

ASSESSMENT PLAN FOR BILINGUAL ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS IN THE  
UNITED STATES

by

KATHRYN JOY CARPENTER

A THESIS

Presented to the Department of Romance Languages  
and the Robert D. Clark Honors College  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Bachelor of Arts

June 2014

**An Abstract of the Thesis of**

Kathryn Joy Carpenter for the degree of Bachelor of Arts  
in the Department of Romance Languages to be taken June 2014

Title: Assessment Plan for Bilingual Elementary Programs in the United States

Approved:  \_\_\_\_\_

Robert Davis

Because of the substantial and growing number of Spanish speakers in the United States, educational policies that support elementary students who use Spanish at home are necessary. Long-term, additive bilingual programs have been shown to be an effective educational method for students who use Spanish at home. This thesis therefore presents a four-part assessment plan for a bilingual program that takes into account necessary characteristics, in order to ensure that the bilingual program has all the attributes to ensure student success.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank Professor Davis for his direction and advice throughout this process, and for helping guide my research. I would like to thank Professor Lucero for sharing her knowledge of bilingual education, giving me invaluable resources, and helping me draft my surveys. I would also like to thank Professor Prazniak for guiding me through the thesis process and helping me plan my project.

I would like to acknowledge the anonymous teacher that I interviewed for their information on the bilingual school where they teach, and for all the other support and encouragement they provided for this research. I would like to thank the school where I interned and volunteered, and everyone in it, for their support of my research interests.

I would like to thank my parents, Jeff and Joyce Carpenter, for their continued support of my education, including this thesis. I would also like to thank them for their unwavering confidence in me, and for always being there for me when I needed support.

Lastly, I would like to thank all the professors, mentors, and advisors that I have encountered who have helped me throughout my education and encouraged my academic interests and research, and have therefore supported this project.

## Table of Contents

Introduction and Research Question	1
Spanish Users in the United States	1
Definitions	2
Bilingualism and Bilingual Education Background	4
The Benefits of Being Bilingual	4
The Importance of Spanish Language Instruction for Children who Use Spanish	5
Methods of Language Instruction for Minority Language Users	7
Research on Bilingual Education Policies and Methods	9
United States Government Policy	10
Contribution to Field	13
Bilingual Program Assessment Plan Introduction	14
Assessment Plan	18
Student Achievement	18
Student Progression towards Fluency/Proficiency in Spanish and English	18
Student Content Learning	20
Curriculum, Classroom, and Bilingual Instruction Traits	22
Additive and Long-term Bilingual Programs	22
Curriculum Aligned with Bilingualism	25
Exposure to Cultural Elements from both English-speaking Country and Spanish-speaking Countries	26
School Atmosphere and Student Support	29
Bilingualism as a School-wide Goal	29
Extra Services and Programs Outside the Classroom Offered to Students in both Languages	30
Bilingual Infrastructure Incorporated	32
School Community	33
Bilingual Teachers	33
Stakeholders' Involvement and Input	34
Parents	34
Teachers	36
Students	37

Conclusions and Future Research	38
Appendix	40
Appendix A: Parent Survey	40
Appendix B: Teacher Survey	46
Appendix C: Student Interview	51
Appendix D: Program Trait Assessment Outline	53
Works Cited	57

## **Introduction and Research Question**

This research stems from a bilingual internship during the 2013-2014 school year at a bilingual elementary school where many of the students use Spanish at home. This thesis will focus on the means of education for children in the United States who use Spanish at home. I will look at the importance of teaching children in both Spanish and English and the effects that this has on them academically, linguistically, and socially. I will address different accepted methods of teaching Spanish-speaking children, and will discuss the existing research about the ways of instructing them. I will also analyze at the United States' policy for bilingual education, and contrast that with the accepted policies according to linguists and educators.

The culmination of this research is a plan for assessing bilingual programs, which outlines necessary characteristics of successful bilingual programs and describes how their inclusion can be assessed in the program. This plan is broad enough that any bilingual school could potentially apply it to their program to assess its quality, and evaluate what traits it may be lacking and what characteristics may make it successful.

## **Spanish Users in the United States**

There are currently 53 million Hispanics (as defined and described in the U.S. Census Bureau) in the United States, making the U.S. the second largest Hispanic country in the world, after Mexico (Hispanic Heritage Month, 2013). The population of the United States is around 314 million, meaning that Hispanic people make up 17% of the population, which makes them the largest minority group (State and Country Quick Facts). The Hispanic population grew by over 1 million between 2011 and 2012.

Seventy five percent of Hispanics, most of whom are born in the US with Mexican heritage, speak Spanish at home (Hispanic Heritage Month, 2013).

There are some discrepancies between the level of education attained by the Hispanic population and the general population. Thirteen percent of Hispanics (25 and older) have a bachelor's degree (Hispanic Heritage Month, 2013), while the national average is 28% (State and Country Quick Facts). Sixty three percent of Hispanics have a high school education (Hispanic Heritage Month, 2013), while the national average is 85% (State and Country Quick Facts). In sum, the average level of education attained by the Hispanic population is lower than the national average.

### **Definitions**

The group of students, parents, and teachers that I am studying has unique and varying language profiles. Though many of them are highly proficient bilinguals, some of them may be more adept in one language. For the purposes of this research, I will discriminate between two groups: *students/others who speak or use Spanish outside the classroom/at home*, meaning people who use any Spanish within their family or community outside school, and *students/others who use or speak only English outside the classroom/at home*. Similarly, a *home language* will refer to a language that is spoken in the person's home (which in this paper, mainly refers to English and Spanish). There is wide variation in the amount of Spanish spoken by the group that uses it at home, but for the purposes of this thesis, I will not differentiate between different levels of usage, as I will only focus on the differences between those who use Spanish outside of school regularly and those who do not. I will use the term *bilingual speakers* to mean people of all ages who are comfortable using both Spanish and

English, which would describe, for example, teachers that teach in a bilingual program. The term *LEP (Limited English Proficient)* is one used exclusively (in my research) by the US government to describe an English learner (Skutnabb-Kangas and McCarty, 14). *Executive Function/Control* refers to controlled mental processing that oversees cognitive task completion (Baese-Berk, in class).



## **Bilingualism and Bilingual Education Background**

### **The Benefits of Being Bilingual**

Cognitively, there are several reasons that it is beneficial for a person to be bilingual. Children who are bilingual perform better than monolingual children on tasks that require them to make complex judgments. Bilingualism enhances executive control, allowing speakers to control complex goals (Bialystok, 466). Therefore, as indicated by this research, use of more than one language has intellectual and developmental benefits.

In adults, there are neuroanatomical differences between the bilingual and monolingual brain, and research shows a correlation between bilingualism and increased cognitive reserve (functional part of brain associated with intellectual/social/physical activities) and which can lead to delayed Alzheimer's disease in older adults (Schweizer et al, 994-995). Similarly, in older adults, lifelong bilingualism is related to maintenance of white matter in the brain, possibly as a result of brain structure changes based on enhanced cognitive control (Luk et al, 16812). White matter may assist the transfer of information and result in better executive performance (Luk et al, 16808). Therefore, this research supports the conclusion that bilingualism may help adults maintain brain structure and function.

These cognitive benefits of bilingualism are in addition to the obvious social one: language is used for communication, and the more languages a person speaks, the better he or she is able to communicate across cultural and linguistic boundaries. This ability can provide increased employment opportunities, allow one to expand in a

society while still staying ingrained in one's heritage culture, and help build relationships between cultures.

In summary, being bilingual not only provides more communication opportunities, but also keeps the brain operating well, allowing a person to make better judgments and handle complex goals, as well as helping keep the brain healthy into advanced age.

### **The Importance of Spanish Language Instruction for Children who Use Spanish**

There are several theories that explain why it is important to use a home language (one other than English) in tandem with English instruction, in order to help students learn English and maintain their home language abilities. They are as follows:

#### *The Cultural Mismatch Paradigm*

The Cultural Mismatch theory (Zanger) explains why many bilingual students may have academic struggles that monolingual students do not: "the academic difficulties of many language minority students [is a] result of the cultural mismatch or the cultural discontinuities between home and school...the communication process is disrupted when students and school personnel come from backgrounds that have different conventions governing appropriate behaviors, values, and non-verbal styles" (Erickson, cited in Zanger, 4). However, there are some criticisms of this paradigm; for instance, it cannot explain some academic variability often seen within different minority groups (Zanger, 11).

### *The Empowerment Approach*

The Empowerment Approach theory was developed in the late nineteen eighties by J. Cummins (“Empowering Minority Students: A Framework,”; *Empowering Minority Students*) and addresses some of the issues with the cultural mismatch paradigm (Zanger, 14). The Empowerment Approach claims that, “schools academically disable members of politically and economically dominated groups because the social relations within schools replicate the unequal intergroup relations of society at large” (Zanger, 14).

Trueba (in “Empowerment and Mainstreaming”) also discusses that some language minority students are labeled as learning disabled, and have stressful educational experiences, causing communication problems and traumatizing experiences. When they have to perform with subpar language abilities, they participate less, get embarrassed and confused, and cannot handle learning tasks (cited in Zanger, 18-19).

Krashen’s “Affective Filter Hypothesis” also helps explain why children learning English in an English-only classroom may not be able to learn effectively.

Krashen explains this hypothesis:

The acquirer needs to be open to the input. The ‘affective filter’ is a mental block that prevents acquirers from fully utilizing the comprehensible input they receive for language acquisition. When it is ‘up,’ the acquirer may understand what he hears and reads, but the input will not reach the LAD [Chomsky’s Language Acquisition Device]. This occurs when the acquirer is unmotivated, lacking in self-confidence, or anxious, when he is on the defensive, (Stevick, 1976), when he considers the language class to be a place where his weaknesses will be revealed. The filter is down when the acquirer is not concerned with the possibility of failure in language acquisition...(Smith 1982a, 1983). (Cited in Krashen, 3)

In other words, according to Krashen, when a language learner is put in an environment where he or she is not comfortable, a block against language acquisition is implemented, which could inhibit learning ability.

Placing a student who uses some Spanish at home or who uses solely Spanish at home into an English classroom, or a classroom where he or she is discouraged from using Spanish to communicate could cause the student to feel stressed, anxious, and misunderstood, which according to this theory could lead to a decreased ability to learn and absorb information. A possible solution that would allow students to use Spanish in the classroom while still developing their English skills is bilingual instruction, which allows children to feel comfortable, and culturally and linguistically connected. In the next section, I will discuss some bilingual and dual language educational programs that foster this environment, as well as some that do not.

