The National Dual Language Education Teacher Preparation Standards

Michael D. Guerrero and Joan R. Lachance

Dual Language Education of New Mexico

DUAL LANGUAGE EDUCATION OF NEW MEXICO
FUENTE PRESS
1309 Fourth Street SW, Suite E
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102
www.dlenm.org

Library of Congress Number:

Abstract

A variety of factors have collectively created the impetus for the proposed set of National Dual Language Education Teacher Preparation Standards (NDLETPS). PK-12 student growth among non-English speaking learners has steadily increased and is projected to do so throughout the 21st century in the United States. Continued national growth of dual language education programs is also evident, buttressed by empirical studies that show how well implemented dual language programs gradually and steadily close the achievement gap between emergent bilingual children and their monolingual English-speaking counterparts. Given student growth, the proliferation of dual language programs, and program effectiveness, the need for well-prepared dual language education teachers (and other related school personnel) is clear. However, to date there are no national standards that might provide guidance for the preparation of such educators, and very few states provide such guidelines.

The present document draws from a variety of sources in presenting six Standards to fill this void. First, the established three central pillars that undergird the implementation of effective dual language education programs are integrated. A fourth pillar, aimed at addressing program related inequities, has recently been justified and has also been integrated across the proposed six standards and their components. The document also draws on contemporary theory, research, and practice to give the standards substance and integrity.

The NDLETPS are intended to provide guidance while allowing for the flexibility to address myriad local contextual realities and language groups, inclusive of and also beyond Spanish-English programs. Moreover, the reader will notice that the framing of these Standards entails certain characteristics that are anchored to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Aligning the NDLETPS to CAEP is intentional in order to leverage this

reputable accrediting entity, from a supportive stance for the greater merit of dual language education. Dual Language Education of New Mexico (DLeNM) recognizes the need for a set of standards that will not only provide guidance to educator preparation programs but also create a sorely needed vehicle leading to program accreditation. From this vantage point, the prospect of having access to visiting examiner teams that are experts in the field of dual language education to help support the design, development, and evaluation of educator preparation programs across the United States has formidable potential for moving the profession forward and better serving all learners.

Table of Contents

From the Authors

The proposed National Dual Language Education Teacher Preparation Standards (NDLETPS) were influenced by many professionals and scholars in the field of teacher preparation. The genesis of the project took place in 2015 with a small group of scholars who met at a La Cosecha pre-conference institute sponsored by Dual Language Education of New Mexico (DLeNM). These researchers began conversations that led to engaging discussions, sketching out the needs of dual language teacher preparation from the IHE perspective, and exploring the possibility of CAEP accreditation. Between 2016 and early 2018, a core group of researchers in teacher preparation from various states worked to solidify the efforts. Two more pre-conference institutes were also sponsored by DLeNM at the annual La Cosecha conference.

The idea to develop and author the NDLETPS has also been presented at various academic conferences, such as the American Educational Research Association (under the auspices of the Bilingual Education Special Interest Group) and the California Association for Bilingual Education, with the purpose of gauging responses to drafts of the standards and receiving feedback from practitioners and scholars in the field. The proposed standards therefore represent the culmination of numerous conversations, planned meetings, debates, reflection, and most importantly long overdue action.

Acknowledgements

Special thanks are given to Dual Language Education of New Mexico and its executive director, David Rogers, for consistently being the "North Star" of the work. DLeNM has provided the platform for the project to be publicly vetted prior to its submission to the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) for national-level feedback. The field is sincerely appreciative of DLeNM's support for the project and the long-term commitment that it has provided.

Introduction

Innovative teacher preparation in the 21st century continues to progressively examine best practices that prepare teachers across the United States to serve multilingual learners, emergent bilinguals, and native speakers of English in K-12 dual language classrooms. Institutions of higher education (IHEs) find themselves at the core of a transformational landscape in an era of teacher preparation reform, in both policy and practice. Given that nearly one third of all early elementary school children in the United States come from a household where at least one parent speaks a language other than English, K-12 teachers and those who prepare them are juxtaposed to support the countless benefits of dual language education (Park, Zong, & Batalova, 2018). Furthermore, in addition to language development, other aspects of superdiversity in K-12 learners' countries of origin, racial and ethnic identities, socioeconomic statuses, and patterns of marginalization and minoritization contribute to dual language teachers' need for specialized professional preparation and development. Teacher preparation programs nationwide, grounded in empirical theory and recent research, serve to shape candidates' competencies related to professional dispositions, critical thinking, ideological reflections and demonstrations, as well as curricular knowledge. Separately and collectively, these competencies have significant pedagogical implications which must be given significant preparation for successful dual language teaching and learning.

Rationale for NDLETPS

Since the year 2000, the number of dual language learners in the United States has increased by nearly 25 percent, with projected continued growth. Nearly one third of all early elementary school children come from a household where at least one parent speaks a language other than English. Likewise, the diversity within the dual language learner population continues

to stretch beyond traditional immigrant groups. Recent data regarding dual language learners reported by the Migration Policy Institute (Park et al., 2018) indicate that a majority of dual language learners nationwide come from Spanish-speaking families. However, when the data are viewed at the state level, sizeable differences in the language groups represented in U.S. dual language programs become apparent. For example, the top partner language represented among Alaskan dual language learners was Aleut, while Tagalog was represented in Hawaii and the state of Maine most commonly noted French. Likewise, second only to Spanish-English dual language programs, substantial numbers of dual language programs pair English with Mandarin Chinese (Park et al., 2018).

In the last decade alone, and despite the undeniable hegemony of English, dual language education programs have experienced a significant expansion of statewide initiatives, indicating increased investment in multilingualism across the United States. Thirty-nine states and the District of Columbia reported offering dual language programs during 2012-13 (Boyle et al., 2015). Myriad states, such as New York, California, Utah, Georgia, Delaware, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and North Carolina, have strategically changed policy and practice to grow dual language education with a variety of partner languages (Center for Applied Linguistics [CAL], 2017), including 12 states offering such programs in Native American languages (Boyle, August, Tabaku, Cole, & Simpson-Baird, 2015). To date, legislation and policies regarding the Seal of Biliteracy are also present in 31 states and the District of Columbia.

Following suit, universities and colleges are increasing collaborative efforts to develop new or expand existing coursework and pathways for specialized credentials in dual language education, with the sound point of departure for guidance being the third edition of the *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* (Howard et al., 2018). These developments, combined

with continued expansion of dual language programs across the United States, signify the national shift toward additive bilingualism/biliteracy to support emerging bilingual students, which requires an amplified pool of well-prepared dual language educators (López & Santibañez, 2018).

Empirical Research

Dual language education is widely supported by research as a highly effective additive bilingual education approach that is associated with significant academic and linguistic benefits as well as amplified sociocultural and socioemotional competencies, or what might be called 21st century skills. Rich multilingual and multicultural learning takes place via a curriculum that honors and integrates all students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds (August & Shanahan, 2006; Collier & Thomas, 2009; Gándara & Callahan, 2014; Howard, Sugarman, & Christian, 2003; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Steele et al., 2017; Thomas & Collier, 2014; Valentino & Reardon, 2015). The documented success of these programs has resulted in their dramatic proliferation over recent years (CAL, 2017; Gross, 2016; Harris, 2015).

In spite of the diversity in the dual language learner population, the consensus in the field is that well implemented dual language programs rest on three pillars aimed at the development of academic achievement, bilingualism/biliteracy, and sociocultural competencies for all students (Howard et al., 2018). More recently, a call has come from the field to include a fourth pillar: the critical consciousness of educators working within the dual language landscape, particularly teachers (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017). The driving force behind this call comes from a number of researchers who have documented inequities within these programs that privilege the native English-speaking student at the expense of the emergent bilingual learner. As such, dual language teachers need to be prepared to skillfully advocate for their students. DLeNM views the

addition of this fourth pillar as both necessary and compatible with the overarching and transformative goals of the Standards.

Existing Preparation Parameters

Given the increased interest in and rapid expansion of dual language programs across the United States, there is a need for a nationally systematized approach to preparing teachers to serve in dual language settings. In many states, teacher preparation programs focus on developing competencies and skills to teach in English-medium classrooms, or in transitional bilingual education classrooms where native language instruction is provided for English learners only until they become proficient in English and transition to general education classrooms (U.S. Department of Education Office of English Language Acquisition [USDE OELA], 2015). Even in states that have established bilingual teacher preparation standards and defined pathways to bilingual teacher certification/licensure, teacher preparation programs may benefit from additional standards that prepare teachers to promote biliteracy along with rigorous grade-level core content in a language other than English, foster second language development in both English and the partner language, and generate sociocultural competencies with varying student populations (García, 2009; Howard et al., 2018; Park et al., 2018). Only eight states issue guidance to school districts on the qualities to look for when hiring teachers for dual language programs, and very few states have developed credentials for these teachers (Boyle et al., 2015).

In some states, preservice teacher candidates who are interested in teaching bilingual education and/or ESL are able to do so through an integrated preservice program that prepares them for both initial certification[1] in early childhood, elementary, middle school, or secondary

[1] The authors use the term "certification" to also include what some states refer to as teacher licensure, and the term "teaching certificate" to indicate what some states may refer to as a teaching license.

education and an additional endorsement in bilingual education and/or ESL. In other states, the bilingual education and/or ESL endorsements are granted after acquiring the general teaching certificate with graduate coursework. Also, some inservice teacher candidates who are currently teaching a particular subject but are new to the profession of language teaching may be seeking both an initial teaching certificate in ESL or World Languages and a bilingual education and/or ESL endorsement. In addition, certified dual language or bilingual teachers may seek a master's degree or continuing education credential coursework in dual language education.

Regardless, researchers and practitioners alike contend that effective dual language educators must encounter a unique set of competencies and body of knowledge within their education coursework (Achugar & Pessoa, 2009; Diaz Soto, 1991; Goulah & Soltero, 2016; Guerrero & Guerrero, 2009; Menken & Antunez, 2001). The Standards may serve in many fashions as the basis for dual language teacher preparation curriculum and benchmark assessments aligned to national accreditation standards, as well as providing extended options for teacher licensure in the field of dual language (Darling-Hammond, 2012; Herrera, Cabral, & Murry, 2013; Knight et al., 2014; Lachance, 2017).

Accreditation within Teacher Preparation

Federal and state contexts affirm the significance of institutional and programmatic accreditation in teacher preparation, as noted in the USED reports on quality assurance in teacher preparation. To date, numerous IHEs maintain regional institutional accreditation as well as program-specific professional accreditation for specialized areas of study (USDE, 2010; USDE Office of Postsecondary Education [USDE OPE], 2017). Similarly, the professional organizations of TESOL International and the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) have national professional readiness standards for professional teaching in

the fields of ESL and World Languages (WL) (CAEP, 2017). TESOL and ACTFL have been developing their present-day leadership and governance in educator preparation since the early to mid 1960's, with strong representation in the professional accreditation arena with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP, 2017).

An equivalent level of national standards representation for dual language education does not exist. This absence of national dual language education teaching standards leaves an incomplete pathway for programmatic accreditation processes, creating a barrier to states' options in dual language professional teaching licensure. The void is also connected to compulsory benchmark assessments for accredited teacher preparation programs, serving as criterion measures for recommendations for state professional teaching licensure upon completion of an accredited teacher preparation program (American Association of Colleges and Teacher Education [AACTE], 2016).

Implications for Policy and Practice: A Call to Action

DLeNM continues to emphasize that dual language education is an educational program model that is highly effective in increasing academic outcomes for all students, especially those who come from historically marginalized backgrounds, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and particularly emergent bilingual learners (EBs) (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000; Collier & Thomas, 2009, 2017; de Jong & Bearse, 2011; Howard, Sugarman, & Christian, 2003; Lindholm-Leary, 2012, 2014; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato 2005; Lindholm-Leary & Hernández, 2011; Steele et al., 2017). To this point, students who are developing English as a second language are commonly referred to as English learners (ELs). García (2009) contends that these students should be authentically designated as those who demonstrate promise in developing bilingualism. Not only does dual language education provide the best

pathway for developing solid biliteracy foundations; it also serves as a fundamental platform for advocacy, equity, and social justice within U.S. schools (Beeman & Urow, 2013; Escamilla et al., 2013).

The challenge is that quality dual language programs depend heavily on qualified educators with highly specialized preparation. Given the current expansion of DLE programs, districts across the nation face extensive barriers due to the shortage of qualified DLE educators (Howard & López-Velásquez, in press; Lachance, 2017; Thomas & Collier, 2014). The NDLETPS provide much needed guidance in the field of dual language teacher preparation that can also inform inservice professional development. Moreover, key stakeholders, including organizations such as Dual Language Education of New Mexico (DLeNM), the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), the Center for Equity and Biliteracy Research (CEBER), and the Bueno Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Colorado at Boulder, have had ongoing dialogue and collaborations about the urgent need to develop national standards to guide the preparation of dual language educators.

The primary goal and nexus of this work has been to develop clear, effective, and applicable dual language teacher preparation standards that are appropriate for a variety of dual language/immersion models that use a variety of partner languages, including indigenous languages. As noted previously, while the majority of U.S. dual language programs are Spanish-English or Mandarin-English, the increase in other program languages calls for the Standards to prepare dual language educators who may work in programs that provide instruction through any number of languages. Moreover, because English counterpart teachers in dual language programs have typically been excluded from certification requirements, the standards have been developed to address the professional capacities they need as well. With this in mind, the

NDLETPS are conceptualized without a specific focus on any one language. This intentionally all-inclusive focus of the Standards aims to ensure that university preparation programs have the flexibility to be responsive to local and regional demographics and needs.

The Six Standards

The Standards as they are now written are framed and presented in two ways. The first portion of each Standard is introduced by a brief review of the literature that provides the theoretical and research foundations for the Standard's Domain and its corresponding components. Across the Standards, competencies related to Critical Consciousness are rooted within each of the six Domains, solidifying these competencies' significance as foundational aspects of each Standard. The Standards' Domains include:

1) Bilingualism and Biliteracy

2) Sociocultural Competence

3) Instruction and Pedagogies

4) Authentic Assessment

5) Professionalism, Advocacy and Agency

6) Program Design and Curricular Leadership

The second portion of each Standard indicates the corresponding four components, strategically aligned to the *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* (Howard et al., 2018) and then cross-walked to the CAEP Standards (CAEP, 2018) as well as to the relevant TESOL and ACTFL professional standards. The *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* are widely used by schools and school districts to plan, improve, and support dual language education programs. The CAEP Standards serve as guidelines for accreditation and

inclusion of educator professional standards in PK-12 teacher preparation programs. Finally, dual language education resides at the nexus of bilingual education, ESL, and world language education; as such, it is important to align the professional standards for dual language teachers to those for TESOL and ACTFL teachers as appropriate. Unlike the ACTFL and TESOL Standards, however, in the NDLETPS the language strand is framed around bilingualism and biliteracy to stress the fact that dual language teachers are charged with promoting oral and written language development in not just one language, but two. Moreover, teachers' language proficiency is not included as its own standard as it is in ACTFL, but rather is subsumed within the bilingualism and biliteracy standard.

Like the TESOL and ACTFL Standards, the NDLETPS include accompanying measurable indicator rubrics designed to facilitate the implementation and evaluation of their corresponding components. The rubrics are strategically created to measure transformative dual-language-specific outcomes for evaluation parameters for teacher educators and the preparation of dual language education teachers. The indicator rubrics may also serve for ongoing self-reflective and transformative professional development purposes once candidates are in the field.

In conclusion, the NDLETPS provide an innovative and critical approach for transforming many teacher education colleges nationwide at a time when demographic shifts are considerably altering population trends and challenging the PK-12 educational system to prepare all learners in an equitable manner for the 21st century. Even so, DLeNM recognizes that the proposed standards only mark the beginning for what will hopefully become an all new activity to advance the profession.

Introduction References

Achugar, M., & Pessoa, S. (2009). Power and place: Language attitudes towards Spanish in a bilingual academic community in Southwest Texas. *Spanish in Context*, *6*(2), 199-223. https://doi.org/10.1075/sic.6.2.03ach

American Association of Colleges and Teacher Education [AACTE]. (2016). *About edTPA.* Retrieved from http://edtpa.aacte.org/about-edtpa.

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: A report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Beeman, K., & Urow, C. (2013). *Teaching for biliteracy: Strengthening bridges between languages.* Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.

Boyle, A., August, D., Tabaku, L., Cole, S., & Simpson-Baird, A. (2015). *Dual language education programs: Current state policies and practices*. U.S. Department of Education Office of English Language Acquisition. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.

Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL). (2017). *National dual language forum: Dual language program directory.* Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/ndlf/directories/.

Cervantes-Soon, C. G., Dorner, L., Palmer, D., Heiman, D., Schwerdtfeger, R., & Choi, J. (2017). Combating inequalities in two-way language immersion programs: Toward critical consciousness in bilingual education spaces. *Review of Research in Education, 41*, 403-427.

Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education.* Boston: Heinle.

Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2009). *Educating English learners for a transformed world*. Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2017). Validating the power of bilingual schooling: Thirty-two years of large-scale, longitudinal research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 37*, 1-15.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). (2018). *The CAEP Standards.* Retrieved from http://caepnet.org/standards/introduction.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). (2017). *What is accreditation.* Retrieved from http://www.caepnet.org/accreditation/about-accreditation/what-is-accreditation.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). The right start: Creating a strong foundation for the teaching career. *Phi Delta Kappan, 94*, 8-13.

de Jong, E. J., & Bearse, C. (2011). The same outcomes for all? High school students reflect on their two-way immersion program experiences. In D. J. Tedick, D. Christian, & T. Williams Fortune (Eds.), *Immersion education. Practices, policies and possibilities*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Diaz Soto, L. (1991). Teacher preparation and the linguistically diverse young child. *Education*, *111*(4), 487-490.

Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., Butvilofsky, S., Sparrow, W., Soltero-González, L., Ruiz-Figueroa, O., & Escamilla, M. (2013). *Biliteracy from the start.* Philadelphia: Caslon.

Gándara, P., & Callahan, R. (2014). Looking toward the future: Opportunities in a shifting linguistic landscape. In R. Callahan & P. Gándara (Eds.), *The bilingual advantage. Language, literacy and the U. S. labor market*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective.* West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Goulah, J., & Soltero, S. (2015). Reshaping the mainstream education climate through bilingual-bicultural education. In Y. Freeman & D. Freeman (Eds.), *Research on preparing inservice teachers to work effectively with emergent bilinguals. Advances in research in teaching series* (pp. 177-203). UK: Emerald Books.

Gross, N. (2016, August 3). Dual language programs on the rise across the U. S. *Latino Ed Beat.* Retrieved from https://www.ewa.org/blog-latino-ed-beat/dual-language-programs-rise-across-us.

Guerrero, M. D., & Guerrero, M. C. (2009). El (sub)desarrollo del español académico entre los maestros bilingües: ¿Una cuestión de poder? *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *8*(1), 55-66. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348430802466795

Harris, E. A. (2015, October 8). Dual language programs are on the rise, even for native English speakers. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/09/nyregion/dual-language-programs-are-on-the-rise-even-for-native-english-speakers.html.

Herrera, S. G., Cabral, R.M., & Murry, K.G. (2103). *Assessment accommodations for classroom teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse students* (2nd ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Howard, E. R., Lindholm-Leary, D., Rogers, D., Olague, N., Medina, J., Kennedy, B., Sugarman, J., & Christian, D. (2018). *Guiding principles for dual language education* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Howard, E. R., & López-Velásquez, A. M. (in press). "Put the brakes on. If I can't staff the program, we can't grow it." The challenges of recruiting and retaining dual language

teachers. In D. DeMatthews & E. Izquierdo (Eds.), *Dual language education and English language learners: Teaching and leading through two languages.* New York: Springer.

Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., & Christian, D. (2003). Trends in two-way immersion education: A review of the research. ERIC No. ED483005. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED483005.

Knight, S. L., Lloyd, G. M., Arbaugh, F., Gamson, D., McDonald, S. P., Nolan Jr., J., & Whitney, A. E. (2014). Performance assessment of teaching: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*, 372-374.

Lachance, J. (2017). A case study of dual language program administrators: The teachers we need. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, (12)*1, 1-18.

Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education.* Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2012). Successes and challenges in dual language education. *Education, Theory Into Practice, 51*(4), 256-262.

Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2014). Bilingual and biliteracy skills in young Spanish-speaking low-SES children: Impact of instructional language. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 17*(2), 144-159. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2013.866625

Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Borsato, G. (2005). Hispanic high schoolers and mathematics: Follow-up of students who had participated in two-way bilingual elementary programs. *Bilingual Research Journal, 29*, 641-652.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Hernández, A. (2011). Achievement and language proficiency of Latino students in dual language programmes: Native English speakers, fluent English/previous ELLs, and current ELLs. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 32*(6), 531-545.

López, F., & Santibañez, L. (2018). Teacher preparation for emergent bilingual students: Implications of evidence for policy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 26*(36). https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.2866

Menken, K., & Antunez, B. (2001). *An overview of the preparation and certification of teachers working with Limited English Proficient (LEP) students*. ERIC Number ED455231. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED455231.

Park, M., Zong, J. ,& Batalova, J. (2018). *Growing superdiversity among young U. S. dual language learners and its implications.* Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Steele, J. L., Slater, R. O., Zamarro, G., Miller, T., Li, J., Burkhauser, S., & Bacon, M. (2017). The effects of dual-language immersion programs on student achievement: Evidence from lottery data. *American Educational Research Journal* (Centennial Issue), *54*(1S), 282S-306S.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2014). *Creating dual language schools for a transformed world: Administrators speak.* Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

U. S. Department of Education [USDE]. (2010). *National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity*. Retrieved from https://sites.ed.gov/naciqi/.

U. S. Department of Education Office of English Language Acquisition (USDE OELA). (2015). *Dual language education programs: Current state policies and practices*. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oela/resources.html.

U. S. Department of Education Office of Post-secondary Education (USDE OPE). (2017). *Database of accredited postsecondary institutions and programs*. Retrieved from https://ope.ed.gov/accreditation/Index.aspx.

Valentino, R. A., & Reardon, S. F. (2015). Effectiveness of four instructional programs designed to serve English language learners: Variation by ethnicity and initial English proficiency. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,37*(4): 612-637. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373715573310

Standard One: Bilingualism and Biliteracy

A dual language teacher candidate (hereafter candidate) must appropriate four basic and integrated dimensions of language in order to effectively facilitate development of learners' bilingualism, biliteracy, and overall academic well-being. Each dimension is required and no single one is more critical than the others. Consequently, the order of their presentation here is linear by default and does not reflect any sort of ranking. It is perhaps best to think about a candidate's language ideologies, knowledge about language and bilingualism, understanding of micro level language planning, and language abilities as an integrated, interdependent and dynamic whole that must be nurtured over the course of a candidate's preparation and beyond.

Critical Language Awareness

One dimension concerns the teacher's degree of critical language awareness regarding the language ideologies that give life to bilingualism and biliteracy in the U. S. context (Achugar,

2015; Fairclough, 1992; Tollefson, 2011). This critical consciousness about bilingualism entails knowledge linked to abstract notions such as language ideologies, beliefs, attitudes, and values and how they become interwoven with policies and practices that influence what transpires linguistically in the social context of schools where two or more languages coexist, often in asymmetrical linguistic power relationships (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Kroskrity & Field, 2009; Montrul, 2013; Padilla, Fan, Xu, & Silva, 2013; Palmer & Martinez, 2016).

Myriad state laws and rules and regulations govern medium of instruction language policy and practice, and the candidate must understand that these are not always neutral (Tollefson & Tsui, 2004). The use of language as a means to power has a very long history. Peñalosa (1980; see also García & Wei, 2014) explains that over 500 years ago, Queen Isabella of Spain came to realize that the first printed grammar of the Spanish language represented "the perfect instrument of empire."

More specifically, candidates need to be mindful of how these language dynamics influence their own language ideologies and those of school personnel, and, by extension, how they affect the development of bilingualism and biliteracy of the learners at the site where they engage in daily language practices (Ek, Sanchez, & Quijada Cerecer, 2013; Palmer, 2011; Zúñiga, 2016). Teacher candidates must understand the hegemony of English within bilingual education, including two way immersion programs, so that they can exercise some kind of agency aimed at creating a more socially and linguistically just school and community milieu (García, 2009).

Language, Brain, and Mind

A second dimension entails the theoretical or psycholinguistic underpinnings of the development of bilingualism and biliteracy. By this we mean that the candidate must have a

working knowledge of contemporary theories and concepts that explain how these two constructs come to exist and develop over time in the brain and mind of a learner and a given community. In line with comprehending the hegemony of English and schooling in the United States, the candidate must be aware of the myths that continue to be propagated which cast bilingualism and biliteracy as some kind of cognitive anomaly or deficit (Flores, 2005) when in fact the majority of the world's people are bi- and multilingual and some empirical evidence supports the cognitive benefits of bilingualism (Bialystok, Craik, & Luk, 2012). García (2009) and others (for example, Grosjean, 1985) have been quite forceful in their position that bilingual learners are not two monolingual learners in one person and that monoglossic views of bilingual children must be abandoned.

The candidate must be aware of the fact that bilingualism and biliteracy development exist on a continuum of contextualized proficiency (Hornberger, 1989), and that while this development is influenced by social practices, there are also biological, cognitive and individual psychological factors that influence the development of bilingualism and biliteracy (Spolsky & Hult, 2008). The candidate must also understand how the age of the learner can wield an important influence in the development of bilingualism and biliteracy, though age of acquisition is also tempered by a host of other contributing factors (Ritchie & Bhatia, 2008). For example, the candidate must understand the linguistic structure of languages, including discourse and pragmatic features, and how two different languages might dynamically evolve over time through processes of bidirectional transfer, cross-linguistic influences, and fossilization, perhaps eventuating in language shift, loss or revitalization.

Micro Level Language Planning

The third dimension concerns the candidate's ability to facilitate the learner's bilingual and biliteracy development through a conscious awareness of classroom, program, school and community level language planning and implementation, akin to what Baldauf (2006) refers to as language-in-education planning. This is distinct from, though obviously related to, the candidate's knowledge of language development methodologies, strategies and techniques. In a dual language context, language in education planning entails understanding and managing matters of classroom and program level language allocation, for instance. Understanding, implementing, and evaluating decisions associated with how much time will be allocated to which language, subject area and grade level is no simple matter (Izquierdo & Espitia Mendoza, 2017) and not directly related to teaching methodologies. Beyond the school building, language in education planning might also entail leveraging families and community in an effort to reverse language shift (Fishman, 2001), given the inflated value generally assigned to English inside and outside of school.

In an integrated manner the candidate must also use critical language awareness and knowledge of language to carefully select and evaluate plans for the use of language. For instance, the traditional approach to biliteracy development anchored to first developing literacy in the learner's first or native language and then the learner's second language has recently been challenged by a paired literacy approach (Escamilla et al., 2014). In this case, the candidate needs to be able to understand why paired literacy might or might not be most appropriate for the learners in question. That is, what might be well suited to simultaneous Spanish-English bilinguals might not be best for Mandarin-English learners who are sequential bilinguals, or for students whose languages vary dramatically in terms of language relatedness (Padilla, Fan, Xu & Silva, 2013).

More contentiously, the practice of careful separation of languages for instructional purposes, a central language allocation matter, has recently been challenged by advocates promoting a translanguaging pedagogy which allows for the strategic use of the learner's entire semiotic repertoire for oral and written communicative acts (García & Wei, 2014; Palmer, Martinez, Mateus, & Henderson, 2014). On the other hand, Ballinger, Lyster, Sterzuk, and Genesee (2017) raise specific issues related to translanguaging in immersion programs. Soltero-Gonzalez and Butvilofsky (2017), in turn, make a strong case for separating simultaneous Spanish-English learners from native English speakers for literacy development, given that their literacy needs are different and each group merits its own approaches in the early years.

In sum, the candidate needs to understand that conscious micro level planning in dual language education ought to take place at the classroom, program, school and community levels, and that it is likely to vary depending on the non-English language (e.g., Navajo, Arabic, Mandarin, Spanish) and social contexts in question. Varghese and Stritikus (2005) conclude that, "Courses in teacher preparation programs should specifically address how teachers can respond to, change and even create policy—specifically language policy—at different levels" (p. 84). This entails the candidate understanding that teachers have agency and may or may not choose to execute a theoretically substantiated and explicit language in education plan (Zúñiga, Henderson, & Palmer, 2018). How a candidate might be prepared to challenge language policy is addressed under Standard Five: Professionalism, Advocacy and Agency.

Candidate Language Ability

The final dimension that the candidate must possess is the ability to effectively use the language(s) of interest to teach across the curriculum and within the broader school and community context (Guerrero & Guerrero, 2017). While there is no substantive strand of

research that explores the influence that a dual language teacher's own bilingual and biliteracy abilities might have on those of the learners, it stands to reason that the candidate must serve as the more capable linguistic other who is able to use and explain features of the language(s) that lie just beyond the level of the learner. More importantly, the candidate must be able to use the language to guide and scaffold the learner's conceptual development (Trueba, 1989).

Professional organizations such as the Center for Applied Linguistics (1974) and the National Association for Bilingual Education (1992) have long advocated for the bilingual teacher to possess native or near native levels of proficiency in both of the languages used for instructional purposes. Other experts in the field of two-way immersion (Boyle, August, Tabaku, Cole, & Simpson-Baird, 2015; Howard et al., 2018) also recommend that the teachers in these programs ought to be native or near native speakers of the academic languages. Thomas and Collier (2002) have taken an interesting albeit indirect position on this matter. Based on their longitudinal research, they maintain that the most critical feature of effective two-way immersion programs is the provision of sustained cognitively complex grade level academic language at least through the elementary school years.

Wong Fillmore (2014), along with a host of other researchers (for example, Kibler, Valdes, & Walqui, 2014), have been quick to point out the learning and linguistic challenges that the Common Core Standards pose for both learners and their teachers, particularly as the Standards relate to English. For the candidate in Common Core states who will be assisting the learners in acquiring and developing the non-English language, a deep knowledge about the structures of complex academic texts is required, including the ability to have meaningful instructional interactions about the texts—both orally and in writing—in the non-English language.

Since the inception of bilingual education nearly 50 years ago, many states across the nation have been remiss in terms of the kinds of language policies and practices that have been used to gauge or measure the non-English language proficiency of teacher candidates. As such, the candidate needs to understand that being certified to teach in a bilingual setting without having to demonstrate cognitively and linguistically complex proficiency in the target language may undermine the ability to fully meet learners' needs. Furthermore, candidates must be able to interrogate their access or lack thereof to the non-English language (Guerrero & Guerrero, 2017) and to secure—perhaps demand—the language learning opportunities needed in order to continually deepen the target language ability.

In sum, the candidate must be critically conscious of his or her language ability and be willing to exercise agency on his or her own behalf and perhaps on behalf of other candidates. To this end, the candidate must be willing to pose difficult questions to the program faculty and administration, who may fail to recognize how entrenched English-based monoglossic language policies and practices undermine the cultivation of the non-English language. The candidate ought to reflect on and question issues such as the following: Why are bilingual education courses taught almost exclusively in English? Why are course readings, textbooks, and media mostly in English? Can bilingual education professors be critically conscious when they publish and teach their courses almost exclusively in English? What changes are needed at the teacher preparation program level in order to move the profession forward?

Standard One Components, Crosswalks, and Program Assessment

Connections to PK-12 Student Learning

The four dimensions of 1) Critical Language Awareness; 2) Language, Brain, and Mind; 3) Micro Level Language Planning; and 4) Candidate Language Ability work together in the context of designing, delivering, and assessing content-based dual language instruction. Ways in which candidates integrate the dual language program languages inside and outside of the classrooms shape learners' academic, linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural development. Inside the classroom dual language teacher candidates will strategically design, deliver, and assess dual language lessons to promote academic biliteracy, cognitive development, and increased content-based outcomes for all students, including those with learning differences. Simultaneously dual language teachers make connections to PK-12 student learning by demonstrating practices evident of critical consciousness to leverage students' empowerment. Furthermore, candidates' knowledge and application of Standard One are to extend outside the classrooms into the program communities, affording advocacy and effective policy development for academic, linguistic, sociocultural, and ideological clarity.

The Standard

The candidate is able to critically analyze how languages are used to structure (PK-12) educational opportunities in society, and identify the strengths and weaknesses of prevailing and contemporary theories and concepts associated with the development of bilingualism and biliteracy in the context of the schools and communities where she or he intends to practice. The candidate is also able to use these insights in order to inform language planning matters at various levels, while demonstrating the ability to use language, and, where applicable, the non-English language, to effectively promote the academic well-being of the learner. The candidate assumes responsibility for critically examining his or her own language abilities, deepening the target language abilities needed, and advocating for teacher preparation program level language policies and practices that promote target language development.

