Confronting the Equity Issues in Dual Language Immersion Programs:
A summary of the 2018 UCLA Forum on Equity and DL Education
December 7-8, 2018

Patricia Gándara, UCLA and Robert Slater, American Councils Research

Section 1. Rationale and Organization of Forum

Dual Language Immersion (DLI) represents an education strategy that offers the promise of access to quality education for students from diverse backgrounds, especially for marginalized or "minoritized" ethnic and linguistic populations. Although there is no current census of DLI programs, program types, or enrollment, the evidence of expansion is considerable. A recent report (Gross, 2016) cited an estimated 2,000 DLI programs nationwide. Recent trends suggest that estimate is dramatically understated with considerable proliferation in states including California, Delaware, North Carolina, Texas, and Utah. New York City, in 2018-19 added 48 new dual language programs to the already more than 175 already existing programs. DLI programs operate in dozens of languages across the country. The greatest demand, by far, is for Spanish-English programs, given that more than three-quarters (77%) of English learners in the U.S. are speakers of Spanish (USED, 2017) and the growing appeal to monolingual English speakers to gain competence in Spanish for its economic value.

Our focus is on Two-Way DLI (TWDLI) programs which require that both native speakers of English and speakers of the "partner" language (e.g. Spanish) are educated together in both languages. Students have both models of native speech as well as companions with whom to use the language they are learning in a "natural setting." Through two-way programs, DLI offers the promise not only to level the playing field for students but to transform schools and school districts through "purposeful integration" of

partner language speakers (immigrant and U.S.-born) and English speakers (Arias and Markos, 2018), perhaps even shifting populations that might help reverse trends that include increased segregation of Latinx and immigrant populations.

Along with the available research demonstrating the successes of DLI are concerns about practices and contexts for different groups of students. There are potentially significant educational achievement opportunities afforded by DLI programs as research evidence has demonstrated. But there is also significant risk to achieving the promise of DLI when students and families with different language experiences, cultures, socioeconomic status, and other demographic and personal history characteristics do not realize the potential full benefits of DLI. Indeed, many of the risks are associated with the aspirations of a strategy that has emerged so quickly and in so many ways pushed the boundaries of curricular innovation, teacher and administrator development and preparation, along with the capacity of school districts to make effective decisions regarding DLI school placement and rules of enrollment. It is important to assess dual language programs in the context of changing and evolving theories and practice in education.

Our goal in the **Forum on Equity and Dual Language Education** was to introduce to dual language education an informed and more systematic dialogue among academics, researchers and practitioners about the relationships between issues of equity and dual language practices. Our hope was to create opportunities for constructive engagement among dual language practitioners (school administrators, teachers) and education equity experts.

We focused on the accumulating evidence for DL programs to narrow the achievement gap for students from different races, ethnicities, socio-economic status and language backgrounds. DL orients schools toward "additive bilingualism" and multiculturalism where both languages and their cultures are valued. Equitably implemented DL entails learning as a constructive and social process and emphasizes instructional practices in an environment that values all students. Yet, there are many potential equity pitfalls in the implementation of such programs and important questions that our agenda will address:

(1) The ideal TWDLI model is a balance of 50% English and 50% partner language speakers. The effort to enroll and appease parents of English speakers by allowing programs to become unbalanced (Dorner, 2011), or the practice of tipping the enrollment balance toward speakers of the partner (e.g. Spanish) language significantly impacts the power of the two-way model.

(2) Decisions about where to locate DL and whether DL will be whole school or "strand" can have a major impact (sometimes unintended) on neighborhood and school demographics. It can also exacerbate transportation issues.

(3) Often more powerful parents of English-speaking students can pressure teachers to respond disproportionately to the needs of their children, resulting in potentially "watered down" partner language instruction in order to accommodate English speakers. This undermines development of strong primary language skills of the partner language (Valdes, 1997).

(4) Shortages of teachers with proficiency in partner languages have led to "importing" teachers from other countries. While these teachers ostensibly speak

the same language, they may disparage the local idiom and lack connection to students due to vastly different social and cultural backgrounds (Cervantes-Soon, 2017).

(5) The choice of partner language may be determined by the school district rather than the needs and desires of the local community. Depriving students access to primary language development in their native language can nullify the potentially positive impact of DL programs (Cheung, 2017).

(6) Inadequate or uneven standards for DL programs restrict the capacity to know how well students are being taught in both languages. This is exacerbated by the fact that no state requires regular assessment of the partner language for accountability purposes.