### **Methods of Language Instruction for Minority Language Users**

There are several methods of bilingual and monolingual instruction (and many combinations of both) that are in use currently in elementary schools in the United States. The main ones are described below. In these explanations, the context is in the United States with students who speak Spanish at home. (Unless otherwise cited, all definitions come from Skutnabb-Kangas and McCarthy, 4-13).

*Subtractive language learning* describes a program where English is taught in such a way that it replaces the learner's Spanish abilities. *Structured immersion* is a US approach where students are submerged in the target language with no home-language support (assuming the home language is different from the target one), and the goal is to replace the home language with English. *Submersion/Sink-or-swim programs* are

similar in that students who speak Spanish at home learn in English with a monolingual teacher. This learning situation is subtractive.

Many programs in the United States for students who speak a language other than English at home are focused mainly on English language acquisition. *English-only* is a US political movement that prohibits instruction in languages other than English. About half of US states endorse this policy. An *English-only* program would also be subtractive, as there is no support for a home language other than English.

Many programs are transitional, which means that students are meant to move from one language to another. In *transitional early-exit* and *late-entry programs*, the home language (one other than English) is used as an instrument for English language learning. Depending on the time frame of the program, the student may receive home-language support until middle school; however, the goal is English acquisition only. Stephen May refers to this type of program as a weak ‘bilingual’ model (21).

Instead of focusing on English acquisition, some programs may emphasize learning only the home language (one other than English), or using the home language to teach English. In *language maintenance/language shelter programs*, students who speak Spanish at home choose to be in programs with other students who do the same and are instructed in Spanish by a bilingual teacher. May defines this type of program as an *enrichment models*, as English is being taught through the use of the home language (one other than English) (22).

A *language maintenance/language shelter program* is similar to a *segregation program*, the difference being that in the latter, students are placed in a program with other students who speak their language and learn only in the home language, rather

than choosing it for themselves. The teacher is monolingual or bilingual, and integration is not a goal.

The opposite of *subtractive language learning* is *additive language learning*, a situation in which English is learned while Spanish is developed. The learner becomes more linguistically advanced in both languages. In *two-way bilingual programs*, 50% majority and 50% minority students and are instructed by a bilingual teacher through both languages. This model can also be called a *dual language program* (Lindholm-Leary, in “Success and Challenges,” 256). In a *90:10 model* of this type of program, instruction moves from mostly Spanish and little English to half Spanish and half English as the student moves through the program, and in a *50:50 model*, the two languages are equally divided throughout the program (Lindholm-Leary, “Success and Challenges,” 257). According to May, two-way/dual language programs would be a *maintenance models*: bilingual programs that aim to maintain the home language (one other than English), strengthen the students’ sense of cultural identity, and “affirm their individual and ethnolinguistic rights” (22).

### **Research on Bilingual Education Policies and Methods**

In 1997, Thomas and Collier completed a study titled “School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students” that studied the data of about 700,000 language minority students over 14 years. They also verified their data after the study in 26 states (Thomas and Collier, 30). I will be using this study as a basis for linguists’ and educators’ perceptions on bilingual education.

Thomas and Collier answer the following questions:

How much time is needed for language minority students who are English language learners to reach and sustain on-grade-level achievement in their second language?

Which student, program, and instructional variables strongly affect the long-term academic achievement of language minority students? (16)

Through their research, they found that:

The first predictor of long-term school success is cognitively complex on-grade-level academic instruction through students' first language for as long as possible and cognitively complex on-grade-level academic instruction through the second language (English) for part of the school day.

The second predictor of long-term school success is the use of current approaches to teaching the academic curriculum through two languages. [Interactive classes, cooperative learning].

The third predictor is a transformed sociocultural context for language minority students' schooling...the instructional goal is to create for the English learner the same type of sociocultural context for learning in two languages that the monolingual native-English speaker enjoys for learning in English. (15-16)

Here, the researchers are describing an additive language program/bilingual program as the ideal learning situation for a language minority student; for example, a student who speaks only or some Spanish at home and is mainly learning English at school. As will be shown below, this is the opposite of what the US government condones, as their policies include no provisions for support of the student's home language (one other than English).

### **United States Government Policy**

The US government has a mixed history with bilingual education. Several prominent politicians have spoken out against it, including Ronald Reagan, saying that it is "absolutely wrong and against American concepts," and Newt Gingrich, who described it as "stunningly destructive" (Cummins, in "Introduction", xiii).

In 2002, the US government passed the “No Child Left Behind Act,” an education reform program that overrode the Bilingual Act of 1968 (“No Child Left Behind Act”). As defined on The House Education and Workforce Committee’s webpage, the new program:

- completely changes the focus of bilingual education programs from programs teaching limited English proficient (LEP) children primarily in their native languages to programs focused on helping LEP children learn English.
- consolidates the former Bilingual Education and Immigrant Education programs into a single flexible program with a totally new focus on helping limited English proficient (LEP) students learn English.
- requires accountability for results in teaching LEP children English. Requires that LEP students be tested for reading and language arts in English after they have attended school in the United States for three consecutive years. (“The No Child Left Behind Act (H.R.1)” Bill Summary)

As shown in the above description, children have to learn in, at best, transitional programs, and at worst, sink-or-swim programs. There is no support or development for a home language other than English, and the instruction is based entirely on English language acquisition. As discussed, neither of these are the optimal method for English instruction.

The change in educational policy for students who use Spanish outside the classroom was not a sudden one. The Bilingual Education program had been shifting towards a more transitional program since it began, changing its policies (ex. changing wording to say that a home language [one other than English] can be used *only* to help a student learn the L1) until it was eventually replaced with the No Child Left Behind policies. (Skuntabb-Kangas and McCarty, 14-15)



These new guidelines do not allow any room for students to learn and develop a home language other than English. Not only will they miss out on the benefits of being bilingual, as laid out at the beginning of this thesis, but they will also suffer from other issues related to being unable to develop their home language academically while having to learn a new one. I acknowledge that it is not always practical to instruct students who speak another language outside of the classroom in their home language. However, because in the United States there exists such a large group of students that speak Spanish in their homes, more effort and resources should be allocated to support including maintenance of the language they speak at home (in this case, Spanish) in the curriculum.

Though home language education has been shown to be important through various types of research, including some shown above, the US government has chosen to take an approach that does not acknowledge the accepted research. May discusses the reasons behind the US government policy in his essay, citing two studies that emerged during the 1970s and 1980s that shaped the government's view of bilingual education. They are the American Institutes for Research's (Danoff et al) evaluation of bilingual programs, and Baker and de Kanter's (*Effectiveness of Bilingual Education and Bilingual Education*) study that replicated the AIR's. Simply put, the studies showed that students in bilingual education programs did no better than students in English-only programs, and the government based their policies on these results (May, 26). May, however, points out several issues with the studies (26-27), and also mentions that when Willig replicated the studies with over a hundred more variables controlled for, she found the research to be in favor of bilingual programs (Willig, in "A Meta-analysis of

Selected Studies” and “Examining Bilingual Education Research,” cited in May, 27-28). According to the opinions and research presented by May, the government is basing their educational policies regarding bilingual education on flawed research.

In addition, racism—both overt and institutional—may be a factor in the language education policies of the US government. In a study done on Latino American men (as defined in the study), it was found that over 50% of the men noticed people being treated unfairly based on their race/ethnicity at least once a day (Ornelas et al). Though this study was not done in an educational context, it shows the racism experienced by Latino Americans daily, a phenomenon that may also affect the way that the educational policies for them are developed. An article on rising racism against Latinos suggests that “the presence of a debate on legal status allows people to claim that their views are not racially motivated” and that people may instead use code words (“alien,” etc.), according to an attorney interviewed for the article (Jebian). The US government may be participating in a similar phenomenon—masking racist views with immigration jargon, legislation, and education policies that target Latinos. While this is speculation, at the very least, it must be noted that racism against Latinos is prevalent in the US, and therefore may be affecting the legislation implemented by the US government, and by individual state governments as well, with regard to bilingual education or programs that allow for Spanish language learning.

### **Contribution to Field**

My research is important because, as shown in this introduction, the number of Spanish speakers in the US is considerable and growing. Assuring that Spanish-speaking children are well educated through a bilingual program has many cognitive,

social, and academic benefits. The research shows that two-way bilingual programs are the most successful means of educating children learning English in an academic setting. My thesis creates a comprehensive plan for evaluating the different aspects of bilingual programs, by pinpointing what program characteristics are important for the success of bilingual schools, and proposing how those characteristics can be assessed. Through my program assessment plan, schools would be able to see how their program compares to the criteria that I have identified as being important for a bilingual education program, and identify potential areas for improvement.

### **Bilingual Program Assessment Plan Introduction**

This section of my research will present a comprehensive plan for evaluating and assessing a bilingual program, to assure that it meets the academic and sociocultural needs of its students. This plan is intended for use on an already functioning bilingual program, but one that could use improvement in certain areas. It is intended to show the important aspects that each individual program should include, and identifies certain areas that the school may need to improve upon. Though discussed below, this plan is also laid out in a condensed outline form to be used for program assessment in *Appendix D*.

As discussed above, as Thomas and Collier's 1997 study on bilingual schools showed that programs with long-term bilingual or dual-language characteristics are the most effective bilingual programs for students' long-term academic success (15-17). However, bilingual schools still face many challenges as they develop and improve their programs. As Lindholm-Leary stated in her article on the successes and challenges of bilingual education, "...successful outcomes require a clear understanding of the

[dual language education] program and full implementation of the various characteristics associated with high quality programs” (“Success and Challenges,” 257). In order for a bilingual program to be successful, it has to meet certain parameters in various facets of the program, from leadership to curriculum to parent involvement.

Various researchers have identified different characteristics that programs need to have to be successful. Though there is a lot of overlap in characteristics of successful programs, there are some distinct aspects that some researchers cover, and some that are absent from the research. Therefore, I have made a comprehensive plan that discusses the aspects of bilingual education that need to be included in a program in order for it to be successful, and that suggests ways to evaluate each of these aspects within a program. However, this plan is intended to be guide for program evaluation, not a set of rules. As the National Research Council Institute of Medicine (NRCIM) discusses in their guide for improving minority student education, school evaluation needs to remain local at least in some aspects, in order for it to help local educators develop their programs (152-153). For that reason, this plan should be modified for each individual school, though the majority of the points should be broad enough and important enough to remain relevant to most schools regardless of the context. In addition, as Rhodes shows through her study (interviewing educational leaders in the field of foreign language learning) on lessons learned from bilingual education, the interviewees think that the language used in the program needs to be one that is relevant to the community of the school (117). In accordance, although this plan focuses specifically on English/Spanish bilingual programs, it could be modified for bilingual programs that use other languages, and that are based in a variety of communities.

The following plan is taken from three different sources. Some content comes from education and linguistics researchers' past studies and observations on bilingual programs. Another source is my personal experiences in language classrooms and bilingual and immersion programs, and my opinions and perspectives based on that experience. The third source is an anonymous classroom teacher in a bilingual school that I interviewed about the program qualities in their school.

Some of the characteristics outlined can be measured quantitatively; others can be measured qualitatively through observation interviews and surveys. Various aspects merely need to be present for the school to have the characteristic, rather than being measured on a degree or scale.

This plan should be used as an addition to the attributes of successful schools in general; that is, as an add-on to what is already considered to be important aspects of schools, not just bilingual schools. The NRCIM cite several studies (Edmonds; Rutter et al; Weber; Purkey and Smith) and define several such characteristics that can be used as parameters to define successful schools (164):

- Strong (instructional) leadership by the principal
- High expectations for students
- School-wide focus on basic skills
- Safe, orderly environment
- Frequent academic assessment of student progress

In addition to these general "effective school" characteristics, NRCIM names many other aspects that were found to be traits of successful programs specifically for minority students. Though these were found in their assessment of several different

types of school programs with many different types of minority student populations (197-243), I think that *all* schools, not just schools that have bilingual programs or that cater specifically to minority groups, should include these characteristics for the success of their programs. For that reason, I have included some of them as characteristics important for all schools (171):

- A supportive school-wide atmosphere
- A tailored learning environment
- Communication and coordination between and within schools
- Inclusion of student-led activities
- Explicit skills instruction
- Instructional approaches that improve understanding
- Opportunities for practice
- Teacher development
- Home involvement in the school

Thus, in assessing a bilingual program, it is important to first assure that these fourteen characteristics are present in the school, before assessing the program's bilingual agenda.

Through the research that I did on the different parts of assessment for school programs, I was able to divide my plan for program assessment into four distinct sections: student achievement; curriculum, classroom, and bilingual instruction traits; school atmosphere and student support; and school community. Each section contains several aspects that the program should include in order to be successful, and offers suggestions for how the characteristic could be evaluated, when necessary.

## Assessment Plan

### Student Achievement

This section discusses the different ways that students can be assessed in various areas in order to monitor their achievement. Many studies (Goldenberg and Sullivan; Slavin and Yampolsky; Slavin and Madden) have shown systematic student assessment is a feature of successful schools—not only to assess students but also to assess the effectiveness of the program (Carter and Chatfield) (all cited in NRCIM, 182-183). Lindholm-Leary (in “Effective Features of Dual Language Education Programs”) adds that, “effective schools use assessment measures that are aligned with the school’s visions and goals and with appropriate curriculum and related standards,” (citing Lindholm-Leary and Molina; Montecel and Cortez) and says that both languages need to be evaluated in addition to content learning.

### *Student Progression towards Fluency/Proficiency in Spanish and English*

In order for bilingual programs to be successful, students have to be learning two languages. Rhodes lists language development monitoring as one of the lessons learned from interviewing bilingual teachers, administrators, and educational leaders. According to this study, the interviewees stressed that it is important for programs to evaluate their students, and to use the results to track progress and monitor goal attainment (124). She cites Solano-Flores and Trumbull, who argue that the same aspects need to be evaluated in both languages, in order to have a more accurate assessment (8). Gilzow and Branaman analyze seven bilingual programs in order to understand what makes them successful, and they identified ten different elements that

they think are most important to a bilingual program. Two salient features were implementing national standards used for foreign language learning, and student assessment; these schools taught their students according to national requirements for achievement, and they assessed them to make sure that they were achieving the expected level (175-179).

In my own interview with a classroom teacher at a bilingual school, I found that the school measures English and Spanish differently, though the program is working on plans to change this practice. The teacher said that in order to measure English language development, the school uses the district-wide tests that are given twice a year, and students are compared to a grade-level benchmark. Students who fall below a certain percentile are given extra help with specific aspects. Teachers also do their own individual classroom evaluations. For Spanish, the school does not have many materials or resources that it can use to assess proficiency, and those that they do have are not necessarily practical to administer. Teachers mainly do their own assessments, and compare data. However, the school is working on a system that would allow for a more systematic approach (standards and assessments) and resources to make sure that students are performing on level. The school where I interviewed uses a standardized testing system, supplemented by any other assessment that the teachers might use for their individual classroom assessment, for their own evaluation processes. However, there are other ways of assessing students' abilities and progress that can be used in conjunction with the ones mentioned above. Gilzow and Branaman lay out four specific types of language assessment used in four separate successful bilingual programs. In the first, students take home task cards that their parents have to sign after they complete a



certain task. The second involves students being awarded points for achieving levels of proficiency, which they can exchange for prizes. In the third, students follow the district curriculum in the classroom through logs, teacher checklists, and role-playing. In the last, the program uses periodic interviews as well as portfolios to assess students' progression as they learn the language (178-9). While this list only provides a few very specific different ways of assessing the language learning of students in bilingual programs, it does give some examples of various ways that a bilingual program could incorporate diverse methods of assessment, based on what would work best for the students, parents, teachers, and the program in general.

In general, programs need to have some way of assessing how students are improving their language abilities in both languages. Programs can use the data gathered from assessment to improve their practices and to monitor their students' progression through the language learning process.

### *Student Content Learning*

Several studies (Lindholm-Leary and Borsato, "Academic Achievement"; Lindholm-Leary and Genesee; Lindholm-Leary and Howard) show that students in bilingual programs score similar in content learning to their peers at the latest by 7<sup>th</sup> grade, and they achieve at grade level in reading and math (cited in Lindholm-Leary, "Success and Challenges," 257). In this article, Lindholm-Leary cites a study that says that in later education, dual-language students are more likely to enroll in higher-level math (Lindholm-Leary and Borsato, "Hispanic High Schoolers and Mathematics"), and are more likely to close any learning gap with their peers by the end of high school

(Thomas and Collier, “A National Study of School Effectiveness;” Lindholm-Leary and Borsato, “Academic Achievement”) (257-258).

As research shows that it is expected for students in bilingual program to succeed in content areas, bilingual programs need to monitor their students in order to make sure that they are progressing at a reasonable pace, and are on par with their monolingual program peers.

The teacher at the bilingual program that I spoke with says that their program complies with this best practice by evaluating student scores on district standardized tests, and the program is moving towards a school-wide agreement of content and levels taught. This type of program could be helpful in evaluating the progression of students’ content learning. Simply put, successful bilingual programs need to have a way to assess what content their students are learning, and how well they are progressing through it.

It should be mentioned that students who speak a home language different than the area’s prominent one (in this case, students who speak Spanish at home) may take several years to perform at the same level as students whose home language is the dominant one (in this case, English) (Thomas and Collier, “A National Study of School Effectiveness,” cited in Lindholm-Leary, “Success and Challenges,” 259). In addition, students who speak English at home who are also in a bilingual program may need an extra year or two to catch up to their peers who are not in bilingual programs (Genesee and Riches, cited in Lindholm-Leary, “Success and Challenges,” 259). Students generally have caught up to (or usually exceeded) other students not in bilingual programs by middle school or late elementary school (Lindholm-Leary and Borsato,

“Academic Achievement;” Lindholm-Leary and Genesee; Lindholm-Leary and Howard; cited in Lindholm-Leary, “Success and Challenges,” 257). Therefore, students at a comparatively low level in content in a bilingual program does not necessarily mean that the program is not a successful one; they may simply need extra time to progress to the same level as other students. Educators should keep this lag in mind when assessing students in bilingual programs.

### **Curriculum, Classroom, and Bilingual Instruction Traits**

This section discusses the various features of instruction and specific educational bilingual traits that the program needs to have in order to be successful. Because it was already shown above in Thomas and Collier’s study that successful two-way bilingual programs or dual-language programs have the characteristics that are most effective for students’ development and learning (“School Effectiveness,” 15-17), this section will not debate the most effective methods of bilingual education or which programs work better, rather, it will show the basic requirements that a bilingual program would need to have to be successful. It will also discuss the aspects specifically of bilingual curriculum that need to be included.

#### *Additive and Long-term Bilingual Programs*

Studies by Hernandez-Chavez and Skutnabb-Kangas (cited in Lindholm-Leary, *Dual Language Education*, 62) show that enrichment models, or additive language programs, produce students with high proficiency in both languages. Lambert shows that subtractive language programs produce students with lower levels of proficiency, academic underachievement, and psychological disorders (cited in Lindholm-Leary,

*Dual Language Education*, 62). Lindholm-Leary says that successful programs use the benefits of additive bilingual programs to better educate their students (Lindholm-Leary, *Dual Language Education*, 62).

Lindholm-Leary (“Effective Features of Dual Language Education Programs”) also cites several studies that show that additive programs are more beneficial to students. In Ramirez (“Longitudinal Study of Structured English Immersion” [Executive Summary]), the researchers found that students in a bilingual program with more Spanish language use and instruction had the same English reading and language levels as students in a program with more English use, but that the students from the program with more Spanish had better math scores later in their education (29). She also cites Collier, who found in her synthesis of studies that students who had more home language support (for a language other than English) in elementary school performed better on English achievement assessments compared to those in mainstream programs (30). In sum, according to the results of this research, additive programs that encourage development of both languages, not just English, have been shown to be more effective for students across various academic skills.

In order to evaluate whether a program is additive, I will refer back to the definition given in the beginning of this work: in additive language learning, English is learned while Spanish ability is developed, and the learner becomes more linguistically advanced in both languages (Skutnabb-Kangas and McCarthy, 4).

Citing the National Commission on Excellence in Education, Lindholm-Leary (*Dual Language Education*) says that students need to study language for four to six years, at the very least, in order to reach academic proficiency in the language (66).

