organizations and their participation is supported by program resources. There are allies that lobby and voice support regularly at the district and state levels. | |
| E | The program advocates for funding based on its needs. | | | | E |
| | The program does not seek funding beyond what it automatically gets from the district. | The program occasionally asks the district or state for additional funding for acute needs. | The program systematically communicates its needs to the district and state and explores possibilities for outside funding, as appropriate. | The program systematically communicates its needs to the district and state, and actively seeks state, federal, and foundation grants to meet its goals and expand its scope. | |

Resources are distributed equitably within the program, school, and district.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY | |
|----------|---|--|--|---|----------|
| A | The dual language program has equitable access to state, district, and school resources. | | | | A |
| | Dual language programs do not have the same access to state, district, and school resources as other programs. | A plan is in place to allocate resources fairly across programs, but some programs or schools still have more resources than others. | All programs share resources equitably, responding directly to the needs of the students. | All programs share resources equitably, and funding initiatives ensure that full, effective implementation of the various programs will continue. | |
| B | Equal resources exist in both languages within the dual language classroom and in school-wide facilities (e.g., library, computer lab, parent center, science lab). | | | | B |
| | There are few or no materials in the partner language in classrooms or school-wide facilities. | There are adequate materials in both languages in the dual language classrooms, but not in school-wide facilities. | There are adequate materials in both languages in the dual language classrooms and school-wide facilities. | There is an abundance of up-to-date content and literacy materials in both languages in the classrooms and school-wide facilities. | |



Appendix: Rating Templates

After reading through this publication, you should have a clear sense of the essential guiding principles for dual language education programs, the research and practice base for these principles, and the indicators that describe minimal, partial, full, and exemplary alignment with them. To help you use this document as a tool for self-reflection, we are providing a set of blank templates for each of the seven strands. You are encouraged to photocopy the templates and use them 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, and support staff 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, programs in the planning or early implementation stage may want to focus on program structure, while established 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.

Principle 1: The program creates and maintains an infrastructure that supports an accountability process.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A The program has developed a data management system for tracking student data over time. | | | | |
| B Assessment and accountability action plans are developed and integrated into program and curriculum planning and professional development. | | | | |
| C Personnel are assigned to assessment and accountability activities. | | | | |
| D Staff are provided ongoing professional development opportunities in assessment and accountability. | | | | |
| E The program has an adequate budget for assessment and accountability. | | | | |

Principle 2: Student assessment is aligned with state content and language standards, as well as with program goals, and is used for evaluation of the program and instruction.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|---|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A The program engages in ongoing evaluation. | | | | |
| B Student assessment is aligned with classroom and program goals as well as with state standards. | | | | |
| C Assessment data are integrated into planning related to program development. | | | | |
| D Assessment data are integrated into planning related to instructional practices and curriculum. | | | | |

Principle 3: The program collects a variety of data, using multiple measures, that are used for program accountability and evaluation.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|---|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A The program systematically collects data to determine whether academic, linguistic, and cultural goals are met. | | | | |
| B The program systematically collects demographic data (ethnicity, home language, time in the United States, types of programs student has attended, mobility, etc.) from program participants. | | | | |
| C Assessment is consistently conducted in the two languages of the program. | | | | |

Principle 4: Data are analyzed and interpreted in methodologically appropriate ways for program accountability and improvement.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A Data are purposefully collected and subject to methodologically appropriate analysis. | | | | |
| B Achievement data are disaggregated by student and program variables (native language, grade level, student background, program, etc.). | | | | |

Principle 5: Student progress toward program goals and NCLB achievement objectives is systematically measured and reported.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A Progress is documented in both program languages for oral proficiency, literacy, and academic achievement. | | | | |
| B Student progress is measured on a variety of indicators. | | | | |
| C Progress can be documented for all students through indicators such as retention rates and placement in special education and gifted/talented classes. | | | | |

Principle 6: The program communicates with appropriate stakeholders about program outcomes.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|---|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A Data are communicated publicly in transparent ways that prevent misinterpretations. | | | | |
| B Data are communicated to stakeholders. | | | | |
| C Data are used to educate and mobilize supporters. | | | | |