CAEP Principles: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE, CONTENT, THE LEARNER AND LEARNING, PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Crosswalks

DL Guiding Principles:	Strand 2, Strand 3, Strand 5, Strand 6
InTASC:	Standard 1, Standard 2, Standard 4, Standard 10
TESOL Standards:	Standard 1: Knowledge About Language
ACTFL Standards:	Standard 1: Language Proficiency: Interpersonal, Interpretive, and Presentational

Components

Component 1.1. Language Ideologies, Policies and Practice
PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the social and political power associated with languages in the U.S. educational context.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates demonstrate knowledge that language ideologies may not be generally neutral and that they are sometimes used to benefit certain segments of a given society to the detriment of others. Candidates also demonstrate knowledge about educational language policies and practices, such as a state's related rules and regulations, judicial cases, and federal policies, are used to establish, sanction, and perpetuate a given society's language ideologies. Candidates apply knowledge to evaluate and serve as advocate for those language policies and practices that best represent the interests of the learner within the local context.

Component 1.2. Foundational Knowledge of Bilingualism
CONTENT; THE LEARNER AND LEARNING

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the theoretical nature of the acquisition and development of language, bilingualism, and biliteracy across the lifespan.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of contemporary theories and concepts associated with the study of bilingualism and biliteracy development of the individual learner in the social contexts of family, community and schooling. Candidates apply knowledge of how two or more languages are acquired, structured, and organized yet subject to influences of a cognitive and maturational nature, including language readiness and the learner's age, motivation, and identity development. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of one's degrees of bilingualism and biliteracy are best represented along a continuum that will vary contextually and over the lifetime of the learner, inclusive of cognitive and contextual nuances associated with diverse learners.

Component 1.3. Enacting Language Practices
CONTENT; INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE

Candidates apply knowledge related to how language practices implicitly and explicitly permeate the school, program, and classroom and are able to identify language related inequities that undermine the quality of the program.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates apply knowledge of critical awareness of micro level language planning at the classroom, program, and school levels to develop and evaluate plans designed to leverage family and community support to augment the learner's language development. Candidates apply knowledge of myriad best approaches to promote bilingualism and biliteracy for all learners in all dual language contexts (e.g., sequential versus simultaneous versus literacy development approaches; translanguaging, grouping of learners; time and subject area allocation; diverse learners) and demonstrate knowledge to justify why one approach may be better suited than another for a particular context. Candidates apply knowledge of enacting established micro level language policy and planning, mitigating the implementation of a given policy and plan, and are key to evaluating and improving micro level language policy.

Component 1.4 Candidate Language Abilities
THE LEARNER AND LEARNING; CONTENT; PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Candidates possess the language ability, both spoken and written, to teach across the curriculum and to effectively communicate with students' families and communities.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of why and how a teacher's language ability impacts the development of a learner's ability in the program languages, including diverse learners. Candidates apply knowledge of critical awareness of his or her own language potential, seek out opportunities to continue to advance needed language skills, and are critically conscious of the language policy and practices governing the program. Candidates apply knowledge of the oral, aural, written and reading language abilities that support the pedagogical delivery of meaningful and cognitively complex instruction across the curricular areas and demonstrate language abilities needed to communicate effectively with families and communities.
**Candidates' requisite language abilities are determined by the dual language program structure, including situations of co-teaching whereby two teachers deliver content in one and/or both of the program languages.*

Program Assessment

Standard One and its components are largely met using Assessment 2 (Content and Authentic Assessment Portfolio), Assessment 4 (Dual Language Thematic Unit of Instruction), and Assessment 6 (Dual Language Professional Development Project).

Program evidences for candidates' attainment of Standard One:

- Assessments are required of all candidates.
- Assessments and corresponding data (charts, evidences, artifacts, etc.) are aligned with all four components.
- Rubrics and assessment criteria are clearly specific to standard component(s).
- Assessment rubrics are designed with distinguishable levels of candidates' performance.
- Data reports are rubric aligned to delineate candidates' performance levels.

Standard 1 References

Achugar, M. (2015). Critical language awareness approaches in the Americas: Theoretical principles, pedagogical practices and distribution of intellectual labor. *Linguistics and Education, 32*, 1-4.

Baldauf, R. B. (2006). Rearticulating the case for micro language planning in a language ecology context. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 7*(2), 147-170. https://doi.org/10.2167/cilp092.0

Ballinger, S., Lyster, R., Sterzuk, A., & Genesee, F. (2017). Context-appropriate crosslinguistic pedagogy: Considering the role of language status in immersion education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education, 5(1),* 30-57.

Bialystok, E., Craik, F., & Luk, G. (2012). Bilingualism: Consequences for mind and brain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 16*(4), 240-250.

Boyle, A., August, D., Tabaku, L., Cole, S., & Simpson-Baird, A. (2015). *Dual language education programs: Current state policies and practices*. U.S. Department of Education Office of English Language Acquisition. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.

Center for Applied Linguistics. (1974). *Guidelines for the preparation and certification of teachers of bilingual/bicultural education*. Arlington, VA: Author.

Cervantes-Soon, C. G., Dorner, L., Palmer, D., Heiman, D., Schwerdtfeger, R., & Choi, J. (2017). Combating inequalities in two-way language immersion programs: Toward critical consciousness in bilingual education spaces. *Review of Research in Education, 41*, 403-427.

Ek, L., Sanchez, P., & Quijada Cerecer, P. (2013). Linguistic violence, insecurity, and work: Language ideologies of Latina/o bilingual teacher candidates in Texas. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *7*(3), 197-219.

Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., Butvilofsky, S., Sparrow, W., Soltero-González, L., Ruiz-Figueroa, O., & Escamilla, M. (2014). *Biliteracy from the start: Literacy Squared® in action.* Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Language and power*. New York: Longman.

Fishman, J. A. (2001). *Reversing language shift.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Flores, B. (2005). The intellectual presence of the deficit view of Spanish speaking children in the educational literature during the 20th century. In P. Pedraza & M. Rivera (Eds.), *Latino education: An agenda for community action research* (pp. 75-98). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective.* Chichester, United Kingdom: Wiley Blackwell.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and bilingual education*. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765

Grosjean, F. (1985). The bilingual as a competent but specific speaker-hearer. *Journal of multilingual and multicultural development, 6* (6), 467-477.

Guerrero, M., & Guerrero, M. (2017). Competing discourses of academic Spanish in the Texas-Mexico borderlands. *Bilingual Research Journal, 40*(1), 5-19. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2016.1273150

Hornberger, N. (1989). Continua of biliteracy. *Review of Educational Research*, 59(3), 271-296.

Howard, E. R., Lindholm-Leary, D., Rogers, D., Olague, N., Medina, J., Kennedy, B., Sugarman, J., & Christian, D. (2018). *Guiding principles for dual language education* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Izquierdo, E., & Espitia Mendoza, V. (2017). La educación de lenguaje dual: una reforma educativa. In M. Guerrero, M. Guerrero, L. Soltero-Gonzalez, & K. Escamilla (Eds.), *Antología crítica sobre la educación bilingüe de doble immersión*. Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

Kibler, A., Valdes, G., & Walqui, A. (2014). What does standards-based educational reform mean for English language learner populations in primary and secondary schools? *TESOL Quarterly, 88*, 433-453.

Kroskrity, P. V., & Field, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Native American language ideologies: Beliefs, practices, and struggles in Indian Country.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Montrul, S. (2013). *El bilingüismo en el mundo del hispanohablante*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

National Association for Bilingual Education. (1992). *Professional standards for the preparation of bilingual/multicultural teachers*. Washington, DC: Author.

Padilla, A., Fan, L., Xu, X., & Silva, D. (2013). A Mandarin/English two-way immersion program: Language proficiency and academic achievement. *Foreign Language Annals, 46*, 661–679.

Palmer, D. (2011). The discourse of transition: Teachers' language ideologies within transitional bilingual education programs. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 5*, 103-122.

Palmer, D., & Martinez, R. (2016). Developing biliteracy: What do teachers really need to know about language? Research Commentary, *Language Arts 93*(5), 379-385.

Palmer, D., Martinez, R., Mateus, S., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on language separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 98*, 757-772.

Peñalosa, F. (1980). *Chicano sociolinguistics: A brief introduction.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Ritchie, W., & Bhatia, T. (2008). Psycholinguistics. In B. Spolsky & F. Hult (Eds.), *The handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 38-52). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Soltero-Gonzalez, L., & Butvilofsky, S. (2017). La enseñanza de la biliteracidad en programas de doble inmersion. In M. Guerrero, C. Guerrero, L. Soltero-Gonzalez, & K. Escamilla (Eds.), *Abriendo brecha: antología crítica sobre la educación bilingüe de doble inmersión*. Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

Spolsky, B., & Hult, F. (Eds.). *The handbook of educational linguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement*. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, Excellence, University of California-Santa Cruz. Retrieved from http://repositories.edlib.org/crede/finalrpts/1_1_final.

Tollefson, J. (2011). Ideology in second language education. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. II) (pp. 801-816). New York: Routledge.

Tollefson, J., & Tsui, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Medium of instruction policies: Which agenda? Whose agenda?* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Trueba, E. (1989). *Raising silent voices: Educating linguistic minorities for the 21st century*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Varghese, M. M., & Stritikus, T. T. (2005). "Nadie me dijo (NOBODY TOLD ME)": Language policy negotiation and implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*, 73–87.

Wong Fillmore, L. (2014). English language learners at the crossroads of educational reform. *TESOL Quarterly, 88*, 624-632.

Zúñiga, C. (2016). Between language as problem and resource: Examining teachers' language orientations in dual-language programs. *Bilingual Research Journal, 39*, 339-353.

Zúñiga, C., Henderson, K., & Palmer, D. (2018). Language policy towards equity: How bilingual teachers use policy mandates to their own ends. *Language and Education 32,* 60-76.

Standard 2: Sociocultural Competence

As one of the pillars of dual language programs, the candidate must be able to promote the development of sociocultural competence among the learners who generally come from at

least two differing cultural backgrounds (e.g., Chinese and Anglo American). The goal, however, is much more than merely teaching each cultural group about the other's cultural world (i.e., cross-cultural competence). A deeper goal is to positively influence learners' individual identities or how they perceive themselves as members of their local community and the broader society (Bearse & de Jong, 2008; Feinauer & Howard, 2014; Gort, 2008; Lindholm-Leary, 2011; Norton, 2010; Palmer, 2008; Potowski, 2007; Werito, 2013).

In the film documentary centered on immersion programs *Speaking in Tongues,* produced by Marcia Jarmel and Ken Schneider (2009), one of the focal student's experiences and voices this deep cultural transformation. Julian, an Anglo native-English-speaking learner, comes to question whether or not he is Chinese like some of his classmates and provides testimony that the Mandarin language and related culture are very much a part of who he is or how he sees himself. Because Julian attended a well-implemented two-way immersion program for several years, he has become a global citizen able to communicate with a relatively large portion of the world's inhabitants. In order to move all learners towards such a goal, the candidate must appropriate intermeshed knowledge, dispositions, and curricular and pedagogical practices.

Positionality and Learner Background Knowledge

It is essential that candidates engage in self-reflection as part of their own professional development and honestly examine their own beliefs and attitudes in order to deal with any prejudices that might influence their value systems and treatment of learners and their families (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Each candidate must also understand that moving learners towards a heightened sense of cross-cultural understanding and identity formation entails understanding and critically examining the historical, social, economic and political relationships between the two target cultures beyond the school walls and into the community and broader society. While

conditions of genocide, slavery, colonization, and internment of specific ethnic and racial groups may seem to represent historical events long gone, such events run deep and may still linger in subtle and not so subtle ways (e.g., racism, linguicism, ethnocentrism), privileging one group over the other.

Further, the candidate must recognize that there is very little related research on sociocultural competence. Defining, influencing the development of, and measuring this psychological construct represent a complex empirical undertaking (Feinauer & Howard, 2014). Moreover, the authors cited suggest that this third goal of dual language education is sometimes construed as less important than either the goal of academic achievement or the development of bilingualism and biliteracy. On the other hand, they note (citing Cummins, 2014) that identity formation is intertwined with academic and linguistic outcomes. Recent research on learner positioning and investment represents an effort to more fully understand how identity and language development are linked (Lee, Hill–Bonnet, & Raley, 2011; Potowski, 2007; Werito, 2013). Candidates ought to be able to weigh the available evidence, formulate their own positions on the matter, and be open to questioning and adjusting their related beliefs and practices.

Curricular and Instructional Practices

Understanding how the prescribed or mandated program curriculum contributes to the development of sociocultural competence also entails a series of qualities the candidate will need to develop and appropriate over time. The candidate must understand that a central source of cultural content is embedded within the curriculum spanning each content area. Oliva (2009) broadly defines curriculum in the following manner:

> …curriculum is perceived as a plan or program for all the experiences that the learner encounters under the direction of the school. In practice, the curriculum consists of a number of plans, in written form and of varying scope, that delineate the desired learning experiences. The curriculum, therefore, may be a unit, a course, a sequence of courses, the school's entire program of studies—and may be encountered inside and outside of class or school when directed by the personnel of the school. (p. 7)

Oliva also maintains that there are at least four discernible philosophies of education, each of which relies on a different orientation to curriculum. At some point the candidate must critically engage with questions like: Is the purpose of the curriculum to develop a learner who is able to reconstruct and improve society, preserve society and its supposed truths, transmit a given cultural heritage, or meet the needs and interests of individual learners? Or is the curriculum concerned with issues of power, economics and ideologies, as Apple (2009) argues?

With this challenge in mind, the candidate must be prepared to respond to a curriculum that may mitigate the goal of creating a learner who is socioculturally adept. This entails developing better understanding of the cultural backgrounds of the target learners, including their histories, and again reflecting on how those learners' cultures are depicted (or not) in the prescribed curriculum. Beyond recognizing culturally related stereotypes and misrepresentations about the target cultures, the candidate must also be able to find ways to make the curriculum culturally relevant. Valero (2017) points out that the dual language educator must be aware that curriculum may well be monocultural and offer few meaningful opportunities for emergent bilingual children to learn, and calls for dual language educators to create a more equitable, socially just, culturally sensitive and linguistically enriching student-centered environment.

The ability to do so requires that the candidate engage in actual observation and study of the target communities, neighborhoods, and families where cultural practices are instantiated. Moreover, the candidate must be able to integrate the learners' previous knowledge, experiences, and interests into the curriculum in order to enhance its relevancy for them (Valero, 2017). Riojas Cortez (2017), citing Esteban-Guitart and Moll (2014), would add that the dual language teacher must identify and leverage the learners' funds of knowledge as well as their funds of identity. These funds must be considered in light of the mandated curriculum, as learners must be able to see themselves and how they are represented in the curriculum; this is paramount to the development of a healthy identity.

Howard et al. (2018) make clear that the candidate must be prepared to understand both the need for conscious programmatic planning and the use of specific instructional strategies to promote the development of sociocultural competence. On a macro level, candidates need to understand that a program-wide plan is needed that details the roles that the school personnel, students, their families, and the community might play to promote such an outcome. At a more micro level, the candidate must be prepared to create and or use particular instructional strategies that might foster the desired goal. The authors recommend that dual language teachers demonstrate the following pedagogical ability:

> Teachers consistently use a variety of strategies (e.g., conflict resolution, perspective-taking, empathy development, cross-grade buddies) to promote the sociocultural competence of all students during instructional time in both program languages. (p. 66)

Finally, the candidate will need to engage in the use and/or design of assessment tools aimed at gauging sociocultural competence. Again, while this is not a simple matter, the complexity of assessing this construct (Phinney & Ong, 2007) is not unlike the challenges

associated with defining, circularizing, promoting, and assessing bilingualism. The candidate in this sense must be able to understand the limitations and promise of dual language education, persevere, and continue to grow.

Standard Two Components, Crosswalks, and Program Assessment

Connections to PK-12 Student Learning

Sociocultural processes are at the core of the Prism Model advanced by Thomas and Collier (1997) and are fundamental to the effectiveness of dual language programs. As such the sociocultural processes enveloping the learners influence their identity and academic, linguistic, and cognitive development in an interdependent manner. Furthermore, education reform is intensely focused on the urgency of students becoming global citizens, empowered with knowledge and skills to be highly proficient in communication patterns with our world's inhabitants. In order to transform all learners with magnitude, including those with special needs, candidates are obliged to develop foundational knowledge, dispositions, curricular, and pedagogical practices related to sociocultural competence.