Lindholm-Leary and Borsato (“Academic Achievement”) show in their study that students who were in bilingual programs over a longer period of time had better results in English than mainstream school students did (Cited in Lindholm-Leary, “Effective Features of Dual Language Education Programs,” 28). Rhodes also found that though her interviewees thought it was challenging, creating long-term programs that last from kindergarten through high school was recommended (119). Accordingly, in order for students to get the full benefit of a bilingual program, the program should continue for at least 4-6 years, or throughout the entirety of the students’ primary and secondary education if possible.

Though difficult to implement, the longevity of a program could easily be assessed in a bilingual program. A program of this type would, at the very least, start in kindergarten and go through sixth grade, although ideally it would continue through high school. The program would either need to be a 90:10 model, where instruction moves from mostly Spanish and little English to half Spanish and half English as the student moves through the program, or a 50:50 model, where the two languages are equally divided throughout the program (definition from Lindholm-Leary, “Success and Challenges,” 257). Lindholm-Leary (“Effective Features of Dual Language Education Programs”) cites two studies (Christian et al, and Lindholm-Leary, *Dual Language Education*) which show that students in both types of programs show similar English reading and math test scores, and have similar proficiencies (though Lindholm-Leary (*Dual Language Education*) found that 90:10 students become more proficient bilinguals) (30). In summary, as demonstrated by this research, in order to meet this

requirement, the program would be one of these two types of programs, and would have to offer at least four years of bilingual instruction.

### *Curriculum Aligned with Bilingualism*

Lindholm-Leary (“Effective Features of Dual Language Education Programs”) outlines the importance of having the program’s curriculum aligned with the bilingual goals of the school. She cites several studies that show that because of the overall language goals of a bilingual program, “language instruction is integrated within the curriculum” (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, Cloud et al, Genesee, Short, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) (10). She goes on to state that since the goals of a bilingual program should include multiculturalism (more on this below), “the curriculum needs to reflect and value the students’ cultures” (citing Berman et al; Corallo and McDonald; Lucas, Henze, and Donato; Montecel and Cortez; Reyes et al)(10). Montecel and Cortez also tout the benefits of using bilingual books and other materials to improve learning and exam performance in bilingual students (10). Therefore, in order for a bilingual curriculum to be successful, it needs to have the traits of a successful monolingual curriculum, as well as incorporate the bilingual and multicultural goals of the program.

In their study of several successful bilingual programs, Gilzow and Branaman discovered that all of them use similar types of curriculum: content-based or content-enriched. The authors show that all the programs used language together with content material: math, science, history, geography, and English language arts; all taught using the language curriculum. Though the type of curriculum, and how it was created, implemented, and assessed depended on a variety of factors, in each case course content

learning and language learning were integrated (175-176). Though these studies were done on only seven schools, that they all included this aspect of their curriculum is important in that it may have contributed to their success. Bilingual programs may want to consider this research when planning the curriculum for their program, at least making certain that the curriculum accounts for the program's bilingual goals and is content-based or content-enriched.

*Exposure to Cultural Elements from both English-speaking Country and Spanish-speaking Countries*

Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba define culture in their work on education for immigrant children as, “social shared cognitive codes and maps, norms of appropriate behavior, assumptions about values and world view, and lifestyle in general...” (17). They also say that for students who are “ethnically and linguistically different,” the conveyance of culture is one of the problems that they face in achieving academic success (18). Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba also address the fact that each child learns differently based on their cultural and social background, citing Grant and Sleeter; Ortiz; and Rumberger (32). Multiple studies (Delgado-Gaitan, “Sociocultural Adjustment to School,” “The Value of Conformity;” Fernandez, Paulsen, and Hirano-Nakanishi; Rumberger; Trueba, *Raising Silent Voices*) show that by failing to provide contexts where children are able to succeed academically contributes to the high rate of school dropout later in education, specifically for many Mexican American students (cited in Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba, 33).

Huerta-Macías cites a study done by Hayes et al on a classroom of the children of Mexican immigrants, which showed that incorporating cultural knowledge and

learning into their education contributed to their overall learning and success rate in school (29). She also cites several studies (Delgado-Gaitán and Trueba; Heath and Mangiola; Trueba, “The Role of Culture in Literacy Acquisition”) that argue for going beyond holidays, food, costumes, etc., to include customs, values, and patterns of behavior in the curriculum (30).

Huerta-Macías cites Giroux, who says that schools tend to support the dominant culture, by legitimatizing certain ways of acting, learning, speaking, and seeing the world (30). She argues that schools need to support students by addressing the different sociocultural aspects of each learner, and applying them to the learning environment (31).

Huerta-Macías discusses several ways that teachers can incorporate sociocultural aspects of learning for Latino children into the classroom, and address differences that might be present among the general student populace and Latino students (29-43). First, teachers should consider patterns of interaction, which include different ways of participation, types of activities, styles of cooperation and collaboration, and tutoring. Second, teachers must recognize distinct sociolinguistic patterns, which include variation on how learners write and differences in texts, different styles of oral communication, text analysis, and the occurrence of two languages used at once. Finally, she discusses community and family as instructional resources and offers different ways that teachers can encourage Latino students and parents to participate more in the classroom, respecting cultural patterns that Latino parents might be more comfortable with.



In general, by recognizing and paying attention to cultural aspects, the school environment should reflect the community and society that students encounter outside of the classroom and thus allow students to succeed academically. As Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba argue, including culture in learning contributes to education success for minority students (17-33). As Huerta-Macías discusses, classrooms should include not only superficial things like food and holidays of each culture, but also types of communication, learning, outreach, language use, participation, and other more complex cultural characteristics that will be applicable and familiar to students (29-43).

The educational context in bilingual classrooms should address not only important American customs, beliefs, and ways of interacting, but also those of students in the classroom who come from other cultural backgrounds. Huerta-Macías admits that it is impossible to do this for all students in a classroom, as any classroom in the US could be very diverse (31, citing Macías, and Sosa) but that the learning context should be “multiculturally sensitive, where differences are acknowledged and appreciated and where opportunities do exist for learning in nonmainstream patterns” (31). I would take this a step further and say that in a dual-language bilingual classroom, where a substantial percentage of students may be from one cultural background, that cultural perspective should be weighted more.

Measuring the ways that culture is used in the classroom and school in general is a difficult task, and would mainly need to be done using observation and qualitative assessment. To sum up the information presented above, teachers need to create an environment that allows for different values, customs, beliefs, and ways of interaction from different groups of students, and would need to create programs, tasks, and

activities that account for those factors. In order to evaluate whether a bilingual program was able to do this, the involvement of the teachers and parents in the school in each culture would need to be evaluated, and ways of communicating and interacting within different value systems would need to be noted and assessed to make sure that all student groups are accounted for.

## **School Atmosphere and Student Support**

### *Bilingualism as a School-wide Goal*

In Rhodes' study conducted on some of the teachers and leaders involved in bilingual programs, participants all listed the importance and prioritization of the bilingual program across the school as one of the integral factors for the success of the program (117-118). They all thought that, in order for a bilingual program to be successful, everyone involved needed to view the program as an important aspect in the school and district. According to one participant in the study:

Everyone has to support the idea and the existence of the program and nurture it. There has to be support from the union so that, if you're planning a program, you need to involve the people from the union who may be called upon to make some exceptions to their policies in order to make it possible to have the teachers you need for your program. And you need to have the support from the elementary school [non-language] teachers as well. They have to perceive it as an integral part of the educational program and not as an interloper. And you don't disband your planning committee once the program is underway. You have to have an advocacy system always there to support your program. If it takes a whole village to raise a child, it also takes a whole community to support a foreign language program (120-121).

This quote outlines the support needed from the school community to sustain a language program in the school, and why different aspects of that support might be important for the development and continuation of the program. Lindholm-Leary

(“Effective Features of Dual Language Education Programs”) also mentions the importance of “shared values” in dual language schools, citing Berman et al; Montecel and Cortez; and Slavin and Calderón (23). Based on this research, it is important for the success of the program to have all aspects of the educational community in agreement about and supportive of the bilingual program. In order to do this, program advocates need to communicate with administrators, teachers, parents, school board officials, and district officials in order to ensure that the program is supported.

*Extra Services and Programs Outside the Classroom Offered to Students in both Languages*

Effective language programs generally accept students with learning disabilities or special needs, and they are not usually removed from the program once they have been accepted (Cloud et al, cited in Lindholm-Leary, *Dual Language Education*, 74). The teacher that I spoke with stated that this is the policy at the bilingual school that they work at: students are not counseled out of the program for any learning disabilities or special needs. The teacher added that if there is some sort of learning issue with a student, the school has to decide if it’s a learning disability or a special-needs based problem, or if the student merely has a language/communication problem. The program also needs to decide what the language of intervention will be in these cases.

In outlining the important criteria for evaluating exceptional bilingual students, or those who may need special learning assistance, Baca and Metz discuss the Holographic and Culturally Responsive Informal Assessment (HCRI) model, which includes seven goals for the assessment process. The first goal is identifying the area of concern, and the second is identifying the sociocultural context that may be affecting

the area of concern (cited in Baca and Cervantes, 171-172). By including the student's sociocultural context in the assessment, the assessors should be able to decide the best course of action for that student based on the issue and the student's language and cultural background.

In my opinion, if a program has students from two language backgrounds and uses the languages in the school as part of a bilingual program, and during problem assessment if the student's sociocultural context is taken into account (as the HCRI model argues that it should), then the school has to be prepared to support that student based on the sociocultural context that may be influencing the problem. Once the problem has been identified, the school can offer that student additional resources, such as extra reading help, math help, afterschool homework help, and other resources that support the student. If the student's sociocultural or language background is causing or exacerbating the problem, then that support should be offered at least partially in their home language (one other than English) and in the context of their culture.

Though I was not able to find much research in this area, especially done in the past 30 years, I believe that in order to understand and diagnose a possible learning problem and provide the necessary assistance to a student, the services in the school need to be available in both the languages that are taught at the school, in this case English and Spanish. Diagnostic procedures or material need to be available in both languages, and that special-needs services, counseling services, and general learning support and assistance needs to be offered in both languages. By having these resources in both languages, the program will be better able to diagnose and provide assistance for students who may have issues that require extra support outside the classroom.

### *Bilingual Infrastructure Incorporated*

This section includes all the aspects of bilingual education that do not fall within cultural, classroom, or programs and services categories. What I am calling the bilingual infrastructure includes aspects such as bilingual signs and notices, bilingual administrators, both languages used naturally among people in the school, bilingual parent/student conferences (based on parents' language ability), bilingual letters sent home, and other features outside of the classroom and planned programs that shows that the school is truly bilingual in all ways. The bilingual school teacher that I interviewed explained the way that their school incorporates these characteristics and says that they include some bilingual administrators, bilingual hall signs, and that both languages are spoken in the halls and newsletters that are sent home with students are bilingual.

Unfortunately there appears to be limited research on effects that including such infrastructure may have on bilingual students' educational experience. The only mention that I was able to find of these types of traits in a program was in Lindholm-Leary ("Effective Features of Dual Language Education Programs"); according to a panel of experts, when parents come to a bilingual school, they must see the bilingualism reflected, including in bilingual signs and office staff (36). However, as cited in Lindholm-Leary ("Effective Features of Dual Language Education Programs") this aspect of bilingual education is approached from the standpoint of creating a welcoming environment for all parents, rather than providing basic services for students.

Based on my experience, these services are a valuable part of a bilingual school, as they show that bilingualism is valued and included on all levels of the education—

not just formally or academically in the classroom, or culturally through value systems, art, or activities—but truly used as a means of communication and integrated in the school and its community and services.

## **School Community**

### *Bilingual Teachers*

Lindholm-Leary (*Dual Language Education*) outlines the characteristics of successful teachers and staff who work in effective bilingual programs, saying that they are native speakers or have native-like proficiency of children's home language, and that they are sufficiently trained in the bilingual model and bilingual theory, second language development and its instructional tactics, multiculturalism, and cooperative learning (citing Cloud et al; Day and Shapson; Met and Lorenz, 64-65). Montecel and Cortez (cited in Lindholm-Leary, "Effective Features of Dual Language Education Programs") add that bilingual teachers continually develop ability and knowledge that can help them in making informed choices about other areas of their teaching, such as program structure, curriculum, etc (18).

The teacher that I interviewed said similarly that teachers have to show that they are "highly qualified" bilinguals based on a test score, and also are involved in professional development. Lindholm-Leary's (*Dual Language Education*) research demonstrates that bilingual teachers with more experience, training, and teaching certifications were better able to assess their programs and how well they were working (cited in Lindholm-Leary, "Effective Features of Dual Language Education Programs," 18). As Rhodes shows through her study, educators generally seem to value "good"

teachers over anything else. One of the interviewees loosely defines a good teacher as someone who motivates their students, has sufficient training, who uses the language and works on their language skills, and who is a mentor and role model to their students (118). Though the definition of a good teacher varies and this is not an exhaustive list of characteristics, this definition does show some of the qualities that a good teacher may have.

In sum, successful teachers are generally those who have a high level of bilingualism and are able to use their training and education in the classroom, and are “good” teachers, as defined in Rhodes, who shows that those teachers are valued and an important part of the bilingual program.

#### *Stakeholders’ Involvement and Input*

This section will describe the roles the different stakeholders (parents, teachers, and students) that are involved with a school’s bilingual program. It will discuss different ways that these groups can be involved and how they may affect the program, in addition to providing surveys and an interview that could assess involvement and provide feedback for the program. Transcripts, in both English and Spanish, can be found in the appendix.

#### *Parents*

Several studies have shown that students benefit when their parents are involved in their education, and parent involvement has been shown to be linked to program effectiveness. Parents who take an active role in their child’s education improve academic achievement (Bermúdez and Márquez; Hidalgo et al; Levine and Lezotte;

Mortimore et al; Ramirez et al, “Longitudinal Study of Structured Immersion Strategy;” Slaughter-DeFoe; Snow et al), language proficiency (Bermúdez and Padrón; Lindholm and Padilla; Padilla and Sung) and home-school relations (Bright; Herman and Yeh; Hidalgo et al; Met; among others) (cited in Lindholm-Leary, *Dual Language Education*, 144). Parental involvement in childhood education can be manifested in a variety of ways: assisting teachers, helping planning and activities, attending events, attending workshops, helping students with homework, and encouraging students (Levine and Lezotte, cited in Lindholm-Leary, *Dual Language Education*, 145).

Lindholm-Leary (“Effective Features of Dual Language Education Programs”) builds on this idea by citing several studies (Berman et al; Marzano; Reyes et al) that argue that effective bilingual programs make the school into an accepting and welcoming environment for all types of parents, regardless of language or cultural background. She also cites several studies (Cloud et al; Met and Lorenz; Tizard, Schofield, and Hewison) that show that especially for language minority students, parents’ involvement contributes to “positive academic consequences” (36). Rhodes similarly says that the bilingual program must include input from all stakeholders, including the parents, and that their inclusion can help the program during times when it is struggling (120). Thus, parents who involve themselves in one of the ways the Lindholm-Leary lists or by being involved with general program planning can contribute to the success of both their child and the bilingual program.

The teacher I interviewed affirmed what has been discussed here: that the teachers in the bilingual program want communication with parents, and though the



program does not currently have a plan for parent involvement, they are working on developing one.

In order to help include parents in program planning and to evaluate their perceptions of the program, solicit input on the direction of the program, and facilitate their involvement in the process, I have created a survey that could be distributed to parents. These surveys should not be the sole means through which parents are interacting with the school and with their child's education, but they are an easy, straightforward way for the school to make sure it is collecting input from all the stakeholders. They are intended mainly to gather opinions and perceptions about the program, information that the school should take into consideration when planning their goals, curriculum, use of language, and other side programs. See *Appendix A* for a transcript of the parent survey.

### *Teachers*

Just as parents' views need to be considered and taken into account when a bilingual program is planning curriculum and programs, teachers' opinions need to be accounted for as well. Lindholm-Leary ("Effective Features of Dual Language Education Programs") cites a panel of experts who argue that individual teachers' goals, principles, and values need to be assessed and analyzed and need to become a part of the bilingual program (20). Rhodes similarly says that when interviewed, educators emphasized that the program needs to be a team effort of all involved (117), therefore including teachers. One interviewee in her study stressed that the program has to be "owned by the school district and...owned by the school board and...owned by the teachers," recognizing that while teachers are not the only players in bilingual

instruction programming, they do play an important role in it and their support is necessary for a successful program (120). Another interviewee says that, “language teachers need to be part of everything,” referencing the fact that a successful program will have teachers involved in many aspects of the program (120).

With this in mind, I crafted surveys that could be distributed among teachers, in order to collect their perceptions about the bilingual program. Again, these surveys would be only a part of bilingual teachers’ planning of the program, but they would hopefully provide some clarity into what teachers value in a bilingual program and what aspects they think need to be improved or changed in the program. The teacher survey can be found in *Appendix B*.

### *Students*

The teacher that I interviewed said that that their program did not have any formal measures in place to evaluate students’ opinions on bilingual education, but that many teachers had informal discussions about the bilingual program with their students, in order to improve their classroom. Though it does not appear that a large amount of research has been done in the area of students’ opinions on bilingual education, Rhodes’ study shows that there are many interviewed that tout the involvement of all the stakeholders involved (120) and I infer that that includes the students. For that reason, I have come up with an interview that could be given to students to evaluate their perceptions of the bilingual program. See *Appendix C* for the student interview.

## **Conclusions and Future Research**

There are many other assessment plans that outline possible program characteristics of a successful bilingual program. However, in my experience they seem to either have a specific focus (for example, advocacy, program model, curriculum) or ignore some factors that I found to be important. My plan for program assessment is strives to reflect a more complete view of the critical aspects of a bilingual program, and offers some insight into how some of the characteristics could be included and assessed in a program. The results this assessment plan could help identify the strengths and weaknesses of a program, and be used to help improve it.

My hope is that this plan is broad enough that a bilingual program could adapt it to their specific needs, based on their community, resources, teachers, curriculum, and program model. It is intended to include important aspects applicable for any bilingual program, to help develop the program by highlighting important characteristics and giving a means to assess them. As mentioned in the beginning, in *Appendix D*, there is an outline that a program could use to help assess and understand what the program is doing well and where it may need to improve.

This plan does highlight some areas that are in need of more research. There does not seem to be a large amount of research in the area of bilingual special education programming and assessment, bilingual school counseling, and other bilingual learning support programs. Similarly, I found little work on the importance of having a bilingual infrastructure in a school, where all aspects of the school are truly bilingual. In addition, I was not able to find any research in the field of student perceptions of their experiences in bilingual programs and how their perspective could be helpful in

program and curriculum planning. I think that more research in these areas could be enlightening with regard what aspects of a bilingual program are most important for student success.

A part of this research, the parent and teacher surveys and student interviews, was originally planned to be executed in a local bilingual school, but because of administrative obstacles the original plan was not realized. However, it would be easy for a school to use my surveys and interviews as a starting point, and add evaluation of the other parts of the program that contribute to a successful bilingual school that I have listed above. It is also a possibility that schools could use this plan in conjunction with other methods of developing and assessing bilingual programs, based on the values and resources that a program may have. Regardless, this plan is intended to assess a bilingual program, to ensure that it has the qualities of a successful bilingual school.

Bilingual education is an important method of education for children who speak a home language other than English. My plan provides a way for schools to assess many of the essential characteristics of their bilingual programs to ensure that they are meeting the needs of their students.

## Appendix

### *Appendix A: Parent Survey*

1. Please describe your relationship with the student (mother, father, grandparent, legal guardian, etc).
2. What language(s) do you speak in your home (Spanish, English, any others)? Please describe the languages you use and how often they are used (ex: English about 80% of the time, Spanish when the grandparents are here, etc).
3. If you primarily speak Spanish at home, how important is it to you that your child maintains Spanish?
4. If you speak primarily Spanish at home, how important is it to you that your child develops their English abilities?
5. If you primarily speak English at home, how important is it to you that your child learns Spanish?
6. Has your child attended a monolingual school in the past? If so, how would you compare this school with a monolingual school? At this school, are there things about the bilingual program that make the school better for your child? Are there things that make it worse? Please describe.

7. What about the bilingual program is working well at this school? Where do you see your child succeeding?

8. What do you think needs to be improved on at this school, in terms of the bilingual program? Where is your child struggling/what measures could be taken to improve that aspect of the school?

9. How does this school support (culturally, linguistically, etc) students to ensure their success? In your opinion, does the support vary by language group?

10. How well do you think your student's language and cultural background is represented at this school? In what ways, if any, do you see it represented?

11. Compared to another school that your child might have attended, how has the bilingual program at this school affected your child:

academically?

socially?

culturally?

linguistically?

other?

12. Considering your response to the previous question, how might this be different if your child attended a monolingual school?

13. What would you like to see done at this school to improve your child's education?

14. What do you think are the most important aspects of bilingual education? Do you see them incorporated at this school?

15. Do you feel welcome and accepted at this school?

16. How are you involved in the school?

17. Any other thoughts/suggestions/ideas about this school and its policies/methods/classrooms/other programs that you would like to share?

*Encuesta para padres*

1. Cuál es su relación con el/la estudiante? (madre, padre, abuelo/a, tutor legal, etcétera).

2. ¿Qué idiomas se usan en su casa (español, inglés, otros)? Indique qué idiomas se usan y la frecuencia y el contexto del uso de cada uno (por ejemplo: inglés 80% del tiempo, español cuando los abuelos están presentes, etcétera).
  
3. Si habla principalmente español en casa, ¿qué tan importante es que su hijo/a mantenga el español?
  
4. Si habla principalmente español en casa, ¿qué tan importante es que su hijo/a desarrolle sus habilidades en inglés?
  
5. Si hablan principalmente inglés en casa, ¿qué tan importante es que su hijo/a aprenda español?
  
6. ¿Su hijo/a ha asistido a una escuela monolingüe en el pasado? En caso de sí, ¿cómo compararía esta escuela bilingüe donde está ahora con la escuela monolingüe? En esta escuela, ¿hay cosas en el programa bilingüe que mejoran la experiencia educativa de su hijo/a? ¿Hay cosas que la empeoren? Describanlas, por favor.
  
7. ¿Qué aspectos del programa bilingüe funcionan bien en esta escuela? ¿En qué aspectos triunfa su hijo/a?



8. ¿Qué aspectos necesitan mejorarse en el programa bilingüe en esta escuela? ¿Qué retos tiene su hijo/a? ¿Qué se puede hacer para mejor apoyar a su hijo/a a enfrentar estos retos?

9. ¿Cómo apoya (cultural y lingüísticamente) esta escuela a sus estudiantes para asegurar su éxito? A su parecer, ¿todos los grupos lingüísticos reciben un apoyo igualitario?

10. Según usted, ¿en qué medida son representados el idioma y la cultura de su hijo/a en esta escuela? ¿Cómo los ve representados? Dé ejemplos específicos si es posible.

11. En comparación con otra(s) escuela(a) a las que su hijo/a ha asistido, ¿Cómo ha afectado a hijo/a el programa bilingüe? Comente los siguientes aspectos:

¿académicamente?

¿socialmente?

¿culturalmente?

¿lingüísticamente?

¿otro(s) aspecto(s)?

12. Considerando su respuesta a la pregunta anterior, ¿cómo habría sido diferente la experiencia de su hijo/a en una escuela monolingüe?

13. ¿Qué sugerencias tiene para mejorar la educación de su hijo/a en esta escuela?

14. ¿Cuáles son los aspectos más importantes de la educación bilingüe? ¿Los ve incorporados en esta escuela?

15. ¿Se siente usted bienvenido/a y aceptado/a en esta escuela?

16. ¿Cómo se involucra usted en esta escuela?

17. ¿Otras ideas o sugerencias sobre esta escuela y sus métodos de enseñanza/clases/políticas que quiere compartir?

The purpose of this survey is to gather perceptions and opinions that parents may want to share with the program, in order to improve it based on their opinions and to ensure that they are involved in the process. As mentioned earlier, this would be only one aspect of parental involvement in bilingual education, but would show parents that their input was important, hopefully opening gates for more involvement, while including their opinions in the decision-making process.

*Appendix B: Teacher Survey*

1. What motivated you to work at this school?
  
2. What are the goals/purposes of the bilingual program at this school?
  
3. How often do you use Spanish or English in your classroom or in the school in general, and in what capacity do you use each? (For example, Spanish 70% of the time, English only during recess, etc.)
  
4. Whom do you think the bilingual program benefits and why?
  
5. Do you think it is better for a student who is exposed primarily to English at home to come to this school as opposed to a monolingual school? Why?
  
6. Do you think it is better for a student who is exposed primarily to Spanish at home to come to this school as opposed to a monolingual school? Why?
  
7. How well do you think the bilingual program at this school helps the school support its students academically and culturally, in comparison with a school that does not have such a program? Please explain.
  
8. In your opinion, what are some specific differences for the students between having a bilingual program, versus being English only?

9. Do you teach any of your students differently based on the language they are exposed to at home (Spanish or English), or have different programs/groups/support in different areas for them? Please explain.

10. How does this school support (culturally, linguistically, etc) students to ensure their success? Does the support vary by language group?

11. What about the bilingual program is working well at this school? Where do you see your students succeeding?

12. What do you think needs to be improved on at this school, in terms of the bilingual program? Where are your students struggling/what measures could be taken to improve that aspect of the school?

13. What opportunities for family participation and inclusion do you offer/create in your classroom? In what ways do parents (of both language groups) participate and support students?

14. Since you've been here, have you seen any changes in the bilingual program that you think benefits one language group of students or the other? Any changes that put one group or the other at a disadvantage? What were the effects of those changes/what might their effects be?

15. Please describe your involvement in the bilingual program's development.

16. What is your perception of the support that the bilingual program receives, be it from parents, the district, the school board, etc.?

17. Is there anything else you would like to mention about the bilingual program, current characteristics, or future possibilities?

*Encuesta para maestros*

1. ¿Cuál fue su motivación original para trabajar en esta escuela?

2. ¿Cuáles son los objetivos del programa bilingüe en esta escuela?

3. ¿Con qué frecuencia usa usted los dos idiomas (español e inglés) en su clase o en la escuela por lo general, y en qué contexto usa cada uno? (Por ejemplo, “uso español el 70%”, “sólo uso inglés en los recreos”, etc.)

4. ¿Quién se beneficia del programa bilingüe? ¿Por qué?

5. Según usted, ¿es mejor que un estudiante que usa principalmente inglés en su casa venga a esta escuela, en lugar de una escuela monolingüe? ¿Por qué?

6. Según usted, ¿es mejor que un estudiante que usa principalmente español en su casa venga a esta escuela, en lugar de una escuela monolingüe? ¿Por qué?

7. Según usted, ¿en qué medida el programa bilingüe de esta escuela apoya a sus estudiantes académica y culturalmente, en comparación con una escuela que no tiene un programa de este tipo? Incluya detalles concretos, por favor.

8. Desde el punto de vista del estudiante, ¿en qué se diferencian un programa bilingüe y uno que sólo ofrece clases en inglés?

9. ¿Emplea usted técnicas de instrucción diferentes según el idioma que el estudiante habla en casa? ¿Ofrece diferentes tipos de apoyo según el idioma familiar del estudiante?

10. ¿Cómo apoya (cultural y lingüísticamente) esta escuela a sus estudiantes para asegurar su éxito? ¿El apoyo varía según el grupo lingüístico?

11. ¿Qué aspectos del programa bilingüe funcionan bien en esta escuela? ¿En qué aspectos triunfan sus estudiantes?

12. ¿Qué aspectos necesitan mejorarse en el programa bilingüe de esta escuela? ¿Qué retos tienen sus estudiantes? ¿Qué se puede hacer para mejor apoyar a sus estudiantes a enfrentar estos retos?

13. En su clase, ¿qué oportunidades ofrece para la participación e inclusión de las familias? ¿Cómo participan y apoyan a los estudiantes los padres (de los dos grupos de idiomas)?

14. Desde que llegó usted a esta escuela, ¿ha visto cambios en el programa bilingüe que cree que beneficien a un grupo de estudiantes (basado en idioma) u otro? ¿Cambios que pongan en desventaja a un grupo u otro? ¿Cuáles fueron/podrían ser los efectos de estos cambios?

15. Por favor, describa su participación en el desarrollo del programa bilingüe.

16. ¿Cuál es su percepción del apoyo que recibe el programa bilingüe de los padres, el distrito, school board, etcétera?

17. ¿Hay algo más que quiere usted mencionar sobre el programa bilingüe-- características actuales, o posibilidades futuras?

This survey could be used as a way to understand teachers' beliefs and values and what they think the program needs to work on. It could be useful for a program to use in order to make sure that teachers are included in the decision-making process and have an opportunity to express their opinions.

*Appendix C: Student Interview*

1. What languages do you speak at home with your parents, or the other people who take care of you? How often do you use English? How often do you use Spanish?
2. Many schools are taught in only one language: English. In your school, you learn in two languages: Spanish and English. Do you think this is good or bad? Why?
3. Do you like learning in Spanish and English? Why?
4. Would you prefer to learn in just Spanish or just English?
5. Are there certain things at school that are hard for you? What are they?
6. Are those things harder for you when you learn them in English or in Spanish?
7. Do you ever feel confused when you are being taught in English or in Spanish?
8. Which language is easier for you to learn in?
9. How has being taught in two languages helped you?
10. How has being taught in two languages not helped you, or made school harder for you?



11. Have you learned about culture in your class? What have you learned?

12. Is there anything else you want to say about learning at school in both English and Spanish?

*Entrevista para estudiantes*

1. ¿Qué idiomas usas en tu casa con tus padres, o con las personas que te cuidan? ¿Con qué frecuencia usas inglés? ¿Con qué frecuencia usas español?

2. Muchas escuelas usan sólo inglés para la instrucción. En tu escuela, aprendes en dos idiomas: español e inglés. ¿Crees que esto sea malo o bueno? ¿Por qué?

3. ¿A ti te gusta aprender en dos idiomas al mismo tiempo? ¿Por qué?

4. ¿Prefieres aprender en sólo español o sólo inglés?

5. ¿Hay cosas en la escuela que son difíciles para ti? ¿Cuáles son?

6. ¿Estas cosas difíciles te cuestan más trabajo en inglés o en español?

7. ¿Te sientes confundido/a cuando te enseñan en inglés o en español?

8. ¿En qué idioma es más fácil aprender para ti?
9. ¿Cómo te ha ayudado aprender en dos idiomas?
10. ¿En qué medida te ha causado dificultades aprender en dos idiomas?
11. ¿Has aprendido sobre la cultura en tu clase? ¿Qué aprendiste?
12. ¿Hay algo más que quieras decir sobre tu experiencia en la escuela bilingüe?

Through the use of this interview, the program would hopefully be able to collect more information on the views and values of the students, and be able to take those into account as well in order to improve the program.