Principle 1: The curriculum is standards-based and promotes the development of bilingual, biliterate, and multicultural competencies for all students.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|---|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A The curriculum meets or exceeds district and state content standards regardless of the language of instruction. | | | | |
| B The curriculum includes standards for first and second language development for all students. | | | | |
| C The curriculum promotes equal status of both languages. | | | | |
| D The curriculum is sensitive to the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of all students. | | | | |

Principle 2: The program has a process for developing and revising a high quality curriculum.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|---|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A There is a curriculum development and implementation plan that is connected to state and local standards. | | | | |
| B The curriculum is based on general education research and research on language learners. | | | | |
| C The curriculum is adaptable. | | | | |

Principle 3: The curriculum is fully articulated for all students.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|---|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A The curriculum builds on linguistic skills learned in each language to promote bilingualism. | | | | |
| B Instruction in one language builds on concepts learned in the other language. | | | | |
| C The curriculum is coordinated within and across grade levels. | | | | |
| D The curriculum is coordinated with support services such as English as a second language, Spanish as a second language, special education, and Title I. | | | | |

Principle 1: Instructional methods are derived from research-based principles of dual language education and from research on the development of bilingualism and biliteracy in children.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|---|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A Explicit language arts instruction is provided in both program languages. | | | | |
| B Academic content instruction is provided in both program languages. | | | | |
| C The program design and curriculum are faithfully implemented in the classroom. | | | | |
| D Instruction incorporates appropriate separation of languages according to program design. | | | | |
| E Teachers use a variety of strategies to ensure student comprehension. | | | | |
| F Instruction promotes metalinguistic awareness and metacognitive skills. | | | | |

Principle 2: Instructional strategies enhance the development of bilingualism, biliteracy, and academic achievement.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A Teachers integrate language and content instruction. | | | | |
| B Teachers use sheltered instruction strategies, such as building on prior knowledge and using routines and structures, to facilitate comprehension and promote second language development. | | | | |
| C Instruction is geared toward the needs of both native speakers and second language learners when they are integrated for instruction. | | | | |
| D Instructional staff incorporate technology such as multimedia presentations and the Internet into their instruction. | | | | |
| E Support staff and specials teachers coordinate their instruction with the dual language model and approaches. | | | | |

Principle 3: Instruction is student-centered.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A Teachers use active learning strategies such as thematic instruction, cooperative learning, and learning centers in order to meet the needs of diverse learners. | | | | |
| B Teachers create opportunities for meaningful language use. | | | | |
| C Student grouping maximizes opportunities for students to benefit from peer models. | | | | |
| D Instructional strategies build independence and ownership of the learning process. | | | | |

Principle 4: Teachers create a multilingual and multicultural learning environment.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A There is cultural and linguistic equity in the classroom. | | | | |
| B Instruction takes language varieties into consideration. | | | | |
| C Instructional materials in both languages reflect the student population in the program and encourage cross-cultural appreciation. | | | | |

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

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A A recruiting plan exists. | | | | |
| B Selection of new instructional, administrative, and support staff takes into consideration credentials and language proficiency. | | | | |
| C Staff members receive support. | | | | |
| D Retaining quality staff is a priority. | | | | |
| E Staff evaluations are performed by personnel who are familiar with dual language education. | | | | |

Principle 2: The program has a quality professional development plan.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A A long-term professional development plan exists that is inclusive, focused, and intensive. | | | | |
| B Action plans for professional development are needs-based, and individual staff plans are aligned with the program plan. | | | | |
| C Professional development is aligned with competencies needed to meet dual language program standards. | | | | |
| D All staff are developed as advocates for dual language programs. | | | | |

Principle 3: The program provides adequate resource support for professional development.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|---|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A Professional development is supported financially. | | | | |
| B Time is allocated for professional development. | | | | |
| C There are adequate human resources designated for professional development. | | | | |

Principle 4: The program collaborates with other groups and institutions to ensure staff quality.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A The program collaborates with teacher and staff training programs at local universities. | | | | |
| B Program staff partner with professional organizations. | | | | |
| C Program staff engage in networking with staff from other programs. | | | | |

Principle 1: All aspects of the program work together to achieve the goals of additive bilingualism, biliteracy and cross-cultural competence while meeting grade-level academic expectations.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A There is a coordinated plan for promoting bilingualism and biliteracy. | | | | |
| B There is a coordinated plan for promoting cross-cultural competence. | | | | |