The Standard

Teacher candidates are prepared to design and deliver engaging, student-centered, standards-based dual language lessons that transcend cross-cultural competence and foment the transformation of student identities with the goal of promoting social justice and global understanding. The candidate regularly reflects on his or her own cultural positioning and is informed by a keen sense of sociohistorical knowledge as well as current knowledge of the students' cultural practices and experiences. The candidate is able to critically examine the cultural content embedded in the curriculum, act on any discrepancies and design learning experiences that promote sociocultural competence, inclusive of diverse learners. The candidate is also aware of the challenges associated with assessing the development of such a complex yet crucial construct. CAEP Principles: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE, CONTENT, THE LEARNER AND LEARNING, PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Crosswalks

DL Guiding Principles:	Strand 2, Strand 3, Strand 6, Strand 7
InTASC:	Standard 2, Standard 3, Standard 7, Standard 10

TESOL Standards:	Standard 2: ELLs in the Sociocultural Context
ACTFL Standards:	Standard 2: Cultures, Linguistics, Literatures, and Concepts from Other Disciplines

Components

Component 2.1. Sociohistorical Awareness
THE LEARNER AND LEARNING

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the socio-historical backgrounds of the learners (both past and present) as well as research and theories of power relations between and among groups and how these might influence academic achievement.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of how the learners' sense of identity is intimately linked to their past, present, and future, inclusive of diverse learners. Candidates identify and implement methods to address the various political, social, economic, psychological and linguistic events of the past and present that influence the learners' sense of identity, whether privileged or subordinated locally, regionally, nationally or globally. Candidates discern and describe the causes of historical patterns of achievement characterizing the student groups being served, including those with special needs.

Component 2.2. Positionality
PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Candidates demonstrate critical awareness of their sociocultural positioning in society in general and in relation to the local communities, the school, the program, and the learners and their families.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates critically reflect on their own sociohistorical positioning (based on race, gender, language, class, learning differences, etc.) and the possible influences it may have on interactions with members of the school and community. Candidates also critically examine their sociohistorical positioning and the possible influences it may have on equitable interactions with the learners, including those with special needs.

Component 2.3. Curricular Awareness
CONTENT

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of curriculum as a sociocultural construction and that cultural content is embedded, including content associated with language and literacy.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates identify and implement theory-based methods to address racist, stereotypical or culturally biased content within the prescribed or mandated curriculum. Candidates locate, modify, and create curricular content that is equitable and enhances learners' sociocultural competence, including those with special needs. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of learners deep personal, familial, and communal cultural knowledge, and draw on such knowledge to co-construct new cultural knowledge, emphasizing learners' assets.

Component 2.4. Teaching to Sociocultural Competence
INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE

Candidates promote the development of sociocultural competence at the classroom, program, family and community levels.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates design, deliver, and assess theory-based learning activities that are firmly anchored to the development of learners' cross-cultural and sociocultural competence, leveraging assets and diverse learner strengths. Candidates plan, implement, and assess theory-based activities to promote cross-cultural and sociocultural competence across the curriculum to support program and school personnel. Candidates design, implement, and assess effective theory-based activities aimed at building a mutual appreciation and respect for the diverse cultural groups among families and community members.

Program Assessment

Standard Two and its components are largely met using Assessment 1 (Dual Language Learner Case Study); Assessment 2 (Content and Authentic Assessment Portfolio), Assessment 3 (Dual Language Student Teacher Internship Portfolio) and partially with Assessment 4 (Dual Language Thematic Unit of Instruction).

<u>Program evidences for candidates' attainment of Standard Two:</u>

- Assessments are required of all candidates.
- Assessments and corresponding data (charts, evidences, artifacts, etc.) are aligned with all four components.
- Rubrics and assessment criterion are clearly specific to standard component(s).
- Assessment rubrics are designed with distinguishable levels of candidates' performance.

- Data reports are rubric aligned to delineate candidates' performance levels.

Standard 2 References

Apple, M. (2009). *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge Falmer.

Bearse, C., & de Jong, E. (2008). Cultural and linguistic investment: Adolescents in a secondary two-way immersion program. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 41*, 325–340. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665680802174817

Cummins, J. (2014). Beyond language: Academic communication and student success. *Linguistics and Education, 26*, 145–154. DOI: 10.1016/j.linged.2014.01.006.

Esteban-Guitart, M., & Moll, L. (2014). Funds of identity: A new concept based on the funds of knowledge approach. *Culture & Psychology, 20*, 31-48.

Feinauer, E., & Howard, E. (2014). Attending to the third goal: Cross-cultural competence and identity development in two-way immersion programs. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Learning Education, 2*, 257-272.

Gort, M. (2008). "You give me idea!": Collaborative strides toward bilingualism, biliteracy, and cross-cultural understanding in a two-way partial immersion program. *Multicultural Perspectives, 10,* 4, 192–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/15210960802526086

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

Jarmel, M., & Schneider, K. (2009). *Speaking in Tongues*. San Francisco, CA: PatchWorks Films.

Lee, J. S., Hill–Bonnet, L., & Raley, J. (2011). Examining the effects of language brokering on student identities and learning opportunities in dual immersion classrooms. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 10*, 306–326.

Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2011). Student outcomes in Chinese two-way immersion programs: Language proficiency, academic achievement, and student attitudes. In D. J. Tedick, D. Christian, & T. W. Fortune (Eds.), *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities* (pp. 81–103). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Norton, B. (2010). Language and identity. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 349–369). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Oliva, P. (2009). *Developing the curriculum* (7th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Palmer, D. K. (2008). Building and destroying students' 'academic identities': The power of

discourse in a two-way immersion classroom. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 21*(6), 647–667. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390701470537

Phinney, J. S., & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*, 271–281. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.271

Potowski, K. (2007). *Language and identity in a dual immersion school*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Riojas Cortez, M. (2017). La familia como sistema de apoyo en el desarrollo de los niños bilingues. In M. Guerrero, M. Guerrero, L. Soltero-Gonzalez, & K. Escamilla (Eds.), *Abriendo brecha: Antología crítica sobre la educación bilingüe de doble immersión*. Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

Valero, W. (2017). El estudiante emergente: eje, razon y riqueza de un desarrollo curricular de rigor y relevancia. In M. Guerrero, M. Guerrero, L. Soltero-Gonzalez, & K. Escamilla (Eds.), *Abriendo brecha: Antología crítica sobre la educación bilingüe de doble immersión*. Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

Villegas, A., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*, 20. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053001003

Werito, V. (2013). Dine youth and identity in education. In J. Reyhner, J. Martin, L. Lockard, & W. S. Gilbert (Eds.), *Honoring our children: Culturally appropriate approaches for teaching indigenous students* (pp. 53-64). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

Standard 3: Dual Language Instructional Practices and Pedagogy

For decades, research and literature related to best practices with English learners, emergent bilinguals, and other multilingual student populations have given emphasis to the importance of specialized pedagogies for increased language development in the context of school (August, McCardle, & Shanahan, 2014; García, 2015). Supportive lesson design and delivery frameworks strongly advocate for skillful classroom use of high-leverage practices, increased student interaction and multidimensional pedagogies, recognizing students' full potentials and strengths (Ball & Forzani, 2010; de Jong & Bearse, 2014; Echervarría, Vogt, &

Short, 2016). Teachers working with dual language learners are vitally positioned to increase opportunities for students' use and application of new, contextualized academic language in content-based classrooms, while also empowering students to realize their own potential.

To this point and beyond, solid, empirical lines of inquiry and scholarly works have confirmed that language learning is an innately social process that is most beneficial for development when students learn from each other in supportive settings (Vygotsky, 1978; Walqui & van Lier, 2010).

Specifically, for teacher preparation programs, dual language teachers must be skilled in creating and fostering highly supportive, culturally compatible classroom climates where rigorous, thematic concepts promote student agency (Walqui & van Lier, 2010). Extraordinary language development for the future must be reflective of students' fierce intellectual grit as they forge their way to academic success by building upon each other's thinking (Wong Fillmore, 2014). In this manner, dual language learners develop themselves and each other as they collaborate to expand their linguistic and conceptual knowledge. Standard Three, with authentic, critically conscious teaching methods at its heart, spotlights preparing candidates' instructional practices and pedagogies to cultivate students' academic, linguistic, and cognitive development from a constructivist approach.

Dual Language Pedagogy: Infusing Myriad Standards for Equitable Literacy Development

Standard Three: Instructional Practices and Pedagogies recognizes that effective dual language teacher preparation programs require highly specialized pedagogies, inclusive of distinct shapes and labyrinthine aspects of dual language teaching and learning. To start,

candidates must be prepared to design and deliver instruction that is autonomously beneficial for both groups of learners, recognizing and avoiding instances of "flat" mainstream methodologies that prevail at the expense of emergent bilingual learners. Fundamental aspects for candidates' multidimensional pedagogical development begin with the uniqueness of dual language pedagogy and its complex nature that combines elements of myriad standards. Unlike any other discipline, dual language teaching and learning obliges teachers to draw from multiple sets of standards, consistently blending them into their instructional and assessment practices on a daily basis. Educator preparation programs must ensure that well-prepared candidates' pedagogical practices demonstrate applications that consider the TESOL standards for academic English language development, world languages via the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) standards addressing learner modes of communication, and states' content curriculum standards that serve as the nexus for all dual language instruction.

The complexities of preparing dual language teachers to draw upon multiple standards are also influenced by the critical point that language groups are undoubtedly associated with social and systemic structures of power. Decades of large-scale, empirically defended research has resulted in the Prism Model for Bilingual Learners (Collier & Thomas, 2009). Collier and Thomas examined English-only programs, transitional bilingual programs, and dual language programs in several states across the United States to measure students' levels of achievement as well as their first and second language acquisition processes. The Model's framework supports the notion that linguistically diverse students who are learning academic English must be provided with educational conditions that recognize and equitably mirror those of the language majority group with whom they share the schooling experience (Collier, 1992; Collier & Thomas, 2009). The Prism Model's four components of sociocultural, linguistic, academic, and

cognitive processes indicate that sustained responsiveness in these developmental areas is necessary for all learners. With regard to dual language education, teacher candidates must know how to address all aspects of the prism, in both languages, doubling the Prism Model's components from four to eight (Collier & Thomas, 2009; Thomas & Collier, 2012).

Active Engagement and Learner Motivation

Accordingly, in tandem with the complexities associated with utilizing multiple standard sets, dual language teacher preparation programs must give attention to candidates' pedagogical competencies regarding students' active engagement and learner motivation. Research in the area of educational neuroscience strongly supports the vast, dynamic connections among learners' personal meaning-making processes, their active engagement, and the impact of motivation in the context of language learning (Immordino-Yang & Gottlieb, 2017; Sousa, 2017). While factors such as internal desire and sociocultural demands also impact learners' motivation, the work of Dörnyei and Al-Hoorie (2017) suggests that students' actual experiences of being engaged in the language learning process significantly shape their levels of motivation. They contend that in most language learning environments, including countries other than the United States, students are carrying out assigned tasks that are most often determined by the teacher and/or curricular parameters. While educators may lean toward agreeing that students benefit from having direction within their learning, it is vitally important for teachers to consider that learners benefit more when they see themselves as actively participating in the learning process. On this point, two-way dual language programs substantially increase *all* students' academic outcomes by capitalizing on improved critical thinking, increased student motivation, and collaborative learning strategies (Calderón, Slavin, & Sánchez, 2011; Thomas & Collier, 2012).

Dual language teacher candidates must also be prepared for the cautionary underlying dominance of English in students' active participation. Oftentimes, without even knowing it, students themselves will adhere to social norms with regard to power dynamics and may simply select English as their language of use (Nuñez & Palmer, 2016).

Along the research continuum, best instructional and pedagogical practices give measure to students' cognitive investments and emotional engagement to provide ample, accessible pathways for student success. Himmele and Himmele (2017) make the connection to the importance of teaching methods that steer away from teacher-centered "delivery of content" in lecture-based lessons. They state,

> After 24 hours, average students retain an average of 5 percent of what was lectured, 10 percent of what was read, 50 percent of what was learned as a result of being involved in a discussion group, and 90 percent of what they immediately used or taught to others. (p. 7)

With this in mind, sadly, research also suggests that lectures are still the predominant teaching method in our schools, especially in middle grades and high school classrooms (Sousa, 2017). Therefore, Standard Three obliges active participation and student engagement as non-negotiables in dual language teaching and learning. Ultimately, students' interaction and teacher facilitated strategic connections to content-based concepts in meaningful, motivating ways are essential for successful language development in the context of school (Lindholm-Leary, 2016).

Scaffolding for Language Development

Another significant component within dual language instructional practices and pedagogies for teacher candidates is that of scaffolding. Dual language classroom configurations

include students who are learning rigorous content concepts in two languages. Consequently, the importance of scaffolded instruction is amplified, making it vitally necessary that teacher candidates implement methodologies to facilitate comprehensible input for a wide range of language learners, in both the partner language and English (Echevarría, et al., 2016; Gibbons, 2015). Dual language teacher candidates' considerations of students' diverse grammatical competencies, pragmatics and sociocultural norms, directionality and communicative patterns, as well as their discourse and metalinguistic competencies, are especially essential while designing engaging lessons in two-way immersion programs (Collier & Thomas, 2007; SCALE, 2014). In short, dual language teacher candidates must learn and apply theoretically-based methodologies encompassing increased student collaboration, visual aids, varied grouping configurations, and authentic dual language materials in both the partner language and English to ensure effective dual language learning (Echevarría, et al., 2016).

Likewise, dual language teacher candidates must also study and reflect upon the vital language development and acquisition principles related to students' common underlying proficiencies when designing and delivering multilingual lessons (Cummins, 2005). With some current deliberation, there are differing viewpoints with regard to firm separation of languages during dual language teaching and learning. On one side of the debate, research supports the idea that students may benefit by tapping into both languages when necessary in order to utilize multiple cognitive and linguistic resources as they make meaning of new language (Freeman, Shook, & Marian, 2016). Emergent bilinguals may benefit when they are able to use both the partner language and English, meaning their all-inclusive linguistic repertoires, in a more fluid way during instruction (Hopewell & Escamilla, 2015). Conversely, literature also cautions teachers regarding the use of translanguaging pedagogies in some dual language contexts,

especially when dual language learners are in the earlier stages of biliteracy development (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2015). Ultimately, with regard to dual language instructional practices and pedagogies, dual language teacher candidates need to understand translanguaging and its operationalization to determine when it may be supportive to learners' successes and when a more clearly defined separation of languages is needed (Howard et al., 2018).

Using New Language in New Ways

The third point within Standard Three for dual language instructional practices includes candidates' development of pedagogical competencies that give dual language learners various ways to collaboratively *practice* new language. This means that, through authentic, active engagement, students are guided to interact frequently with each other in diverse grouping configurations, with both structured and unstructured opportunities to use language as often as possible (Howard et al., 2018; Schleppegrell, 2013). To avoid active disengagement, teacher candidates must give special attention to rigorous, content-based language production in both languages. Albeit similar to best practices for other language learning scenarios, language production in two languages involves nuances that play a significant role in students' development of increased content knowledge and language skills. The process is reflexive, as students are learning two languages through content while learning content through two languages (Beeman & Urow, 2013; Lachance, 2017).

Furthermore, research supports the notion that students' comfort levels have a direct impact on effective learning. In order for students to be successful they must be in a supportive learning environment (Swain & Lampkin, 2013). The supportive nature of instructional practices in dual language classrooms is considerably intensified given that students must be willing to

take risks with content concepts in two different languages, with diverse language learning peers (Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013; Zwiers, 2014). Therefore, it is essential for dual language teacher preparation standards to consider the doubled layers of pedagogical complexity in order for candidates to address the creation of inclusive, student-valued classroom environments.

Oracy for Biliteracy

Finally, Standard Three gives attention to specialized pedagogies regarding oral language development that simultaneously support increased content-based writing skills (Calderón & Minaya-Rowe, 2011; Walqui & van Lier, 2010; Zwiers & Crawford, 2011). Dual language teacher candidates must demonstrate instructional strategies, including leading group discussions for eliciting and interpreting students' thinking, that recognize the linguistic and sociocultural relationships between oral language, bilingualism, and biliteracy in the instructional design and delivery processes (Ball & Forzani, 2010; García, 2009; Gottlieb & Ernst Slavit, 2014). Dual language learners, including emergent bilinguals and native speakers of English, need explicit instruction emphasizing vocabulary and sentence-level and discourse-level patterns, in both the partner language and in English (Kroll & Bialystok, 2013). To emphasize the point, students need multiple, relevant, language-rich opportunities to practice new language in relation to the subject area in order to fully comprehend content concepts. Dual language teacher candidates must recognize high-leverage practices that address the nuances associated with phonological patterns, vocabulary, syntax, register, and language functions and how these factors influence students' comprehension in two languages (Ball & Forzani, 2010; Howard et al., 2018; Klingelhofer & Schleppegrell, 2016).