Section II: **The Structure of the Forum**

An organizing committee composed of Dr. Patricia Gándara (UCLA), Dr. Robert Slater (American Councils Research Center), Mr. Gregg Roberts (American Councils Research Center), and Dr. Donna Christian (Center for Applied Linguistics) met several times by phone to determine the best mode for enabling discussion at the forum, identify critical topics for papers, and roles for paper discussants. We undertook a brief literature review to identify names and topics that were prominent in the recent journal literature. The team sought as much geographic diversity as possible as well individuals who had a solid record of scholarship, not the least to ensure that the commissioned papers would be thorough and completed in a timely fashion. It was decided that commentators/reviewers would receive the papers at least two weeks before the conference and provide feedback to

the author as s/he wished, and prepare a 20-30 minutes response to the paper, including the points they felt were most critical to insert in the discussion.

The paper topics and authors and discussants were:

- Robert Slater, Donna Christian, Richard Brecht," Overview of the field of dual language instruction."

- Kathryn Lindholm-Leary, San Jose State, "Dual language program planning and equity" Discussant: Ana Hernandez, CSU San Marcos

- Claudia Cervantes-Soon, Arizona State, "Race, social justice and power equity." Discussant: Nelson Flores, Penn

- Magaly Lavadenz, LMU, "Recruiting and Preparing the *right* teachers." Discussant: Shelly Spiegel-Coleman, Californians Together

- Deborah Palmer, UT Austin, "Equity and dual language immersion." Discussant Lisa Dorner, U of Missouri

The agenda for the forum was built around the five papers and as much as possible, during a day and one-half meeting, we built in time for open discussion. In addition to the paper presenters and discussants we invited a representative group of researchers and practitioners. We limited the total to 40 participants in addition to the organizing committee and three student notetakers in an effort to maximize conversation and discussion. It is notable that this was the first time many of these participants had met. A copy of the forum agenda is included in the appendix.

Paper Overviews

Slater et al. Overview of the field of dual language:

The goal of this paper was to lay a foundation for the discussion of equity issues by summarizing some of the more recent research (and identifying some critical gaps) that might inform our understanding. The paper focused on three key areas of research: (1) Academic outcomes; (2) Biliteracy and bilingualism; (3) Social and behavioral development. The paper also included a report on the results of an unscientific survey of DLI administrators undertaken in September and October 2018. The goal of this survey was to identify issues and areas of concern across school districts that would help guide the equity conversation.

Academic Outcomes. There is limited but growing evidence that supports the argument that instruction in two languages from early grades produces higher academic achievement in core academic content (e.g. language arts, mathematics, and science) tested in English, especially for English language learners. Since most testing is carried out in English, it is difficult to assess the role of proficiency in the partner language, other than by assuming a degree of bilingualism based on the curriculum offered. The paper discusses at some length the findings from a number of recent research efforts.

There remain some serious gaps and flaws in research on academic outcomes. Many studies, particularly those from the 1990s and early 2000s, were suspect because of a failure to adjust for selection bias. DLI programs have not been particularly attentive to collecting systematic data on DLI students making it difficult for researchers to investigate longitudinal data. We have very limited research that is able to control for the differential effects by race, ethnicity, or other factors such as poverty. It is also important to

understand whether benefits hold across racial/ethnic groups. Notably, African American student populations have been absent from most research, perhaps because many DLI programs struggle to include them. Dual language education researchers have called for such research to examine the effects of demographic factors and ways of providing effective and equitable DLI for all students.

Bilingualism and Biliteracy. It is clear that the future success of DLI depends upon accommodating race, ethnicity, class, and social and economic status of its students. The focus on proficiency and usage/exposure provides measurable variables within "core program elements" that tie to cognitive advantages proven to affect educational achievement. Understanding the relationship of documentable variables of proficiency and usage with race, ethnicity, class and SES enables better understanding of the different cadres of students who must be accommodated in DLI programming--which students are succeeding by these explicit criteria and which are not--and to develop appropriate curricula and responsive staff, critical steps forward in social justice goals.

These considerations raise additional important questions that have not been addressed by research: How much DLI is enough to ensure desired levels of bilingualism as defined to include both proficiency and usage/exposure? What is the effect of time-on-task and its apportionment for the two languages in class (50/50 vs. 90/10, length of program) and out of class? Do effects persist or atrophy after exit from DLI? Does subsequent contact with one or both languages matter? How does DLI program student motivation and usage opportunities? Most relevant to equity, do all DLI students profit and do they profit equally in their development of language proficiency? Of course, in order to answer these

questions it is critical to include assessment of the target non-English language in the accountability structure for these programs.