*Appendix D: Program Trait Assessment Outline*

<b>Program Traits</b>		<b>Program Assessment</b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>Program Trait</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Development in progress</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<i>Student Achievement</i>	Student Progression towards Fluency/Proficiency in Spanish and English <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students learn both languages</li> <li>• Both languages assessed</li> <li>• Progress is monitored</li> </ul>			
	Student Content Learning			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scores on par with non-bilingual students</li> <li>• Progress is monitored</li> <li>• Possible lag is accounted for</li> </ul>			
<i>Curriculum, Classroom, and Bilingual Instruction Traits</i>	<p>Additive and Long-term Bilingual Programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additive</li> <li>• Long-term</li> <li>• 90:10 or 50:50 model</li> </ul>			
	<p>Curriculum Aligned with Bilingualism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrated language instruction</li> <li>• Content-based/enriched</li> </ul>			
	<p>Exposure to Cultural Elements from both English-speaking Country and Spanish-speaking Countries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sociocultural aspects incorporated</li> <li>• Culturally, school reflects student community</li> </ul>			
<i>School Atmosphere and Student Support</i>	<p>Bilingualism as a School-wide Goal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All members of school support bilingual program</li> </ul>			
	<p>Extra Services and Programs Outside the Classroom Offered to Students in both Languages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special learning assistance and evaluation offered bilingually</li> <li>• Other student services and assistance (counseling, etc) offered bilingually</li> <li>• Sociocultural aspects</li> </ul>			

	<p>taken into account in offering extra student services</p>			
	<p><b>Bilingual Infrastructure Incorporated</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Features outside the classroom and planned programs are bilingual</li> <li>• Bilingual signs, notices, letters sent home, administrators, etc.</li> <li>• Both languages integrated in school and used as means of communication</li> </ul>			
<i>School Community</i>	<p><b>Bilingual Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have native(-like) proficiency</li> <li>• Sufficiently trained</li> <li>• Involved in professional development</li> </ul>			
	<p><b>Parents' Involvement and Input</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School welcomes input and involvement</li> <li>• Parents are involved in a variety of ways</li> </ul>			
	<p><b>Teachers' Involvement and Input</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School welcomes input /involvement</li> <li>• Teachers are involved in a variety of ways</li> </ul>			
	<p><b>Students' Involvement and Input</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student input is gathered and taken into account</li> </ul>			
<i>Notes</i>				

This table should be used *in conjunction* with the rest of this thesis; the information written in the thesis informs and expands upon these categories. A bilingual program could use this chart to understand which parts of the program need development, and what parts are already successful.

## Works Cited

- Baca, Leonard. and I. Metz. "The Holographic and Culturally Responsive Informal Assessment Model." Unpublished paper, Evaluation Assistance Center, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1993. Medium Unknown.
- Baca, Leonard M. and Hermes T. Cervantes. "The Bilingual Special Education Interface." 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1998. Print.
- Baese-Berk, Melissa. "Linguistic Principles and Second Language Acquisition." University of Oregon. Gerlinger, Eugene, OR. Nov. 11, 2013. Lecture and Discussion.
- Baker, Keith and Adriana De Kanter, eds. *Bilingual Education: A Reappraisal of Federal Policy*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1983. Medium Unknown.
- . *Effectiveness of Bilingual Education: A Review of the Literature*. Washington, DC: US Dept. of Education, 1981. Medium Unknown.
- Berman, Paul et al. *School Reform and Student Diversity: Case Studies for Exemplary Practices for LEP Students*. Santa Cruz, CA: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, and B.W. Associates, 1995. Medium Unknown.
- Bermúdez, Andrea B. and Judith A. Marquez. "An Examination of a Four-way Collaborative to Increase Parental Involvement in the Schools." *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 16 (1996): 1-16. Medium Unknown.
- Bermúdez, Andrea B. and Y. N. Padrón. "Improving Language Skills for Hispanic Students Through Home-School Partnerships." *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 6 (1990): 33-43. Medium Unknown.
- Bialystok, Ellen. "Coordination of Executive Functions in Monolingual and Bilingual Children." *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*. 110. (2011): 461-468. *National Center for Biotechnology Information*. Web.
- Bright, Josephine A. "High-achieving, Low-achieving, Low-income Black Children: What Makes the Difference?" Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, 1992.
- Carter, Thomas and Michael Chatfield. "Effective Bilingual Schools: Implications for Policy and Practice." *American Journal of Education* 95 (1986): 200-232. Medium Unknown.

- Christian, D. et al. *Profiles in Two-Way Bilingual Education*. Washington, DC, and McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems, 1997. Medium Unknown.
- Chomsky, Noam. *Reflections on Language*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1975. Medium Unknown.
- Cloud, Nancy, Fred Genesee, and Else Hamayan. *Dual Language Instruction: A Handbook for Enriched Education*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle, 2000. Medium Unknown.
- Collier, Virginia. "A Synthesis of Studies Examining Long-term Language Minority Student Data on Academic Achievement." *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16 (1992): 187-212. Medium Unknown.
- Corallo, Christopher and Deborah McDonald. *What Works With Low-Performing Schools: A Review of Research Literature on Low-Performing Schools*. Charleston, WV: Appalachian Educational Laboratory, 2002. Medium Unknown.
- Cummins, Jim. *Empowering Minority Students*. Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education, 1989. Medium Unknown.
- . "Empowering Minority Students: A Framework for Intervention." *Harvard Education Review*, 56 (1986): 18-36. Medium Unknown.
- . Introduction. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Ed. Jim Cummins and Nancy H Hornberger. Vol 5. New York: Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2008. xiii-xxiii Print.
- Danoff, Malcolm, et al. *Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English Bilingual Education Program*. Palo Alto: American Institutes for Research, 1978. Medium Unknown.
- Day, Elaine Mellen, and Stan M. Shapson. *Studies in Immersion Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1996. Medium Unknown.
- Delgado-Gaitan, Concha. "Sociocultural Adjustment to School and Academic Achievement." *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 8 (1988a): 63-82. Medium Unknown.
- . "The Value of Conformity: Learning to Stay in School." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 19 (1988b): 354-381. Medium Unknown.
- Delgado-Gaitan, Concha, and Henry Trueba. *Crossing Cultural Borders: Education for Immigrant Families in America*. Bristol, PA: The Farmer Press, 1991. Print.

- Edmonds, Ronald. "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." *Educational Leadership* 37.1 (1979):15-24. Medium Unknown.
- Erickson, Frederick. "Transformation and School Success: The Politics and Culture of Educational Achievement." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18.4 (1987): 335-356. Medium Unknown.
- Fernandez, Roberto M., Ronnelle Paulsen, and Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi. "Dropping Out Among Hispanic Youth." *Social Science Research*, 18 (1989): 21-52. Medium Unknown.
- Genesee, Fred. *Learning Through Two Languages*. Cambridge: Newbury House, 1987. Medium Unknown.
- Genesee, Fred and Caroline Riches. "Instructional Issues in Literacy Development." *Educating English Language Learners: A Synthesis of Research Evidence*. Ed. Fred Genesee, et al. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 109-175. Print.
- Gilzow, Douglas F. and Lucinda E. Branaman. *Lessons Learned: Model Early Foreign Language Programs*. City Unknown: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems Co, Inc, 2000. Print.
- Giroux, Henry A. "Critical Literacy and Student Experience: Donald Graves' Approach to Literacy." *Becoming Political: Readings and Writings in the Politics of Literacy Education*. Ed. Patrick Shannon. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1992. 15-20. Medium Unknown.
- Goldenberg, C. and J. Sullivan. *Making Change Happen in a Language Minority School: A Search for Coherence*. EPR #13. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1994. Medium Unknown.
- Grant, Carl A. and Christine E. Sleeter. "Race, Class, and Gender in Education Research: An Argument for Integrative Analysis." *Review of Educational Research*, 56 (1986): 195-211. Medium Unknown.
- Hayes, Curtis W., Robert Bahruth, and Carolyn Kessler. *Literacy con Cariño*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1991. Medium Unknown.
- Heath, Shirley Brice, and Leslie Mangiola. *Children of Promise: Literate Activity in Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Classrooms*. Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1991. Medium Unknown.
- Herman, Joan L. and Jennie P. Yeh. "Some Effects of Parent Involvement in Schools." Report No. CSE-R-138. Boston, MA: Annual Meeting for the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 206 963.) 1980. Medium Unknown.



- Hernandez-Chavez, Eduardo. "The Inadequacy of English Immersion Education as an Educational Approach for Language Minority Students in the United States." *Studies on Immersion Education: A Collection for US Educators*. California State Dept. of Education. Sacramento: California Dept. of Education, 1984. Print.
- Hidalgo, Nitza M., et al. "Research on Families, Schools, and Communities: A Multicultural Perspective." *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*. Ed. James A. Banks and Cherry A. McGee Banks. New York: Macmillan, 1995. Page Unknown. Medium Unknown.
- "Hispanic Heritage Month 2013." *United States Census Bureau*. US Department of Commerce. Jun 30, 2013. Web. Nov 14, 2013.
- Huerta-Macías, Ana. "Learning for Latinos: The Sociocultural Perspective." *Educating Latino Students: A Guide to Successful Practice*. Ed. María Luísa González, Ana Huerta Macías, and Josefina Villamil Tinajero. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Technomic Publishing Company, 1998. Print.
- Jebian, Wayne. "Study Finds Rising Racism Against Latinos." *CTlatinonews.com*. Nov 14, 2012. Accessed Dec 9, 2013. Web.
- Krashen, Stephen D. *The Input Hypothesis. Issues and Implications*. UK: Longman Group, 1985. Print.
- Lambert, Wallace E. "An Overview of Issues in Immersion Education." *Studies in Immersion Education: A Collection for US Educators*. 8-30. Sacramento: California State Dept. of Education, 1984. Medium Unknown.
- Levine, Daniel U. and Lawrence W. Lezotte. "Effective Schools Research." *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*. Ed. James A. Banks and Cherry A. McGee Banks. New York: Macmillan, 1995. 525-547. Medium Unknown.
- Lindholm-Leary, Kathryn. *Dual Language Education*. Avon, England: Multilingual Matters, 2001. Medium Unknown.
- . *Dual Language Education*. Great Britain: Cambrian Printers Ltd, 2001. Print.
- . "Effective Features of Dual Language Education Programs: A Review of Research and Best Practices." *Guided Principles for Dual Language Education*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Ed. Elizabeth Howard, et al. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 2007. 5-50. PDF.
- . "Success and Challenges in Dual Language Education." *Theory into Practice*. 51.4 (2012): 256-262. *EBSCOhost*. PDF.