Standard Three and its competencies thus foster and shepherd dual language teacher candidates' development and demonstrated application of instructional practices and pedagogies unique to dual language settings.

Connections to PK-12 Student Learning

A fundamental aspect of successful K-12 teaching and learning is the notion that skillful instructional practices are supported by a strong set of well-planned units for learning. Likewise, teachers are positioned to confront curricular biases as they select and create supporting materials for learning activities that motivate and engage a wide-range of dual language learners. Furthermore, dual language teachers are positioned to employ multiple sets of curricular standards to infuse content and language development in two languages.

The Standard

Teacher candidates are prepared to design and deliver engaging, student-centered, standards-based dual language lessons. Informed by principles of biliteracy development, sociocultural competence, authentic assessment, professionalism, agency, and advocacy within the programmatic and community contexts of learning, candidates must demonstrate abilities to structure instructional practices for all language learners in the dual language setting, including those with special needs. Candidates must demonstrate pedagogical applications of scaffolding and differentiated instruction with deliberate and consistent attention to students' active engagement, interaction with each other via the curriculum, sociocultural motivation, developmentally appropriate learning strategies, and the development of both partnering languages through content-based instruction.

CAEP Principles: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE, CONTENT, THE LEARNER AND LEARNING

Crosswalks

DL Guiding Principles: Strand 2, Strand 3	
InTASC:	Standard 1, Standard 2, Standard 7, Standard 8
TESOL Standards:	Standard 3: Planning and Implementing Instruction
ACTFL Standards:	ACTFL Standard 4: Integration of Standards in Planning, Classroom Practice, and Use of Instructional Resources.

Components

Component 3.1. Standards-based Planning
CONTENT; THE LEARNER AND LEARNING

Candidates demonstrate comprehensive lesson design skills that draw from myriad standards sets for content-based dual language instruction. Candidates demonstrate knowledge about planning for their students' academic, linguistic, sociocultural, and developmental needs, including those with special needs.

Supporting Explanation

Independently or with a co-teacher (depending on the program model), candidates demonstrate knowledge to design lessons that draw from myriad standards sets, including state-required standards for content-based dual language instruction. Candidates have knowledge of relevant standards and draw on them to apply instructional standards across languages, to create cohesive instructional plans that lead to biliteracy development and the transfer of learning objectives across both languages and content areas. Candidates plan a variety of formative and summative assessments to measure students' content knowledge and language growth throughout the lesson/units of instruction. Candidates are able to develop integrated (and ideally thematic) units comprised of lessons and assessments that are based on a combination of appropriate academic and language/literacy standards, considering both partner languages of the program, including guiding principles for sociocultural development and critical consciousness to specifically address and assess the needs of all dual language learners within the PK-12 continuum.

Component 3.2 Standards-based Instruction
INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE

The candidate demonstrates comprehensive student-centered lesson delivery, employing myriad standards sets within pedagogical practices for content-based dual language instruction.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates demonstrate the use of asset-based pedagogies that draw upon all students' linguistic, cultural, and academic funds of knowledge, including students with special needs. Candidates understand the importance of implementing a variety of grouping strategies to promote students' active engagement and to provide sufficient opportunities for students' practice of all four language modalities in a natural and integrated manner. Candidates apply methodologies, including those that are inquiry-based, to provide language-rich instruction through the use of a wide variety of assets-based strategies, including those that support minoritized students as well as students with special needs to support students' use of broad linguistic repertoires to promote the transfer of learning objectives across languages.

Component 3.3 Standards-based Curricular Materials
INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE

The candidate demonstrates comprehensive lesson design and delivery, using authentically developed curricular materials, to support myriad standards sets for content-based dual language instruction.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates are able to select and/or create appropriate pedagogical materials that are standards-based and reflective of students' backgrounds and experiences. Candidates understand how to effectively use a variety of materials such as multimedia, video, audio, and other digital and technology-based tools to foster the development of biliteracy and the transfer of concepts. Candidates understand the linguistic and sociocultural communication patterns among oral language, bilingualism, biliteracy, and authentic instructional materials to support pedagogical practices that build oracy and literacy in both program languages. Candidates also demonstrate pedagogical practices that support students' use of grammatical, pragmatic, discourse, and metalinguistic competencies, with ample opportunities for structured and unstructured language production in both the partner language and English.

Component 3.4 Scaffolding
INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE, THE LEARNER AND LEARNING

The candidate demonstrates pedagogical skills to scaffold rigorous, language-rich instruction for diverse dual language learners.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates understand the importance of and demonstrate a broad scope of skills in scaffolding instruction, encompassing features of sheltered instruction, thematic instruction, and other meaning-based methodologies that ensure student engagement and participation for a wide range of language proficiency levels, in both the partner language and English. Candidates demonstrate understanding the significance of scaffolding rigorous lessons to promote a safe, supportive classroom environment where all students are valued and encouraged to take new risks with new language, whether it is English for English learners or the partner language, including those with special needs ranging from those with learning differences as well as gifted dual language learners. Candidates demonstrate knowledge and skills with regard to scaffolding for the languages of instruction and separation of languages along with appropriate points for transliteracy and translanguaging. Candidates demonstrate understanding of the phonological, lexical, syntactic, and directional differences between the two languages and scaffolds instruction accordingly.

Program Assessment

Standard Three and its components are largely met using Assessment 4 (Dual Language Thematic Unit of Instruction), and Assessment 5 (Dual Language Assessing Student Learning Project).

Program evidences for candidates' attainment of Standard Three:

- Assessments are required of all candidates.
- Assessments and corresponding data (charts, evidences, artifacts, etc.) are aligned with all four components.
- Rubrics and assessment criteria are clearly specific to standard component(s).
- Assessment rubrics are designed with distinguishable levels of candidates' performance.
- Data reports are rubric aligned to delineate candidates' performance levels.

Standard 3 References

August, D., McCardle, P., & Shanahan, T. (2014). Developing literacy in English language learners: Findings from a review of the experimental research. *School Psychology Review, 43*, 490-498.

Beeman, K., & Urow, C. (2013). *Teaching for biliteracy: Strengthening bridges between languages.* Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.

Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. M. (2010). Teaching skillful teaching. *Educational Leadership*, *68*(4), 40–45.

Calderón, M., & Minaya-Rowe, L. (2011). *Preventing long-term ELs: Transforming schools to meet core standards.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Calderón, M., Slavin, R., & Sánchez, M. (2011). Effective instruction for English learners. *Future of Children*, *21*(1):103-127.

Collier, V. P. (1992). Acquiring a second language for school. *Directions in Language & Education, 1*(4), 1-8.

Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2007). Predicting second language academic success in English using the Prism Model. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching, Part 1* (pp. 333-348). New York: Springer.

Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2009). *Educating English learners for a transformed world.* Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2018). *Transforming secondary education: Middle and high school dual language programs.* Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

Cummins, J. (2005, September). *Teaching for cross-language transfer in dual language education.* Paper presented at the TESOL Symposium on Dual Language Education: Teaching and Learning in Two Languages in the EFL Setting. Istanbul, Turkey.

de Jong, E. J., & Bearse, C. (2011). The same outcomes for all? High school students reflect on their two-way immersion program experiences. In D. J. Tedick, D. Christian, & T. Williams Fortune (Eds.), *Immersion education. Practices, policies and possibilities* (p. 104-122). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., & Al-Hoorie, A. (2017). The motivation foundation of learning languages other than global English: Theoretical issues and research directions. *The Modern Language Journal, 101*, 455-468. DOI 10.1111/modl.12408.

Echevarría, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. L. (2016). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Freeman, M. R., Shook, A., & Marian, V. (2016). Cognitive and emotional effects of bilingualism in adulthood. In E. Nicoladis & S. Montanari (Eds.), Bilingualism across the lifespan: Factors moderating language proficiency (pp. 285-303). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. DOI 10.1037/14939-016.

García, O. (2015). What do educators need to know about language as they make decisions about Common Core State Standards implementation? In G. Valdes, K. Menkin, & M. Castro (Eds.), *Common Core bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators* (pp. 47-49). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.

Gibbons, P. (2015). *Scaffolding language scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Gottlieb, M., & Ernst Slavit, G. (2014). *Academic language in diverse classrooms*. English Language Arts Series. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Hamayan, E., Genesee, F., & Cloud, N. (2013). *Dual language instruction from a-z: Practical guidance for teachers and administrators.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Himmele, P., & Himmele, W. (2017). *Total participation techniques: Making every student an active learner.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Hopewell, S., & Escamilla, K. (2015). How does a holistic perspective on (bi/multi)literacy help educators address the demands of the Common Core State Standards for English language learners/emergent bilinguals? In G. Valdes, K. Menkin, & M. Castro (Eds.), *Common Core bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators* (pp. 39-40). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.

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

Immordino-Yang, M. H., & Gottlieb, R. (2017). Embodied brains, social minds, cultural meaning: Integrating neuroscientific and educational research on social-affective development. *American Educational Research Journal (54)*1S, 344S-367S. DOI 10.3102/0002831216669780.

Klingelhofer, R. R., & Schleppegrell, M. (2016). Functional grammar analysis in support of dialogic instruction with text: Scaffolding purposeful, cumulative dialogue with English learners. *Research Papers in Education, 31*(1), 70-88. DOI 10.1080/02671522.2016.1106701.

Kroll, J. F., & Bialystok, E. (2013). Understanding the consequences of bilingualism for language processing and cognition. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology, 25,* 499-514.

Lachance, J. (2017). Case studies of dual language teachers: Conceptualizations on the complexities of biliteracy for teacher preparation. *NYS TESOL Journal.4*(2), 48-65.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice. 18*(7), 641-654. DOI 10.1080/13803611.2012.718488.

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2016). Bilingualism and academic achievement in children in dual language programs. In E. Nicoladis & S. Montanari (Eds.), *Bilingualism across the*

lifespan: Factors moderating language proficiency (pp. 203-223). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Nuñez, I., & Palmer, D. (2016). Who will be bilingual? A critical discourse analysis of a Spanish-English pair. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 14*(4), 294-319. DOI 10.1080/15427587.2016.1266266

Schleppegrell, M. J. (2013). The role of metalanguage in supporting academic language development. *Language Learning, 63* (Suppl. 1), 153-170.

Sousa, D. (2017). *How the brain learns* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Swain, M., & Lampkin, S. (2013). A Vygotskian sociocultural perspective on immersion education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-based Language Education, 2*(2), 165-180. DOI 10.1075/jicb.1.1.05swa.

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity [SCALE]. (2014). *Recommended professional performance standard*. Retrieved from http://www.edtpa.com/PageView.aspx?f=GEN_PerformanceStandard.html.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2012). *Dual language education for a transformed world.* Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walqui, A., & van Lier, L. (2010). *Scaffolding: The academic success of adolescent English language learners.* Danvers, MA: WestEd.

Wong Fillmore, L. (2014). English language learners at the crossroads of education reform. *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(3), 624-632.

Zwiers, J. (2014). *Building academic language: Meeting Common Core across disciplines* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Zwiers, J., & Crawford, M. (2011). *Academic conversations: Classroom talk that fosters critical thinking and content understandings.* Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Standard Four: Authentic Assessment in Dual Language

Research widely supports the importance of authentic assessment with language learners (Gottlieb, 2016; Solano-Flores, 2016). At the same time, literature universally acknowledges the vast challenges associated with authentic assessment given the academic, linguistic, programmatic, sociocultural, and socioemotional complexities of all dual language learners (Collier & Thomas, 2007, 2009; García, 2009; Umansky & Reardon, 2014; Wong Fillmore, 2014). A crucial aspect of effective dual language programs requires that specific emphasis be

given to systems of assessment that truly reflect what students know about content and language, avoiding diluted interpretations of learners' performance due to the use of monolingual assessments (Hopewell & Escamilla, 2014). Dual language programs require teachers to be fully prepared to design and implement formative and summative assessments that sincerely capture inclusive information. Teacher candidates need to display competencies showing that they can use and interpret relevant multimeasures to avoid relying solely on large-scale assessments for informed dual language practices (Beeman & Urow, 2013; Escamilla et al., 2013; Gottlieb, 2016; Herrera, Cabral, & Murry, 2013). To this point, authentic assessment in dual language programs must allow teacher candidates to consider the measurement of content-based language progression and discourse patterns as well as the academic and social conventions shared by dual language learners and their teachers (Solano-Flores, 2016). Ultimately, teacher candidates need preparation to understand the distinct relationships between the assessment of academic language development, biliteracy acquisition, and grade-level content concepts in two languages that ultimately shape and reshape dual language instruction (Lachance, 2017a; Solano-Flores, 2016; WIDA, 2007, 2012).

Standard Four, Authentic Assessment in Dual Language and its four components signify the genuine symbiosis between highly specialized pedagogies and authentic assessment measures within the unique multidimensional aspects of dual language learning. The premise for Standard Four is that teacher candidates must be prepared to authentically and holistically assess dual language learners for specific purposes, including program evaluation, using multiple, intricate measures with multilingualism in mind. Authentic assessment in dual language is fundamentally informed by principles of additive biliteracy development, pedagogy and instructional design, as

well as holistic, formative and summative multilingual assessments inclusive of learners with special needs.

Dual Language Learners and Monolingual Assessments

In addition to the challenges associated with the national shortage of dual language teachers, educators also continue to find themselves cemented in an era of high-stakes testing in which there is grave concern about the validity of standardized measures with multilanguage learners (Abedi & Linquanti 2012; Bailey & Wolfe, 2012; Escamilla, Chávez, & Vigil, 2005; Lachance, 2017b). While some progress can be noted since researchers and practitioners agree on the importance of rigor and dual academic language development across the content areas, discouraging voids in equal and equitable authentic assessment options in language-rich dual language programs still exist (Howard et al., 2018; Lindholm-Leary, 2012). This widespread gap and its implications are noteworthy given the current national emphasis on K-12 Common Core State Standards along with globalized College and Career Readiness multilingual goals (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2013; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2013; U.S. Department of Education Office of English Language Acquisition [USDE OELA], 2015; Walqui, 2015).

Dual language programs remain significantly challenged with systemic parameters that "lock in" schools to show students' language development and growth using assessment measures intended to capture grade-level competencies from what some argue is a perpetually monoglossic perspective (García, 2009). With this in mind, by way of a fractured accountability system, many dual language programs are forced to function with insufficient time parameters and questionable tools to accurately describe the broad range of successful dual language development and the limited testing conducted in languages other than English (Escamilla et al., 2013; Howard et al., 2018). The work of Soltero-González, Escamilla, and Hopewell (2012) and

Hopewell and Escamilla (2013) provides a clear picture of how bilingual/biliterate learners are often inappropriately assessed as if they were two monolinguals within one bilingual student when subjected to labels based on assessments created for native speakers of English. An example scenario is presented here as an adapted version of the research.

> *Cristina is learning about the parts of the human cell in her middle school science class, with Spanish as the language of instruction. Even though her teacher provides opportunities for her to take science tests in Spanish, the program's site administers end-of-grade tests in English. This means Cristina's measure of progress about science will be measured separately in both languages. As a result, she unauthentically appears to know less in both languages (see Figure 1).*

	Science Vocabulary in Spanish for Spanish Assessment	Science Vocabulary in English for English Assessment	Total Science Vocabulary
Cristina (bilingual)	25	25	50
John (English only)		26	26

Figure 1: Performance Interpretation (adapted from Hopewell & Escamilla, 2013)

This scenario reveals the need for dual language teacher candidates to demonstrate abilities to effectively design and administer inclusive content-based assessments as well as to collect, analyze, interpret, and report on a broad range of student assessment data. Candidates must also demonstrate the ability to create and consider formative assessments and, how they relate to broader systems of accountability and program evaluation.

Formative Assessment in Engaged Teaching and Learning

Standard Four, like the other Standards, makes conceptual connections to the importance of dual language learners' engaged learning through active participation in daily learning

experiences. Soltero-Flores (2016) presents the importance of both formal and informal formative assessments in language learning. The research contends that formative assessments in language learning must be social by design, providing learners with opportunities to engage with each other while also facilitating teachers' multiple points of reference to measure students' contextual use of language (p. 106). Furthermore, and importantly, formative assessments provide ample ways for teachers and learners to set learning targets that promote learners' self-assessments. Such formative assessments give students increased clarity regarding learning expectations, so that, with appropriate, meaningful teacher feedback, they are able to review and reflect upon their own progress.

From the teacher candidates' perspectives, formative assessment with dual language learners as a communication process is vital to inform instructional design and delivery (Ruiz-Primo, Solano-Flores, & Li, 2014). Trends in education indicate an over-emphasis on the use of assessments for grading; teacher candidates must focus on the importance of assessment as an authentic source of information that must be used to inform pedagogy (Linquanti, 2012).

Standard Four Components, Crosswalks, and Program Assessment

Connections to PK-12 Student Learning

PK-12 schools remain in an era of high-stakes testing whereby systems give considerable emphasis to classroom, school, district, and state-level assessments for myriad decision-making processes. The aspects of teachers employing a wide range of assessment data directly connects to PK-student learning in Standard 4 as EPPs are obliged to prepare teachers for data-based shaping and re-shaping instructional practices in content-based dual language programs. With multi-sourced, authentic assessment data in mind teachers can implement corresponding, informed pedagogical approaches that aim to directly address dual language learners' academic, linguistic, and sociocultural needs. Simultaneously, data-informed teachers may support dual language programmatic needs for increased student outcomes.

The Standard

Teacher candidates are prepared to authentically and holistically assess dual language learners for specific purposes using multiple measures that are informed by principles of biliteracy development, equity and advocacy, and to use holistic multilingual assessments that include learners with special needs. Candidates can demonstrate abilities to effectively design and administer inclusive formative and summative content-based assessments as to collect, analyze, interpret, and report on a broad range of student assessment data, including technology-based sources. Candidates can also demonstrate the ability to consider systems of accountability and program evaluation.

CAEP Principles: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE, CONTENT, THE LEARNER AND LEARNING, PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Crosswalks

DL Guiding Principles:	Strand 4
InTASC:	Standard 2, Standard 6, Standard 7, Standard 9
TESOL Standards:	Standard 4: Assessment and Evaluation
ACTFL Standards:	Standard 5: Assessment of Languages and Cultures

Components

Component 4.1. Assessment and Biliteracy
CONTENT; INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE

Candidates demonstrate and apply a holistic, authentic assessment of language progression and content development to shape pedagogical practices for biliteracy with dual language learners.

Supporting Explanation

Candidates demonstate knowledge of assessing biliteracy and how to use multiple, inclusive, holistic, valid, and reliable measures to assess literacy development, oral language development, and content-concepts in both the partner language and in English. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of complex, early literacy patterns with emerging bilinguals, English learners, and other multilingual learners including those with special needs, and apply knowledge of how systems of assessment change along the continuum with adolescents and young adults for long-term biliteracy development.

Component 4.2 Assessment and Equity
THE LEARNER AND LEARNING

The candidate applies assessment principles reflective of the language and power dynamics within assessment systems, including classroom-based, standardized, and language proficiency assessments to promote language equality and equity with dual language learners.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates apply knowledge of the nuances and relationships among accessibility, accuracy, reliability, and validity in large-scale, state-approved standardized tests, including misuse of translated tests. Candidates demonstrate skills and knowledge related to assessment and equity, including dual language learners' myriad, complex academic, linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural attributes that impact the assessment processes. Candidates demonstrate and apply knowledge of critical advocacy for equal and equitable assessment practices to reflect the measurement of a broad range of dual language learners' outcomes of content knowledge, and sociocultural competencies, even within the confines of high-stakes, monoglossic assessment systems.

Component 4.3. Assessment and Variation
INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE

Candidates apply knowledge of varying classroom-based formative, summative, and diagnostic assessments used with dual language learners to authentically capture learner outcomes for language and content development.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the purpose, structures, and interpretation of results of formative, summative, and diagnostic assessments and apply the knowledge to shape pedagogical practices to support content and language learning in both the partner language and English. Candidates demonstrate and apply knowledge of the nuances associated with biliteracy testing, evaluation, and assessment in dual language, including adaptive technology, accessibility and appropriate accommodations for language learning and special needs.

Component 4.4. Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability
PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Candidates apply the use of multiple measures and data sets for specific and leadership purposes to articulate learner and programmatic success with dual language programs.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the relationships among authentic assessment, program evaluation, and national, state, and local accountability systems. Candidates apply knowledge of collecting, analyzing, and reporting appropriate assessment data and data management skills aligned with biliteracy development, dual language programmatic features, and national, state, and local systems of accountability to accurately depict students' progress for advocacy.

Candidates apply knowledge of growth and progression in content-based learning and biliteracy development in both the partner language and English.

Program Assessment

Standard Four and its components are largely met using Assessment 2 (Content and Authentic Assessment Portfolio), Assessment 3 (Dual Language Teaching Internship Portfolio); and Assessment 6 (Dual Language Professional Development Project).

Program evidences for candidates' attainment of Standard Four:

- Assessments are required of all candidates.
- Assessments and corresponding data (charts, evidences, artifacts, etc.) are aligned with all four components.
- Rubrics and assessment criteria are clearly specific to standard component(s).
- Assessment rubrics are designed with distinguishable levels of candidates' performance.
- Data reports are rubric aligned to delineate candidates' performance levels.

Standard 4 References

Abedi, J., & Linquanti, R. (2012). *Issues and opportunities in improving the quality of large scale assessment systems for English language learners*. Stanford, CA: Understanding Language. Retrieved from https://ell.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/pdf/academic-papers/07-Abedi%20Linquanti%20Issues%20and%20Opportunities%20FINAL.pdf.

Bailey, A., & Wolf, M. (2012). *The challenge of assessing language proficiency aligned to the Common Core State Standards and some possible solutions*. Stanford, CA: Understanding Language. Retrieved from https://ell.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/pdf/academic-papers/08-Bailey%20Wolf%20Challenges%20of%20Assessment%20Language%20Proficiency%20FINAL_0.pdf.

Beeman, K., & Urow, C. (2013). *Teaching for biliteracy: Strengthening bridges between languages.* Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.

Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2007). Predicting second language academic success in English using the Prism Model. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching, Part 1* (pp. 333-348). New York: Springer.

Collier, V. P. & Thomas, W. P. (2009). *Educating English learners for a transformed world.* Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

Dove, M. G., & Honigsfeld, A. (2013). *Common Core for the not-so-common learner, Grades K-5: English language arts strategies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Escamilla, K., Chávez, L., & Vigil, P. (2005). Rethinking the gap: High-stakes testing and Spanish-speaking students in Colorado. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(2), 1-13.

Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., Butvilofsky, S., Sparrow, W., Soltero-Gonzalez, L., Ruiz-Figueroa, O., & Escamilla, M. (2013). *Biliteracy from the start.* Philadelphia: Caslon.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective.* West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gottlieb, M. (2016). *Assessing English language learners: Bridges to educational equity.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Herrera, S. G., Cabral, R. M., & Murry, K. G. (2013). *Assessment accommodations for classroom teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse students* (2nd ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. (2013). *Common core for the not-so-common learner, Grades 6-12: English language arts strategies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Hopewell, S., & Escamilla, K. (2013). Struggling reader or emerging biliterate student? Reevaluating the criteria for labeling emerging bilingual students as low achieving. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *46*(1), 68–89.

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

Lachance, J. (2017a). Case studies of dual language teachers: Conceptualizations on the complexities of biliteracy for teacher preparation. *NYS TESOL Journal.4*(2), 48-65.

Lachance, J. (2017b). A case study of dual language program administrators: The teachers we need. *International Journal of Educational Leadership. 12*(1), 1-18.

Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2012). Successes and challenges in dual language education. *Education, Theory Into Practice, 51*(4), 256-262.

Linquanti, R. (2012). *Supporting formative assessment for deeper learning: A primer for policymakers*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Ruiz-Primo, M. A., Solano-Flores, G., & Li, M. (2014). Formative assessment as a process of interaction through language: A framework for the inclusion of English language learners. In C. Wyatt-Smith, V. Klenowski, & P. Colbert (Eds.), *Developing assessment for quality learning: The enabling power of assessment, Vol 1*. (pp. 265–282). Dordrecht: Springer.

Solano-Flores, G. (2016). *Assessing English language learners: Theory and practice.* New York: Routledge.

Soltero-González, L., Escamilla, K., & Hopewell, S. (2012). Changing teachers' perceptions about the writing abilities of emerging bilingual students: Toward a holistic bilingual perspective on writing assessment. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *15*(1), 71–94.

Umansky, L., & Reardon, S. (2014). Reclassifying patterns among Latino English learner students in bilingual, dual immersion, and English immersion classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal, 51,* 871-912.

U.S. Department of Education Office of English Language Acquisition (USDE OELA). (2015). *Dual language education programs: Current state policies and practices*. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oela/resources.html.

Walqui, A. (2015). What do educators need to know about language as they make decisions about Common Core State Standards implementation? In G. Valdés, K. Menken, & M. Castro (Eds.), *Common Core, bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators* (p. 49–50). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.

Wong Fillmore, L. (2014). English language learners at the crossroads of education reform. *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(3), 624-632.

World-class Instructional Design and Assessment [WIDA]. (2012). *The 2012 amplification of the English language development standards, kindergarten to grade 12.* Madison, WI: Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin on behalf of the WIDA Consortium.

World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment [WIDA]. (2007). *English language proficiency standards and resource guide, prekindergarten through grade 12.* Madison, WI: Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin on behalf of the WIDA Consortium.

Standard 5: Professionalism, Advocacy, and Agency

As the authors of this document have laid out in the introduction and each of the previous standards, the candidate must develop critical consciousness (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017) by understanding the histories of the learners, their families and communities within the broader society and bringing this knowledge to bear on addressing inequities in dual language programs. More specifically, researchers have taken the position that white native-English-speaking children enrolled in a dual language program are benefiting more than the emergent bilingual learners for whom the program was originally intended. This situation has readily been linked to the cautionary note set forth by Valdes (1997) over two decades ago.

Advocacy and Agency

The present standard anchored to professionalism is primarily aimed at preparing the candidate to *act* on this critical consciousness, or, as Cervantes-Soon et al. (2017) endorse, to combat inequalities in two-way language immersion programs in order to push the field of dual language education toward more equitable learning spaces for both groups of learners, their families, and their communities. To act or to engage in such combat entails advocacy and agency, however. Athanases and de Oliveira (2007) characterize advocacy in the following manner:

> This concept of advocate for equity relates to those teachers as change agents who critically examine school conditions and work to create empowering school cultures for students of color (Banks, 1995); develop commitment and skills to make change (Villegas & Lucas, 2002); and engage as activists for more equitable urban schooling (Oakes, Franke, Quartz, & Rogers, 2002). In such views the teacher takes action—on behalf of students underserved or on the academic margins—to re-envision teaching and school policies and practices to meet all students' needs. (p. 125)

The basis for bilingual teacher advocacy and agency can be traced to the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) (1974, p. 6) calling for bilingual education teachers to understand the significant role that the community and families play in the educational process and to act on this understanding. Under Guideline VII. School-Community Relations, CAL recommended that bilingual/bicultural teachers serve as catalysts for the integration of diverse cultures within the community, acquire skills to facilitate basic contacts and interaction between the learner's family and school personnel, serve as facilitators for the exchange of information and views concerning the rationale, goals, and procedures for the instructional programs of the school, and demonstrate

leadership. Conversely, the National Association for Bilingual Education standards (1992) for preparing bilingual educators do not include explicit standards associated with advocacy.

More recently, Howard et al. (2018) make clear that families and communities are key to implementing an effective dual language program. Under Strand 6: Family and Community, the authors detail six related principles, each of which entails a number of key points. Briefly, some of the points speak directly to addressing issues associated with managing power of one group over another, maintaining shared governance, ensuring equitable participation by families, empowering parents, and pursuing social justice. Other scholars have been especially transparent about the key role that family and community involvement play in creating and maintaining an effective and socially just dual language program (Izquierdo & Espitia Mendoza, 2017).

In an effort to more deeply understand teacher advocacy, Dubetz and de Jong (2011) examined 30 empirical studies describing examples of teacher advocacy for emergent bilingual learners. They highlight that advocacy emphasizes action and activism, enacted at the individual and collective levels. The studies centered on pedagogy, curriculum, and language matters as well as instances of advocacy at the school, district, and family and community levels. In the studies beyond the classroom, the authors report that few details were provided with regard to how the acts were planned or implemented. They also point out that teacher educators need to help teachers develop the skills to manage confrontation and conflict, especially when engaging with more powerful constituencies (e.g., school administrators, veteran colleagues).

Becoming a Professional Collaborator

Athanases & de Oliveira (2007) offer valuable insight into how programs might prepare teachers to advocate. Their study examined the ways a credential program prepared teachers to advocate for equity in schools. Stated as an explicit program goal, the role of advocate for equity

entailed becoming a reflective practitioner, an inquirer into one's own practice, and a professional collaborator. Program graduates traced the advocacy they engaged into assignments and experiences embedded in course work and apprenticeships, as well as the provision of role models as advocates. What can be drawn from the study is that the targeted experiences need to vary in terms of the contextual level where they unfold (e.g., classroom, program, school, community, state), the participants involved (e.g., students, parents, teachers, administrators), and their substance (e.g., issues related to language, curriculum, pedagogy, evaluation, resources, services, policy).

Athanases and de Oliveira (2007) highlight that managing conflicts and confrontations entails varying degrees of risk (e.g., being labeled a trouble maker, retaliation from veteran faculty, formal reprimand, loss of job), and teacher candidates need to understand this clearly. Study participants felt particularly underprepared for managing confrontation and conflict with parents and other educators. The researchers recommend that programs explore the use of role-playing within varied scenarios to prepare the teacher candidates. While not directly addressing the preparation of dual language teachers, Cervantes-Soon et al. (2017) propose problem-posing as espoused by Freire (2007) for reframing two way immersion spaces with the goal of examining power relations and oppressive conditions.

Managing Cultural Nuances

It is important to keep in mind that dual language contexts are clearly challenged by inequities and matters of power relations (see, e.g., Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Palmer & Martinez, 2013), but that these challenges sometimes blur the roles of race, culture, and even language. Guerrero and Guerrero (2017) clearly point out that the prospective dual language teachers they studied in the Texas-Mexico borderlands, who were primarily Mexican-American,

encountered a variety of inequities being perpetrated by Mexican-American certified bilingual education teachers. Consequently, role playing or problem posing must take this very complex dynamic into consideration; a candidate needs to be prepared to confront and do battle with individuals who may share the same racial and cultural orientations, including language abilities. Clearly, this challenge is different from confronting an Anglo mainstream teacher opposed to dual language education. On the other hand, it is similar to a situation where a Latino parent of a monolingual English-speaking child confronts a bilingual Latino dual language teacher.

Moreover, it is important to bear in mind that varying cultures may approach problem solving or conflicts in different ways, again even among seemingly similar cultures (Holt & DeVore, 2005; Kim, Wang, Kondo, & Kim, 2007). Boyle et al. (2015) report that while the vast majority of dual language programs in the United States were Spanish-English, programs were also being offered in 29 other languages, including Chinese, Navajo, Arabic, Russian and French Creole. Thus, candidates ought to have the opportunity to explore and reflect on the ways in which the varying cultures associated with their local contexts might manage conflict (e.g., stances associated with smoothing, withdrawing, compromising, forcing, or problem-solving).

Transcending Combat

While the candidate must be prepared to combat inequalities in two-way language immersion programs and to manage cross-culturally hued conflicts in defense of the oppressed (Athanases & de Oliveira, 2008; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017), learning how to pursue peaceful resolutions to inequities would make for a more sophisticated and better prepared candidate. Perhaps it is not beyond the possibilities of dual language teacher preparation to integrate peace pedagogies (Cook, 2014) into the experiences of the candidates. These pedagogies are much in line with what has already been surveyed under this standard. As Cook explains,

> In peace education, students are expected to listen to and understand the views of others, especially where these views contrast with their own (Pike & Selby, 2000; Wahlstrom, 1992). Beyond the interpersonal level, pedagogies of critical peace building democratic citizenship requires practice discussing "conflictual global and local multicultural issues and viewpoints" (Bickmore, 2007, p. 238), and to "embrace dialogical, problem-posing, and participatory/praxis methods; multiple, varied and alternative viewpoints and content; and flattened organizational structures that foster collaboration and connection rather than hierarchy and compartmentalization" (Hantzopoulos, 2011, p. 225). (p. 503)

La Paz Community School in Costa Rica represents a case in point. In this dual language school the students pursue the following peace practices:

- Develop the self into a peaceful, lifelong learner by improving physical and mental well-being through critical thought and extension of comfortable limits.
- Cultivate peace amongst family and community by disseminating and sharing love and compassion.
- Create peace within the community by preserving the environment and respecting the delicate balance between local and foreign cultures.
- Spread peace throughout the world by effectively communicating thoughts and ideas as well as actively listening to all perspectives.

(La Paz Community School, 2018)

In sum, while preparing candidates to engage in combat is critical, equipping candidates with some of the pedagogies to build peace—and potentially better global citizens—would complete the candidates' initial preparation.

Standard Five Components, Crosswalks, and Program Assessment

Connections to PK-12 Student Learning

Dual language teachers will be in leadership positions in addition to their classroom contexts. Specifically, they serve as "the voice of advocacy" for dual language learners. In connection with PK-12 student learning, they will need advanced knowledge and skills to explain, describe, and articulate students' outcomes and progression in the program, all with ideological clarity. Leadership in this fashion is crucial as some dual language learners will be at risk of uniformed retention or program omission. Furthermore, dual language teachers are in leadership positions whereby critical consciousness and cultural awareness support teaching and learning ideologies related to peaceful pedagogies, trauma awareness, and global citizenship.

The Standard

Teacher candidates understand that part of their professional responsibility will be to advocate for learners and act on their behalf in order to address matters of inequities and conflicts. The candidates understand that said matters might be rooted in different contexts, involve different participants, and entail potential risks. Thus, the candidates have practiced a range of conflict management strategies and have insight into cultural preferences for managing and resolving conflicts within and between two cultural groups. The candidates also understand that the goal of advocacy and agency is not solely anchored to resolving the conflict but also to pursuing peace through the application of peaceful pedagogies in the classroom setting with the goal of assisting learners to become better global citizens.

CAEP Principles: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE, THE LEARNER AND LEARNING, PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Crosswalks

DL Guiding Principles:	Strand 5, Strand 6, Strand 7
InTASC:	Standard 3, Standard 5, Standard 9, Standard 10
TESOL Standards:	Standard 5: Professionalism and Leadership
ACTFL Standards:	Standard 6: Professional Development, Advocacy, and Ethics

Components

Component 5.1 Cultural Sense
THE LEARNER AND LEARNING; PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of and apply broad ranges of advocacy and agency and, can explain how advocacy and agency may take on different forms depending on people's cultural orientations.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates practice self-relation to past personal experiences with school-based inequities and/or privilege that can be linked but not limited to race, culture, language, class, special needs, and gender. Candidates apply theoretically based knowledge to identify and summarize the similarities and differences in cultural practices among dual language program cultural groups. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of cultural sense within the advocacy process. Meaning that advocating, confronting, speaking up, managing conflicts, taking risks, taking a stance, questioning authority, or exercising one's agency can vary across cultures, social classes, race, ethnicity, gender, and immigration status.

Component 5.2 Advocacy and Pedagogy
THE LEARNER AND LEARNING; INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

Candidates engage in a valid interpretation of a past inequity or conflict anchored to dual language education and/or the profession.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates analyze theoretically based past examples of teacher and/or educator advocacy and agency from myriad sources (research articles, judicial cases, mass media, and other relevant media), to describe context, risks, strategies used to address inequity, related challenges, and a critical assessment of outcomes. Candidates apply knowledge of a variety of problems or conflicts, within varied levels of contexts, audiences (e.g., students, peer teachers, supervisors, parents), and levels of risk to render and explain informed positions including critical reflections for alternative approaches to the problem. Candidates design lessons aimed at promoting the development of learners' critical consciousness, their ability to manage inequities and conflicts, overcoming trauma, and their embrace of the possibility of creating a more just society using problem-posing, social justice, and/or peace-based pedagogies.

Component 5.3. Identifying and Resolving Inequity
PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY; INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE

Candidates engage in identifying and proposing theoretically based resolutions to a current inequity or conflict anchored to dual language education and the local school community at varying points in the EPP.

Supporting Explanation

Candidates engage in clinical experiences, field work, and supervised student teaching to identify and describe an inequity in the local school community. Candidates apply knowledge of key stakeholders, data collection, data analysis, collaboration strategies, and potential risks to create and practice a theoretically based plan of action with cooperating educators and supervising faculty. Candidates use feedback from cooperating educators and supervising faculty to practice the application of plans of action in the program's partner language(s) and engage in critical reflection to honor their positions as advocates by proposing alternative approaches for resolution.

Program Assessment

Standard Five and its components are largely met using Assessment 3 (Dual Language Teaching Internship Portfolio); Assessment 4 (Thematic Unit of Instruction); and Assessment 6 (Dual Language Professional Development Project).

Program evidences for candidates' attainment of Standard Five:

- Assessments are required of all candidates.
- Assessments and corresponding data (charts, evidences, artifacts, etc.) are aligned with all four components.
- Rubrics and assessment criteria are clearly specific to standard component(s).
- Assessment rubrics are designed with distinguishable levels of candidates' performance.
- Data reports are rubric aligned to delineate candidates' performance levels.

Standard 5 References

Athanases, S., & de Oliveira, C. (2007). Conviction, confrontation, and risk in new teachers' advocating for equity. *Teaching Education, 18*, 123–136.

Athanases, S., & de Oliveira, C. (2008). Advocacy for equity in classrooms and beyond: New teachers' challenges and responses. *Teachers College Record, 110*, 64-104.

Banks, J. (1995). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. A. Banks & C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 3–49). New York: Macmillan.

Bickmore, K. (2007). Linking global with local: Cross-cultural conflict education in urban Canadian schools. In F. Leach & M. Dunne (Eds.), *Education, conflict and reconciliation: International perspectives* (pp. 237–252). Oxford, UK: Peter Lang.

Boyle, A., August, D., Tabaku, L., Cole, S., & Simpson-Baird, A. (2015). *Dual language education programs: Current state policies and practices*. U.S. Department of Education Office of English Language Acquisition. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.

Center for Applied Linguistics. (1974). *Guidelines for the preparation and certification of teachers of bilingual bicultural education*. Arlington, VA: Author.

Cervantes-Soon, C., Dorner, L., Palmer, D., Heiman, D., Schwerdtfeger, R., & Choi, J. (2017). Combating inequalities in two-way language immersion programs: Toward critical consciousness in bilingual education spaces. *Review of Research in Education*, 41, 403–427.

Cook, S. (2014). Reflections of a peace educator: The power and challenges of peace education with pre-service teachers. *Curriculum Inquiry, 44*, 489-507. https://doi.org/10.1111/curi.12058

Dubetz, N., & de Jong, E. (2011). Teacher advocacy in bilingual programs. *Bilingual Research Journal, 34*, 248-262. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2011.623603

Freire, P. (2007). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Continuum.

Guerrero, M., & Guerrero, M. (2017). Competing discourses of academic Spanish in the Texas-Mexico borderlands. *Bilingual Research Journal, 40*, 5-19. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2016.1273150

Hantzopoulos, M. (2011). Institutionalizing critical peace education in public schools: A case for comprehensive implementation. *Journal of Peace Education,* 8, 225–242.

Holt, J., & DeVore, C. (2005). Culture, gender, organizational role, and styles of conflict resolution: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*, 165-196.

Izquierdo, E., & Espitia Mendoza, V. (2017). La educación de lenguaje dual: una reforma educativa. In M. Guerrero, M. Guerrero, L. Soltero-Gonzalez, & K. Escamilla (Eds.),

Abriendo brecha: Antología crítica sobre la educación bilingüe de doble inmersión. Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

Kim, T., Wang, C., Kondo, M., & Kim, T. (2007). Conflict management styles: The differences among the Chinese, Japanese and Koreans. *International Journal of Conflict Management,18*, 23-41.

La Paz Community School. (2018). The peace practices. Retrieved from https://www.lapazsch.ool.org/we-are-la-paz/about-la-paz/the-la-paz-peace-practices/.

National Association of Bilingual Education (NABE). (1992). *Professional standards for the preparation of bilingual/multicultural teachers*. Washington, DC: Author.

Oakes, J., Franke, M. L., Quartz, K. H., & Rogers, J. (2002). Research for high-quality urban teaching: Defining it, developing it, assessing it. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*, 228–234.

Palmer, D., & Martinez, R. (2013). Teacher agency in bilingual spaces: A fresh look at preparing teachers to educate Latina/o bilingual children. *Review of Research in Education*, *37*, 269-297. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X12463556

Pike, G., & Selby, D. (2000). *Global teacher, global learner.* Toronto, ON: Pippin.

Valdés, G. (1997). Dual language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*, 391–429.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53,* 20–32.

Wahlstrom, R. (1992). The challenge of peace education: Replacing cultures of militarism. In E. Boulding (Ed.), *New agendas for peace research: Conflict and security re-examined* (pp. 171–184). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Standard 6: Program Design and Curricular Leadership

As the numbers and types of PK-12 dual language programs continue to increase exponentially nationwide, Standard Six makes full circle connections both literally and figuratively as it relates to the other five Standards. With the Standards' goals of providing a solid framework for preparing highly qualified dual language teachers who are grounded in the pillars of academic achievement, bilingualism/biliteracy, sociocultural competencies, and critical consciousness, Standard Six is vital in its capacity to bring sound yet malleable structures to dual

language programs. This Domain includes components to establish candidates' conceptual and demonstrable constructs in the areas of program design, partner languages and time, dual language learner variation, and curricular leadership for assets-based language learning.

Standard Six also strategically provides an arena to support dual language program designs that work in conjunction with myriad partner languages and the families and communities they serve. The U.S. Department of Education's Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA) has indicated that, while the majority of dual language programs couple Spanish and English as the languages learners use to develop literacy and content, 30 partner languages are used in dual language programs in the United States (OELA, 2015). After Spanish, Mandarin Chinese is the most frequently reported partner language in dual language programs, representing the nearly nine million Mandarin speakers worldwide (Thomas & Collier, 2017). In addition to OELA, several other comprehensive resources outline the scope of dual language programs in the United States. Combining calculations from the national Dual Language Program Directory (CAL, 2017), Dual Language Schools, and other sources suggests that nearly 2,500 dual language programs currently exist, with more two-way immersion programs being established annually (Thomas & Collier, 2017). Other prevalent partner languages include Arabic, French, Japanese, German, Korean, Hmong, and Russian. Most significantly, 12 states report Indigenous languages as partner languages (also referred to Native American in some states), including Arapahoe, Cherokee, Crow, Navajo, Lakota, and Shoshone. Therefore, Standard Six and the other five Standards take the broad scope of partner languages into consideration with dual language teacher preparation (CAL, 2017).

Program Design: Students, Families, and Communities at the Heart of Dual Language

National reports continue to indicate that dual language program design parameters vary greatly from state to state, with many key decisions left to district and school stakeholders (OELA, 2015). It is also important for teacher educators to be deeply mindful of the tumultuous and marginalizing history of bilingual education in the United States. Far too many communities and families continue to live in the shadows of punishments from the English-only movement, demoralized by and disempowered from being bilingual (Aquino-Sterling, Rodriguez-Valls, & Outes, 2017; Gándara & Hopkins, 2010). It therefore stands to reason that dual language teachers will experience dual language programs that are highly contextual based on the state, district, school, and community where the program resides. Dual language learners themselves have mixed levels of empowerment as bilinguals, and all of their parents play key roles in their community schools. Candidates must be prepared to involve families, advocating for parental involvement even when additional resources are needed for immigrant parents to fully participate (Izquierdo & Mendoza, 2017). Furthermore, candidates must be prepared for programs that are situated as a strand within a school, with some student populations being bused in from locations across town. Other programs may be school-wide, also with community and non-community learners. Ultimately, these programs are vastly different from one another with regard to the families and communities where they reside. In any case, the NDLETPS recognize the need for candidates' preparation to attend to many options for dual language program design, beginning with the program type based on the learners, families, and communities to be served.

The four main types of dual language programs are the following:

- Developmental (also referred to as maintenance) bilingual programs that mostly serve learners who primarily speak the partner language

- One-way immersion programs (also referred to as foreign language immersion) that mainly serve native speakers of English
- Heritage language programs to serve learners whose primary language is English, but who come from families and groups that are dominant in the partner language
- Two-way (bilingual) immersion programs, which aim to serve a balance of native speakers of the partner language and native speakers of English (Howard et al., 2018).

While these National Standards are fundamentally geared toward preparing teachers to support the design and sustainability of two-way immersion programs, it should be noted that they are fully intended to also present structural tenets with sufficient flexibility to inform teacher preparation programs that serve the broad range of program types.

More specifically, teacher candidates will need to demonstrate readiness to provide informed consultancies with many stakeholders regarding well-designed two-way immersion dual language programs. School administrators, teacher colleagues, parents, and students themselves often look to dual language teachers with questions regarding the rationale for the "ideal" 50-50 balance between learners who are native speakers of the partner language and learners who are native speakers of English. The candidates must therefore be comfortably versed in the rule of practice, also demonstrating praxis from Standard One on biliteracy. Additionally, given programmatic variations even within two-way immersion programs, candidates must be prepared to present counter-arguments regarding program composition that includes more than two-thirds of either learner population, clarifying how such a configuration veers away from the benefits of two-way immersion program design. In all cases for two-way immersion, candidates must be disposed to articulate the principles of authentic dual language

learner interactions for additive bilingualism and biliteracy, standards-based accelerated learning and equal and equitable linguistic practices.

A crucially important lateral aspect of program design in Standard Six relates to candidates' encounters with the programmatic span of dual language education. While programs exist at elementary, middle grades, and high school levels, the national trend continues to position most dual language programs at the elementary level (CAL, 2017). However, research demonstrates the substantial benefits associated with two-way immersion in higher grades, as established in the prior five Standards. Even with the higher academic and linguistic demands of high stakes testing and graduation requirements, secondary dual language learners continue to demonstrate increased cognitive, metacognitive, metalinguistic, and culturally compatible outcomes, consequently justifying the goal of expanding middle and secondary programs (Collier & Thomas, 2012; de Jong & Bearse, 2011; Howard & Sugarman 2009; Lindholm-Leary 2012, 2014; Lindholm-Leary & Hernández, 2011).

Partner Languages and Time

Dual language teachers are frequently in a position to inform program stakeholders on the topic of time allocated for partner language and English language instruction. While dual language educators agree on the academic benefits of the program, beginning with the closure of the academic gap when compared to English-only students, many are still uninformed or misinformed about time allotments for partner languages. The idea that "more English" doesn't always result in higher test scores remains a subject of debate. Howard's & Sugarman's research (2009) on two-way immersion program models and the language of initial literacy presents details regarding the basic recommendations as well as variations in time allocations and program duration. Candidates will need preparation to distinguish between dual language

programs that range from 90/10, where the partner language is used for most of the school day across curricular areas, to 50/50, where the partner language and English are used for equal amounts of time. Additionally, they will have to clarify programmatic nuances that reveal approaches including team teaching versus self-contained classrooms. The candidates will also need to be well informed on programmatic changes to instructional times in the two languages, where the allocations may move from 80/20 through 70/30 and 60/40 before reaching the 50/50 allocation (Howard & Sugarman, 2009).

Another point of alignment with Standard One is the portion of Standard Six that focuses on the candidates' need to demonstrate understandings of the programmatic benefits and challenges of the three options for approaching initial literacy:

- All dual language learners begin reading in the partner language:
- All dual language learners begin reading in both languages simultaneously:
- All dual language learners begin reading in their native language first and then add literacy in the second language.

A key component of teacher preparation related to this topic and aligned with Standard Two also connects to articulating the contextual details to the families and communities these programs serve. Stakeholders with minoritized student populations at the forefront of advocacy agendas will need special reassurance regarding the benefits of two-way immersion and literacy instruction, including the realistic time spans required for academic gains. Likewise, many parents and community members, including those of native-English-speaking students, will benefit from candidates' explanations of the socioculturally relevant, critically conscious details in tandem with the brain-based literacy research to support the determined approach (Bialystok, 2011; Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013). With these details in mind, and also aligned with

Standard Four on Authentic Assessment, teacher candidates will need strong skills to articulate programmatic data on the successes and literacy progressions of their learners.