Social-Emotional Development. Concurrent with DLI expansion is the emerging consensus that effective social and emotional skills are essential to a child's development and success as an adult. Social-emotional learning (SEL) "is the process through which children and adults acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions. Evidence suggests that the use of a child's home language in the classroom encourages closer relationships between teachers and students, promoting better behaviors in the classroom. There is also consistent evidence that when different racial or language groups are brought together in a classroom under equal status conditions, it can result in enhanced intergroup relations. Given increasing concerns about equity in instructional practices the paper argues that getting a better handle on social-emotional development will guide DLI programs in focusing more attention on those marginalized students.

We do not know a lot about the social and behavioral development of students enrolled in DLI. It is a relatively new field of empirical study and highly subjective and inconsistent efforts to "measure" and evaluate social-emotional development have limited our understanding. Studies also suffer from (1) failure to track learners' social-emotional development over time; (2) lack of systematic definition of DLLs across datasets; (3) lack of differentiation among learners from non-English-speaking backgrounds by assuming homogeneity within language groups (e.g., all Spanish speakers are the same); and (4)

inconsistencies in approaches to SEL measurement. With a reenergized effort to more systematically measure and analyze SEL we should be better able to assess the role that DLI might play in the social, behavioral and identity development particularly of young children.

Survey of Dual Language Immersion Administrators. In order to reflect perspectives from the field and gain some additional awareness of how practitioners understand the equity issue, the authors conducted a brief open-ended survey during September/October 2018. Eighty-two DLI administrators (not teachers) from schools, districts and states across the U.S. were identified and sent, via Survey Monkey, seven basic questions about defining equity and identifying key equity issues in their schools and school districts. Thirty -two responses were received from administrators across 23 states.

In general, we would say that the responses were reflective of the state of the DLI field with a broad recognition of the critical importance of equity, but also a degree of uncertainty as to the depth and breadth of equity issues and their potential impact on DLI programs. In some cases, respondents indicated there were not significant equity issues because their districts are located in predominantly English speaking and non-immigrant communities. It is clear at least from the 32 respondents that as a group they are well aware of the important equity issues confronting DLI although their characterizations of each issue vary and their approaches and solutions range from simplistic to complex.

Kathryn Lindholm-Leary, Dual language program planning and equity

This paper was organized around four main themes: administrative equity, programmatic equity, schools, and parents and community. The paper was designed to address the key issues in establishing and operating an equitable dual language program

from a material and managerial perspective. Lindholm-Leary touched at least briefly on almost all of the equity issues that would be raised later by other authors and participants, yet focused her discussion at the level of those administering the programs.

Under **administrative equity** Lindholm-Leary raised the need to ensure that there is strong support for the program up and down the chain of command in the district so that programs are sustainable. Resources must be available to develop and purchase curriculum, materials and assessment in both English and the partner language. Lindholm-Leary raised the issue of assessment in the partner language as this is a weakness of many programs as in most programs partner language assessment is not part of any accountability system and we know that what is measured is valued. She also notes the importance of high-quality professional development, including for special education teachers, another category of individuals that are frequently overlooked. Finally, under administrative equity she points to the critical issue of whether in planning for the program both groups of students' (native English and non-native English speakers) needs are considered equally in planning for the program.

Under **programmatic** concerns Lindholm-Leary notes that schools need to think about equity in support of different programs serving the needs of Els, including transitional and developmental bilingual programs in addition to DLI, and whether the programs will adopt a 90-10 or 50-50 approach, something that needs to be discussed by the community. Although many bilingual educators consider 90/10 to be the ideal, Lindholm-Leary notes that this must be a decision of the parents and community if they are to be supportive of the program. Of course, the partner language(s) must also be decided in an equitable way. There is a default notion that DLI programs will all be Spanish/English,

but different language communities need to be considered where there is greater diversity of languages and cultures.

A critical issue in fostering equity within DLI programs is determining the **school site.** This can easily make or break the program and result in unequitable schooling if not thought through carefully. Lindholm-Leary poses several questions: What is the profile of the neighborhood? Is it accessible to all groups? Is transportation provided and/or available? What is the socio-economic status of the neighborhood; will all parents feel comfortable sending their children to the neighborhood? Are parents consulted in making the choice of location? One of the thorniest problems in setting up DLI schools or programs is the selection of students. It is common to have long lists of students wanting to enroll and not enough space to accommodate them. It is also common to experience challenges in enrolling sufficient numbers of native speakers of the partner language, yet the program cannot be equitable without an equitable distribution of students. So, the siting of the school can be key in attracting both groups of students in something like equal numbers. Finally, what will happen to students as they transition to middle and high school? Is there an appropriate and accessible school available when students complete elementary school? Parents will weigh this in determining if they want to enroll their children.

Do program planners consider the full range of diversity in the district and provide equitable opportunities for all of these students? Under the topic of **students and families**, Lindholm-Leary drills down into the selection process in terms of recruitment. Does the school recruit from all communities? Are diverse native English speakers recruited and accepted? Does the program accept students who do not speak either of the languages being taught? Are special education students enrolled? With respect to families

there has been a concern that more savvy, middle class parents tend to wield disproportionate decision-making power. Are parents from the full range of cultural, linguistic and socio-economic groups represented in decision making?

Rosa Molina, President of the Association of Two-way and Dual Language Education (ATDLE), stepped in for Kathryn who had a medical emergency at the last minute. Molina presented the paper that Kathryn had written but provided her own emphasis as well. She emphasized the importance of the students and parents being at the center of decision making—"it's their program not the school's"-- but also called attention to the political nature of student selection. She pointed out that diversity in the programs is a strength and the programs should endeavor to incorporate IFEPs, special education, and diverse English speakers as well as those students who speak the target language. The issue of IFEPs is an important one as often they are overlooked when programs are looking to include speakers of the partner language (which is interpreted as English learners) and native speakers of English (which is interpreted as English only speakers). The student that speaks both is an asset in the classroom. She also emphasized the importance of careful planning before launching, otherwise programs fail.

Ana Hernandez response to Kathryn Lindholm-Leary

Ana Hernandez provided commentary on the paper and presentation. She chose to emphasize points in the paper that she considered especially important, including:

- The importance of aligning other curricular offerings with the DLI programs, such a STEAM courses and other student interests. Hernández cautioned us that "We tend to set the structures, as well as the limits, to

access when equity is weakened by our own confining visions and low expectations for student potential."

- Two-thirds of bilingual teachers have received their credentials through examination and not through a strong program that provided guided experience in the classroom and intensive preparation. She urged that professional development attend to this weakness in the preparation of many DLI teachers.
- Hernández called out "society's bias for the language of prestige in education [which is] compounded by a weak ideological stance on bilingualism and biliteracy." This leads toward a bias for 50/50 versus 90/10 instruction, which not only shortchanges the native language education of EL students but has been shown to have weaker outcomes for all. She also urged an emphasis on DLI pre-school education as critical for students' identity and native language development.
- Hernández urged administrators to attend to building community especially in schools where only a strand is dedicated to DLI and feelings of neglect or unfair advantage can occur, dividing faculty and reducing **support for the program.**

Claudia Cervantes-Soon, Race, Social Justice, and Power Equity in Dual Language Education

Cervantes-Soon takes on what is effectively the elephant in the room: social justice in programs that are designed to attract "advantaged" mainstream English speakers while also providing a strong education for immigrant and "minoritized" students. She argues that, from an historical perspective, the language minority (LM) students should be the first

priority for any two-way program. It is they, she asserts, who most need and deserve a strong program that serves their interests as they have been historically undervalued and underserved by the education system. She argues that bilingual education has effectively been "hijacked" by Dual Language programs that often serve the interests of the powerful majority students at the expense of the minoritized students. She notes "the ways in which neoliberal policies, global economic interests, and emphasis on developing human capital have become the moral compass guiding these programs." That is, they have lost their moral compass and traded it in for a linguistic commodity.

Cervantes-Soon first noted the equitable outcomes that LM students are supposed to derive from DLI programs, including increased academic achievement, decreased segregation, additive bilingualism, strengthened sense of identity and greater engagement of families in students' learning. She then argues that these outcomes often do not materialize because of hegemonic Whiteness and the dominance of English throughout the society. The unrealized promise of DLE is described largely as a result of poor implementation of programs that do not incorporate strategies designed to counter the inherent bias in favor of majority white students. For example, programs that may seek to desegregate students but lack strategies for creating equal status learning opportunities; students allowed to re-segregate within the classroom. But Cervantes-Soon sees the problem as being more than a failure to implement equitable strategies, she finds the total lack of a social justice orientation to be a critical factor in the inequity built into many programs.

Cervantes-Soon concedes that the society as a whole is not likely to change radically in the near future and these programs will have to continue to exist within a social context

that is fundamentally unjust in many ways. Given this reality, she argues for a "fourth pillar" of DLE—critical consciousness. That is, educators must learn to constantly reflect on their practice and question their actions through a social justice lens. Being aware of the injustices that can occur in the DLE classroom is the first step. The next step is to honestly confront the ways in which one may contribute to these inequities and seek to change one's own behavior in favor of creating a more socially just classroom.