Principle 2: The program ensures equity for all groups.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A All students and staff have appropriate access to resources. | | | | |
| B The program promotes linguistic equity. | | | | |
| C The program promotes cultural equity. | | | | |
| D The program promotes additive bilingualism. | | | | |
| E Whether the dual language program is a whole-school program or a strand within a school, signs and daily routines (e.g., announcements) reflect bilingualism and multiculturalism. | | | | |

Principle 3: The program has strong, effective, and knowledgeable leadership.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A The program has leadership. | | | | |
| B Day-to-day decision making is aligned to the overall program vision and mission, and includes communication with stakeholders. | | | | |
| C Leaders are advocates for the program. | | | | |

Principle 4: The program has used a well-defined, inclusive, and defensible process to select and refine a model design.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A Sufficient time, resources, and research were devoted to the planning process. | | | | |
| B The planning process included all stakeholders (teachers, administrators, parents, community members). | | | | |
| C The program meets the needs of the population. | | | | |
| D The program design is aligned with program philosophy, vision, and goals. | | | | |

Principle 5: An effective process exists for continual program planning, implementation, and evaluation.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A The program is adaptable. | | | | |
| B The program is articulated within and across grades. | | | | |

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

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A There is a staff member designated as liaison with families and communities associated with the program. | | | | |
| B Office staff members have bilingual proficiency and cross-cultural awareness. | | | | |
| C Staff development topics include working equitably with families and the community. | | | | |

Principle 2: The program has parent education and support services that are reflective of the bilingual and multicultural goals of the program.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|---|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A The program incorporates ongoing parent education that is designed to help parents understand, support, and advocate for the program. | | | | |
| B The program meets parents' needs in supporting their children's education and living in the community. | | | | |
| C Activities are designed to bring parents together to promote cross-cultural awareness. | | | | |
| D Communication with parents and the community is in the appropriate language. | | | | |
| E The program allows for many different levels of participation, comfort, and talents of parents. | | | | |

Principle 3: The program views and involves parents and community members as strategic partners.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|---|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A The program establishes an advisory structure for input from parents and community members. | | | | |
| B The program takes advantage of community language resources. | | | | |

Principle 1: The program is supported by all program and school staff.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A Administrators are knowledgeable about and supportive of the program and provide leadership for the program. | | | | |
| B Teachers and staff are knowledgeable about and supportive of the program and provide leadership for the program. | | | | |

Principle 2: The program is supported by families and the community.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|---|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A The program communicates with families and the community. | | | | |
| B Families and community members are knowledgeable about and supportive of the program and provide leadership and advocacy for the program. | | | | |

Principle 3: The program is adequately funded.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|---|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A Funding allocations match the goals and objectives of the program. | | | | |
| B Funding provides sufficient staff, equipment, and materials to meet program goals and objectives. | | | | |

Principle 4: The program advocates for support.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A The program seeks the tangible support of the state, district, school board, and local business community. | | | | |
| B The program engages in public relations activities to promote the program to a variety of audiences (e.g., publicizing assessment results or outside recognition). | | | | |
| C The program participates in coalitions of similar programs. | | | | |
| D Program staff network to strengthen support for dual language education. | | | | |
| E The program advocates for funding based on its needs. | | | | |

Principle 5: Resources are distributed equitably within the program, school, and district.

| | MINIMAL | PARTIAL | FULL | EXEMPLARY |
|---|---------|---------|------|-----------|
| A The dual language program has equitable access to state, district, and school resources. | | | | |
| B Equal resources exist in both languages within the dual language classroom and in school-wide facilities (e.g., library, computer lab, parent center, science lab). | | | | |

Two-Way Immersion Resources from CAL

The Center for Applied Linguistics has a variety of resources that provide information about the research supporting dual language education, particularly two-way immersion. We also offer tools for practitioners who are planning, administering, or teaching in TWI programs.

Supplementary materials for the *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* can be found on our Web site at www.cal.org/twi/guidingprinciples.htm.



Browse the Two-Way Immersion Web Site

Our two-way immersion Web site provides access to online resources on instruction, assessment and evaluation, research, and program design, including free downloadable materials and publications available for purchase.

These are some of the resources you will find on our Web site:

- Directory of Two-Way Immersion Programs in the U.S.
- Online toolkits, digests, and briefs
- Information about our latest publications

Bookmark our TWI Web site and check back often for new resources and updates.

Visit our TWI Web site for more information
www.cal.org/twi

CAL

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS

