

11-27-2018

Planning for Enrichment and Equity in Dual Language Education: A Study of Eight Program Master Plans

Charles Merritt

This research is a product of the Doctor of Education (EdD) program at George Fox University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Merritt, Charles, "Planning for Enrichment and Equity in Dual Language Education: A Study of Eight Program Master Plans" (2018). *Doctor of Education (EdD)*. 121.
<https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/edd/121>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctor of Education (EdD) by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

Planning for Enrichment and Equity in Dual Language Education:

A Study of Eight Program Master Plans

by

Charles Merritt

FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Chair: Susanna Thornhill, Ph.D.

Member: Karen Buchanan, Ed.D.

Member: Gary Sehorn, Ed.D.

A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of the
Doctor of Educational Leadership Department
in partial fulfillment for the degree of

Doctor of Education

GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY

November 27, 2018



GEORGE FOX
UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

"PLANNING FOR ENRICHMENT AND EQUITY IN DUAL LANGUAGE EDUCATION: A STUDY OF EIGHT PROGRAM MASTER PLANS," a Doctoral research project prepared by CHARLES MERRITT in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in Educational Leadership.

This dissertation has been approved and accepted by:

11/27/18

Committee Chair

Date

Susanna Thornhill, PhD

Associate Professor of Education

11/27/18 Karen Buchanan

Date

Karen Buchanan, EdD

Professor of Education

11/27/18 Gary Sehorn

Date

Gary Sehorn, EdD

Associate Professor of Education

ABSTRACT

This qualitative study analyzed eight dual language master plans developed by school districts on the West Coast of the United States. Each of the plans represented one or more dual language programs within each school district. The purpose of the study was to determine how school districts express their priorities for dual language programming. Master plans were analyzed for their structure, rationales, and their intended impact on students and families. Through numerous coding passes, several themes revealed themselves related to proposed benefits to students in language, academics, and social-emotional growth. The findings of this study indicated an informal community of practice among the groups who wrote the plans, and conceptions of family involvement that positioned families as receivers, rather than actors in the education of their children. This analysis illuminated areas where equity in emergent bilinguals' access to authentic language and parent involvement could be improved. Implications for further research point to the need for ethnographic study of programs as compared to their plans, and a deeper examination of the ways the dual language community of practice functions. Implications for practice include the need to expand the implied *canon* of dual language research informing dual language master planning, and the importance of revisiting translanguaging for both pedagogical and equity reasons. Finally, future dual language master planning ought to expand on particular ways to support new teachers in this complex work through locally-relevant professional training and leadership roles.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank the George Fox School of Education for the opportunity to engage in this study as part of earning a doctorate in education. My doctoral cohort, with whom I began this journey, are an amazing group of people that were very supportive and of material help. More than I can express, I am grateful to my advisor at GFU, Dr. Susanna Thornhill, who was an insightful guide to the culture of qualitative research. Her company on this journey of qualitative exploration was of inestimable value, both for her expertise and her kind persistence. Likewise, I want to thank my committee members, Dr. Karen Buchanan, Dr. Patrick Allen, and Dr. Gary Sehorn. Their encouragement and counsel have been very important to me. My thanks, too, to our graduate program coordinator, Holli Paskewich, and the wonderful team at George Fox.

I also want to thank my wife, Dr. Sharon Merritt, who encouraged me to embark on this work and knows much better than most the significance of this document. Sharon is both my partner in life and my partner in an interest in dual language education. She and I were fascinated by dual language learning when we enrolled our daughter, Emily (now a graduate student), in a Spanish Immersion program in the school district in which I taught at the time. Years later, I became principal of that same school, Escondido Elementary, and received encouragement from my former colleagues there, for which I am grateful. Finally, I want to thank the faculty and staff of the School of Education at Fresno Pacific University, where I am charged with preparing novice teachers to serve bilingual students. I have joined Sharon and her supportive colleagues at FPU with great hopes of supporting dual language studies for the children in our area.

Table of Contents

Chapter One	1
Background.....	1
Problem Statement.....	3
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Questions.....	6
Organization of the Study	6
Significance of the Study.....	7
Definition of Terms	8
Limitations/Delimitations	10
Summary.....	11
Chapter Two	12
Criteria for Inclusion	12
The Educational Benefits of Dual Language Education	12
The Cognitive Benefits of Dual Language Education.....	16
Social Aspects of Dual Immersion Education	19
Language for Global Awareness	23
Implications for Language Policy and Program Design.....	25
Summary of the Benefits of Bilingualism	26
Model Selection in Dual Immersion.....	26
The role of theory in model selection.....	27
The role of achievement in model selection	28

Equity Considerations.....	29
Summary.....	30
Chapter Three: Methodology.....	32
Purpose and Research Questions.....	32
Design/Research Approach	33
Data Sources	33
Pilot analysis.....	35
Settings of the Districts.....	37
Data Analysis Procedures	38
First cycle coding.....	38
Initial coding.....	39
Coding of categories.....	39
Second cycle coding	40
Coding of categories and themes.....	40
Organization of data into themes.....	41
The Researcher	41
Delimitations, Limitations, and Assumptions of the Study	42
Trustworthiness and Credibility	43
Summary.....	43
Chapter Four: Findings.....	45
Structure of Dual Language Master Plans	45

CAL Guiding Principles	45
Background information and Title VII grants	47
Common research sources	48
Patterns Found in Dual Language Plans	50
Purposes for creating the plans varied by longevity of program	50
Research rationales interpret the intended benefits	54
Instructional design had implications for equity	56
Assessment plans value language and academics over social-emotional growth	59
Language separation policies are nuanced by current research.....	61
Rationales Seen as Benefits Inform Views of Practice and Equity	64
Benefits as signal of community of practice	64
Benefits for English Learners as signal of equity concerns.....	65
Rationales and language orientation	67
Intended Impact on Students and Families	70
Achievement gap	70
Parent involvement	72
Chapter 5: Conclusions.....	75
Discussion of Findings	75
Professional organizations influenced plans significantly.....	76
Dual language program claims pointed to the Common Core	77
Language orientation informed dual language rationales.....	78

Program priorities could utilize parent involvement	81
Implications for Practice	82
The role of dual language communities of practice	82
Expectations for dual language education	83
Recommendations for Practice	84
Professional outreach to school districts	85
Data gathering on the efficacy of dual language	85
Revisit the inclusion of students with special needs.....	86
Expand the role of dual language parents.....	86
Recommendations for Further Research	87
Methods of educational planning with stakeholders	87
Action research within dual language programs	88
Cultural and language equity in dual language programs	88
Lessons Learned	89
References	91
Appendix A.....	99
Appendix B.....	100
Appendix C.....	101
Appendix D.....	102
Appendix E.....	103
Appendix F	104

Chapter One

Of the various types of bilingual education in American schools, dual language education is the one that is most clearly associated with increasing bilingualism in students, and is sometimes referred to as additive bilingualism or enrichment bilingual education (Thomas & Collier, 1998). This model of bilingual education stands in contrast to the transitional and maintenance models of bilingual education (Cobb, Vega & Kronauge, 2009) which do not focus on increasing competence in two languages, but mainly English competence. Dual language education has as its aim for students to become bilingual, biliterate, and have access to multiple cultures (Babino & Stewart, 2016). The valuing of students' proficiency in two languages represents a *language-as-resource* orientation (Ruiz, 1984). Many other forms of bilingual education have different orientations, such as *language-as-problem* (typified by the belief that children need to learn English as quickly as possible), or *language-as-right* (typified by the belief that certain languages have more importance than others). These orientations may lead to programs that value students' acquisition of English without regard for building language capacity in English Learners' native languages (Ruiz, 1984). The high goals of bilingualism and biliteracy are exciting, but they are also complex, placing an important planning burden on those educational agencies that enact them (Ruiz, 1984; Thomas & Collier, 1998). Within the past 20 years, the use of dual language master planning documents developed as a practice along the U.S. West Coast where districts focus these planning efforts, revealing district priorities and shaping influences on dual language programs.

Background

In the past few years, dual language education has attracted a great deal of attention as an effective pathway for bilingualism and biliteracy, along with criticism for whether it actually

creates educational access for English Learners. Dual language programs typically deliver the general education curriculum in two languages (English and another language) and often include instructional settings designed to serve a purposeful mix of native speakers of both languages. These programs have generated strong support from staff, parents, and students because of remarkable results in student language acquisition and academic achievement in two languages as measured by norm-referenced tests across the curriculum (Collier & Thomas, 2004). Yet dual language programs also face public scrutiny and criticism for the validity of their purpose of promoting bilingualism, and for questions about their ability to deliver on the promises of language acquisition and academic success for all students (Cervantes-Soon, Dormer, Palmer, Heiman, Schwerdtfeger, & Choi, 2017).

Public perception of dual language programs often focuses on the idea that English should be the “only” language of instruction for English Learners. These English-Only proponents’ belief that bilingual education does not benefit English Learners either academically or cognitively is refuted by research that shows that English Learners in dual language education show equal or greater mastery of English when compared to their English Learner peers in other types of educational settings (Lindholm-Leary, 2012). Native-English learners in dual language education were also shown to succeed at higher levels than their monolingual peers (Berens, Kovelman, & Pettito, 2013; Lindholm-Leary, 2012). Three claims made often by dual language programs are: 1) the model produces bilingualism in both language minority and language majority students, 2) it produces high levels of literacy in both languages by both groups of students, and 3) it promotes a multicultural mindset. Of the three claims, the third is the most difficult to demonstrate (Hornberger, 2003). However, a strong argument can be made that more

specific cultural goals of inclusion of native languages and equity of educational access for English Learners can be addressed by dual immersion education (Hornberger, 2003).

Problem Statement

Dual immersion programs require careful planning to clarify their rationales, program characteristics, and expected benefits to all students, particularly in the face of the many critiques that this model of education faces. Teaching students to read, write, and do mathematics in one language is challenging enough for many schools; accomplishing these goals in two languages simultaneously requires very clear and focused goals (Thomas & Collier, 1998). For this reason, school districts frequently use a planning document called a dual immersion master plan. This master plan can be used to either initiate a new program or to move an existing program back on track. The details of these plans are meant to serve as a multi-year guidepost for school districts. These programs typically start by building a kindergarten program and then continue by adding a grade level each year as the initial cadre moves up. The master plan memorializes the intentions of the school district to guide their program's implementation over many years, and can also serve a reorienting purpose for programs that have been in operation for some years. Dual immersion master planning benefits from a clear expression of priorities, program, and outcomes because the immediate circumstances of these complex programs are not static. Program continuity is particularly affected by changes in teaching and administrative staff (Armendáriz, & Armendáriz, 2002). The question of how a dual language master plan communicates its mission can be critical to the success of the program.

The practice of creating dual immersion master plans originated with Title VII grant applications designed to fund the creation of new dual immersion programs in the 1990s (Liberty & Gonzalez, 2014). Currently, the recommended practice is that school districts take full

responsibility for funding dual language programs (Howard, Lindholm-Leary, Rogers, Olague, Medina, Kennedy, Sugarman & Christian, 2018). In the early 1990's, dual immersion advocates such as Katherine Lindholm-Leary, met with school district leaders to show them how to construct the grant applications. Since then, school districts (and their consultants) have frequently based their planning on previous plans by other districts. Thus, the dual language master planning format often reflects the original Title VII grant questions (R. Molina, personal communication, November 10, 2017). These original Title VII grant requirements include: the district's mission and vision; the research base cited by the district for choosing dual language as a program model; demographic information about the school district; and the district's plans for curriculum, instruction, assessment, enrollment, and professional development of teachers. A very similar template is still used today by school districts to publicly express the purposes and priorities of their dual language programs as well as setting direction for curriculum, instruction, and operations through dual immersion master plans.

The most recently revised version of the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Programs (Howard et al., 2018) states that “strong planning processes should be in place that focus on meeting the goals of the program (i.e., promoting bilingualism, biliteracy, and sociocultural competence) and on improving all students' achievement” (p. 13). The importance of appropriate planning processes was affirmed in this document that was published several months after the start of this study.

Stakeholders with an interest in this understanding are not only school district planners and their consultants, but also the school districts' communities, including parents, teachers, and local organizations. These stakeholders often have an interest in knowing the rationale and the plan for dual language. Beyond these local groups, there are regional and national organizations

that often seek to discern how the dual language master plans align with their organizational priorities. Dual language education is a complex endeavor that generates a great deal of public interest and is supported by a large body of research. It is no wonder that school districts should want to “get it right.”

Purpose of the Study

Given the importance of robust planning in the success of dual language programs, the purpose of this study was to examine the planning documents of a group of school districts to analyze their statements of purpose, specific instrumental plans, and intended outcomes. Since both current and historical language directing dual language programing was available, this language became an important feature of the study. My intention was to discover the important elements of this type of planning and to connect them to current research on dual language. Dual language master plans, as an official expression of school agency purpose and planning, were explored in this study for the connections between their stated purposes and the districts’ proposed benefits to all of their students. I used the dual language database housed within the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) website to search for dual immersion programs with published master plans. Balancing socio-economic status and English Learner classification, I explored a sampling of these dual language master planning documents in order to understand more fully how individual school agencies express their rationales for a particular type of dual immersion. I wanted to compare school agencies’ rationales for their programs against their program design and discern their intended efforts to create equitable educational access for students. I looked for internal consistency within the documents, as well as making comparisons between different school agencies’ documents.

This study utilized eight master plans reflecting a balance of high and low socio-economic student populations and the percentage of English Learners enrolled in the schools. In addition to these characteristics, the programs varied in geographic location between small towns and big cities up and down the Pacific Coast. I studied the expression of the program rationales to understand what school agencies say about their understandings of bilingualism and biliteracy, their definitions of multiculturalism, and their commitment to the academic achievement of English Learners. I explored the specific program models of each master plan to compare the program design to the linguistic, academic, and cultural rationale for each program. My goal was to gain an understanding of each program's design and its relationship to their stated rationales. Additionally, I wanted to gain an understanding of how equitable these plans are to all students, particularly to English Learners.

Research Questions

This study was guided by these key research questions: What does an examination and analysis of a sampling of dual language master plans reveal about how school districts express their priorities for dual language programming? What patterns can be observed in their research justifications, instructional plans, and intended outcomes for students?

- What rationales and priorities are revealed in the documents?
- What programmatic outcomes are expressed in the documents?
- What types of benefits to students and families are referenced for various programs in the documents?

Organization of the Study

Having presented background on dual language programming and rationales for the study in this chapter, the following chapter offers a review of the literature on the controversies about

the efficacy of bilingual education, the known academic, cognitive, and social benefits of dual language education, and the equity issues surrounding dual language instruction. Chapter 3 discusses the methodology that I employed in studying the selected dual language master plans, including the research design, the selection of documents, and the process used for data analysis. This process of data analysis describes cycles of coding, code reduction, and the creation of categories and themes, all of which I employed in this study. Chapter 4 presents findings from the data analysis and presents the evident patterns across these data. In Chapter 5, I discuss the significance of the findings and make suggestions for its relevance to practice and future research.

Significance of the Study

Dual language master planning is becoming a more common practice used to create plans for new programs, to recalibrate existing programs, and to make improvements to existing programs for the broader purpose of ensuring positive educational outcomes for all students. This study proposes to address a gap in the literature on dual language programs by exploring the language that educational entities use to explain choices that they make to design their programs. Past research has included case studies that look at the design questions and decisions for a single school (Amendáriz & Amendáriz, 2002; Cobb, Vega & Kronauge, 2009; Freeman, 1994). To date, there is little scholarly writing about dual language master plans per se, although resources are available that discuss dual language planning. Studies like this are significant to organizations like CABA (the California Association for Bilingual Education), which serve to support the development and ongoing improvement of new bilingual education programs. As the number of dual language programs and consultants increases, clarity and consistency in assisting

school agencies with their master plans becomes more important (California Association for Bilingual Education, 2017; Center for Advanced Linguistics, 2017).

Definition of Terms

There are a number of terms that define dual language program characteristics and that have specific meaning within the study of dual immersion education. These are exemplified by the name of one of the organizations that advocates for the study and dissemination of this form of bilingual education, namely the Association of Two-way, Dual Language Educators (ATDLE). The definitions of these key terms are shared by The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) in Washington, D.C. and the Center for Advanced Research in Language Acquisition (CARLA) in Minneapolis, as well as CAFE in California.

Bilingual Education - A type of education directed to English Learners that uses their first language to access educational goals. There are four sub-definitions pertinent to the term Bilingual Education: Transitional bilingual education, Dual language education, One-way immersion, and Two-way immersion:

Transitional bilingual education - A model of bilingual education that begins with a percentage of content instruction in the English Learners' first language and gradually fades out the first language in favor of English. It does not have as a primary goal the students' retention of their first language. Sometimes referred to as subtractive bilingual education.

Dual language education - Teaching content through a language, as opposed to Second Language instruction that primarily teaches the structure of the target language. Dual immersion is immersive, or content-based instruction in two languages (Collier & Thomas, 2004).

One-way immersion - Dual immersion education where all or most of the students have the same first language.

Two-way immersion - Dual immersion education where the students are intentionally registered in roughly equal numbers of native English speakers and students whose first language is the program target language. Some programs are referred to as two-way immersion because their design reflects the bilingual demographic of the community, providing for enrollment of both language majority and language minority students (Collier & Thomas, 2004.)

English Only – A term that refers to the education of bilingual students without employing their first language. It alternately refers to a political movement that has as its goal to make English the official language of states and the federal government in the United States. The implications for education are that content instruction would be limited by law to only take place in English. There are two sub-definitions pertinent to the English-Only movement: Structured English Immersion and English Language Development

Structured English immersion - A type of program for English Learners where English is the medium for both content and language instruction

English Language Development (ELD) - Instruction in English that is delivered to English Learners who are enrolled in general education (mainstreamed) classrooms

Target Language - the language that students are taught at a particular time for the purpose of increasing their proficiency (i.e. English for English Learners, or another language for the English proficient in a Second Language classroom). Both English and the partner language in dual language settings can be the target language depending on the focus of instruction at any given time. In this case, *language of instruction* is a useful term; these are defined below.

Translanguaging - The practice of using two languages together in either speaking or writing. Traditionally frowned upon, translanguaging is being increasingly accepted as normal language use

“*Code-switching*” - A somewhat pejorative term for translanguaging meant to signal non-standard and unhelpful language use

Intersentential and *Intrasentential* - The combining of two languages by bilingual speaker either inserting whole phrases or sentences (e.g., “What a great game, *¡que divertido!*”), or by combining languages in a single phrase or sentence (e.g., “Hey, pass me the *pelota*! It’s my turn.)

Limitations/Delimitations

Written documents representing the plans of an educational agency have the potential to express the collective opinion and analysis of a team of educators and others who represent the official voice of the educational agency. One of the limitations of the study is that an analysis of planning documents is unable to reveal the intentions of the individual members of the groups who developed the dual language master plans, nor can it offer insight into the quality of the actual program. The documents only represent meaning as official documents of a particular school district. Additionally, by limiting the search to published dual immersion master plans, the study did not examine master plans that have not been made public. The purpose for looking only at published master plans was to understand the official voice of school districts as they explained their purposes and strategies for engaging in this type of education.

The practice of creating dual language master plans has been heavily influenced by several organizations, primarily those of CAFE and ADTLE. While the original design of the dual language master plan was partly based on Title VII grants in the 1990s (Liberty &

Gonzalez, 2014), Two-way CABE (later ATDLE) became the proponent for the use of dual immersion master plans. Since the regional influence of these organizations was primarily on the West Coast of the United States, the majority of the published master plans were from California, Oregon, and Washington state (R. Molina, personal communication, November 10, 2017). I view these organizations' influences on these master plans as a delimitation that better enabled me to find themes across the plans.

Summary

This study explored the official plans and stated potential benefits of dual immersion master plans. This research is valuable because these programs are increasingly significant for their popularity and successful academic outcomes. This study made it possible to identify some of the intended educational consequences (as expressed by the documents) for vulnerable populations such as English Learners, along with the relationships between educational agencies' expressed goals for dual language programs and the instructional plans of those programs. Additionally, this study offered an opportunity to explore whether language planning, including planning for instruction, can be informed by ideas about whether language is a problem, a right, or a resource (Ruiz, 1998). Program design is an essential element of dual immersion success (Lindholm-Leery, 2012, p. 258). Thus, this analysis of programmatic design may inform educators engaging in the dual immersion planning process on behalf of their communities.

Chapter Two

The practice of dual language master planning has operated in the context of a variety of rationales and purposes that were important to clarify for the sake of understanding program continuity. These rationales included arguments for educational benefits, social benefits, cognitive benefits, and global awareness, among others. The programs' purposes were expressed as stated reasons for engaging in dual language education and were supported in the master plans by research literature.

Criteria for Inclusion

The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) in Washington D.C. has curated a collection of scholarly articles on dual language education (DLE), as has the Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA) at the University of Minnesota. These articles, as well as those cited by the authors of these articles, received special attention in this review. I found a number of essential names in the field of dual language (DL); theorists and researchers such as Katherine Lindholm-Leary, Patricia Gándara and Ellen Bialystok who cover many aspects of DLE from program design and social relevance to neurocognitive benefits of DLE methodology. Both depth and breadth of DLE research were attended to by cross-referencing the cited articles in research used here. While more recent articles written within the last ten to fifteen years reflect recent program results, there were seminal articles from the 1990s that contained very helpful conceptual summaries of policy and practice around DLE programs.

The Educational Benefits of Dual Language Education

DLE is a specific type of bilingual education that is not universally available in the United States but is growing in popularity in public school settings (Lindholm-Leary, 2012). Its emergence during a time of increasing pressure to provide equitable learning opportunities for

non-native English speakers (Ovando, 2003) and its distinctive qualities, both educational and social (Cobb, Vega, & Kronauge, 2009; Ovando, 2003) have drawn dual immersion education into a fierce debate about whether and what type of bilingual education ought to be provided to students.

The bilingualism debate. In explaining the historical debate concerning the costs and benefits of bilingualism, it is helpful to describe three main types of bilingual education: the transitional, maintenance, and enrichment models of bilingual education (Cobb, Vega & Kronauge, 2009). Transitional bilingual education, the most common model in the U.S., focuses on teaching English to language minority students and not on maintaining students' first language competency, since instruction is designed to transition students away from their L1 and towards English. Maintenance bilingual programs, also referred to as late-exit bilingual programs, do have as a goal the *maintenance* of students' L1 but do not work toward helping students be fluent in it because the goal of maintenance bilingual education is fluency in English. The goal of *enrichment* bilingual education is to provide instruction with the goal of fluency in two languages and is primarily represented by dual language education, also described as additive bilingualism. In addition to this characteristic of dual language education, the two-way immersion type of dual language serves not only students whose L1 is a language other than English, but also students whose L1 is English, whose L2 is the target language (the paired language to English) and whose goal is also fluency in both languages.

In the introduction to their study of the effectiveness of dual language elementary education, Cobb, Vega, and Kronauge (2009) described the forty-some year history of modern bilingual education beginning in the mid 1970s through a review of the work of key researchers from that era. They found that studies that compared English Immersion (instruction without the

support of students' L1) with transitional and maintenance bilingual education had very different findings as to students' English fluency between program types.

In 1996, Rossell and Baker conducted a meta-analysis of 72 studies of bilingual programs that, while lamenting the lack of random assignment of subjects (Rossell & Baker, 1996), found that transitional bilingual and maintenance model bilingual programs benefited students less than the structured English Immersion model as measured by performance on standardized tests. It should be noted that no dual language (or enrichment model) programs were included in Rossell and Baker's analysis. A year later, Greene (1997) conducted a meta-analysis that contradicted Rossell and Baker's assertion that bilingual education was less effective than English Immersion, particularly for their inclusion of studies that were methodologically flawed. This round of debate over the efficacy of bilingual education was conducted in the context of the debate leading up to the passing of Proposition 227 in California in 1998, which severely restricted bilingual education until November of 2016, when the passing of California Proposition 58 removed most of these restrictions (Aquino-Sterling, Rodriguez-Valls, & Outes, 2017).

The academic benefits of dual language education. When the enrichment model of bilingual education is studied, insofar as dual immersion is the main representative of this model, the study of academic benefits is expanded to include all areas of study at grade level since the goal of dual immersion is to teach language through an entire grade level's curriculum (Lindholm-Leary, 2012). Advocates of DI education point to multiple benefits of this model among which include social, cognitive, and academic benefits (Gándara, 2015). Among the ways in which academic benefits of dual language education have been measured are reclassification rates of English Learners (Umansky & Reardon, 2014), English Language Arts

scores, and academic achievement in content areas where language ability can be tied to success (Cobb, Vega, & Kronauge, 2009; Gándara, 2015; Kempert, Hardy, & Saalbach, 2011).

An analysis of educational language policy (Rossell, 2005) commented on both the official requirement for tracking reclassification of English Learners under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the illogical way in which NCLB tracked the data. Rossell (2005) made the point that, unlike other groups of students whose proficiency is tracked, students determined to be Limited English Proficient (LEP) will not *stay* LEP as they demonstrate academic growth through acquiring English language skills. Thus, it is impossible for a group defined by low language scores to show improvement as a group because the group changes as students are re-designated from LEP to proficient. Six years later, instead of looking at LEP language achievement, Umansky and Reardon (2014) examined re-designation rates for students in various types of bilingual education programs, including dual immersion. They found that while dual language students did not have the fastest or soonest (in terms of number of years) re-designation rates, they did have the highest re-designation rates by the time that they completed high school compared with other bilingual models, and with students who went through structured English immersion (Umansky & Reardon, 2014).

In their study of the effects of elementary dual immersion on student achievement, Cobb, Vega, and Kronauge (2009) used sixth- and seventh-grade reading, writing, and math scores to measure the effects of a K-5 dual immersion program. This *ex post facto* study used a cohort sampling model using experimental and control groups. The findings supported the claim that dual language instruction is at least as effective as traditional programs (including ESL or English immersion) in allowing students to achieve academically across the core curriculum and

was preferable to other types of bilingual education (Cobb, Vega, and Kronauge, 2009). Their study also demonstrated the durability of these effects past elementary dual language instruction.

A study of the effect of bilingualism on math education examined the cognitive benefits of bilingualism (Kempert, Saalbach, & Hardy, 2011) and also shed light on the importance of making content available through using two languages for instruction. That study found significant interference from the lack of language familiarity in the measurement of student knowledge that was overcome by assessing (and, presumably, teaching) students the content in their first language as well as in English (Kempert, Saalbach & Hardy, 2011).

One observation about dual language education points out that the ways in which dual language programs are framed by official documents can affect the way in which they are used (Valdez, Freire & Delevan, 2016). The researchers analyzed five key foundational documents of Utah's dual language program expansion to look for language patterns that indicated a tendency to plan for privileging white, wealthy or English-dominant students. Their findings suggested that the role of language and cognitive benefits of dual language were communicated to parents in a way that suggested that they were primarily intended for native English speakers. Another problematic feature found in the Utah studies was the preference of the 50-50 model over the 90-10 model for its value in protecting the English language while disregarding the research supporting the greater efficacy of the 90-10 model (Valdez, Freire & Delevan, 2016, p. 14). This study provides a useful cautionary note concerning the ways in which dual language programs are conceptualized and how this affects their enactment.

The Cognitive Benefits of Dual Language Education

The case for cognitive benefits that accrue to bilinguals includes studies that examine working memory and executive control in the young, along with the protections these cognitive

advances provide against cognitive deterioration in old age. In a meta-analysis of studies that examine these issues, Bialystok (2011) traced the details of the emerging research that examines these cognitive benefits of bilingualism. She posited that a likely explanation for the benefits that are reported in executive function is language selection or conflict resolution between lexical choices. One critique of the benefits of bilingualism is the relatively smaller vocabulary learned by bilinguals compared to monolinguals (Bialystok, Craik & Luk, 2008). These differences were found to disappear, however, when the lexical items were categorized as whether they were most associated with *school* language rather than *home* language (Bialystok, Luk, Peets & Yang, 2010), suggesting both the need for attending to assessment technique as well as the beneficial effects of using students' L1 as the language of instruction. In studies that were conducted creating conditions where executive control played a role in successfully completing the identification (either through switching or monitoring complexity) bilinguals with relatively high vocabulary (HV Bilinguals) outperformed monolinguals (Luo, Luk & Bialystok, 2010). These studies suggest a strong benefit for bilinguals in the area of executive control that also ameliorates the smaller total vocabulary phenomenon when vocabulary tasks are controlled for in situations that particularly require increased executive function.

The claimed benefits of bilingualism went beyond attending skills. Roeper (2012) even posited the possible benefits of bilingualism to children diagnosed with Speech Language Impairment (SLI). Using Chomsky's idea of Universal Grammar, a theory of innate structures generally common to all languages, Roeper argued that the resource of one language's rich grammatical structure (e.g., cases, recursion, the use of particles, etc.) can help a child with SLI. The student can gain access to the target language's lack or reduced presentation of this same grammatical feature through their familiarity with the stronger presentation of this feature in

their native language. If this theory accurately reflects the dynamics of language acquisition, even a serious language impairment such as SLI could be ameliorated by studying in a bilingual setting.

In an above-mentioned study by Kempert, Saalbach and Hardy (2011), Turkish/German bilingual and German-only monolingual elementary students in Germany were presented with math word problems in order to understand the costs and benefits of bilingualism. Bilingual and monolingual students were given tests that included normed math word problems as well as modified math word problems that contained a distractor, or an additional numeric information irrelevant to solving the problem. The study found that monolinguals performed significantly better on the straightforward word problems and that bilinguals and monolinguals performed equally well on word problems with a distractor. The researchers also tested for control factors of income, cognitive ability, and general arithmetic skills to eliminate these as causes of the results. Their results suggested that a phenomenon known as the *switching hypothesis* causes bilinguals to test poorly due to having to access instruction *only* through their less-understood language. However, the study also demonstrated that a benefit of bilingualism is increased cognitive skill through attention, giving bilingual students an increased ability to sort through distracting information (Kempert, Saalbach & Hardy, 2011, p. 557).

For the last forty years, researchers have been working to understand the benefits of bilingual education. They have compared models of bilingual education with one other, with structured English immersion, and with traditional education. While many researchers have found impressive academic and cognitive benefits of dual language education, other voices raise cautionary notes. For the DLE model to deliver strong benefits, the enactment of the model must meet the standard of full biliteracy by completion of the program. Also, the program values must

be clear and care taken to seek the benefit of all students in the programs, Native English Speakers (NES) and Native Spanish Speakers (NSS) alike. Most recently, researchers have employed the techniques of testing working memory, executive function, and other cognitive processes in order to investigate the benefits of bilingualism and, by implication, the benefits of DLE's goal of achieving dual fluency (Kempert, Saalbach & Hardy, 2011).

Social Aspects of Dual Immersion Education

Dual language programs share with other forms of bilingual education that they are a response to a history of educational inequality (Ovando, 2003). By their chief characteristic of teaching public education curricula in two languages, dual language programs promote a social program with which some disagree. The role of bilingualism in public schools in the United States is a debated question and so are the merits of the various forms of bilingual education.

Attitudes towards bilingualism. The rise in popularity of DLE programs in the U.S. during the last sixty years has been driven by social forces that recognized the need for a more effective model of bilingual education for speakers of languages other than English and also recognized the need of monolingual English speakers to learn other languages (Ovando, 2003). In his review of historical sources, Ovando (2003) outlined the changes in attitude regarding bilingual education in American from the earliest years of this country. Bilingual education had been permitted and even encouraged in some states during the 18th and 19th centuries but had not acquired a national voice. In the first half of the 20th century, bilingualism was countered by strong nativist and isolationist social forces (Ovando, 2003). The Bilingual Education Act (BEA) of 1968 brought national attention to the need for non-native English-speaking students to access education in their own language, ultimately requiring school districts to develop bilingual programs. Ovando points out that by not proposing a theory of language learning to accompany

the charge to help students be bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural, the act produced a wide-ranging assortment of types of bilingual education; from traditional pull-out forms of bilingual educations that isolated non-native speakers in separate classrooms to dual language programs that paired English speakers with speakers of the target language in the same classrooms. An important court case, *Lau v. Nichols*, which adjudicated the education of Chinese-speaking students by allowing them to access public education through their native language, reinforced the bilingual education movement as a question of students' rights to learn in their own first language (Ovando, 2003).

While many forms of bilingual education have as their focus the assimilation of emergent bilinguals into monolingual English education (Freeman, 1994), DLE -- specifically Two-way immersion -- programs have at their heart the idea that the two groups that are placed together should serve each other as language and cultural models. Freeman's (1994) case study of a dual language program was accomplished through the perspective of a participant-researcher. She conducted interviews and observations to understand the school's perspective on students' rights concerning their native language, their aspiration to maintain their culture of origin and their right to a high-quality education. Freeman found that students should be able to retain their L1 at the same time that they are acquiring English as their L2 through a dual language model, particularly if the goals of the program are clearly articulated and broadly held, as they were found to be in her case study. In her review of research, Lindholm-Leary (2012) highlighted that DLE programs benefit students whose L1 is not English by not only allowing them to retain an important aspect of their identity, but also to be more successful academically if they can become biliterate in their L1 before (or at the same time as) learning to read and write in English.

The practice of any form of bilingual education is confronted in many areas of the U.S. with the social pressure to subordinate languages other than English through trivialization and marginalization (Schenk, 2011). There are institutional and political barriers to bilingual education that negatively impact children's access to this resource (Sarmiento, 2008). Ironically, there is in fact a traditional pattern of language loss within 2-3 generations of arrival in the U.S. (Suarez, 2007). The generational distance of students from their immigrant parents or grandparents can affect their attitudes toward the previous generation's L1, their own heritage language, and toward recent immigrants from corresponding countries (Jeon, 2007). Historical attacks on language identity in the U.S. have included the restriction of public speech in languages other than English (Ovando, 2003). But no less an attack on bilingualism is the restriction of bilingual education. In the early part of the 20th century, the delivery of elementary education was restricted to only the English language in some states (Ovando, 2003). In the later 20th Century, the Bilingual Education Act created access to bilingual education that was then repressed with the dismantling of the federal Office of Bilingual Education around the time of No Child Left Behind (Schenk, 2011). In recent years, various legislative actions such as California Proposition 227 continued the attack on bilingual education (Lindholm-Leary, 2012).

Language equity. Shannon Fitts (2009) approached the problem of language equity in schools as the challenge to include alternatives to the officially sanctioned "voice" or forms of expression and use of language. Analyzing conversations in a dual language 5th grade classroom, she used the concept of "third space" to discuss the intersection of students' language identity and the official discourse created by schools. She critiqued the school's lack of recognition of students' native language as a resource in the context of a dual language program. First, Fitts identified a type of discourse that the teacher would frequently use, Initiation-

Response-Evaluation (IRE) that she identified as fitting with Anglo cultural norms. The inherent comparative nature of this discourse style in which students respond to the teacher's prompt spontaneously relied on the cultural assumption that students would be comfortable throwing their hat in the conversational ring or being called on in an unstructured way. Fitts' analysis of this type of discourse was that it did not particularly represent Latino or Mexican-American ways of participating in class and so was primarily accessible to Anglo students in the dual language program. This represents an interesting perspective for the evaluation of DLE programs' goal of producing biculturality in their students. Another area that Fitts challenged in DLE practice is the disadvantaging of translanguaging or "code-switching." The official school reason to frown upon translanguaging, or using two languages either inter-sententially or intra-sententially, is the concern that students will not learn to speak the target language without being able to maintain discourse in a single language. This official language policy about discourse ignores the students' own knowledge about discourse, insofar that students are typically aware that in the real world there are times when code-switching is acceptable and other, formal, occasions when it is not. Fitts argued that teacher and student discussions of this phenomenon would further language equity by giving students a voice concerning their own native language practice (Fitts, 2009).

Another analysis of equity within the context of bilingual education is exemplified by a dual case study of two DLE schools in metropolitan communities in the Western U.S. (Scanlan & Palmer, 2009). In this study, the authors, both of whom were pre-disposed to believe that DLE would provide language equity through enhancing the status of the target language (Spanish), sought to problematize enrollment as a feature of both equity and inequity. In one of the two schools, the creation of a Spanish-English strand within the public neighborhood school

was a response to language inequity of the transitional bilingual program that it replaced. The community was dissatisfied with the separation of Latino students from the “mainstream” students through their placement in the transitional program. As a result, the Two-way immersion model of DLE was seen as a way to integrate Latino students into the largest demographic in the school which was African-American students. However, some staff resisted recruiting African-American students for fear that they would not be high-quality models of English for the Latino students. An analysis of the race of enrolled students showed a striking imbalance with white students highly over-represented in enrollment in the immersion program and African American student highly underrepresented. In the case of the second school studied, which was private and over 75% Latino, two areas of imbalance in enrollment were uncovered that were hidden by a lack of transparency in the overall admissions process. While the administrators of this school acknowledged preferring Latinos over Anglos in their admissions process, nowhere in their school literature was this made clear. Another imbalance was a lack of inclusion of students with special needs and no organized plan to address their access to the academic program. This study indicated that two-way immersion does indeed privilege the target language but that other areas of equity should also be addressed (Scanlan & Palmer, 2009).

Language for Global Awareness

Many school districts seemed to acknowledge the value of global awareness in their vision statements, though research indicates this value should be nuanced by a concern for social justice and a critical approach to globalization (Moss, 2008). The call to increase efforts to teach American students that they live in an interconnected world and that they should value the complexity of that world by understanding its languages, culture, and geography has had at best mixed results (Smith, 2002). The specific value of DLE education is that it provides a clear goal

for students to become globally aware through their development of oral language, literacy, and cultural knowledge in at least two world languages (Howard, 2002). The nature of Two-way immersion is that the goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, and multiculturalism are generally taught in the context of elementary education with a high value placed on collaboration (Howard, 2002). The combination of students from at least two different linguistic and cultural backgrounds is the ideal beginning for a life of multicultural awareness. The two-way immersion type of DLE calls for language modeling, alternating between students whose L1 is English and those whose L1 is another language. The interdependency of the linguistic skills of these two groups of students is the basis for another skill that students should develop, which is cooperative learning. The success of Two-way immersion education is precisely dependent on the cooperation of two groups of students since each take their turn providing linguistic and cultural modeling and expertise supported by appropriate instructional design for cooperative learning (Martin-Beltrán, 2010). Cooperation is a 21st Century skill that combines well with global awareness as they both include interdependence in their central themes (Kilbane & Milman, 2014). One of the watchwords of DLE education is “additive bilingualism,” which is to say a form of bilingual education where English does not supplant the L1 of the non-native English speaker, but rather is added to it in equal measure. The DLE student should have access to the entire curriculum in two languages and access to cultural knowledge of at least two distinct cultures. In fact, many of these schools have programs that allow students to have direct contact with other countries at some point in their studies (Howard, 2002). In this way, dual language programs could be said to be on the forefront of global education.

Implications for Language Policy and Program Design

Strengthening the cultural and linguistic identity of non-native English speakers is a core purpose for DL programs in general (de Jong & Bearse, 2014). It is important to consider issues of language identity in designing a dual language program so as not to subvert this desire (Fitts, 2009). The history of bilingual education in the U.S. shows that without broad community support for programs that help native speakers retain their L1 and help English-dominant students acquire that language as their L2, these programs can be misunderstood in the general call for English as a national language (Ovando, 2003). Therefore, program marketing and community information should be cornerstones of DL program design. Strong efforts should be made to demonstrate and communicate the social value of language retention as well as language acquisition in both directions.

Language equity should likewise be considered in the design of DLE. Care should be taken to understand authentic language practices and to not force a socio-linguistic conformity onto student speech and writing. Students should have the possibility of sharing their vernacular home language practices along with learning the standard academic version of the language (Fitts, 2009; Freeman, 1994). This should be understood in the context of becoming multicultural. Scanlan and Palmer (2009) recommend that other issues of equity not be discarded as language equity is sought. Admissions and recruitment policies can be aligned with the desire to create equitable opportunities for students of color and those that are socio-economically disadvantaged (Scanlan & Palmer, 2009).

Finally, the goal of raising students' awareness of their membership in a global community can a profitable aspect of program design questions. Partnerships with overseas

schools and travel programs may be considered alongside the multicultural curriculum that naturally figures into the context of the language studied (Howard, 2002).

Summary of the Benefits of Bilingualism

The case for including criteria that address the social benefits of dual language education in a list of necessary components for program evaluation also demands consideration of the complex attitudes towards bilingualism in the United States. It includes the desire for language equity for non-native English speakers, the desire by many in public education to address globalization in the curriculum, and the anticipated outcome that many students become bilingual. A successful program may be one that produces, in addition to high-quality academic achievement, positive social outcomes for all of its students. In many programs of this type, the needs of the most socially and economically vulnerable students are placed in counterpoint to the needs of wealthier and more privileged middle-class students. Questions of language identity and equity can be addressed through language policy, both formal and informal. The role of program design must include these elements in order to create a well-rounded program that will be beneficial to all students.

Model Selection in Dual Immersion

The evaluation of the performance of particular types of dual language programs is a reasonable next step after examining the effectiveness of the various types of bilingual education models. The study of the effectiveness of types of bilingual education has led many to believe that dual language is the preferable type of bilingual education for its strong social and academic outcomes for minority language students (de Jong, 2002). Several studies that examine the qualities of effective dual language programs produce a list of program characteristics, some of which overlap between studies (Alanís & Rodriguez, 2008; Amrein & Peña, 2000; Armendariz

& Armendariz, 2002; Christian, Howard, & Loeb, 2000; Lindholm-Leary, 2012; Montague, 1997). These characteristics include the choice of program model, issues of instructional equity, the quality of classroom discourse, the quality of teacher training, the involvement of parents, and the hiring of committed administrators. Of these programmatic qualities, the three that occur most frequently in the research by the authors cited above are choice of model, instructional equity, and teacher/staff training. It is these three program components that deserve discussion in the conclusion of this paper, both for how they are ascertained, and why they are relevant aspects of programmatic evaluation.

The role of theory in model selection. In her analysis of the Barbieri School's Two-way Bilingual Education Program (TBEP), de Jong (2002) made the case that decisions about program design and implementation should be connected to theoretical constructs that inform social and educational aspects of dual immersion. She stated that "theory-based" decision-making will provide important support to teachers and policy-makers as they work to provide a high-quality education to their students. This was evident in the research around the Barbieri TBEP model in their decision to integrate the non-literacy areas of instruction before integrating the Spanish L1 and L2 groups of students within classrooms. The decision was based on the concern that Spanish L1 students would be held back by Spanish L2 students in the initial stages of language and literacy instruction (de Jong, 2002). This consideration was based on the theory developed by Valdés (1997) that dual language programs may provide Spanish L1 students less access to English than their counterpart English L1 students receive to Spanish. The result of this access inequality would result in privileging the majority language student over the minority language student (Valdés, 1997). By referencing the role of Valdés' research (1997) in her analysis of the Barbieri case, de Jong demonstrated the interaction between theory and practice

in a dual immersion program. The Barbieri example also signals how social equity theory can inform instructional design decisions, blending categories of language theory into a program design. According to de Jong, Valdés' critique of dual immersion did not dissuade the Barbieri school from using the dual immersion approach altogether, but did inform important changes to the choice of language used to teach literacy lessons, as well as the choice to teach native speakers of Spanish separately from native speakers of English in the initial years of Spanish language acquisition.

The role of achievement in model selection. The selection of an appropriate model of dual immersion includes consideration of a) how the target language and English are blended (90/10, 50/50, etc.), b) the characteristic of two-way versus one-way immersion (Collier & Thomas, 2004), and c) the placement of the program as a strand or strands within another school or its placement within its own school (de Jong & Bearse, 2014). Collier and Thomas (2004), in their study of four models of dual immersion (Two-way 90/10, Two-way 50/50, One-way 90/10 and One-way 50/50) measured the annual achievement of English Language Learners enrolled in these types of programs using a norm-referenced English language assessment. They took the average annual achievement of students in these programs and extrapolated the annual effect on students who remained in the programs for a full six years (K-5). With the assumption of a continuous K-5 enrollment in dual immersion, each program performed better than transitional bilingual education programs (p. 15), in part because students spent more time learning the target language in the immersion programs. Additionally, they found that three of the models (Two-way 50/50, One-way 90/10, and Two-way 90/10) had a strong possibility of closing the achievement gap for ELLs in the dual immersion programs and that one in particular (Two-way 90/10) showed the highest likelihood of closing the achievement gap (Collier & Thomas, 2004).

The examination and comparison of a significant number of dual immersion master plans may shed light on the ways in which research into bilingual education has been incorporated into the actual practice of program design and evaluation in specific communities. The relationship between the demographics of the educational communities in which these programs are imbedded and the characteristics of the programs may reveal interesting connections between communities and their purposes for engaging in dual immersion.

Equity Considerations

The type of program model selected for a dual language program has an important impact on the chances for equitable learning outcomes for bilingual students (Montague, 1997). Montague concluded that equity for minority language students includes access to the language of their parents, grandparents, and forefathers (p. 410) and is of particular importance to students of families who do not have the means to frequently travel to their parents' country of origin. Lindholm-Leary (2012) cited equitable educational outcomes for both non-native English and native English speakers in studies that compared dual language students with their peers in traditional English instruction. The parity of educational outcomes was seen in language arts and mathematics testing by 5th to 7th grade (p. 257). These beneficial outcomes were even evident across socio-economic conditions, including for students from underrepresented minorities (p. 258).

Clear communication about the importance of consistent participation in a DLE program is another important equity consideration for minority language children, as some of the benefits of dual language education may only apply after four or five years of participation (Alanís & Rodriguez, 2008). In addition to positive linguistic and educational outcomes, the two-way model of DI education ensures that students from different cultural backgrounds are educated

together, subsequently building an appreciation for each other's language and culture (Christian, Howard & Loeb, 2000). Thus, the choice of delivering the general education curriculum in two languages (dual immersion), the choice of including native speakers of both English and the target language (Two-way immersion), the sheltering of instruction in the target language through using the 90/10 model of dual language immersion, and the parental commitment to an extended participation in the program (ideally through 5th grade) are all design issues that positively address educational equity. These areas for programmatic evaluation may be examined through both qualitative and quantitative measures of success. The choice of language, participants, and design can be viewed from the perspective of the satisfaction of the learning community as well as the demonstration of learning outcomes.

Summary

The research on bilingualism and DLE includes a wide variety of topics, including the history and benefits of bilingual education. The specific benefits concerned academic, cognitive, and social advantages to bilingualism and, in many cases, to dual language education.

A preference for dual language education over other types of bilingual education was evident in the body of research literature. Many of the referenced studies discussed dual language students' favorable performance in tests of language acquisition, content knowledge, cognitive flexibility, and measures of social understanding. Studies used here included one that critiqued previous positive research and one that problematized the practice in some states of engaging in dual language program planning overly focused on the upper middle class. Another aspect of planning that I discussed was the selection of models in dual language planning, specifically the consideration of academic growth and questions of equity.

The research literature helped to frame my approach to the examination of the dual language plans. I found useful *a priori* codes from several sources in the literature that I was able to use to begin the coding of the eight dual language master plans. The background that I discovered in the above sources provided important help in the discovery of categories and themes in the study of the dual language documents.

Chapter Three: Methodology

This study examined the conceptualization of dual language planning instantiated through eight master plan documents. These documents represented the myriad choices school districts make with regard to curriculum, instruction, and assessment, particularly in light of program language choice and criteria for participation. These master plan documents shape outcomes for students who are served in these programs. Research in Chapter 2 indicated the significance of programmatic design in affecting language, academic, and social-emotional outcomes (Howard, 2003; Lindholm-Leary, 2005), namely, that the planning process impacts how students will be potentially served through these programs.

Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to discern what those groups that engaged in dual language planning (and by extension, their school agencies) revealed about their intentions and priorities through the documents they created to express these intentions. Accordingly, I examined eight dual language master plan documents from eight different school districts. These documents were created by school personnel, school district representatives, and community stakeholders, and describe their dual language programs in detail.

The research questions that guided this study were: What does an examination and analysis of a sampling of dual language master plans reveal about how school districts express their priorities for dual language programming? What patterns can be observed in their research justifications, instructional plans, and intended outcomes for students?

- What rationales and priorities are revealed in the documents?
- What programmatic outcomes are expressed in the documents?

- What types of benefits to students and families are referenced for various programs in the documents?

Design/Research Approach

I used a qualitative approach similar to a collective case study (Creswell, 2013) for this study. The reason for engaging in a qualitative analysis was to focus on priorities, program plans, and intended outcomes as expressed through the documents. This study shared characteristics with collective case study methods in that I identified a specific issue (dual language program planning) that could be analyzed across multiple documents to compare different perspectives about identified issues (Creswell, 2013).

This approach was beneficial because the documents all shared the common, specific topic of dual language planning. Additionally, the documents were authored by different organizations, all school districts, providing the potential of showing a variety of perspectives about dual language. This approach proved to be very useful in this study because of the many commonalities across the plans.

Data Sources

The selection of dual language master plans was informed by two key features: some predetermined criteria and some on-the-ground exploration. I began with CAL's Dual Language Database to find published master plans (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2017). I limited my search to the West Coast, finding 60 entries for the Pacific Northwest and 292 entries for California. The reason for my focus on the West Coast was the prevalence of the use of the Dual Immersion Master Plan process in this region, a circumstance I discovered through Internet searches using the search terms "Dual Language" and "Master Plan(ning)" in combination.

The first filter that I used to search for master plans within the database was to look only at school district entries (as opposed to plans specific to particular schools or other educational agencies). One reason for this was that the CAL database included many school programs that are listed both by school and by school district, creating unhelpful duplicate listings. Another reason to look exclusively at school districts was to capture the officially sanctioned plans of the governing bodies (typically school boards) that are responsible for the educational priorities and plans of their school districts.

Looking only at school districts' entries in the CAL database of dual language programs limited the number of entries to 25 in the Pacific Northwest and 117 entries in California. The next step was to search the selected school district websites for any published dual language master plans. My search proceeded as follows:

- Search for links to dual language programs under “departments”
- Search for links to dual language programs under “education” or “instruction”
- Search for links to dual language programs under “English Language Learners”
- Search on embedded search engines on district websites using the keyword “immersion”

These search criteria produced a total of four dual language master plans from school districts in the Pacific Northwest and nine master plans in California. This enabled me to eliminate non-published, incomplete, or unapproved dual language master plans.

I finalized the selection of eight plans by seeking geographic diversity across the plans. Two of the plans are from the Pacific Northwest and six are from California. Four of the plans represent communities with a rural or small-town identity, and four of the plans represent suburban communities that are part of a metropolitan area.

Pilot analysis.

I decided to do a preliminary analysis of one dual language master plan (Elm) as a pilot analysis designed to inform the larger study. This allowed me to practice using a group of initial codes on one plan before coding the remaining plans. The pilot provided insights into how to manage a group of initial codes and gave me some idea of what patterns I might expect to find.

I chose the earliest created document (2010) in the range of creation dates for my pilot. This offered me a lens for observing the genre structure of the other dual language master plans. These codes included recommended elements of dual language planning (CAL, 2018) and key descriptors from my own research questions (rationales, priorities, outcomes, benefits). I made multiple passes through the pilot document to identify codes for document structure and codes for content relevant to my research questions. It taught me how to study the relationship between document structures and my research questions, which helpfully informed my analysis of the remaining documents.

As I conducted the pilot analysis, I identified five different types of codes that I used. These types were a) *a priori*, b) descriptive, c) *in vivo*, d) pattern, and e) process. These types were informed primarily by Saldana's (2016) work in qualitative coding, a procedure by which *a priori* codes (determined beforehand) are used in an initial coding cycle. This is followed by a second cycle, where researchers synthesize codes and categories into themes derived from the first cycle of coding.

A priori. This is a typical first-cycle code that is provisionally determined beforehand for use with a text because the code is related to concepts from a review of literature (Saldaña, 2016). I selected *a priori* codes from key two sources: the CAL database, and Title VII

considerations put forth in 1994 (Howard, et al., 2018; Liberty et al., 1999). Examples of a priori codes used in this study can be found in Appendix A.

Descriptive. This type of code consists of a word or phrase that identifies a characteristic and is also typical of first-cycle coding (Saldaña, 2016). Much of my initial coding was of this type. I used this coding method to identify many common features and concepts in dual language programs. Examples of descriptive coding can be found in Appendix B.

In vivo. These are codes that consist of the exact words or phrases from a participant (Cresswell, 2013). In this study, the document took the place of the participant and so my use of the term *in vivo* refers to exact quotes from sections of the documents. Some of these can be seen under Rationales in Appendix C.

Pattern. In the first cycle of coding, pattern coding (Saldaña, 2016) can be used to summarize segments of data. In the context of second-cycle coding, pattern coding is used to condense codes or categories into themes. I used pattern coding to simplify codes when I was analyzing them for their relationship to language orientation theory; for an example, see Appendix D.

Process. A process code is used to denote an action (it is sometimes referred to as an action code) represented in data (Saldaña, 2016). I used this type of coding when I was reducing longer explanations to shorter phrases to describe an activity or state resulting as a consequence of a type of instruction. I used verbal phrases to code these actions.

In the pilot, I began analysis by applying a simple descriptive coding strategy for my first cycle of coding. I did this initially by using a selection of codes derived from sources that described dual language planning. These initial codes helped me understand the structure of the documents themselves, which enabled me to compare content across documents.

When I was looking for the expression of values in the documents, the use of *in vivo* coding (Saldaña, 2016) allowed me to appropriate the actual language of the plans to express key value-laden concepts in the data. This type of coding helped me to have confidence in my understanding of values expressed in each of the documents. In areas of the documents that referred to intended outcomes, the use of *process* coding was helpful for simplifying extensive language into key actions that might be expected to result from program characteristics. Reducing the data to a code that highlighted the intended action brought clarity to my understanding of the intent of the teams of dual language planners.

Settings of the Districts

The subject under study was a set of planning documents, but these documents came from educational and social contexts. In this case, these documents represented the educational priorities of eight school districts distributed along the West Coast of the United States. Saldaña (2016) noted that, “documents are ‘social products’ that must be examined critically because they reflect the interests and perspectives of their authors” (p. 61). The dual language master plans included evidence of being social products via the expressed community values within the background sections of the plans. Table 1 provides information about the relative income level, percentage of English Learners, and the companion languages chosen by the districts behind these eight documents.

Table 1

Settings of School Districts

Districts	Size income	% of low students	% of English learners	Languages that partner with English
Ash	20k	73	20	Spanish, Chinese, Korean
Cedar	11k	64	29	Spanish
Citrus	19k	60	18	Spanish, Chinese
Elm	8.7k	20	11	Spanish
Oak	2k	49	19	Spanish
Palm	3.4k	11	18	Spanish
Pine	4.5k	62	<5	Spanish
Spruce	26k	47	11	Spanish

<http://www.ed-data.org/>

<http://www.district6.org/>

<https://nces.ed.gov/>

These documents were developed in eight communities with different socio-economic characteristics and represented the key data set for this study. I sought a limited amount of contextual information from outside the documents that I then applied to their analysis. This information included the size of each district in terms of total student population, the socio-economic status of the districts' students expressed as the percentage of low-income students, and the districts' percentage of English Language Learners.

Data Analysis Procedures

As outlined previously, I followed Saldaña's (2016) paradigm for coding and the creation of categories and themes across two major cycles of analysis. In the first cycle of coding, I applied a set list of *a priori* codes that were derived from my review of literature. The first passes of coding that I conducted with these *a priori* codes were developed from the pilot analysis.

First cycle coding. Saldaña (2016) uses the term *cycle* of coding because it reflects his conception of coding as a progressive and cyclical process wherein data are identified through

the application of codes, codes are compared to other codes, and categories are formed through these comparisons. Categories are compared to other categories and then back to data and codes. I used this iterative understanding of coding to inform my own process. I found that using a variety of coding types solidified my understanding of the documents with which I was working. *Initial coding.* I continued this first cycle of coding by applying the *a priori* codes to the remaining seven documents. I applied twelve *a priori* codes to each document in multiple passes. These twelve codes were derived from the seven Guiding Principles for Dual Language Programs (Howard et al., 2018), and from five elements of the Title VII grant paradigm (Liberty & Gonzalez, 1999). I used one code at a time to examine each of the remaining documents, resulting in approximately 84 initial coding passes. My goal was to set up the creation of categories from the content of the documents. At this stage, I used a password-protected online site with a spreadsheet function in order to create a way to show comparisons between the collected codes from the eight documents.

Coding of categories. While I was still working within the first cycle of coding, I began to collapse codes into categories. The structural analysis of the documents produced the discovery of both similar codes across documents as well as codes that were unique to particular documents. I collapsed similar codes into categories in my data collection spreadsheets. An example of this was collapsing *cross-cultural learning*, *multicultural understanding*, and *critical inter-cultural skills* into ‘multicultural competence. I also adapted some of my data collection spreadsheets to capture codes that were unique to one or two specific documents.

After applying several passes of *a priori* and *descriptive* coding to the data, I saw an opportunity for subsequent passes of coding using other code types, such as *in vivo* and *process* coding. I looked for language that was coded for its relevance to values, concepts, and intended

results of policy (Saldaña, 2016). One example of this was my effort to re-code language about intended benefits and program priorities using *process* codes to see how these benefits and priorities could be interpreted for specific categories of students.

One example of moving from codes to categories was in the analysis of rationales. I took identified sections that focused on expressing the rationales for engaging in dual language education (one master plan at a time) and looked for process codes of active verbs that described either the effects on students or another result that justified the program. I then reduced the repeated references to similar codes into fewer categories of similar rationales within the master plan.

Second cycle coding. In Saldaña's (2016) conceptualization of second cycle coding, the process of deepening the examination of data was not linear, but rather cyclical. This cycle represents a process of deepening analysis, of "reorganizing and reanalyzing data coded through first cycle methods" (p. 234). But Saldaña pointed out that the primary goal of second cycle coding is to develop a conceptual or thematic organization from first cycle codes.

Coding of categories and themes. In first cycle of coding, as I made initial coding passes through the document data, I organized the information that I found using simple, descriptive codes, sometimes applying the *a priori* codes I had created beforehand based on what I had expected I might find. In this second cycle, I abandoned some of the initial codes as less relevant to my purposes and focused on the codes and categories that could be organized around themes. I applied relevant ideas from my review of literature to repeated examinations of codes and categories with the purpose of inductively identifying themes.

One example of this work was the achievement gap theme (Appendix E). This theme became evident by comparing concepts from the literature review with identified categories. The

inductive intersections between the related concepts and categories pointed clearly to this theme. For example, the literature on dual language programs makes the case that these programs are beneficial to students. I compared these benefits with codes for perceived benefits, combining them into categories where the plans suggested that dual language could benefit students in particular ways. This enabled an examination of the types of learners to which they referred, allowing me to connect the intended benefits to the under-represented students for whom a shrinking of the achievement gap benefit was claimed (Appendix F).

Organization of data into themes. I derived themes from categories in two main ways. First, potential themes were evident in my research questions related to the constructs of justifications, programmatic outcomes, and intended benefits. I made repeated passes through these data to confirm these deductive categories. Secondly, I compared the anticipated themes from the review of literature to the categories of data that I found to be significant across the documents to verify that they should be considered actual themes with the documents.

I also used the graphical representation of categories as a tool to identify themes. In some cases, I applied data found outside of the plans themselves in order to add a demographic analysis to the categories found within the documents themselves. These charts and spreadsheets allowed me to compare categories side by side to determine their thematic coherence. These categories served as organizing constructs for the ways I present data in Chapter 4.

The Researcher

This research study emerged out of my interest in dual language program planning for a variety of reasons. For three years, I served as the site administrator of a K-5 elementary school that housed a Two-Way, Spanish Immersion program for 22 years. I currently serve as the Coordinator of the Bilingual Authorization at a small private university, which places me in

charge of preparing new teachers to work in dual language settings. I have given presentations on program design at both CABA (the California Association of Bilingual Educators) and CARLA (Center for Advanced Research in Language Acquisition) conferences within the last three years. I observed the development of two dual language master plans during that same time that I served as the World Languages coordinator of a medium-sized school district. In one case, I was an observer at the end of the development process and in the other case I was an off-site observer/advisor throughout its development. While holding the coordinator position, I was charged with blending educational policies for two elementary dual language programs, two middle-school immersion programs, and five secondary World Language programs.

These experiences inspired a desire to do a deep study of the documents by which districts propose and hone their dual language programs. Thus, in my work as a doctoral student at George Fox University, I sought to apply my knowledge of dual language education to my dissertation. These various roles led me to my research questions and informed my analytic steps. I managed my various roles by staying reflective on questions of objectivity and my responsibility to the academy to report all of the findings that relate to my research questions.

Delimitations, Limitations, and Assumptions of the Study

I intentionally delimited the study to include only dual language master plans in this document study. The reason for this delimitation was to access the official voice of district decision makers and the stakeholders that they included in their process. As I searched for dual language master plans, I discovered that published plans were rarer than I had expected. The low ratio of available master plans to the final count of documents chosen for the study was a limitation in this study. I was careful to choose documents that represented a wide geographic and demographic spread.

I made several assumptions about dual language master plans as I prepared to study them. One assumption was that they are thoroughly developed documents that represent the voices of multiple stakeholders. I also assumed that the plans were responsive to stakeholder and community needs. Data from the plans' acknowledgements and description of process sections seemed to verify these assumptions.

Trustworthiness and Credibility

One way in which I ensured trustworthiness of the process was to thoroughly and systematically examine all of the data multiple times. I kept careful analytical notes, creating codes as I went along. I kept these notes in journals and subsequently transferred them to spreadsheets. The initial coding process was made more trustworthy by applying an established external protocol from the Guiding Principles (Howard et al., 2018). The Guiding Principles supplied some of the *a priori* codes used to analyze the structures of the planning documents. I created spreadsheets as a technique for mapping the data from the various sections of the plans. I also used the spreadsheet technique to create a map of common ideas from the plans, simplifying and reducing the codes during second-cycle coding. These spreadsheets established an audit trail of my work, pointing to the depth with which I conducted this study.

Summary

In this chapter, I described the process used to analyze a collection of eight dual language master plans in order to better understand the practice of dual language planning in school districts. The design for the study was explained in light of the source material being a collection of documents written by separate organizations that shared a similar purpose. I described how I chose to pilot the process with a single study and how this created a space to try various coding

techniques. This pilot helpfully informed analysis of the remaining studies to reduce codes into categories and to discern themes.

This process illuminated how the dual language plans represented choices districts make about curriculum, instruction, assessment in the light of potential student outcomes. The many choices that are typically made through the dual language planning process have a significant impact on the success of dual language programs. Specifically, student outcomes in the areas of language acquisition, academic achievement, and social-emotional growth are at play in the development of dual language master plans.

Chapter Four: Findings

This chapter outlines findings from this study of eight school districts' dual language master plans. The dual language master plan is a tool used by some school districts to express the rationales, instructional plans, and intended outcomes for students in dual immersion programs in their schools. In this chapter, I discuss what I found regarding the structure of the dual language plans and their patterns of priorities and rationales, instructional plans, and programmatic outcomes, and highlight their intended benefits to students.

Structure of Dual Language Master Plans

Several structures were indicated across the dual language master plans. Many of the chapter titles had common language and were presented in a similar, though not identical, order. I coded the titles and then combined codes to form categories that bore a striking similarity to some of the dual language resources evident in the review of literature. These resources included guidelines from the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), federal funding protocols (Title VII), and several research studies that acted as a “canon” of literature cited by the eight plans. The plans used this research canon to offer academically-supported justifications for dual language education. Below, I outline the significance of these three major structures, before explaining the major patterns evident across the documents.

CAL Guiding Principles. The master plans' content that described the implementation of the dual language programs was coded and compared to several of the *a priori* codes taken from the review of literature done in preparation for this study. These codes were informed by the CAL Guiding Principles for Dual Language Programs (Howard et al., 2018). I chose to look at the CAL Guiding Principles because they were designed to guide the conceptualization of dual language programs. The Center for Applied Linguistics, which was founded in 1959, currently

has a special role in the dual language community (Howard et al., 2018). With the third edition (2018) of their Guiding Principles document, the authors effectively expanded their functionality by including an extensive self-evaluation tool for use by dual language programs. Another area of expansion over the 2007 edition is an increased focus on students' access to their own language and language equity issues as they relate to civil rights (Howard et al., 2018).

Table 1 contains a brief summary of the Guiding Principles and the dual language planning decisions they are designed to guide. When I began this study, I anticipated finding master plans that described dual language programs that were in the midst of being created. Instead, I found the majority of the master plans were written after a program had been initiated, often out of a need to recalibrate their existing program. One of the eight plans (Pine USD) had a master plan process that coincided with the creation of the program. The plans revealed a variety of reasons for engaging in master planning after the start of a dual language program. These included supporting the expansion of the existing program and modification of the model being used.

Table 1

The CAL Guiding Principles

<i>Principle</i>	<i>Task</i>
Program structure	Decide on program model (ie. language, one-way/two-way, etc.)
Curriculum	Decide what will be taught and in which language at which point
Instruction	Decide on teaching methodologies, (ie. language separation, etc.)
Assessment	Decide how student language development will be assessed
Professional development	Decide on desired characteristics of teachers and how to support
Family & community	Decide how to communicate and treat them as a valued resource
Support & resources	Decide on the financial resources and personnel requirements

This basic plan format, categorized to adjust for differences in the master plans' vocabulary and chapter placement, mirrored the CAL Guiding Principles very closely. Each of these categorizes in the table represented programmatic descriptions in the plans, beginning with a description of the basic characteristics of each program and moving to details about the content and methods for carrying out each program.

Background information and Title VII grants. A second major structure of the plans was the presence of relevant school district background information that provided context and justification for the dual language plans. These sections mirrored an older planning protocol that was created through a Federal dual language education grant application process associated with Title VII grants awarded in the 1990s (Liberty & Gonzalez, 2014). These sections of the dual language plans offered insight into the rationales, priorities, and intended benefits of the programs. I coded the plans for content related to each program's background, rationales, priorities, and benefits. Table 2 notes the program background information indicated by the Title VII-related codes and the program content information derived from the CAL Guiding Principles categories.

The consistency of the presence of these features (indicated with an X in Table 2) is a potential signal of a community of practice (Wenger, 1997) that informally binds together these school districts. Further evidence of this is in the acknowledgement sections of the dual language master plans, indicating that the sharing of plans from one school district to another helped in the development of the respective plans. These acknowledgement sections detailed the contributions of the districts and site representatives to the master plan committee, as well as the advisors and consultants. The advisors mentioned were often attached to bilingual advocacy organizations such as CAL, The Association of Two-way Dual Language Educators (ATDLE),

the California Association of Bilingual Educators (CABE), and the federal Foreign Language Assistance Project (FLAP). This repetition suggests that an informal professional community of practice may have produced the strong commonalities in these plans.

Table 2

Comparison of Master Plans for Categories of Background and Structure

Categories	Districts	Ash	Citrus	Cedar	Elm	Oak	Palm	Pine	Spruce
Background (Title VII)		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Mission/Vision (Title VII)		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Benefits (research) (Title VII)		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Program Structure (CAL)		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Curriculum (CAL)		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Instruction (CAL)			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Assessment & Accountability (CAL)	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
Professional Development (CAL)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Family & Community (CAL)			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Support & Resources (CAL)	X			X	X		X	X	X

Both the CAL Guiding Principles and the Title VII categories influenced the structures of the eight studied plans. These sources helped me observe additional patterns in the school districts' plans, including the presence of common conceptualizations held by plan authors of major structural elements. This enabled a consideration of the types of family involvement intended by the dual language planners. The common features and the evidence of an informal community of practice indicated that the school districts were very committed to developing strong, research-based plans.

Common research sources. The presence of a common body of regularly-cited research was apparent across the plans and revealed collaboration among plan authors. Table 3 indicates the most-cited research studies across all the plans, adding further evidence to the ways a community of practice influenced the creation of the eight dual language planning documents.

The research cited in these collections of dual language sources provided consistent rationales for the implementation of dual language programs in schools. These research justifications indicated that the professional community of dual language experts were in communication with school districts' planners about why dual language programs were effective. The common research literature obviously influenced the patterns of expression of rationales in the dual language master plans. The common rationales shaped the patterns of intended benefits that the authors and their districts anticipated for students through dual language education.

Table 3

Citations in Dual Language Research Literature Shared by All Plans

Citation	Rationale (DL = dual language)
Howard, Sugarman, Perdomo & Adger, 2005	Additive bilingualism is beneficial
Thomas & Collier, 2002	Language skills transfer from L1 to L2
Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2009	Longer exposure to L2 = greater gains in language acquisition and content
Cummins, 1986; Ager, 2005, Soltero, 2004	DL enhances multicultural awareness
ACTFL, 2006	DL enhances interdisciplinary perspectives
(American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language)	DL enhances understanding of comparative language structures

Table 3 does not itself reflect the extensive language used by each plan to describe the six key rationales supported by this collection of research literature, but offers the categories derived from common codes. Beyond that, these research sections developed the importance of the rationales beyond a simple list of rationales. Each plan's discussion seemed to reflect an interpretation of the cited research, perhaps indicating that a conversation took place about the sources on the part of the preparers of each plan. For example, the Palm USD document cited the article by Thomas and Collier (2002) as meaning that "second-language learning enhances comprehension in the native language. Second language learners apply these reading and

language analysis skills to their native language” (p. 8). The Pine USD document said of the same research (Thomas & Collier, 2002) that it “...also found that the fewest high school dropouts come from two-way programs” (p. 5). This perhaps signals that high school dropout rates were a specific concern in Pine USD. This would make sense, as Pine USD had 64% of students identified as low SES as compared to Palm USD, with only 11% of students identified as low SES. Citrus USD expressed the research finding from the same study in this way: “Second language learners apply these reading and language analysis skills to their native language for both English-dominant and partner language-dominant students” (Thomas & Collier, 2002, p. 4). These three examples from Thomas & Collier (2002) indicate the thoughtful construction of language in these different versions of analysis of the same research.

Patterns Found in Dual Language Plans

In order to explore how school districts expressed their priorities for their dual language programs, I elected to search for patterns across the eight dual language plans. I wanted to see whether a pattern of expressed priorities could be discerned. I focused on the research justifications, the instructional plans, and the intended outcomes in order to understand how the plans were meant to guide dual language programs to better serve students and parents. This analysis revealed five major patterns across the plans, which are elucidated below.

Purposes for creating the plans varied by longevity of program. The first pattern deserving explanation was the apparent purposes for creating these dual language plans. The dual language programs that I studied were, on the whole, created to modify the characteristics of an existing program. For example, Palm USD cited their need to address specific questions of practice that became evident after the inauguration of a dual language kindergarten program. Programs like those in Ash, Cedar, Citrus, and Spruce Districts grew from elementary-only

programs into the secondary grades, increasing the complexity of their programs. This turned their programs into multi-school site programs that needed to recalibrate policies between the school sites. Ash USD also described the addition of a new dual language program (Korean) to the ones they were already operating in other languages (Mandarin and Spanish), providing another reason to engage in master planning for their programs. Two of the plans, Elm and Oak, were updates of much earlier plans. These two plans also represented programs that had been in existence for 19 years or longer before their most recent plan.

Overall, the dual language master plans were created across a span of seven years (2010-2016). All of the plans were created by groups of stakeholders that included district, site and community representatives. The differences in the purposes for creating the plans did not greatly change the process used to engage in dual language planning, suggesting a high level of consistency in the vision for dual language education during this period of time. Table 4 describes the various purposes for master planning that were referenced in each school district's plan.

Table 4

Dates of Studied Plans Compared to Program Creation

District	Program creation	Date of new plan	Previous plans / new purpose
Ash	2009	2016	Adds Korean and secondary options
Cedar	2005	2013	Expands from K-5 to K-8
Citrus	2009	2013	Expands from K-5 to K-8
Elm	1983	2010	Updates previous plan from 1993
Oak	1996	2015	Updates plans from 2009, 2005
Palm	2007	2012	Redesign from one-way to two-way
Pine	2014	2015	2015 is initial plan
Spruce	2011	2014	Expands from K-5 to K-12

Of all the dual language master plans, only one plan, Pine USD, was completed during the first year of operation of the program. In their case, a grant from their state was awarded to the school district specifically to begin a dual language program. The grant carried the stipulation that planning take place before the program began:

The grant was designed for the 2013-14 school year to be a planning year. Our TWI team spent the year visiting countless other districts in the state, attending any professional development we could locate including the national TWI conference – ATDLE, designing and marketing our program, collaborating with our grant consultants.... (Pine USD, p. 2)

The Pine USD master plan was completed in 2015, part way into the initial year of the program. Of the eight plans, Pine USD is the only one that was written contemporaneously with the start of the dual language program. The Palm plan explained how the district changed their program model from one-way immersion (Native English speakers only) to two-way immersion (Native speakers of both languages):

The program was initially implemented as a One-Way Immersion Program serving primarily English-speaking families and children... using Spanish as the primary language of instruction. As the program progressed it attracted both native Spanish-speaking and bilingual students and has evolved into a Two-Way Immersion Program. (Palm USD, 2012)

This modification of the Palm plan seems to respond to a concern for equity of access provided to Latino students in their community. This might be an example of a master plan designed to transition a district dual language program to a model that reflected equity over enrichment. The equity implications of providing dual language instruction to native Spanish-

speakers became apparent to district officials when that language community expressed interest. This resonates with Ruiz' (1984) language orientations paradigm of language-as-right and language-as-resource.

These modifications point to the finding that the master planning process was often used to adjust dual language programs to school districts' circumstances. This study revealed that seven of the eight published dual language master plans were developed between three and 35 years after the inauguration of those programs. For example, the school districts with the longest history of dual language education (Oak USD and Elm USD) developed their current master plans 19 and 35 years respectively after starting their programs. Oak USD began their program in 1996:

[Acorn school] received a \$1 million Title 7 Federal Grant to support program development, professional development and supplemental materials. The program expanded to [Pine Cone] Middle School in 2001 when the first class of exiting 5th graders entered middle school. (Oak USD, p. 1)

This most recent Oak plan was preceded by two previous plans in 2005 and 2009. Elm USD recorded the earliest program start of all the plans (1985) and produced at least one prior plan (1993) before publishing their current plan in 2010. In the case of the Elm plan, they noted the need to influence the broader educational community toward bilingual education: "Once again, [Elm] Unified School District has the opportunity to be a leader in public education. ...The Spanish Immersion Program can help show the way as the district explores how to provide expanded coordinated opportunities for learning world languages" (Elm USD, p. 2). The purposes of the plans written between three and eight years after the inauguration of their programs all signaled an important shift in program design. Cedar USD and Citrus USD

expanded their programs to K-8 (adding middle school programs) and Ash USD and Spruce USD extended their programs through K-12: “The Dual Language Master Plan outlines the K-12 Pathway for students in the [Spruce] Dual Language Program and will allow our teachers and administrators to continue to grow in their understanding of Dual Language Education at all grade levels” (Spruce USD, 2014). This example indicates clearly how the expansion of dual language education into secondary education was an important reason for the plans.

Indeed, most of the programs in this study included purposes beyond defining a new program. In some of the plans, the stated purpose expressed a need to plan for the expansion of their programs to upper grades. For Oak and Elm, the act of revising the program through a defined planning process may have become a practice that was enacted on a semi-regular basis. The Elm plan specifically referenced itself as a potential model for this planning practice. The fact that school districts with established programs would look ahead to their potential influence as a model for other districts points to a professional community of practice in dual language education. This comparison of purposes in engaging in dual language planning revealed that school districts’ purposes changed over time in ways that suggest a pathway of program maturation.

Research rationales interpret the intended benefits. The second major pattern identified in an analysis of justifications, rationales, and intended outcomes was the way plans cited research to justify engaging in dual language education. The research justification sections of the plan were given various names; “Research Review” (Pine USD), “Benefits of Spanish Language immersion” (Elm USD), “Benefits for All Students” (Citrus USD), and “Research-Based Benefits” (Palm USD), yet all served the purpose of justifying the programs.

There were six main rationales that were very consistent in language and meaning across the eight programs. As I coded these program justifications, I observed that they referred in each case to specific, expected benefit to students. Those six expected benefits were 1) language skills transfer between two languages, 2) competent second language acquisition, 3) a strong knowledge of language structures, 4) an interdisciplinary perspective on academics, 5) the retention of one's first language while acquiring a second language (also known as Additive Bilingualism), and 6) multicultural awareness. These benefits are represented in Table 5, in association with the three categories of learning discerned through my review of literature (de Jong & Howard, 2009; Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010; Sarmiento, 2008). These categories of learning were: 1) language acquisition, 2) academic awareness, and 3) social-emotional growth.

Table 5

Expected Benefits to Students Represented in All of the Master Plans

Expected benefit	Type of learning
Language skills transfer from L1 to L2	Language acquisition
Strength of L2 acquisition	Language acquisition
Knowledge of language structures	Academic awareness
Interdisciplinary awareness	Academic awareness
Additive bilingualism	Social-emotional growth
Multicultural awareness	Social-emotional growth

The presence of these six expected benefits in each of the eight dual language master plans signaled a common vision of the efficacy of dual language programs. Considering that these expected benefits are all stated in published, official documents, these benefits that were attributed to dual language education seem to signal a commitment by districts to these intended outcomes.

Instructional design had implications for equity. The third pattern identified across the plans was the way that the many design choices available to dual language planners were found to operate beyond a merely instrumental purpose. Each area of design presented opportunities to provide more or less equitable access to education. The detailed explanations of the design choices below are followed by their implications.

The choices involved in instructional design for dual language education are the parameters of how the partner language is combined with English to produce competency in both languages. Four areas of instructional design that were addressed in the dual language master plans were 1) choice of *partner language* to English (ie. Spanish, Mandarin, etc.), 2) *language distribution* or the distribution of percentages of instructional time in the partner languages in the first year of instruction (ie. 90/10, 50/50), 3) *sequence* of language instruction where *sequential* meant that the emphasis on the partner language changes as the students pass through the elementary grades (i.e. K is 90/10, 1st grade is 80/20, 2nd grade is 70/30, etc.) and *simultaneous*, which indicated that the language emphasis is always equal (i.e. K-5 remains 50% of instruction delivered in English and 50% of instruction in the partner language), and 4) *directionality of instruction*, which referred to the students' first and second languages.

In directionality, a *one-way* program referred to one where all of the students have the same first language (L1) and are moving toward the acquisition of the same second language (L2). In the one-way model, all students are either English-only students or are English language learners whose first language is the partner language. A *two-way* program has roughly half of its students whose first language is English and the other half speak the target language. Therefore, in this model, all of the students were moving toward competency in their respective second languages together but in opposite directions.

Table 6 demonstrates the finding that, while there are various partner languages represented across the plans, the most often-chosen partner language with English was Spanish (Out of 15 DL schools in the eight districts, only three taught a partner language other than Spanish). The plans also demonstrated that a majority of schools employed a 90/10 model of language distribution in the entry grade to elementary dual language instruction. Ten schools mentioned across the plans were identified as 90/10 programs, 2 schools used 100 percent Spanish in their initial year, and three schools were identified as 50/50 schools. In this study, the typical dual language program was a Spanish Immersion program that followed a sequential, two-way model.

Table 6

Pattern of Instructional Models

Plan and Partner Language	Language distribution	Sequential v. Simultaneous	Directionality	K-5 Sites
Ash (Spanish)	90/10	Sequential	Two-way	2
Ash (Mandarin)	50/50	Simultaneous	Two-way	1
Ash (Korean)	50/50	Simultaneous	Two-way	1
Cedar (Spanish)	50/50	Simultaneous	Two-way	1
Citrus (Spanish)	90/10	Sequential	Two-way	2
Citrus (Mandarin)	90/10	Sequential	Two-way	1
Elm (Spanish)	100/0	Sequential	Two-way	2
Oak (Spanish)	90/10	Sequential	Two-way	1
Palm (Spanish)	90/10	Sequential	Two-way	1
Pine (Spanish)	90/10	Sequential	Two-way	1
Spruce (Spanish)	90/10	Sequential	Two-way	2

One of the important distinctions made in the literature about dual language education concerned program effectiveness (Lindholm-Leary, 2012). The 90/10, or sequential, model has been shown to produce equal or superior achievement with either Spanish and Chinese as the partner language. The difference between *sequential* and *simultaneous* language instruction

builds on the language distribution model. Only simultaneous instruction models begin with equal amounts of instructional time in English as in the partner languages (in the three cases of *simultaneous* instruction) found in this study were one program each of Mandarin, Korean, and Spanish. The feature of sequential language instruction signals the gradual shift of emphasis on the partner language to a more equal emphasis of the two languages, usually ending in a 50/50 distribution by 5th or 6th grade. Sequential language instruction was the predominant model in these plans. The 50/50 language model does not produce as strong results in language competency as the 90/10 model (Valdez, Freire, & Delevan, 2016) and yet in the dual language plans in this study, it was the model selected for two of the three Asian language plans.

The *directionality* of instruction was the one common characteristic between all of the dual language programs described in the plans. Directionality in this study referred to whether a student's second language is English and if they are moving toward bilingualism by acquiring a partner language to English or whether they are native speakers of the partner language and are acquiring English as their second language. *Two-way* immersion referred to the practice of having students enrolled in the same program whose native language was either English or the partner language acquiring both languages at the same time. Two-way immersion was the common model at the time of the creation of the eight plans. However, the Palm plan documented in its background section that its program began as a one-way model (in this case, native English speakers learning Spanish) until interest on the part of native Spanish speakers caused the district to reconsider the design and to rewrite their master plan. This description in the Palm USD plan suggests that there may be a phenomenon of plan change that is related to the public's awareness or perception of the dual language programs.

The choice of instructional model may at first seem to be merely about instrumental skills, however each one has significant implications for the equitable use of dual language instruction. The selection of partner language may be driven by the desire to address social inequalities by privileging the language of an underrepresented minority. Alternately, it may be driven by the need for a marketing strategy to bolster enrollment. The research-based language competency advantages of the 90/10 model over the 50/50 model may be mitigated by other concerns about the amount of English presented to primary school learners. The directionality of instruction has equity implications that, in the case of Palm USD, were observed by the change in their model from one-way to two-way immersion.

Assessment plans value language and academics over social-emotional growth. The fourth major pattern identified in this study was the way assessment plans emphasized academics over social-emotional growth. The plans each included an assessment plan that described the skills and knowledge the programs planned to assess, as well as the means by which they intended to assess them. Categories of three areas of assessment, language acquisition, academic achievement, and social-emotional growth were revealed by comparing the codes. An examination of the assessment plans showed fewer references to the social-emotional category than either the language assessment or academic achievement categories.

The specific assessments themselves seemed to represent the shift to Smarter Balanced achievement tests (from STAR to CAASPP). Through the process of coding and recoding the various references to assessments, I perceived the following categories of assessments that measured 1) language acquisition, 2) academic success, and 3) social-emotional growth (see Table 7). The “X” underneath each school district’s name indicates a mention of specific assessments that measured these areas.

Table 7

Categories of Assessment Design in Dual Language Plans

Assessments	Ash	Cedar	Citrus	Elm	Oak	Palm	Pine	Spruce
Language acquisition development								
English language	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Partner language	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Academic Success								
Content assessments	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Achievement tests	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Social-emotional growth								
Attitudinal surveys	X		X			X		

I simplified the codes with the names of the assessment tools to focus on the common purposes of the assessment plans. I observed purposeful strategies to measure both active (speaking and writing) and receptive (listening and reading) language skills in both English and the target language of the programs. The plans were less specific about the assessment tools to be used with the non-Spanish partner languages, perhaps reflecting something about the availability of these tools or about the commitment to those specific assessment tools. The intent to assess academic achievement outcomes was also consistently represented in the plans. I reduced the codes that I found into the two categories of content assessments and achievement tests. I categorized the standardized state and national assessments (ie, STAR, CAASPP, Smarter Balanced, etc.) as *achievement tests*. Any school and district assessments (i.e. APRENDA, CELDT, “curricular tests”, etc.) of math, social studies, or other subjects that were not specifically about language acquisition were categorized as *content testing*. Each of the plans gave examples of assessment tools and techniques that would be used to measure language

proficiency and content knowledge. None of the plans gave specific competency goals within those areas.

The plans consistently represented the importance of the areas of language acquisition and academic achievement. However, only three plans mentioned assessment instruments for measuring multicultural awareness. I noticed that two of the three plans that did mention the intent to measure multicultural awareness through attitudinal surveys were also plans that included programs with non-Spanish partner languages. The generalized nature of the assessment plans (lists of assessments with no levels of proficiency) suggested the plans' purpose was to state that these areas (primarily language proficiency and academic achievement) would indeed be assessed in both languages, rather than providing target performance levels.

Language separation policies are nuanced by current research. I found the fifth major pattern of this study in the policies concerning the separation of languages during instructional time. The policy of language separation is meant to assure that students are being taught in only one language at a time. The plans emphasized the importance of understanding when content was being taught in the partner language versus when instruction should be taking place in English. As indicated in Table 6, the percentage of time spent learning within one language or another was an important feature of a dual language program, one that has implications for the efficacy of the program. The Elm USD plan referred to this policy in this way: "Lessons include both content and language objectives, following the program's policy of language separation. Teachers stay in one language during a given lesson, rather than mixing English and Spanish" (Elm USD, p. 34).

I took the codes representing the separation of languages and reduced them to categories. These categories included two descriptions of what it meant to enact language separation: to

teach in one language at a time and to not translate or mix languages. There were three reasons given for enacting language separation: 1) to develop communication skills, 2) to enhance content-based instruction (CBI), and 3) to enhance language skill transfer between students' first and second languages. Finally, the last category from the analysis and an important context for the enactment of language separation policy, was that the classroom teacher had the responsibility for enacting language separation. My analysis of the plans' references to these categories of language separation policy is found in Table 8.

Table 8

Categories of Language Separation Policies, Purposes, and Context

Policies	Ash	Cedar	Citrus	Elm	Oak	Palm	Pine	Spruce
How languages are separated:								
Teach in one language at a time	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Don't translate, don't mix lang.	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Why language should be separated:								
To develop communication skills)			X	X	X	X	X	X
To enhance Content-Based Instruction			X	X	X		X	
To enhance language transfer (L1=>L2)			X	X	X		X	
Who is responsible for separation:								
Teacher has responsibility to enact		X				X		

The only plan that did not specifically enjoin against translation and translanguaging (Palm) was one of the two plans that specifically stated that it is the teacher's responsibility to avoid engaging in translanguaging. The omission of the rule to not translate, and especially to not *mix* languages when paired with the clarification that the teacher is responsible for teaching one language at a time suggested an awareness that students may legitimately mix languages under certain circumstances. This practice is called *translanguaging* in the dual language

literature (Martinez, Hikida, & Durán, 2015). Martinez et al. problematized the policies of language separation in terms and suggested the need for a nuanced approach to this aspect of language pedagogy.

The only two plans that did not reference the specific purposes of engaging in language separation, Ash and Cedar, were the same plans that included the 50/50 model of instruction in at least one site. Ash USD had two programs, one in Mandarin and the other in Korean that employed a 50/50 *simultaneous* model. Cedar's program in Spanish was also a 50/50 program. This coincidence of the abbreviated reference to language separation and the use of the *simultaneous* model of language delivery might indicate a differentiation in attitude toward the policy of language separation between programs that employ the simultaneous and the sequential models.

The remaining plans communicated a very consistent approach to the policy of language separation, that the ideal was that the two languages not be mixed. These policies represent a traditional idea in foreign language education as well as in dual language education up to this point. The recent literature on translanguageing represents a social justice critique of the traditional practice (Martinez et al., 2015) suggesting that language separation should be the responsibility of the classroom teacher to manage, not enforce. This means students have legitimate contexts in which translanguageing does not hinder the goals of dual language education and the teacher should oversee and support those practices accordingly. Martinez, Hikida, and Durán (2015) argued that “in the protecting space for the cultivation of Spanish, [translanguageing] should not be seen as categorically undesirable” (p. 40). The presence of this nuance in master plans signals the introduction of translanguageing as an issue of equity, something that will be addressed further in Chapter 5.

Rationales Seen as Benefits Inform Views of Practice and Equity

One way that I found to understand the priorities and rationales of a dual immersion program was through their expression of the expected benefits to students in their programs. Each plan's *Expected Benefits* section indicated general rationales for enacting the proposed program. There was high consistency of expression about intended benefits for all students. However, I found much more variation in the categories of intended benefits for non-native English speakers. I also explored an application of Ruiz' (1984) theory of language orientation that considered how attitudes to language as a problem, right, or a resource (Ruiz, 1984) related to themes that I found through my analysis of the master plans' rationales for engaging in dual language education.

Benefits as signal of community of practice. I found that all of the school districts' master plans expressed the same intended benefits of dual language education to all students using nearly identical rationales. The plans varied considerably when referencing the intended benefits to only one group, however. This difference may signal the prevalence of an enrichment perspective across the plans. The benefits (expressed as rationales) are listed in Table 5 and were evident in each of the eight plans. The sameness of the benefits/rationales did not extend to how the planners expressed these in writing. Each plan used unique ways to express the benefits that were referenced in each plan.

The agreement on these intended benefits is a very striking feature of the plans that will be discussed further in Chapter 5. I saw this agreement over the benefits of dual language education as related to the connections that could be discerned between the plans and their consultants, which I discovered in the plans' acknowledgements sections. This indicated the possible influence of a community of practice (Wenger, 1997), some members of which are

identified by name in the master plans. An example of this acknowledgement of referencing other master plans is the comment in the Cedar USD plan made that the planners appreciated having read the Palm USD and Elm USD master plans as well as two other master plans that were not included in the study.

Another aspect of how communities of practice may have influenced the development of these plans was evidenced within the teams created to write the documents. These published documents were created by teams drawn from the members of the school districts' communities, including stakeholders such as parents and faculty. This suggests that the master planning process was itself an example of a transmission of learning, from acknowledged experts to future practitioners and stakeholders, essentially creating a community of practice (Wenger, 1997). My review of the acknowledgement sections of each master plan showed that a variety of stakeholders were involved in the authorship of these documents. I also observed consistency in the assertions about the intended benefits of dual language education made in the master plans. If the school district stakeholders were indeed all aware of the strong claims of intended benefits, as it seems, there would have been an implied commitment to those benefits on the part of the school district. The strongest commitments implied are to the benefits that apply to all students, implying a focus on dual language as an enrichment program more than an equity-driven program.

Benefits for English Learners as signal of equity concerns. I found a less consistent conceptualization of the benefits of dual language study intended specifically for non-native English speakers than I did for all students. The specific benefits listed in the master plans were usually referenced for native Spanish speakers (NSS) but were not always exclusive to that group (See Table 9).

Table 9

Categories of Intended Dual Language Benefits to Native Spanish Speakers (NSS)

Benefits	Plans	Ash	Cedar	Citrus	Elm	Oak	Palm	Pine	Spruce
Achievement Gap: NSS		X	X		X		X	X	X
Positive self-concept: NSS		X	X			X			
Higher achievement: NSS				X		X	X		
Long-lasting benefits: NSS		X							
Cultural validation: NSS									X
Higher EL reclassification: NSS									X
Connection to family: NSS									X

The most often-referenced intended benefit to non-native English speakers was that participation in dual language education would close the achievement gap. Between this assertion about the achievement gap and the more general assertion that dual language education would lead to higher achievement, every one of the plans mentioned students' achievement gains as an intended benefit of dual language instruction.

The plans of three districts, Ash, Cedar, and Oak, specifically referenced positive self-concept as an intended benefit of dual language. The Ash plan also referenced the long-lasting nature of the benefits to non-native English speakers, whereas all plans referenced this attribute for all learners. The Spruce plan added two benefits to non-native speakers that had social-emotional implications. One was the benefit of cultural validation for the culture of the non-native speaker. The other was an increased connection to family through the ability to communicate with all family members, whether or not they spoke English. I found that the attention given by these four districts to the social-emotional needs of English Learners provided a striking contrast to the consistency of the benefits to all students. One small commonality between these four districts that made specific claims about dual language benefits for non-

native speakers of English was that each of their plans was created during the last three years (2013-2016). This suggests a possible development in professional learning in the area of the social effects of dual immersion around this time.

Rationales and language orientation. I used Ruiz' (1984) paradigm of language orientation as a lens for understanding the dual immersion master plan rationales. Ruiz published his seminal article in the journal of the National Association of Bilingual Educators (NABE), which hypothesized attitudes about the role of bilingualism in education and society as a whole. He conceived of three orientations evident at the time: 1) language-as-problem, 2) language-as-right, and 3) language-as-resource. I created the categories shown in Table 10 to represent the result of the coding process of the dual immersion master plans' rationales. I decided to apply the three orientations that Ruiz suggested to these categories. I coded the rationales that I found in the master plans and reduced them to categories (Appendix D). I then analyzed the categories of rationales for their resemblance to Ruiz' three language orientations (see Table 10). The orientation that appeared to be the least represented in the rationales of the studied master plans was the orientation of language-as-problem. I decided to classify the idea that dual language education will close the achievement gap as an educational problem because it was presented as a rationale for dual language education in the plans.

Table 10

Language Orientation and Rationales for Dual Language (DL) in Master Plans

Rationale	Orientation of language as:	Problem	Right	Resource
DL will Close the Achievement Gap		X		
The U.S. is a multilingual nation			X	
Additive bilingualism (access to own L1)			X	
DL gives students valuable language skills				X
Additive bilingualism (career opportunities)				X
DL increases academic achievement				X
DL increases cross-cultural understanding				X
Global interdependence in modern world				X

The orientation of language-as-right was represented by two of the common rationales for dual immersion education. One of these rationales was the statement that the United States is a historically multilingual society. Regardless of this assertion's validity, the implication for rights is that the various forms of bilingual education, of which dual immersion is argued to be the most effective, were a historically necessary form of education. The second rationale was the assertion that the practice of having access to one's native language and English at the same time is a right. This right was actually established in case law in the United States through the 1974 rulings in *Lau v. Nichols* (Ovando, 2003), which gave Chinese-speaking learners the right to access the state curriculum in their first language.

Additive bilingualism, or the educational support of the development of both English and their native language, is a rationale for dual immersion that may be seen as a combination of two orientations (language-as-right and language-as-resource). The language-as-right orientation proposed that native speakers of other languages should have access to their first language as an educational right, as in *Lau v Nichols*. The position is that it is not enough that the educational system should give these students access to English; rather, students should have access to their

native language and literacy alongside their English language and literacy. The language-as-resource stance with which master plans expressed the rationale concerning additive bilingualism was that ELs, by developing both English and their native language, were enhancing their chances to enter college and/or the job market by using the resource of language.

The acquisition of bilingualism and biliteracy was an important rationale in all of the studied master plans. The benefit of academic achievement (as opposed to acquisition of a second language) was represented in the master plans by both content area and standardized achievement tests. The acquisition of cross-cultural understanding (as measured by attitudinal surveys) was cited by some master plans as an awareness of the interdependency of the modern world.

The rationales representative of the language-as-resource orientation occurred most often in these studied master plans. Ruiz (1984) presented the language-as-resource orientation forty years ago as a new way of looking at language planning, speculating whether the language-as-resource perspective would take hold. Ruiz wrote about the resource orientation toward other languages in 1984 as a developing idea. These results showed that the resource orientation was the one most commonly mentioned through these selected dual language master plans. Judging by this sample of master plans and my knowledge of the dual language field, dual language advocates have created many more two-way than one-way immersion programs. This implies a focus on marketing programs to native English speakers, alongside English Learners, and prioritizes dual language as an enrichment program. I argue that the concept of enrichment is laden with language-as-resource orientation. Thirty-four years later, this orientation was evident in the plans analyzed in this study.

Intended Impact on Students and Families

One of my reasons for engaging in this study was to understand the intentions of school districts and the teams who spoke for them in these documents; in particular, the ways these documents were designed to speak to the programs' students and their families. I found two key ways that the concerns of families were represented in these plans. The first was in shrinking the achievement gap, or claims that these programs would help students attain academic success. The second way was indicated in how plans proposed to connect parents to the school community.

Achievement gap. The achievement gap is a complex topic and well-known by the public as a critical issue in education. Yet these plans chose specific aspects of the achievement gap to highlight as a means of offering rationales for their program designs. These centered on promises that English Learners would academically outperform their single-language peers in mainstream classrooms, and also that high achievement would be an outcome for everyone. The specific achievement rationales are indicated in Table 11. I included specific demographic information about the number of English Learners in each district as well as their percentage of low-income students in order to focus on two districts, Ash and Cedar, with the highest number of English Learners to particularly focus on English Learner achievement. These two districts also had the highest number of low-income students, possibly providing an additional reason to focus on equity rationales over an enrichment perspective for their programs.

Table 11

School District References to the Achievement Gap in Master Plan Rationales

District	% of English Learners	% of Low Income	ELs in DL will outperform ELs in Mainstream	Need to close the achievement gap For ELs	High achievement for everyone
Ash	20	73	X	X	
Cedar	29	64	X	X	
Citrus	18	60			X
Elm	11	20	X	X	
Oak	19	49			X
Palm	18	11	X	X	X
Pine	<5	62	X	X	X
Spruce	11	47	X	X	X

Three school districts, Palm, Pine, and Spruce, referenced all three rationales for their dual immersion students' participation in the program. One rationale was that English Learners (ELs) in dual immersion programs would outperform ELs in mainstream classrooms. This rationale specifically claims that EL students would see greater progress in academic achievement as measured by standardized testing.

Another rationale was that the achievement gap that existed in the majority of educational settings between general student populations and specific sub-groups of students (for example, ELs and socio-economically disadvantaged (SED) students) would be reduced. The implication of this rationale was that vulnerable groups of students would also prosper academically. I did find that two of the school districts that omitted the claim of universal academic benefit for dual language learners (Ash and Cedar) also had the two highest percentages of English Learners in their districts. This pattern suggests that these two districts that have a stronger need to publicly signal the equity benefits of dual language education as compared to districts with fewer English Learners.

The third achievement-related rationale for dual immersion cited in the plans was the argument that these programs produced high achievement for all students. This claim was implied for everyone: ELs and native speakers of English, all ethnic groups, and all students of any economic status. The implications of the achievement-related rationales include the possibility that they constitute an argument for ongoing approval of programs made to school boards that have responsibility for the academic performance of all students.

Parent involvement. The involvement of parents in dual language education can take the form of districts' plans to provide information to parents about specific programs or about the nature of dual language in general. However, there are models for taking advantage of parents' own language and cultural assets to directly benefit students (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 2005). The involvement of parents in the dual language programs of the districts was one of the Guiding Principles provided by CAL and was referred to in most of the dual language plans. I coded the language found in the plans regarding the involvement of parents and in creating categories, I reframed the language to reflect the services that district, site or parent groups should offer to parents. These categories reflected the mostly one-way focus of the *parent involvement* categories in how they expressed services received by parents and not in ways that parents might contribute to the strength of the programs, themselves. With the exception of providing a resource with frequently asked questions (FAQs), the focus of each item referenced in the parent section was focused on the parents as *receivers* as opposed to *actors*. Each of the 11 types of parent outreach was expressed as a service (see Table 12) that each plan proposed that a school or district office provide to parents. These examples of parent outreach represented the plans' intentions to provide services to parents. In some cases, the dual language plans included a sample of that communication in the appendices of the master plan.

Table 12

References in Plans to Parent Outreach (activities are italicized)

Type of outreach	Ash	Cedar	Citrus	Elm	Oak	Palm	Pine	Spruce
Published materials								
Parent information	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Bilingual website	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Bilingual brochures	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
List of volunteer opportunities	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
List of dual language FAQs			<i>X</i>		<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>		<i>X</i>
Events								
Dual language (DL) parent group			X	X	X	X	X	X
Bridge DL and non-DL parents	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
DL community info nights	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Misc.								
DL outreach committee	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
District DL outreach			X	X	X	X	X	X
DL Parent Compact		X				X	X	X

The first five types of outreach (information, website, brochure, opportunity list, and frequently asked questions (FAQs)) all refer to published materials. These types of publications were referenced by almost all of the plans except for the frequently asked questions. The bilingual brochures and websites represented a special commitment for a district or school to produce since many of the schools that house dual language programs were split between dual language and regular English programs in the same school.

Events stipulated plans to benefit dual language parents. The most common type of activity represented in the plans was to make connections between dual language and non-dual language parents, which was a priority for those districts housing schools with at least two programs; one dual language and one presumably with an English-only program. The next most common type of event was community nights, which might be for the purpose of education about

dual language or disseminating information. These community nights and the activity labeled dual language parent group may also have been intended to combine learning and fellowship between parents.

The final three outreach types outlined in the plans involved parents in a less direct manner. Planning meetings for parent activities would theoretically only benefit those parents who participated in the planned activities. An additional benefit of these planning meetings would be the training of parent leaders in the future. Six of the plans mentioned the commitment of the school district to reach out to dual language parents without specifying how that would happen. Finally, the Parent Compact was referenced as a technique used to invite parents to express their commitment to the dual language program. This last activity is typically also associated with non-dual language schools, so to be effective, it should have referenced the characteristics of the dual language program.

I included this section on parent outreach in order to compare the intent of involving and engaging families (as expressed in the master plans) with other models of parent involvement found in the research literature on dual language programs. The usefulness in education of a *funds of knowledge* perspective (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 2005), for example, supplied a possible model for a more dynamic involvement of bilingual parents in their dual language students' classrooms. The availability of parent models of language and culture were not evident in the sections on dual language parent involvement.

In Chapter 5, I reference the application of the conceptualization of funds of knowledge as a connection to non-English speaking parents in dual language school communities, tying this concept to a discussion of implications for practice and recommendations for further research.

Chapter 5: Conclusions

This chapter offers comparisons between important findings from this study and the broader research literature about dual language education. This examination of DLMPs offered evidence that these documents can be contested spaces where the conflicting beliefs and needs of school personnel, families, and children are worked out. This chapter explores the implications of this study's findings for dual language programs and their execution, making recommendations for further study into the efficacy of DLE.

Discussion of Findings

Comparisons of the language of the dual language plans and sources cited within the dual language literature indicated an active professional learning community working both in and outside of the studied school districts to shape dual language practice. Specific claims of academic benefit to students resonated with important features of the Common Core standards in ways that were not particularly featured in the master plans. I made connections from the literature between social attitudes about language and the stated benefits and rationales for engaging in dual language education, namely that students in DLE are more multiculturally-minded and better equipped to be good citizens of our world. Finally, an examination of how the plans proposed to involve parents demonstrated a lack of appreciation for the assets they bring, pointing to different ways forward in master planning.

Comparisons of language and plan structure across these plans indicated an apparent link to the professional organizations whose published materials were referenced in the literature. These published materials not only shaped these plans, but authors directly acknowledged the significance of these organizations in the opening statements of each plan. There was great consistency in the expressed intended benefits, while the proposed academic benefits pointed

more specifically to state standards. However, the consistent use of the same body of research by all of the plans suggests the formation of a *canon* of dual language literature that needs refreshing. Some of the plans added particular references to issues of equity, but this was not at all consistent. Unfortunately, this apparent *canon* misses important new authors that speak to cognitive benefits and socially responsive teaching in DLE. Useful sources to include might be, Bialystok (2011), de Jong et al. (2009), Freire et al. (2016), and Martinez et al. (2015), to name just a few. Equity is an area where dual language leaders are vulnerable to criticism within their communities and the informal community of practice within school districts should be careful to show that they are aware of equity issues, have discussed them, and have a cogent response.

Professional organizations influenced plans significantly. The influence on the dual language master plans by various professional organizations appeared in both direct and indirect ways. The most obvious influence was that of the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (Howard, Sugarman, Christian, Lindholm-Leary, & Rogers, 2007), which was sometimes cited by plans directly but most often was simply reflected in the overall structures of the master plans. These are interesting clues within the master plans to the existence of a community of practice supporting dual language education.

Despite the fact that the term “dual language master plan” was not used in either the second (2007) or the third (2018) editions of the Guiding Principles published by CAL, the structures of each plan follow the Guiding Principles very consistently. Nevertheless, the term *dual language master plan* was used by each of the eight school districts as a title for their plan. The use of “master plan” may have echoed the use of the term in other educational settings, for example, *Building Master Plan* or the more relevant *English Learner Master Plan*. Or it may have been employed because it had meaning within a professional community of practice. An

examination of the acknowledgement pages of the master plans showed that a small number of dual language experts had either a consulting or reviewer role in the creation of these plans. There is no one organization that regulates dual language programs, nor is there a call for one within the documents. But the informal nature of the community of practice seemed to indicate the importance of these dual language professionals.

According to Wenger (1997), a community of practice exists through a sharing of practice that is imbedded in a historical and social context. It is much more sharing of world-view than it is training; perhaps a another word is apprenticeship. If it is the case that the commonalities of practice in the context of dual language planning are due to the existence an informal community of practice (Wenger, 1997), then perhaps the acknowledgement sections of the plans offer the evidence. By tracing the consultants and readers acknowledged in the various plans, I noticed references to several dual language leaders (including those whose research is cited) teamed with other practitioners who then showed up as regular participants in the connections to dual language plans in other locales. I perceive in this an apprenticeship of sorts, a transmission of values by doing. As Wenger says, “most communities of practice do not have a name or issue membership cards.” They are “created over time by a shared pursuit or enterprise” (p. 38). It is interesting to think that a set of documents could speak into each other to describe a professional community in this way.

Dual language program claims pointed to the Common Core. The most obvious claims made by dual language education proponents were that the dual language programs promoted bilingualism and biliteracy. Every program made this claim as well as additional claims about the efficacy of dual language education. Beyond that, every master plan claimed that the general academic value of dual language studies included the usefulness of bilingualism

for understanding language arts in general, specifically for being aware of complex structures in language.

Further, plans claimed that critical thinking skills would illuminate how subject content could be connected across disciplines. These academic skills, which involve sophisticated forms of expression and critical and interdisciplinary thinking, are deemed essential in the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2018). The CCSS were in semi-public development by 2008, released to educational agencies for review in 2010, and were officially released in 2013 (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2018), dates which made them available for reference during the time that these master plans were written.

The implication here is that CCSS likely influenced dual language plans in ways that were not specifically acknowledged. As districts were conceptualizing their dual language plans, there may have been simultaneous conversations about where new state standards were likely to take academic standards. While the Common Core was not a major referenced influence on the development of the plans, it is interesting that a major academic shift of the CCSS, a focus on the integration of knowledge, was also cited as a rationale for engaging in dual language education as part of interdisciplinary awareness. I cannot tell whether or not these contemporaneous changes in CCSS standards had an influence on the conceptualization of important benefits by the authors of the dual language plans. However, researchers of biliteracy also reference the integrative benefits of accessing texts in multiple languages. Reyes (2016) found that the combination of bilingualism and biliteracy tends to promote “high metalinguistic and pragmatic awareness” (p. 289), and this analysis of the plans indicated that priority.

Language orientation informed dual language rationales. In 1984, Richard Ruiz’ analysis of language orientation as reflected in public policies (including educational policies)

identified three key orientations. One was the orientation of language-as-problem reflected in, among other laws, the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 (BEA). The discussions surrounding how to enact the BEA focused on the preferability of transitional versus maintenance bilingual education, in terms of which was more likely to produce English competency, even though it came at the expense of students' first languages. Ruiz cited many sources from government and research that indicated the relative strength of the language-as-problem orientation during the 1970s (Ruiz, 1984).

In this study, the closest that the dual language rationales came to problematizing bilingualism was the rationale highlighting the need to close the Achievement Gap. To the extent to which the eight school districts expressed the need for dual language programs to *be seen* as capable of closing the Achievement Gap, I perceive this as an admission that plan authors believed that speaking another language could be a barrier to accessing an American education. Both the identification of ELs as an underrepresented minority and the persistent nature of the Achievement Gap suggest a problem to be solved.

At the same time (the 1970s and before), representations of a language-as-right orientation were expressed through case law, such as *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) and *U.S. v Texas* (1971), which defended the rights of students to access their education through languages other than English. Ruiz (1984) also referenced international law (the 1948 Universal Declaration on the Rights of Man and the 1975 Helsinki Accords) to show that language rights were being considered as human rights in some circumstances. Two of the dual language priorities from the master plans referenced a rights orientation. One was the assertion that the United States has always been a bilingual nation, an assertion (Ovando, 2003) that predated the writing of the eight dual language plans. The other argument was that additive bilingualism (adding English without

losing one's first language) was a civil right, which was adjudicated through *Lau v. Nichols* but never fully realized in practice.

Finally, the orientation that Ruiz saw as the most tenuous, the language-as-resource orientation, received a social impetus in the United States due to American crises of diplomacy and business in the late 1970's and early 1980s and also by the research on primary (or first) language loss among English Learners in the U.S. who did not receive instruction in their first language along with English (Ruiz, 1984). This study reveals that, far from being tenuous, the language-as-resource rationale was strongly represented in the plans, more so than the orientations of *problem* or *right*. It is possible that the language-as-resource orientation is the driving force of dual language education at this time. Indeed, the prevalence of the two-way model of dual language education, with its marketing frame of educational enrichment, seems to cement that orientation.

The advent of two-way immersion, the pairing of groups of native English and non-native English learners, has had a powerful influence on the development of dual language programs as evidenced by the prevalence of these models. The one program in the study that began by employing a one-way immersion model (native English speakers only) soon switched its plan to a two-way model as the program became known to the community. I suspect that bilingual education is seen in a more positive light today because of this shift in orientation that was suggested in Ruiz's foundational work, and now clearly evident in an analysis of these plans. The challenge for dual language educators today is to balance the enrichment outcomes of dual language education with clear plans for guarding the particular beneficial outcomes for English Learners, as a matter of educational equity.

Program priorities could utilize parent involvement. The priorities of bilingualism/biliteracy, high levels of academic achievement, and multicultural awareness were evident across all plans. I worked to see the connections between these goals and the role of dual language program parents, specifically the assets bilingual parents could offer dual language programs. The parents of both groups of children have language skills that are important to all of the students. There are non-native English speakers who need English models for their language development in English and there are native English speakers that need models of the target language for their development, specifically their acquisition of the target language. The potential for parents to not only provide language modeling at home but to model for other families' children at the school is relevant to both native English-speaking parents and to parents that are native speakers of the target language. Yet these resources and ideas were underutilized within the plans. I propose that an analysis of these plans indicates that schools ought to more intentionally and systematically employ parents as language and culture models through a culturally relevant pedagogy. Offering the non-native English-speaker parents a special role in the classroom serving as valued experts in language and culture, validating their language assets by having them read to students, and treating them as part of a local community of practice by listening to their ideas about education are a few ideas for employing parents' assets.

Yet the research issues cautionary notes about the ways parental involvement might be instantiated in dual language programs, even given the best planning evident in official documents. Valdéz, Freire, & Delevan (2016) found that a number of administration and marketing moves within official school district and state documents actually marginalized the English Learner participants in the programs, which subsequently limited the contribution of language minority families. Some of the barriers to language minority student participation were

that locations for programs were far from the homes of language minority students, and that low-income and English Learner students were underrepresented in DL programs characterized by enrichment goals, such as Advanced Placement testing. Other research indicated gentrification of dual language education, where programs can privilege the native English speakers when participating in Spanish or English (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017). This knowledge, taken together with this study, indicates the need for a range of stakeholders to critically reflect not only on the plan documents, but to continuously work on how the plans get implemented to ensure language access for bilingual students and their families.

Implications for Practice

This research points to several implications for practice in dual language planning. This includes the need for an easily identified community of practice to guide the development of new programs, a call for transparency around the potential benefits that are claimed for dual language students, a recognition of the complex equity issues surrounding the needs of English learners, and acknowledgement and wise employment of parents as interested parties who bring important assets to the work of education. Each of these implications are discussed in relation to a finding from this study.

The role of dual language communities of practice. The communities of practice (Wenger, 1997) that are implied in the consistency of the planning documents are a hypothetical group of people. Certain organizations such as CAL, ATDLE, CAFE, and others are certainly part of the community in an informal way, as evidenced by consistent reference to their work in the plans. Other individuals, such as Kathryn Lindholm-Leary, Rosa Molina, and others that I have not named are likely more directly connected given the reference to their names in the acknowledgement and background sections of the plans. With the possibility of a rapid

expansion of dual language programs in the future, these specialists with knowledge of how to construct dual language programs will be in high demand. One of the purposes of a community of practice is to apply expert knowledge to a particular practice or set of practices. But equally important is the work of transmitting the values and historical understanding of those practices to others. Communities of practice may be looser or more tight-knit groups of practitioners. But to the extent that they actually work at the center of the community, they share the core understanding, history and values of the practice. Dual language planning would be well-served by cultivating a vibrant, growing community of practice in service to new programs.

While regional and national communities of practice, such as ADTLE and CABE, have been working hard on developing their outreach to school districts, there is an opportunity for school districts themselves to form local groups of DL educators to meet together to consider practice within their local context. School leaders in particular should be encouraged to meet to share about their programs, to visit their colleagues' school sites, and to engage in meaningful conversations about how to maintain the high quality of their programs. There is even room for the inclusion of institutions of higher learning, particularly those within schools of education that are charged with preparing new DL teachers.

Expectations for dual language education. The plans' high expectations for language acquisition, academic success, and multicultural awareness can only be met when dual language programs are properly constructed and maintained. This is evident through the plans' specific claims of benefits associated with particular structures or instructional practices. Dual language master planning makes unavoidable claims of relationship between practice and certain results. The claims are not baseless because they are referenced to cited research, but they are not easily accomplished, either. One implication of this practice of citing researched claims about the

efficacy of dual language programs is that the school districts must value dual language research and be committed to the deep work of making their programs effective.

Parents, two-way immersion, and funds of knowledge. The role of parents in dual language programs is enshrined in the CAL Guiding Principles for dual language education (Howard et al., 2018). In dual language education and in two-way immersion in particular, the methodology for language learning and culture sharing are particularly challenging because the teacher must be very aware of which students are moving toward which set of goals. The research into the assets of bilingual parents (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 2005) provides possibilities for leveraging the assets of parents in meeting these complex challenges. The range of aptitudes and specialized knowledge that parents possess can be quite wide. When parents' vocational and cultural specialties are connected with learning in schools, the result is not only the enhancement of knowledge but also a stronger connection between children and their parents (Moll et al., 2005). Additionally, when all parents are seen as having assets worthy of being shared in the classroom, empathy and respect among all of the children increases (Moll et al., 2005). The implications for the stated goals of multiculturalism are that the effective inclusion of parents may be the most effective means of accomplishing those goals.

Recommendations for Practice

Based on this study, there are a few ways in which school districts, consultants, and researchers can continue to collaborate to improve dual language education planning. This study indicates that dual language experts would benefit from professional connections and learning opportunities. Plans should be informed by data gathering at a local level, which could provide a way for dual language master planning to extend itself through action research. The stated priorities of improving students' cognitive benefits should cause school districts to examine their

inclusion practices for special needs students. Finally, this study suggests that parents are an untapped resource that many dual language plans do not adequately utilize.

Professional outreach to school districts. The dual language professional community was clearly an important resource for school districts evident in the plans. As the demand for new programs increases, it will be important for professional organizations to find ways to equip those educators that are not only trained in the practices of dual language, but who also have a strong sense of the history and background of dual language education (Wenger, 1997). Through the development of a robust dual language community of practice, with shared practices and values, it might be possible to feed a large expansion in dual language programs.

One group that should not be forgotten, and indeed should be at the center of DL communities of practice, are classroom teachers. Their expertise and understanding of the emergent bilingual student are perhaps the greatest resource of a DL program. Across the master plans the professional development sections all contained similar proposals for how to ensure that teachers were properly credentialed and the types of training they should receive. A more powerful plan would be to explicitly state how classroom teachers will carry the vision of DLE alongside school and district leaders. Expertise is a continually evolving resource and one that is fed by community dialog (Wenger, 1997).

Data gathering on the efficacy of dual language. I believe that districts need to publish their findings on how the claims made concerning the promise of dual language education are being realized. The research these plans cited pointed to significant interest in using research to make decisions about dual language programs. If supported with resources, this interest might prompt teachers and school leaders to engage in action research. Additionally, the higher education dual language community could be leveraged to help guide research efforts organized

by dual language teachers. This would provide the dual language community with an ongoing stream of data about various approaches to dual language education, and also heighten teachers' awareness of the dynamics of their programs and classroom practices.

Revisit the inclusion of students with special needs. Researchers cited in this discussion have shown the benefits of bilingualism in the areas of attending skills (Bialystok, 2011), executive control (Bialystok et al., 2008; Luo et al, 2010), and speech and language impairment (Roeper, 2012). The requirements for inclusion in programs are a regular part of most of these plans, but a robust and fearless response to the question of the inclusion of special needs students where possible should make reference to these authors to make this more than a pro forma statement. Administrators of dual language programs should be conversant with these studies and others of their kind.

Expand the role of dual language parents. School districts that engage in dual language education ought to consider how to empower the parents of English Learners to be actively involved in the dual language classroom, rather than simply listing the resources dual language programs will make available to parents. The language assets of parents who are speakers of other languages are generally not as readily available as are the English-speaking parents' skills. But just as important are the equity implications for the active inclusion of parents who are native speakers of the target languages of the programs. By employing a funds of knowledge paradigm (Moll et al., 2005), school districts could expand their generally passive view of parents as receivers of information to see and utilize parents as critical resources. This expansion could involve showing teachers how to invite parents into the classroom in ways that engage students linguistically and culturally. Several goals for this use of parent assets might

include the effective use of adult volunteers in the classroom, the training of adult learners, and how to prepare students to receive other adults in a classroom community.

Recommendations for Further Research

The strength of districts' commitments to creating useful plans was evident, yet also offers some areas in which further research could enhance the efficacy of the dual language planning process. These include a) working to involve a broad range of stakeholders in the process of planning, b) studying the efficacy of dual language instructional models in the light of current research about the cognitive value of dual language education, and c) the ongoing concern for equitable and culturally responsive practices in dual language settings.

Methods of educational planning with stakeholders. While there is evidence within the master plans of involvement by important stakeholders, it is also clear that a significant purpose of the master plans was to convince the broader public of the value of dual language education. Since it is also clear that the majority of the studied plans were written after the inauguration of each districts' first program, it would be valuable to study the processes used to initiate dual language programs in the first place.

The one example of a plan that was developed contemporaneously with the start of the dual language program described a process that began with a grant application by a district staff person. That grant was funded by the state organization that was providing funds to school districts in order to start dual language programs. I wonder about the possible benefits of documenting a program from its first inception. Of course, the challenge would be to capture that moment when the interest in dual language education began. Given the right opportunity, an ethnographic case study of the process might help to determine how stakeholders were directly involved in the planning process.

Action research within dual language programs. Given the shared influences on the writing of the dual language master plans, it would be valuable to see a continuation of the research on best practices. Knowing that the research cited in the dual language master plans was so influential, this research effort could potentially drive public policy regarding the allocation of resources toward developing new practices. Additionally, the application of *action research* practices in the existing programs in school districts could help contextualize dual language education practices, allowing other districts with similar demographics to see themselves in that research. Researchers in higher education could guide K-12 partners in dual language programs, thereby expanding their work by supporting shared research on aspects of dual language. Further, the sharing of this data could serve as an avenue for discovering best practices and for animating the growth of a cadres of home-grown dual language experts (CABE, 2018).

Cultural and language equity in dual language programs. The significance of English Learners on the history of the development of bilingual education is undeniable. There is a legacy of concern for the language rights of non-native English speakers and a recognition of ELs' needs imbedded in the foundational ideas of additive bilingualism. However, it may be that the focus on a language-as-resource orientation of the sort that currently undergirds the dual language education movement missed certain questions of cultural and language equity.

Research into how opportunities for dual language education are communicated to stakeholders in public education would be a valuable addition to the dual language research agenda. Ethnographic studies utilizing discourse analysis to examine the equitable nature of school district-stakeholder interactions could be useful to consider how best to frame bilingual education opportunities to parents. This research is a call to attend to the history of bilingual

education to inform current and future efforts in order to plan well for its sustenance. This study confirmed the significance of building increased cultural and language equity through dual language programs, and the deep and ongoing commitment of educators who do this work.

Lessons Learned

This study added new analytical background to my involvement in dual language education. The opportunity to research and reflect in this study helped me understand how complex this work is. It has also informed my practice, as I have recently been invited by a small private university to coordinate the development of a program that will prepare dual language teachers in my area. I am aware that these future teachers will face some of the same equity challenges that became evident in this study. I am freshly committed to helping my students consider the best ways to recruit parents as actors, rather than simply receivers. This work is vital for increasing student access to parents' language and cultural assets. Inclusive practices are somewhat hindered by old paradigms of teacher-parent relationships that focus on setting limits on parents. However, a deeper understanding of how other cultures perceive education would reveal pathways for teachers to invite parents into partnership within the classroom and access a living model for students to learn from and to enjoy.

The ethical ramifications of the choices that district and site leaders make for dual language programming will certainly be on my mind as I become part of the loosely-tied community of practice that forms around both new and existing dual language programs in my region. I will have plenty of opportunities to discuss dual language practices as I meet with local school leaders as part of my job representing my university's bilingual authorization of teachers. I also plan to participate with my dual language colleagues locally and nationally in future discussions about policy and practice.

If it were possible to go back in time to enhance this dissertation process, I would consider adding an information-gathering tool, such as a survey of the school districts represented by the master plans in order to enhance an understanding of districts' current practice and perspectives. In the year that has passed between beginning the study and now, Proposition 58 (2016) in California has encouraged school districts to engage in dual language education. Gathering feedback on this recent change in direction could have shed light on the current dual language trajectory of the districts in this study.

Studies such as this offer opportunities to contribute insights to new and changing dual language programs. The implications of this complex and worthwhile work have the potential to support countless students and teachers. The practice of dual language education seems to be expanding at this time. This will naturally increase the variety of demographic contexts in which it is carried out. Increasing the variety of educational, social, ethnic, and economic contexts will add to the complexity of the practice. The goal of reflective planning will be an important undertaking not only for school districts, but also for the broader dual language professional community.

References

- Alanís, I., & Rodríguez, M. a. (2008). Sustaining a dual language immersion program: Features of success. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 7(4), 305-319.
- Amrein, A., & Peña, R. (2000). Asymmetry in dual language practice: Assessing imbalance in a program promoting equality. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(8), 1-17.
- Armendáriz, A., & Armendáriz, E. (2002). An administrative perspective of a two-way bilingual immersion program. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26(1), 169-179.
- Aquino-Sterling, C., Rodriguez-Valls, F., Outes, D. R. (2017). La educación bilingüe en Estados Unidos de Norteamérica: Continuidades y discontinuidades históricas y actuales. In Guerrero, M. D., Guerrero, M. C., Soltero-González, L. & Escamilla, K. (Eds.), *Abriendo brecha: Antología crítica sobre la educación bilingüe de doble inmersión* (pp. 1-16). Albuquerque, New Mexico: Fuente Press.
- Babino, A., & Stewart, M. A. (2016). "I like English better": Latino dual language students' investment in Spanish, English and bilingualism. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 16(1), 18-29.
- Berens, M. S., Kovelman, I., Pettito, L. (2013). Should bilingual children learn reading at the same time or in sequence? *Bilingual Research Journal*, 36, 35-60.
- Bialystok, E. (2011). Reshaping the mind: The benefits of bilingualism. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 65(4), 229-235.
- Bialystok, E., Craik, F., & Luk, G. (2008). Lexical access in bilinguals: Effects of vocabulary size and executive control. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 21, 522-538.

- Bialystok, E., Luk, G., Peets, K., & Yang, S. (2010). Receptive vocabulary differences in monolingual and bilingual children. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 13(4), 525-531.
- Block, N. (2012). Perceived impact of two-way dual immersion programs on Latino students' relationships in their families and communities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(2), 235-257.
- California Association for Bilingual Education. (2017). "Biliteracy and English learner professional learning opportunities for teachers and administrators". Retrieved from <http://www.gocabe.org/index.php/educators/professional-development>.
- Center for Applied Linguistics. (2016). "Two-way immersion". Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/twi/>
- Center for Applied Linguistics. (2017). "Dual Language Program Directory". Retrieved from <http://webapp.cal.org/duallanguage/>
- Cervantes-Soon, C., Dorner, L., Palmer, D., Heiman, D., Scherdtdeger, R. Choi, J. (2017). Combating inequalities in two-way language immersion programs: Toward critical consciousness in bilingual educational spaces. *Review of Research in Education*, March 2017(41), 403-427. DOI: 10.3102/009/732X17690/20
- Christian, D., Howard, E., & Loeb, M. (2000). Bilingualism for all: Two-way immersion education in the United States. *Theory into Practice*, 39(4). 258-266.
- Collier, V., & Thomas, W. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE (National Association of Bilingual Educators) Journal of Research and Practice*, 2(1), 1-20.

- Cobb, B., Vega, D., & Kronauge, C. (2009). Effects of an elementary dual language immersion school program on junior high achievement. *Middle Grades Research Journal*, 1(1), 27–48.
- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2018). “Development Process”. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/development-process/>
- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2018). “Key Shifts in English Language Arts”. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/other-resources/key-shifts-in-english-language-arts/>
- Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- de Jong, E. (2002). Effective bilingual education: From theory to academic achievement in a two-way bilingual program. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26(1), 65-84.
- de Jong, E., & Howard, E. (2009). Integration in two-way immersion education: Equalising linguistic benefits for all students. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(1). <http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050802149531>
- de Jong, E. J. (2015). Program design and two-way immersion programs. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 2(2), 241–256.
<http://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.2.2.06jon>
- de Jong, E. & Bearse, C. (2014). Dual language programs as a strand within a secondary school: Dilemmas of school organization and the two-way mission. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 17(1), 15-31.
- Fitts, S. (2009). Exploring third space in a dual language setting: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 8(2), 87-104.

- Freeman, R. (1994). Language planning and identity planning: An emergent understanding. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 10(1), 1-20.
- Gándara, P. (2015). Rethinking bilingual instruction. *Educational Leadership*, March 2015, 60-64.
- Greene, J. (1997). A meta-analysis of the Rossell and Baker review of bilingual education research. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 23(2/3), 103-122.
- Hornberger, N. H. (Ed.) (2003). *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings*. Clevedon, U.K. Multilingual Matters.
- Howard, E. (2002, October). Two-way immersion: A key to globalization. *Educational Leadership*, 62-64.
- Howard, E. R., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Rogers, D., Olague, N., Medina, J., Kennedy, D., Sugarman, J., & Christian, D. (2018). *Guiding principles for dual language education* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- 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.
- U. S. House. 103rd Congress. 2nd Session. *H. R. 6., Improving America's Schools Act of 1994*. ,Section 7102. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1994.
- Jeon, M. (2007). Language ideologies and bilingual education: A Korean-American perspective. *Language Awareness* 16(2), 114-130.

- Kempert, S., Saalbach, H., & Hardy, I. (2011). Cognitive benefits and costs of bilingualism in elementary school students: The case of mathematical word problems. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103(3), 547-561.
- Kilbane, C., & Milman, N. (2014). *Teaching models: Designing instruction for 21st century learners*. New York: Pearson.
- Liberty, P. & Gonzalez, R. M. (1999). *Dos idiomas, un mundo dual language project: Title VII third year evaluation report 1997-8*. Retrieved from:
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED434161.pdf>
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2005). Review of research and best practices on effective features of dual language education programs. *Center for Applied Linguistics*. Retrieved from
http://powayusd.sdcoe.k12.ca.us/pusdvcs/dl/PDF Files/review_research.pdf
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2012). Success and challenges in Dual Language education. *Theory into Practice*, 51, 256-262.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. & Block, N. (2010). Achievement in predominantly low SES/Hispanic dual language schools, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13:1, 43-60.
- Luo, L., Luk, G., & Bialystok, E. (2010). Effect of language proficiency and executive control on verbal fluency performance in bilinguals. *Cognition*, 114(1), 29-4.
<http://dx.doi.org.georgefox.idm.oclc.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2009.08.014>
- Martin-Beltrán, M. (2010). The two-way language bridge: Co-constructing language learning opportunities. *Modern Language Journal*, 94(2), 254-277.

- Martinez, R., Hikida, M. & Durán L. (2015). Unpacking ideologies of linguistic purism: how dual language teachers make sense of everyday translanguaging. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9 (1), 26-42.
- Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D. & Gonzalez, N. (2005). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. In González, N., Moll, L.C. & Amanti, C. (Eds.) *Funds of Knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities and classrooms* (71-87). London. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Montague, N. (1997). Critical components for dual language programs. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 21(4), 409-417.
- Moss, P. (2008). Toward a new public education: Making globalization work for all of us. *Child Development Perspectives*, 2(2), 114-119.
- Ovando, C. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27(1), 1-24.
- Reyes, I. (2006). Exploring connections between emergent biliteracy and bilingualism. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy* 6(3), 267-292.
- Roeper, T. (2012). Minimalism and bilingualism: How and why bilingualism should benefit children with SLI. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 15(1), 88-101.
- Rossell, C. (2005). The flawed requirements of limited English proficient children of the No Child Left Behind Act. *Journal of Education*, 186(3), 29-40.
- Rossell, C. & Baker, K. (1996). The educational effectiveness of bilingual education. *Research in the Teaching of Education*, 30(1), 7-74.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal* 8(2), 15-34.

- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications.
- Sarmiento, L. (2008, Fall). Dancing with languages. *Teaching Tolerance*, Retrieved from <http://www.tolerance.org/magazine/number-34-fall-2008/feature/dancing-languages>
- Scanlan, M., & Palmer, D. (2009). Race, power and (in)equity within two-way immersion settings. *Urban Review*, 41, 391-415.
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. London: Sage Publications.
- Shenk, E. (2011). Constructing perspectives on language diversity in the U.S. Midwest. *Spanish in Context*, 8(1), 144-168.
- Smith, A. (2002). How global is the curriculum? *Educational Leadership*, 60(2), 38-41.
- Suarez, D. (2007). Second and third generation heritage language speakers: HL scholarship's relevance to the research needs and future direction of TESOL. *UCLA Asia Pacific Center newsletter*. Retrieved from <http://www.international.ucla.edu/asia/article/72420>
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1998). Two languages are better than one. *Educational Leadership*, 55(4), 23-26.
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (2002). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement. *Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence*, 96, 1-351.
- Umansky, I., & Reardon, S. (2014). Reclassification patterns among Latino English learner students in bilingual, dual immersion and English immersion classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(5), 879-912.
- Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(3), 391-421.

Valdéz, V., Freire, J., & Deleván, M. (2016). The gentrification of dual language education.

Urban Review, 48, 601-627. doi: 10.1007/s11256-016-0370-0

Wenger, E. (1997) Practice, learning, meaning, identity. *Training* 34(2). 34-39

Appendix A

Categories Derived from CAL Guiding Principles Used for A Priori Coding

The categories across the top were derived from the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education and compared with the codes from the eight dual language plans. The Xs indicate where there is a section of a plan that corresponds with the category.

Figure 1

Deductive categories formed by condensing codes (source: CAL Guiding Principles) compared to demographic data										
PROGRAM	Program Structure	Curriculum	Instruction	Assessment & Accountability	Staff Quality & Professional Dev.	Family & Community	Support & Resources	Student pop	% of SED	% of ELs
Ash USD	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	20,000	73	20
Cedar USD	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	11,000	64	29
Citrus USD	x	x	x	x	x	x		19,000	60	18
Elm USD	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	8,700	20	11
Oak USD	x	x	x	x	x	x		2,000	49	19
Palm USD	x	x	x	x	x	x		3,400	11	18
Pine USD	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	4,500	62	<5
Spruce USD	x	x	x	x	x	x		26,000	47	11

Appendix B

Descriptive codes of Assessment Plans by School District

These codes were part of first round coding to derive categories of assessment types.

Figure 2

		attribute coding	descriptive coding	attribute coding
PROGRAM				
	INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN Elementary program	ASSESSMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN	KEY CHARACTERISTICS	
Ash USD	Plan for Spanish language instruction: Spanish TWI 90/10 K-90, 1st-80, 2nd-70, 3rd-60, 4th & 5th 50 Mandarin & Korean TWI 50/50 All grades 50/50	Academic achievement Curriculum based assessments Unit test, Benchmark assessments & CAASPP Second Language CELDT & SOLOM, district immersion measures Cultural Attitudinal surveys	90/10 program in Spanish 50/50 program in Mandarin and Korean	
Cedar USD	Plan for Spanish language instruction: K-5 50-50 model throughout Team teacher model (Spanish & English teacher) Spanish: language arts, math, visual & perf. arts English: ELA, science, PE, social studies, math vocabulary bridge SLD or ELD as needed	CST assessments to show academic proficiency in Language Arts and Math in grades 2 through 8 (to be replaced by the Smarter Balanced assessment in 2014-15 Spanish Pre-LAS for incoming Kindergartners to determine Spanish oral language proficiency • Annual Quick Informal Assessment (QIA) for all students to determine oral Spanish progress • Aprenda3 to assessment reading and writing skills • Tri-annual Spanish Language Arts Diagnostic Tests to monitor student literacy development • Tri-annual Spanish Language Arts Benchmark Assessments to monitor student literacy development	50/50 program SLD or ELD as needed Spanish immersion	
Citrus USD	Plan for Spanish language instruction: Spanish AND Mandarin 90/10 K-90, 1st-80, 2nd-70, 3rd-60, 4th & 5th 50 K/1 - SLA or MLA, math, sci, HSS; ELA 2-5 - SLA or MLA, math, sci, HSS; ELA, math, sci, HSS	Academic achievement Curriculum based assessments Unit test, Benchmark assessments & CAASPP Second Language CELDT, APRENDA & SOLOM, district immersion measures Cultural Attitudinal surveys	90/10 programs in Spanish and Mandarin	
Elm USD	Plan for Spanish language instruction: 100/0 - K & 1st - All subjects (ELD for ELs) 95/5 - 2nd - All subjects (ELD for ELs) 80/20 - 3rd - All subjects (ELD for ELs) + ELA, PE 75/25 - 4th - All subjects (ELD for ELs) + ELA, PE 70/30 - 5th - All subjects (ELD for ELs) + ELA, PE 70/30 - 6th - All subjects (ELD for ELs) + ELA, PE	Use of content standards: Local, state & federal standards apply Content assessments - state & local testing Use of ELD standards: EL proficiency levels Use of ACTFL standards: ACTFL Performance guidelines Program proficiency expectations Additional assessments: STAMP, Linguafolio, NOELLA, MLPA	Begin with 100% target language! End elementary program with 70/30 Spanish immersion	
	Plan for Spanish language instruction: 90/10 T/K 150 min/day in Spanish; 30 mins/day in English 83%/17% (ELA) K - 270 min/day in Spanish: SLA, Math, Sci, HSS; 30 mins/day in English 90%/10% ELA, Math, Sci, HSS 1st - 270 mins/day in Spanish: SLA, Math, Sci, HSS; 30 mins/day in English 80%/20% ELA, Math, Sci, HSS 2nd - 240 mins/day in Spanish: SLA, Math, Sci, HSS; 30 mins/day in English 70%/30% ELA, Math, Sci, HSS 3rd - 210 mins/day in Spanish: SLA, Math, Sci, HSS; 30 mins/day in English 60%/40% ELA, Math, Sci, HSS 4th - 180 mins/day in Spanish: SLA, Math, Sci, HSS; 30 mins/day in English 50%/50% ELA, Math, Sci, HSS 5th - 150 mins/day in Spanish: SLA, Math, Sci, HSS; 30 mins/day in English 40%/60% ELA, Math, Sci, HSS 6th - 120 mins/day in Spanish: SLA, Math, Sci, HSS; 30 mins/day in English 30%/70% ELA, Math, Sci, HSS			

Appendix C

Rationale Language In Vivo Coding from Dual Language Plans

Figure 3

PROGRAM	RATIONALES	PRIORITIES	PROGRAM CREATION	CURRENT MP COMPLETED	PRIOR MP?	CODES Language skills = Red Academics = Green Multiculturalism = Blue Access to first language = Orange
Ash USD	Critical intercultural skills Only program with three partner languages (5 sites) High expectations that students will bridge language and culture differences	Bilingualism/biliteracy in target language (Korean, Mandarin or Spanish) and English <i>High academic achievement in two languages</i> <i>Cross-cultural competence</i> <i>Use of both 90/10 and 50/50 models</i>	2009	2016		Multiculturalism Language
Cedar USD	Meet challenges of an interdependent world Bilingual and multicultural learning environment Communicate in another language Master all curricular subjects develop intercultural understanding and respect Nearly passed on DI proposal and then Board heard from the students of neighboring program Additive bilingualism - not sacrifice native language	Designed for both ELs and NES to have: Bilingualism and biliteracy <i>Academic excellence</i> <i>Multicultural competence</i> and to close the achievement gap Uses the 50/50 model exclusively	2005	2013		Multiculturalism Language Academics Access to L1
Citrus USD	Creation of DI program a response to declining enrollment - began programs in Mandarin & Spanish DI was found to be a popular choice program Develop "bi-cognitive", reflective, culturally-sensitive citizens to engage a global society	Bilingualism and biliteracy <i>Academic excellence</i> <i>Multicultural understanding</i> Serve all students: GATE ELs SPED	2009	2013		Multiculturalism
Elm USD	Success in a multicultural / multilingual world Updates MP for 25 year-old program Student success in language learning and in skills & perspectives for a multicultural world US has always been a multilingual nation!! Equip students for pluralistic US and world ELs can develop more proficiency in their L1	Bilingualism / biliteracy Oral & Written proficiency in English & Spanish <i>Academic Excellence</i> Meet or exceed state standards <i>Multicultural understanding</i> Positive attitudes toward other languages/cultures	1985	2010	1993	Multiculturalism Language Access to L1
	Additive language environment where every student has an opportunity to become fully bilingual and bi-literate by adding another language and culture. Program began with a Title VII grant Master Plan is to give input to strengthen K-12 DI Accommodate students from diverse backgrounds	Incorporate 6 Guiding Principles - CAL Use assessment data to guide instruction Realign the curricular sequence (esp. 3rd grade) Develop curricular maps & "learning walls" Align lang & academic targets w/Common Core Develop extracurricular supports			Program reviews	Access to L1 Multiculturalism

Appendix D

Pattern Coding of References to Language Orientation in Dual Language Plans

Figure 4

PROGRAM	Evidence of Language as Problem Rationales Priorities Instructional Plans	Evidence of Language as Resource Rationales Priorities Instructional Plans	Evidence of Language as Right Rationales Priorities Instructional Plans	Evidence of Equity Goals in Plans Rationales Priorities Instructional Plans	Evidence of Cross-Cultural Awareness in Plans Rationales Priorities Instructional Plans
Elm USD		Student success in language learning and in skills & perspectives for a multicultural world ELs can develop more proficiency in their L1	US has always been a multilingual nation	ELs can develop more proficiency in their L1 Very weighted toward strong development of NSS L1 development	Student success in language learning and in skills & perspectives for a multicultural world Positive attitudes toward other languages/cultures
Palm USD		High levels of language proficiency, academic achievement, and cross-cultural understanding		High levels of language proficiency, academic achievement, ...	and cross- cultural understanding
Pine USD		Meet challenges of interdependent world community Need for a bilingual/biliterate work force	US has always been a multilingual nation Additive bilingualism - students should be allowed increase languages	Additive bilingualism - students should be allowed increase languages	
Spruce USD	Improve student performance & close the achievement gap	Engage cultural & linguistic capital Students from diverse backgrounds Increase culturally responsive teaching throughout the school Foster and promote cultural diversity and respect among students and their families Promote a sense of unity throughout the neighborhood school		Students from diverse backgrounds Promote high academic achievement of all students and close the achievement gap	Cross-cultural understanding & development of pro-social skills
Cedar USD		Communicate in another language Develop intercultural understanding and respect Challenges of an interdependent world	Additive bilingualism - students should be allowed to increase languages	Additive bilingualism - students should be allowed increase languages Designed for both ELs and NES to have:Bilingualism and biliteracy	

Appendix E

Comparison of Categories Related to the Achievement Gap Across School Districts

Figure 5

PROGRAM	ELLs to acheive same as NES	ELLs to achieve same as ELLs in mainstream class	ELLs to achieve same as ELLs in other bilingual prog.	Achievement Gap mention in Mission, Vision or Rationale	Achievement Gap in Benefits section
Elm USD		Yes		Yes	
Palm USD	Yes	Yes			Yes
Pine USD		Yes			Yes
Spruce USD	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes
Cedar USD		Yes	(peers not in DI)		
Oak USD					
Ash USD		Yes			Yes
Citrus USD					

Figure 6

A	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
PROGRAM	High academic achievement for all students	Benefits to both NES and native speakers of target language	Access to the curriculum in own language	Reclassify ELL status	Percentage of ELLs in school district 16-17	Free & Reduced Low SES			
Elm USD			Yes		11.2	20.4	http://www.ed-data.org/		
Palm USD	Yes		Yes		18.1	10.8	http://www.ed-data.org/		
Pine USD		Yes	Yes		< 5.0	61.8	https://schools.or	http://www.ode.state.or.us/	
Spruce USD			Yes	Yes	11.4	47	http://reportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/		
Cedar USD	Yes				29.4	64.4	http://www.ed-data.org/		
Oak USD	Yes		Yes		19.2	48.8	http://www.ed-data.org/		
Ash USD					19.9	72.8	http://www.ed-data.org/		
Citrus USD	Yes		Yes		18	59.6	http://www.ed-data.org/		

Appendix F

References to Cited Research Connection to Intended Benefits by School District

Figures 7, 8, and 9 represent the categorization of rationales/benefits derived from cited research literature.

Figure 7

PROGRAM	Additive Bilingualism	Transfer of Language Skills	Long Exposure = greater lang gains & content transfer	Multicultural Awareness	Interdisciplinary Perspectives	Comparative Structures	Closes the Achievement Gap	Positive Self Concept for NSS
Ash USD	Howard, Sugarman, Perdomo and Adger, 2005	Thomas and Collier, 2002	Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, 2009	Cummins, 1986; Ager 2005	ACTFL 2006 (Standards for FL Learning in the 21st C.	ACTFL 2006 (Standards for FL Learning in the 21st C.	Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, 2009	Thomas and Collier, 2002
Cedar USD	Howard, Sugarman, Perdomo and Adger, 2005	Thomas and Collier, 2002	Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, 2010	Soltero, 2004	ACTFL 2006 (Standards for FL Learning in the 21st C.	ACTFL 2006 (Standards for FL Learning in the 21st C.	Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, 2009	Thomas and Collier, 2002
Citrus USD	Howard, Sugarman, Perdomo and Adger, 2005	Thomas and Collier, 2002	Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, 2009	Cummins, 1986; Ager 2005	ACTFL 2006 (Standards for FL Learning in the 21st C.	ACTFL 2006 (Standards for FL Learning in the 21st C.		
Elm USD	Howard, Sugarman, Perdomo and Adger, 2005	Thomas and Collier, 2002	Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, 2009	Cummins, 1986; Ager 2005	ACTFL 2006 (Standards for FL Learning in the 21st C.	ACTFL 2006 (Standards for FL Learning in the 21st C.	Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, 2009	
Oak USD	Howard, Sugarman, Perdomo and Adger, 2005	Thomas and Collier, 2002	Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, 2009 Cummins 1981; Swain, 1984	Cummins, 1986; Ager 2005	ACTFL 2006 (Standards for FL Learning in the 21st C.	ACTFL 2006 (Standards for FL Learning in the 21st C.		Thomas and Collier, 2002
Palm USD	Howard, Sugarman, Perdomo and Adger, 2005	Thomas and Collier, 2002	Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, 2009	Cummins, 1986; Ager 2005	ACTFL 2006 (Standards for FL Learning in the 21st C.	ACTFL 2006 (Standards for FL Learning in the 21st C.	Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, 2009	
Pine USD	Howard, Sugarman, Perdomo and Adger, 2005	Thomas and Collier, 2002	Lindholm-Leary, 2004 Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, 2010	Soltero, 2004	ACTFL 2006 (Standards for FL Learning in the 21st C.	ACTFL 2006 (Standards for FL Learning in the 21st C.	Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, 2010	
Spruce USD	Howard, Sugarman, Perdomo and Adger, 2005	Thomas and Collier, 2002	Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, 2009	Cummins, 1986; Ager 2005	ACTFL 2006 (Standards for FL Learning in the 21st C.	ACTFL 2006 (Standards for FL Learning in the 21st C.	Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, 2009	

Figure 8

PROGRAM	Positive Self Concept for NSS	Higher Achievement Than in Mainstream Class	Culturally-validating Setting	Higher Rate of EL Reclassification	NSS Stay Connected to Their Families	Long Term Benefits to NSS	L2 Instruction Doesn't Impede L1 in NES in fact perform higher than mainstream English	90/10 Model Doesn't Inhibit English Ability in NSS	GATE Students in DI perform Better than Other GATE Students	L2 Proficiency Improvement
Ash USD	Thomas and Collier, 2002					Thomas and Collier, 1997 & 2002				
Cedar USD	Thomas and Collier, 2002									
Citrus USD		Thomas and Collier, 2002							Lindholm-Leary, 2009	
Elm USD										
Oak USD	Thomas and Collier, 2002	Lindholm-Leary, 2009							Lindholm-Leary, 2009	Collier and Lindholm-Leary, 2009
Palm USD		Lindholm-Leary, 2009								
Pine USD							Thomas and Collier, 2002	Lindholm-Leary, 2001		
Spruce USD			Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, 2009	Lindholm-Leary, Promise Initiative, 2012	no citation					

Figure 9

PROGRAM	L2 Instruction Doesn't Impede L1 in NES in fact perform higher than mainstream English	90/10 Model Doesn't Inhibit English Ability in NSS	GATE Students in DI perform Better than Other GATE Ss	L2 Proficiency Positively Impacts SAT & other scores	90/10 Model Produces Higher Lang Results Than 50/50	Students of ALL Ability Levels Can Benefit From L2 Study
Ash USD					Lindholm-Leary, 2001	
Cedar USD						
Citrus USD			Lindholm-Leary, 2009			Marcos and Kreeft Peyton, 2000
Elm USD						
Oak USD			Lindholm-Leary, 2009	Copper, Yanosky and Wisenbaker, 2008		
Palm USD						
Pine USD	Thomas and Collier, 2002	Lindholm-Leary, 2001				
Spruce USD						