Nelson Flores, Response to Cervantes-Soon

Flores highlighted the political nature of two-way dual language programs and critiqued the presumed need for white students to participate in these programs, drawing a parallel with Brown v Board of Education and struggles for desegregation. He argued that the two policies are similar in that they rely on a generalized belief about the minoritized students being psychologically damaged, with the only cure for this damage being to mix them with white students. His primary thesis appears to be that LM communities should have the control over their own language programs without concern for the participation of "white" students (which must be a stand in for any advantaged students). He concludes that two-way programs (can) suffer from neo-liberal ideology that defines LM students as inferior and needing the assistance of native English speakers. However, to the extent they do exist he asserts, as does Cervantes-Soon, that it is essential to develop a critical consciousness within them.

Deborah Palmer, Equity and Dual Language Immersion: Curriculum

Palmer opens her paper with the statement that she would address "the ways in which both "*what* we teach" and "*how* we teach" in a TWBE classroom need to change in order to be more equitable." Continuing on the theme of critical consciousness introduced

by Cervantes-Soon, Palmer argues that "TWBE curricula must explicitly teach critical awareness of oppression and hegemony," and center the stories of marginalized groups within the curriculum. Palmer also asserts that another term for critical consciousness is "ideological clarity," suggesting that the educator is aware of his or her own ideological leanings and the practices that flow from these beliefs or attitudes. Palmer makes three recommendations at the top of her paper:

- Equitable curriculum within two-way dual language programs should include content that reflects the stories and experiences of the LM students.
- Structuring and valuing the participation of all students in the classroom and "centering often marginalized interactional and discourse patterns" of minoritized students. (This, by the way, is not very different from the work of Elizabeth Cohen and Rachel Lotan, 2004, who developed pedagogical strategies for "equal status" classroom practices and Lotan's extensive work in the area of equal status for LM students.)
- Deliberate language use, which incorporates students' everyday use of language, such as *translanguaging* and the use of languages separately and together.

Palmer faults *monoglossic* practices – the rigid use of only one language in multilingual contexts, including assessment in English-- as being a major culprit in inequitable education of LM students. Also named as a factor in inequitable curriculum is the history of bilingual education in which educators were --and are—often forced into a transitional curriculum in which the actual goal was and is English (monolingualism). Dual language programs can interrupt this ideology but the cost to the LM students can still be

high if their language is not given the same value as English and this is not explicit in the curriculum.

Palmer offers a discussion of "translanguaging," a pedagogy that has gained some traction in bilingual and dual language programs but has also fostered a great deal of controversy and confusion about what is meant by the term. As Palmer notes, it should not be a language "free-for-all" but along with designating certain instructional periods or topics to be "Spanish focus" and "English focus," schools might explicitly designate a "translanguaging" or "bilingual focus" time during the school day. The notion behind it, as explained by Palmer, is that students who are already using two languages in their daily lives, as is increasingly the situation in dual language and bilingual programs, should not be made to feel that their linguistic repertoires or that their dual identities are unacceptable or inferior. It is critical to communicate to students that all kinds of language practices are legitimate and appropriate for different situations. Hence the curriculum should be designed with this in mind.

Finally, Palmer advocates for eliminating high stakes standardized tests in either language because they cannot fully account for the uniquely bilingual use of language of students in dual language programs. She argues that assessment for these programs must be re-thought to include "alternative and enriching forms of assessment, such as portfolios, student run conferences and culminating presentations." This is a critical issue for the field.

Lisa Dorner, Uncovering the Hidden Curriculum: Response to Palmer

Professor Dorner's response to the Palmer paper was primarily to reassert the importance of critical consciousness on the part of DLI educators so that their pedagogy

was one of empowerment of LM students. Her second point was the importance of using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to look for the "hidden" in the curriculum and she suggested that this should be done with everyone involved in these programs, from administrators to parents. While it was not clear how this would be conducted in most cases (who initiates, who documents, who trains educators, etc), she suggested that dinners with parents in which their stories could be told and their expectations of the program could be uncovered would be one important way to engage parents.

Dorner also recommended Beloved Community (https://www.wearebeloved.org), which focuses on helping organizations to align their practices to support diversity. The CEO, Rhonda Broussard, was present at the meeting.

Magaly Lavadenz, Preparing and Supporting Bilingual Teachers for Equity in Two Way Dual Language Immersion Programs: A Bilingual Epistemological Framework for Teaching, Research and Policy

After providing a brief introduction to a history of bilingual education, up to and including the passage of Proposition 58 in 2016 in California, which removed the general prohibition on bilingual education in California and encouraged communities to mount bilingual and dual language programs, Lavadenz focused on the certification of teachers for bilingual programs. She found that "analysis of current state bilingual certification requirements reveals that twenty-three out of the fifty states and the District of Columbia offer bilingual certification. Of course, that means that the majority of states do not yet offer this certification. A deeper examination, however, shows that states differ broadly in the criteria required for the authorization "including some states that simply apply a test of unknown validity to credential teachers" with or without any formal training in bilingual education.

While Lavadenz argues that there is no consensus in the field about how exactly to best prepare bilingual teachers to address the burgeoning need, she notes that "advancing all students' capacities to succeed in the 21st century will require special attention to closing the achievement gap and addressing equity issues. It will also require an expanded repertoire of literacy and academic skills including technology, intercultural communication and critical inquiry." A major problem Lavadenz identifies in arriving at consensus standards or competencies for bilingual teachers is the withdrawal of federal funds for preparing bilingual personnel in IHE's who might conduct the required research to be able to know which of these competencies are most critical. This funding was provided as part of the Bilingual Education Act until its disappearance under NCLB.

Lavadenz then asserts that the best approach to understanding what teachers need to know and be able to do to successfully and equitably educate LM students should borrow from the work of Lee Shulman on Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK). PCK includes "(1) knowledge of representations of subject matter (content knowledge); (2) understanding of students' conceptions of the subject and the learning and teaching implications that were associated with the specific subject matter; and (3) general pedagogical knowledge (or generalized teaching strategies); (4) curriculum knowledge; (5) knowledge of educational contexts; and (6) knowledge of the purposes of education." Lavadenz proposes a 7th element, that of Multilingual Pedagogical Context Knowledge. Adding to this she includes multiliteracy competencies—the ability to effectively use tools such as metalinguistic awareness.

In the final section of the paper Lavadenz describes a series of interviews, analysis of classroom observations and artifacts with 11 bilingual teachers over a three-year period

to demonstrate critical issues related to knowledge in practice, or **bilingual epistemologies**. She describes how teachers use **cross-cultural knowledge** to advocate for their students, understanding their particular circumstances. She describes how bilingual teachers use **translinguistic repertoires** for teaching and strategies to bring native language in "from the margins" of classroom instruction, including the use cognates as bridges between English and Spanish. She then describes the use of *translanguaging* in the classroom to respect the actual ways in which students use more than one language in natural communication—unlike the more rigid forms of instruction that require strict separation of languages. (This is an area of bilingual pedagogy that is still under considerable discussion.) Lavadenz also provides multiple examples of bilingual teachers' **critical agency** in which these teachers identified unjust practices and belief systems and acted, often in concert with their students, to address these injustices. In one case the teacher and her classroom began a campaign to include a critical event in Mexican American history that had been omitted from their history books. This ultimately resulted in a legislative bill that changed the state curriculum.

Lavadenz ends on a note about the importance of preparing bilingual teachers to have critical consciousness about their work "especially in this time" when so many injustices are being experienced by students from immigrant communities.

Shelly Spiegel-Coleman, Response to Lavadenz

Spiegel-Coleman directs a consortium that is comprised on approximately 20 individual progressive organizations in California that are primarily engaged in promoting educational equity. Her comments to Professor Lavadenz's paper focused on ways in which it could be strengthened by incorporating additional conversations, such as

providing more discussion about the issue of translanguaging in actual practice. Spiegel-Coleman questions the conclusion that failing to respect translanguaging in the classroom leads to denigration of students' identities, or weaker learning. In her presentation Spiegel-Coleman argued that the critical issue for DLI is the recruitment and preparation of highly qualified bilingual teachers and pointed toward California's Together policy brief on Bilingual Teacher Shortage in California. She pointed out that the brief, based on surveys of dozens of districts, notes that there are thousands of teachers who could qualify as bilingual teachers but that they need –by their own admission—intensive professional development to be ready to enter the classroom. This, Spiegel-Coleman argues is where our efforts should be focused as quality of instruction is the most important issue for DLI.

Section III

The papers succeeded in provoking discussion among participants. It was clear, however, that discussion of the equity in instructional practices in the classroom overwhelmed the conversation and tended to limit dialogue on other equity issues, particularly those raised by Lindholm-Leary's paper. As can happen in uncomfortable conversations about equity and injustice, some voices are heard more loudly and consistently than others, and some appear to be silenced. During the concluding discussion we identified an uneasiness among a number of participants that important equity issues had been ignored. For this reason, we ended the two-day meeting with an appeal to participants to complete a very short survey expressing their opinions on a few key questions to be mailed out shortly after the conference. Our appeal was to capture all voices and ensure that all perspectives were ultimately incorporated in the final report and work that would continue. After several gentle reminders virtually all participants

responded. Below is a snapshot of the responses, which ranged from a single sentence to more than a page.

1. *In order of importance, what do you consider to be most important and urgent issues involving equity in two-way dual language programs?*

The single issue most often raised by respondents was **equity in access**. Yet all respondents did not mean the same thing by this. Many worried about sufficient access by English learners, that middle class English speakers have greater access to the programs. Some noted other "minoritized students," special education students, speakers of other languages, students who were heritage language speakers and also English speakers (IFEPs), and particularly African American students. This concern was expressed by one respondent as changing the narrative that all English speakers are white. But there were also concerns expressed that equitable access needed to focus on students from different backgrounds (and not simply minoritized students) gaining cross-cultural competence.

Other issues that were raised by multiple respondents as important and urgent were (1) the recruitment and preparation of teachers for what is a very complex job; (2) assessment that aligns with the dual language nature of the programs and that does not simply focus on the acquisition of English; (3) participation of all parents, which requires that programs provide adequate information to all parents. There was not a lot mentioned about the methods for selecting students when there are long lists of students wanting access. We know this to be a challenge for practitioners.

2. *Why do you think the issue(s) you've mentioned are so critical?*

The concern about who gets access to these programs was driven by competing notions of good: "many of our DLI programs are coveted by mainstream white English dominant culture . . . . and shifts to meet the interests of those students" versus

"Multilingualism for ALL is a message that I believe is here to stay. We cannot return to the days of bilingual education for some." If bi/multilingualism is to be for all (which, by the way, is inherent in California's new Global 2030 policy), and there is a limited supply, then who *deserves* it most? How do we equitably allocate a limited resource? These are the questions lurking beneath the concerns about equitable access expressed by respondents.

Testing that drives pedagogy (especially standardized testing in English only) was named by several respondents as a key impediment to providing equitable education for all students. Assessment and accountability need to reflect the core differences in these programs versus monolingual English instruction.

3. *Do best practices currently exist that might help address these issues? If so, please describe these best practices.*

A large number of respondents were either unsure of what these practices might be or were concerned about how widely applicable they might be across different contexts. However, with respect to equity of access, several people mentioned lotteries for admission and holding a certain number of seats for ELs. One respondent noted that California policy is to admit no fewer than 40% EL and 40% English dominant in order to maintain a good balance of the two groups. Of course, it is not clear where the bilingual student fits into this paradigm or whether race/ethnicity should be taken into account, or not.

In terms of other urgent issues, some respondents noted the important research on culturally sustaining pedagogies and the opportunity to press states for something like a Spanish-English teacher licensure exam. Another practice mentioned by more than one respondent was better outreach to "minority" communities and families. It was mentioned that organizations in the states such as California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE) offer workshops for practitioners on planning DLI programs. Another respondent

offered that a compilation of best practices in the literature would be a useful contribution to the field. One respondent replied "Of course there are best practices but there is no consensus about what they are."

4. *What equity issues were not raised during the forum that should have been?*

Many respondents could not think of an important issue that was not raised, however among those that offered an issue, these included:

- Race and the critical role it plays in all of education, in particular with respect to dual language education
- Transportation (this was not elaborated on but is known to be a major issue in equity of access to any kind of magnet program)
- Rural schools attempting to establish DLI programs
- The impact of immigration enforcement on these programs
- Late arriving ELs and access to these programs
- Funding, e.g., how to use federal funds for these programs
- Research on culturally responsive DLI programs for African Americans and other "global majority" students

The issue of DLI as a tool for desegregation, while raised by some, was not discussed in any depth during the forum, something that surprised the organizers who had seen this as a key issue and potentially powerful outcome. No one mentioned it as number 1 or 2 urgent or important issues.

5. *What do you see as critical work that needs to be done by researchers and practitioners to address the most important issues?*

Two major themes were mentioned in response to this question: (1) More fine-grained and longitudinal research on a variety of outcomes for these programs and better understanding of best practices with diverse students and contexts; and (2) research on best practices for preparing teachers for DLI programs. With respect to the former respondents articulated a need for case study research to understand processes as well as longitudinal data collection on a variety of outcomes, not just test scores. One respondent also suggested tying this research to other national studies that examined outcomes for ESSA, for example. Several respondents mentioned the need to have better understanding of students' needs beyond the archtypes of Latino EL and "white" English speakers.