- Lindholm, Kathryn and Amado M. Padilla. "The Mount Miguel High School Partial Immersion Program." *Foreign Language Education: Issues and Strategies*. Ed. Amado M. Padilla, Halford H. Fairchild, and Concepción Valadez. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1990. Medium Unknown.
- Lindholm-Leary, Kathryn and E. Howard. "Language and Academic Achievement in Two-way-immersion programs." *Pathways to Bilingualism: Evolving Perspectives on Immersion Education*. Ed. Tara Fortune and Diane Tedick. Avon, England: Multilingual Matters, 2008. 177-200. Medium Unknown.
- Lindholm-Leary, Kathryn and Fred Genesee. "Alternative Educational Programs for English Language Learners." *Research on English Language Learners*. Ed. California Department of Education. Sacramento: California Department of Education Press, 2010. 323-367. Medium Unknown.
- Lindholm-Leary, Kathryn and Graciela Borsato. "Academic Achievement." *Educating English Language Learners: A Synthesis of Research Evidence*. Ed. Fred Genesee, et al. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 176-222. Print.
- . "Hispanic High Schoolers and Mathematics: Follow-up of Students who had participated in Two-way Bilingual Elementary Programs." *Bilingual Research Journal*. 29. (2005): 641-652. Medium Unknown.
- Lindholm-Leary, Kathryn and R. Molina. "Two-way Bilingual Education: The Power of Two Languages in Promoting Educational Success." *The Power of Two Languages 2000: Effective Dual-language Use Across the Curriculum*. Ed. Josefina Villamil Tinajero and Robert A. Devillar. New York: Mcgraw Hill, 2000. 163-174. Medium Unknown.
- Lucas, Tamara, Rosemary Henze, and Ruben Donato. "Promoting the Success of Latino Language-minority Students: An Exploratory Study of Six High Schools." *Harvard Educational Review*, 60 (1990): 315-340. Medium Unknown.
- Luk, Gigi, et al. "Lifelong Bilingualism Maintains White Matter Integrity in Older Adults." *The Journal of Neuroscience*. 31.46 (2011): 16808-16813. Web.
- Macías, Reynaldo. *Bilingual Teacher Supply and Demand in the United States*. City Unknown: University of Southern California, Center for Multilingual, Multicultural Research and The Tomás Rivera Center, 1989. Medium Unknown.
- Marzano, Robert J. *What Works in Schools: Translating Research in Action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2003. Medium Unknown.

- May, Stephen. "Bilingual Immersion Education: What the Research Tells Us." *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Ed. Jim Cummins and Nancy H Hornberger. Vol. 5. New York: Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2008. 19-34. Print.
- Met, Myriam and Eileen Lorenz. "Lessons from US Immersion Programs: Two Decades of Experience." *Immersion Education: International Perspectives*. Ed. Robert Johnson and Merrill Swain. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. 243-264. Medium Unknown.
- Met, Myriam. "Parent Involvement in Foreign Language Learning." *ERIC/CLL News Bulletin* 11, (1987): 2-3, 7-8. Medium Unknown.
- Montecel M. and J. Cortez. "Successful Bilingual Education Programs: Development and the Dissemination of Criteria to Identify Promising and Exemplary Practices in Bilingual Education at the National Level." *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26.1 (2002): pages unknown. Medium Unknown.
- Mortimore, Peter, et al. *School Matters*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988. Medium Unknown.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. Washington, DC: The United States Government Printing Office, 1983. Medium Unknown.
- National Research Council Institute of Medicine. *Improving Schooling for Language Minority Children: A Research Agenda*. Ed. Diane August and Kenji Hakuta. Washington DC: National Academy Press, 1997. Print.
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Yonkers, NY: Author, 1996. Medium Unknown.
- "No Child Left Behind Act." *National Association for Bilingual Education*. n.p. n.d. Web. May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2014. Web.
- "The No Child Left Behind Act (H.R.1)." Bill Summary. *Committee on Education and the Workforce*. House GOP, Oct. 10, 2002. Web. Nov. 14, 2013. Web.
- Ornelas, India, Scott Rhodes, and Eugenia Eng. "Perceived Racism and Coping among Latino Immigrant Men." *Dept.washington.edu*. Web.
- Ortiz, F I. "Hispanic-American Children's Experiences, in Classrooms: A Comparison Between Hispanic and non-Hispanic Children." *Class, Race, and Gender in American Education*. Ed. L Weis. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1988. 63-86. Medium Unknown.

- Padilla, Amado M., and Hyekyung Sung. "Study of Asian Languages in the United States: Students' Motivation, Parents' Attitudes and Parental Involvement." Paper presented at the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Cross-Cultural Communications, August 17, 1995, Harbin, China. 1995. Medium Unknown.
- Panel of Experts. Personal Communication with Kathryn Lindholm-Leary. June 16, 2003.
- Purkey Stewart, and Marshall Smith. "Research on Effective School: A Review." *Elementary School Journal* 83 (1983): 427-452. Medium Unknown.
- Ramirez, J. D. "Longitudinal Study of Structured English Immersion Strategy Early-exit and Late-exit Transitional Bilingual Educational Programs for Language Minority Children (Executive Summary)." *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16 (1992): 1-62. Medium Unknown.
- Ramirez, J D, et al. "Longitudinal Study of Structured Immersion Strategy, Early-exit and Late-exit Bilingual Education Programs for Language Minority Children, Vols 1-2" Report No. 300-87-0156. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, 1991. Medium Unknown.
- Reyes, Pedro, Jay D. Scribner, and Alicia Paredes Scribner, eds. *Lessons from High-performing Hispanic Schools: Creating Learning Communities*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1999. Medium Unknown.
- Rhodes, Nancy. "Elementary School Foreign Language Teaching: Lessons Learned Over Three Decades (1980-2010)." *Foreign Language Annals* 47.1 (2014): 115-133. PDF.
- Rumberger, R W. "Chicano Dropouts." *Chicano School Failure and Success: Research and Policy Agendas for the 1990's*. Ed. R. R. Valencia. Basingstoke, England, Falmer Press, 1989/1990 [date unclear]. n. p. Medium Unknown.
- Rutter, Michael, Barbara Maughan, Peter Mortimore, and Janet Ouston. *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979. Medium Unknown.
- Schweizer, Tom A, et al. "Bilingualism as a Contributor to Cognitive Reserve: Evidence for Brain Atrophy in Alzheimer's Disease." *ScienceDirect*. 48. (2012): 991-996. Web.
- Short, Deborah. "Language Learning in Sheltered Social Studies Classes." *TESOL Journal*, 11 (2002): 18-24. Medium Unknown.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove. *Bilingualism or Not: The Education of Minorities*. *Multilingual Matters* 7. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1981. 121-35. Medium Unknown.

- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Teresa L. McCarty. "Key Concepts in Bilingual Education: Ideological, Historical, Epistemological, and Empirical Foundations." *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Ed. Jim Cummins and Nancy H Hornberger. Vol. 5. New York: Springer Science and Business Media, 2008. 3-17. Print.
- Slaughter-DeFoe, Diana T. "Parental Educational Choice: Some African American Dilemmas." *Journal of Negro Education*, 60 (1991), 354-360. Medium Unknown.
- Slavin, Robert E. and Margarita Calderón. *Effective Programs for Latino Students*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2001. Medium Unknown.
- Slavin R. and N. Madden. *Lee Conmigo: Effects of Success for All in Bilingual First Grades*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April. Center for Children Placed at Risk of School Failure, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, 1994. Medium Unknown.
- Slavin R., and R. Yampolsky. *Success for All. Effects of Students with Limited English Proficiency: A Three Year Evaluation*. Report No. 29. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, The Johns Hopkins University, 1992. Medium Unknown.
- Smith, Frank. "Reading like a Writer." *Language Arts*, 60 (1983): 558-567. Medium Unknown.
- . *Writing and the Writer*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1982a. Medium Unknown.
- Snow, Catherine et al. *Unfulfilled Expectations: Home and School Influences on Literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991. Medium Unknown.
- Solano-Flores, Guillermo and Elise Trumbull. Examining Language in Context: The Need for New Research and Practice Paradigms in the Testing of English-language Learners. *Educational Researcher*, 32 (2003): 3-13. Medium Unknown.
- Sosa, Alicia. *Thorough and Fair*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, 1993. Medium Unknown.
- "State and Country Quick Facts." *United States Census Bureau*. US Department of Commerce. Jun 27, 2013. Web. Nov 14, 2013.
- Stevick, Earl. *Memory, Meaning, and Method*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1976. Medium Unknown.

- Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. *ESL Standards for Pre-K-12 Students*. Alexandria, VA: Author, 1997. Medium Unknown.
- Thomas, Wayne P. and Virginia Collier. "A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students' Long-term Academic Achievement." (2002). Originally retrieved from [http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/research/llaa/1.1\\_final.html](http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/research/llaa/1.1_final.html). Web.
- . "School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students." *NCBE Resource Collection Series*. 9. (1997): 97. Microfilm.
- Tizard, J., W. Schofield, and Jenny Hewison. "Collaboration Between Teachers and Parents in Assisting Children's Reading." *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 52, (1982): 1-15. Medium Unknown.
- Trueba, Henry. "Empowerment and Mainstreaming: Culture Change and the Integration of Home and School Values." Paper read at the annual meeting for the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. 1989. Medium Unknown.
- . *Raising Silent Voices: Educating the Linguistic Minorities for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. New York: Harper and Row, 1989. Medium Unknown.
- . "The Role of Culture in Literacy Acquisition: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Qualitative Research." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 3.1 (1990): 1-1-13. Medium Unknown.
- Weber, George. *Inner-City Children Can be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools*. Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education, 1971. Medium Unknown.
- Willig, Ann. "A Meta-analysis of Selected Studies on the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education." *Review of Educational Research* 55 (1985): 269-317. Medium Unknown.
- . "Examining Bilingual Education Research Through Meta-analysis and Narrative Review: A Response to Baker." *Review of Educational Research* 57 (1987): 363-376. Medium Unknown.
- Zanger, Virginia. "Social and Cultural Dimensions of the Education of Language Minority Students." *Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language: A Research Handbook, 1988-1990*. Alba N. Ambert. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1991. 3-54. Print.