The Array of Dual Language Learners

As presented in the Introduction, the notion of superdiversity in the field of dual language learning is ever present. Scholars as well as practitioners in education are called to lead the charge in informing a broad audience about the variability within all-encompassing terms such as *diversity* or *multicultural* in the context of dual language programs. To this point, the majority of the English learners in U.S. schools are born in the United States (OELA, 2015). Furthermore, the widening population of emergent bilingual students represents multidimensional families and communities, all with deep-rooted sociocultural, racial, and linguistic ties to equal and equitable educational access (Potowski, 2007; Valdés, 2001). Dual language teacher preparation programs are in the vital position of facilitating candidates as advocates for all dual language learners.

Related to the wide array of dual language learners is the point that there will be great variation in students' backgrounds, regardless of their native languages. Some will have parents with high levels of education, who are employed in professional occupations, while others will have parents who completed high school or the equivalent and work in vocational fields. Some will have parents who were unable to complete their own primary school educations or who come from refugee populations. Additionally, dual language learners will come from a wide range of socioeconomic backgrounds and may or may not be attending a dual language school in the same community where they reside. Similarly, many teachers work in schools in communities apart from where they live, requiring them to be prepared to serve the school, its program, its students, and its parents in its actual context.

Finally, the array of dual language learners also shapes the ways in which dual language teachers demonstrate leadership, while simultaneously implementing district and state-led standards-based instruction. Leadership in this capacity also makes the connection to Standard Five with its focus on professionalism, advocacy, and agency. Given the rapid expansion and variation in dual language programs, dual language teacher candidates must be prepared to recognize the programmatic patterns of curriculum and instruction that support high-quality program implementation (Howard et al., 2018). Researchers, including Lindholm-Leary (2014), agree that dual language programs with positive academic and sociocultural results are contingent upon high-quality program design and implementation, especially when considering early literacy through the partner language. Dual language teachers are also positioned to inform others regarding the avoidance of elitist dual language programs that solely aim to serve language majority students (Gándara & Callahan, 2014). Dual language learners from many linguistic and sociocultural backgrounds, with teachers fully honoring the wide variety of family structures to facilitate rigorous curricular engagement, are the very heart of successful two-way immersion programs (Riojas-Cortez, 2017).

In conclusion, Standard Six, while presented in a linear, numerical fashion, embodies ties and connections to all of the other Standards. The authors present the Standard while also exhibiting its alignment with principles of bilingualism and biliteracy, sociocultural awareness, pedagogy and instructional practice, authentic assessment, professionalism and agency, and leveraged by critical consciousness.

Standard Six Components, Crosswalks, and Program Assessment

Connections to PK-12 Student Learning

In tandem with Standard 5, Standard 6 and its facets of leadership connect to PK-12 student learning to ensure high quality program design and implementation. As programmatic stakeholders dual language teachers work with school administrators that may be less familiar with dual language education principles. Therefore, teachers are looked upon to guide program development. Hence, EPPs aim to have candidates complete programs to then demonstrate critical consciousness and informed leadership, resulting in the shaping of quality programs that are framed to promote dual language learners' increased academic, linguistic, and sociocultural outcomes, including those with special needs.

The Standard

Candidates demonstrate critically informed professionalism and leadership by making recommendations regarding policies, procedures, and legislation related to dual language program and curricular design, relative to theoretical foundations of effective program components. Candidates apply knowledge of dual language program models and organizational structures; characteristics and components of high-quality models; factors and criteria that determine model selection appropriate to each school context and demographics; equity and advocacy in two-way programs; and stakeholder involvement and advocacy for program sustainability.

CAEP Principles: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE, THE LEARNER AND LEARNING, PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Crosswalks

DL Guiding Principles:	Strand 1, Strand 2, Strand 5, Strand 6
InTASC:	Standard 3, Standard 9, Standard 10
TESOL Standards:	Standard 5: Professionalism and Leadership
ACTFL Standards:	Standard 6: Professional Development, Advocacy, and Ethics

Components

Component 6.1. Program Design
THE LEARNER AND LEARNING; PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of a variety of dual language program designs and their role(s) within varying programs to leverage advocacy for accessibility of dual language programs for all, especially those from minoritized populations.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of a range of dual language program types and models and can describe the rationale for dual language program types and models to varying stakeholders, explaining benefits of the program for the context and demographics of a school, district, and community. Candidates demonstrate professionalism and leadership by engaging in collaborative practices for program sustainability and continuous professional development for engaged leadership in order to advocate for family and community participation in programmatic decision-making.

Component 6.2. Partner Language and Time
INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE

Candidates apply knowledge of dual language program designs with regard to language and time allocations and their impacts on instructional design, delivery, and assessment.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates collaborate with other educators to make informed recommendations about language and time allocations, available language assessments in the partner language and English, integration of socioculturally relevant curricula aligned with content areas for standards-based instruction based on research and theory. Candidates apply knowledge of vertical dual language program articulation, its developmental connections to biliteracy development, and strategic curricular planning to support the PK-12 continuum for biliteracy development.

Component 6.3. The Array of Dual Language Learners
THE LEARNER AND LEARNING; INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE

Candidates apply knowledge regarding the broad range of dual language learners, the benefits of dual language with diverse learners, and their roles as teachers to advocate for accessibility of dual language programs for all, especially those from minoritized populations.

Supporting Explanation
Candidates apply knowledge of learners' goals related to educator collaboration and program implementation across the PK-12 continuum. Candidates distinguish programmatic needs across grade-cluster levels, including secondary considerations for high school graduation and bilingual diplomas. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of linguistic and social power dynamics in two-way dual language programs, inclusive of student, parent, teacher, and administrator populations from different socioeconomic and sociocultural backgrounds, and engage in appropriate programmatic and curricular solutions to promote equitable access to dual language education.

Program Assessment

Standard Six and its components are largely met using Assessment 3 (Dual Language Teaching Internship Portfolio) and Assessment 6 (Dual Language Professional Development Project).

Program evidences for candidates' attainment of Standard Six:

- Assessments are required of all candidates.
- Assessments and corresponding data (charts, evidences, artifacts, etc.) are aligned with all four components.
- Rubrics and assessment criteria are clearly specific to standard component(s).
- Assessment rubrics are designed with distinguishable levels of candidates' performance.
- Data reports are rubric aligned to delineate candidates' performance levels.

Standard 6 References

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 M. Guerrero, M. C. Guerrero, L. Soltero-González, & K. Escamilla, (Eds.), *Abriendo brecha: Antología crítica sobre la educación bilingüe de doble immersión.* Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

Bialystok, E. (2011). Reshaping the mind: The benefits of bilingualism. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology, 65*, 229-235.

Center for Applied Linguistics [CAL]. (2017). *Two-way immersion directory.* Washington, DC: Author. http://cal.org/twi/directory

Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2012). *Dual language education for a transformed world.* Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

de Jong, E. J., & Bearse, C. (2011). The same outcomes for all? High school students reflect on their two-way immersion program experiences. In D. J. Tedick, D. Christian, & T. Williams Fortune (Eds.), *Immersion education. Practices, policies and possibilities*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Gándara, P., & Callahan, R. (2014). Looking toward the future: Opportunities in a shifting linguistic landscape. In R. Callahan & P. Gándara (Eds.), *The bilingual advantage. Language, literacy and the U. S. labor market*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Gándara, P., & Hopkins, M. (2010). *Forbidden language: English language learners and restrictive language policies.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hamayan, E., Genesee, F., & Cloud, N. (2013). *Dual language instruction from a-z: Practical guidance for teachers and administrators.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

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

Howard, E. R., & Sugarman, J. (2009). Program models and the language of initial literacy in two-way immersion programs. Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/twi/initialliteracy.pdf.

Izquierdo, E., & Mendoza, V. E. (2017). La educación de lenguaje dual: una reforma educativa. In M. Guerrero, M. C. Guerrero, L. Soltero-González, & K. Escamilla (Eds.), *Abriendo brecha: Antología crítica sobre la educación bilingüe de doble immersión.* Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2012). Successes and challenges in dual language education. *Education, Theory Into Practice, 51*(4), 256-262.

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2014). Bilingual and biliteracy skills in young Spanish-speaking low-SES children: Impact of instructional language

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Hernández, A. (2011). Achievement and language proficiency of Latino students in dual language programmes: Native English speakers, fluent English/previous ELLs, and current ELLs. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 32*(6), 531-545.

Potowski, K. (2007). *Language and identity in a dual immersion school.* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Riojas-Cortez, M. (2017). La familia como sistema de apoyo en el desarrollo de los niños bilingües. In M. Guerrero, M. C. Guerrero, L. Soltero-González, & K. Escamilla (Eds.), *Abriendo brecha: Antología crítica sobre la educación bilingüe de doble immersión.* Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2017). *Why dual language schooling.* Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

U. S. Department of Education Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA). (2015). *Dual language education programs: Current state policies and practices.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Valdés, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Program Assessments: Overview

CAEP policy requires that the National Dual Language Education Teacher Preparation Standards be assessed with six to eight assessments. The NDLETPS have six Key Assessments that are required of education preparation providers (EPPs) while assessments seven and eight are optional. As EPPs submit program assessment data for review along with reporting key evidences for each of the standards they will have the opportunity to express ways in which the key evidences demonstrate how the program meets the NDLETPS. The assessments are intentionally comprehensive as they cut across multiple standards yet are general enough to provide for program flexibility.

Optional Key Assessments

EPPs may decide to submit a seventh and/or eighth assessment to further strengthen their report for national recognition. The optional assessments used must align with specific standards and clearly articulate how the standards are met with the additional assessments. In cases where EPPs evidences are lacking strength the program faculty may decide an additional assessment is needed to demonstrate candidates' achievement of one or more of the NDLETPS.

Preponderance of Evidence

EPPs must provide data for all six Key Assessments as the preponderance of evidence in order to earn national recognition. CAEP defines a preponderance of evidence as ***"an overall confirmation that candidates meet standards in the strength, weight, or quality of evidence."*** It should be noted that not all components within a standard must be met, but rather the majority of components of each standard are met to demonstrate overall achievement of said standard. EPPs must meet ***at least 60% of components*** within each standard at the "meets standard" candidate proficiency level in order to accomplish the preponderance of evidence.

Assessments, Rubrics, and Evaluation

EPPs must clearly document the alignment of assessments, rubrics, and evaluation criteria within each standard. Information on scoring and data artifacts must reflect sound alignment so that reviewers can clearly evaluate the attainment of the standards.

Program evidences for candidates' attainment of Standards:

- Assessments are required of all candidates.
- Assessments and corresponding data (charts, evidences, artifacts, etc.) are aligned with all four components.
- Rubrics and assessment criteria are clearly specific to standard component(s).
- Assessment rubrics are designed with distinguishable levels of candidates' performance.
- Data reports are rubric aligned to delineate candidates' performance levels.

Standards and Key Assessments

National Dual Language Education Teacher Preparation Standard	Recommended Key Assessments
Standard One The candidate is able to critically analyze how languages are used to structure (PK-12) educational opportunities in society, and identify the strengths and weaknesses of prevailing and contemporary theories and concepts associated with the development of bilingualism and biliteracy in the context of the schools and communities where she or he intends to practice. The candidate is also able to use these insights in order to inform language planning matters at various levels, while demonstrating the ability to use language, and, where applicable, the non-English language, to effectively promote the academic well-being of the learner. The candidate assumes responsibility for critically examining his or her own language abilities, deepening the target language abilities needed, and advocating for teacher preparation program level language policies and practices that promote target language development.	**2, 4**
Standard Two Teacher candidates are prepared to design and deliver engaging, student-centered, standards-based dual language lessons that transcend cross-cultural competence and foment the transformation of student identities with the goal of promoting social justice and global understanding. The candidate regularly reflects on his or her own cultural positioning and is informed by a keen sense of sociohistorical knowledge as well as current knowledge of the students' cultural practices and experiences. The candidate is able to critically examine the cultural content embedded in the curriculum, act on any discrepancies and design learning experiences that promote sociocultural competence, inclusive of diverse learners. The candidate is also aware of the challenges associated with assessing the development of such a complex yet crucial construct.	**1, 2, 3, (4)**
Standard Three Teacher candidates are prepared to design and deliver engaging, student-centered, standards-based dual language lessons. Informed by principles of biliteracy development, sociocultural competence, authentic assessment, professionalism, agency, and advocacy within	**4, 5**

the programmatic and community contexts of learning, candidates must demonstrate abilities to structure instructional practices for all language learners in the dual language setting, including those with special needs. Candidates must demonstrate pedagogical applications of scaffolding and differentiated instruction with deliberate and consistent attention to students' active engagement, interaction with each other via the curriculum, sociocultural motivation, developmentally appropriate learning strategies, and the development of both partnering languages through content-based instruction.	
Standard Four Teacher candidates are prepared to authentically and holistically assess dual language learners for specific purposes using multiple measures that are informed by principles of biliteracy development, equity and advocacy, and to use holistic multilingual assessments that include learners with special needs. Candidates can demonstrate abilities to effectively design and administer inclusive formative and summative content-based assessments as to collect, analyze, interpret, and report on a broad range of student assessment data, including technology-based sources. Candidates can also demonstrate the ability to consider systems of accountability and program evaluation.	**2, 3, 5, (6)**
Standard Five Teacher candidates understand that part of their professional responsibility will be to advocate for learners and act on their behalf in order to address matters of inequities and conflicts. The candidates understand that said matters might be rooted in different contexts, involve different participants, and entail potential risks. Thus, the candidates have practiced a range of conflict management strategies and have insight into cultural preferences for managing and resolving conflicts within and between two cultural groups. The candidates also understand that the goal of advocacy and agency is not solely anchored to resolving the conflict but also to pursuing peace through the application of peaceful pedagogies in the classroom setting with the goal of assisting learners to become better global citizens.	**1, 3, (4), 6**
Standard Six Candidates demonstrate critically informed professionalism and leadership by making recommendations regarding policies, procedures,	**3, 6**

and legislation related to dual language program and curricular design, relative to theoretical foundations of effective program components. Candidates apply knowledge of dual language program models and organizational structures; characteristics and components of high-quality models; factors and criteria that determine model selection appropriate to each school context and demographics; equity and advocacy in two-way programs; and stakeholder involvement and advocacy for program sustainability.	

Author Bios

Dr. Michael D. Guerrero is a full professor in the Department of Bilingual and Literacy Studies at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley situated along the Texas-Mexico borderlands. He earned his B.A. in Spanish at Eastern Michigan University with a minor in bilingual education. As a graduate student, he studied applied linguistics at the Universidad Nacional Automoma de Mexico (UNAM) in Mexico City through the Becas Para Aztlan program sponsored by the Mexican government. He earned his degree in educational linguistics at the University of New Mexico Albuquerque in 1994. His dissertation was centered on examining the validity of a Spanish proficiency test used in New Mexico to certify bilingual education teachers. He was instrumental in designing a new test for this purpose and has since dedicated most of his academic life to researching the academic Spanish language development of bilingual education teachers. He has over twenty years of experience preparing bilingual education teachers and professionals at the graduate and doctoral level. His publications have appeared in various peer-reviewed journals including the *Bilingual Research Journal*, *Journal of Latinos and Education*, and *Language Testing*. He recently conceptualized and served as lead editor of the first book written originally in Spanish about dual immersion programs in the U.S.: *Abriendo brecha: antología critica sobre la educación bilingüe de doble inmersión*. Dr. Guerrero

is one of the original co-founders of the effort to develop and establish national standards for the preparation of dual language education teachers under the auspices of DLeNM.

Dr. Joan R. Lachance is an associate professor in TESL at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. She earned her B.S in Modern Languages and Linguistics from Florida International University. At the graduate level, Dr. Lachance earned her M.Ed. from Pontificia Universidad Católica de Puerto Rico where she studied School Counseling in the context of K-12 Spanish-speakers in bilingual and immersion settings. Dr. Lachance earned her PhD in Curriculum & Instruction with an emphasis in Urban Education and Teaching English as a Second Language from UNC Charlotte. Her current research agenda and peer-reviewed publications focus on dual language teacher preparation, academic literacy and biliteracy development with English learners, as well as authentic assessment. She is beginning to further specialize her dual language research to include co-teaching in dual language, supporting secondary dual language programs, and the preservation of Native American languages. In addition to her faculty position, Dr. Lachance's service agenda supports the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and the surrounding region. The professional development programs she co-developed for the state showcase best practices for multilingual learners' academic language development and dual language/immersion teacher support. She has assisted for over a decade in designing and delivering educator professional development on the official North Carolina state-led Title III initiatives including *Supporting ELs via Dual Language/Immersion Programs, Implementing the WIDA Standards, The North Carolina Guide to the SIOP Model, Co-Teaching and Collaboration, and LinguaFolio*