Inherent in a number of responses throughout the survey was the need to gain a consensus on the critical competencies for DLI teachers before it will be possible to define best practices for teacher preparation. Some work exists now in this arena (e.g., Faltis & Valdés, 2016; Menken & Antuñez, 2001), but this is largely reviews of expert opinions and perspectives rather than empirical studies. Empirical research on critical competencies for the sub-field of dual language learning within the broader context of bilingual education could move the field forward.

6. *There was discussion of what to call speakers of other languages (ELs). Do you have preferred terminology?*

There appears to be a growing consensus that it is time to come up with a better way of describing students learning in two languages than the term "English Learners,' which only describes what they do not possess—English—rather than a more assets-based term that reflects what they DO have—at least one other language in addition to

the one they are learning. This is especially true for students who are indeed learning in two languages. However, there was no consensus at all on a better label. As many respondents replied they had no ideas in this regard as offered a suggestion. Many stated for bureaucratic purposes it was simply easier to stick with EL, while an equal number suggested terms such as bilingual learner, multilingual learner, emergent bilingual, dual language learner (which has been widely adopted among pre-school practitioners). It would appear that the field will probably stick with EL for the time being, until a broader consensus forms around some new terminology. But labels can be powerful in framing belief systems and this should remain an area of active debate as it can change common perceptions of the value of multilingualism and the individuals who practice it.

Section IV: Conclusions

The reasonable expectation is that the first two-day national forum on equity and dual language would introduce and initiate constructive discussion of the challenges inherent in creating equitable two-way dual language programs for students of widely varying backgrounds attending schools in very diverse contexts. From all accounts the Forum successfully addressed this expectation. Most participants noted that they felt it represented an important first step and that such efforts should continue as they provide a venue for airing concerns and jointly addressing a more systematic research and implementation agenda. Guided by substantial evidence from researcher-practitioner partnerships, we underscore the importance of long-term, mutually beneficial collaborations that bridge the gap between research, policy and practice. There was a distinct sense among some of the participants, including a number of practitioners, that too

much time was spent on "white hegemony" and/or not enough time was spent on a number of practical issues involved in building equitable programs: how to implement the programs in a way that "doesn't overplay our hand and result in losing supporters." But the organizers are in agreement that this must be a process, starting with setting the table and acknowledging the debates that exist.

Moving forward, we are confident that the forum initiated an important step in the process of addressing equity issues in DLI. Too often there is a disconnect between academic researchers and practitioners. As DLI continues to expand it will be challenged by a number of critical equity issues and it is important that these be vetted in a productive and open environment. Consequently, it is our belief that next steps must follow from this forum:

1. There is a need for a census on how many, of what kind, and where these programs exist. There is presently no such information available, making it difficult to know their variation or their impact.
2. Teacher Development. Perhaps the most serious threat to the long-term viability of DLI is teacher recruitment, preparation and professional development. University teacher programs must work more closely with DLI programs to identify approaches to teacher preparation that mitigate some of the issues inherent in teaching a culturally, racially, and linguistically diverse classroom.
3. Given the huge demand for these programs across the country it would be very useful to create a network that can be a clearinghouse of information on topics of equity in DLI that can be easily accessed as programs are under development.

4. Equal Access to Programs. DLI programs struggle to balance the demands from advantaged and disadvantaged parents for access to programs. Best practices need to be developed to ensure that programs remain balanced and that access by minoritized students is protected.
5. School and School District Integration. The decision made by a school district to develop and implement TWDLI programs represents a conscious intent to address inclusiveness. Where TWDLI programs are developed, where they are placed and how they are structured has a major impact on school, district and neighborhood demographics. DLI remains a powerful tool to help reverse a serious trend toward segregation of our nation's public schools, primarily among Latinx but also Africa-American children. Much too little is known about how DLI can and has impacted demographics and how it can be effectively applied to create more inclusive and diverse schools.

References

Cohen, E. G. & Lotan, R. (2004) Equity in Heterogeneous Classrooms, in Banks and Banks (Eds.), Handbook for Multicultural Education, Second Edition, Jossey-Bass. Pp. 736-750.

Faltis, C. & Valdés, G. (2016). Preparing teachers to teach in and advocate for linguistically diverse classrooms: A vade mecum for teacher educators. In D. H. Gitomer & C. A. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (5th ed., pp. 549–592). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Menken, K., & Antuñez, B. (2001). *An overview of the preparation and certification of teachers working with limited English proficient (LEP) students*. Washing, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education