

Author: **Kate Menken, Ed.D.**

City University of New York -
Queens College &
Graduate Center



The mission of the National Dual Language Forum (NDLF) is to promote the benefits of dual language education and foster collaboration among key organizations and individuals dedicated to dual language and bilingual education across the country. NDLF members include a growing cadre of organizations committed to dual language and bilingual education and supporting high-quality effective programs.

The NDLF has two distinct activities: hosting of a dedicated website of information and resources and convening of experts to develop and present white papers at member conferences on important issues around dual language and bilingual education.

NDLF white papers are designed to share the views of a wide range of subject matter experts around key topics related to dual language and bilingual education.

Disclaimer: The views expressed in this white paper do not necessarily reflect the views of the organizations and individuals connected to the NDLF.



Visit www.cal.org/ndlf to learn more.

Copyright © 2017
Center for Applied Linguistics

LEADERSHIP IN DUAL LANGUAGE BILINGUAL EDUCATION

A NATIONAL DUAL LANGUAGE FORUM WHITE PAPER

In recognition of the critical role of school leaders for the success of dual language bilingual education, this paper addresses the topic of leadership within these programs. Dual language bilingual programs involve sustained use of a student's home language, in which instruction occurs in English and a partner language with the goals that students develop bilingualism, biliteracy, and multicultural understandings.¹ Leadership in this white paper includes district administrators, school administrators (especially principals), teacher leaders (teachers who are also school leaders, formally or informally), as well as community and family members.

This paper is organized into the following sections:

1. Leading Dual Language Bilingual Education (DLBE) Programs within an English-Only Context
2. Characterizing Effective Leadership in DLBE
3. The Need for Prepared School Leaders in Dual Language Bilingual Education
4. Dual Language Bilingual Education Programs for Families and the Community: Holding True to the Original Social Justice Aims of Bilingual Education
5. Parent and Family Leadership in DLBE
6. Social Justice Leadership in DLBE
7. Distributed Leadership in DLBE

It is worth noting from the outset that, although a robust body of research in educational leadership identifies characteristics of successful school leaders (Leithwood & Day, 2007; Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning, 2011; Waldron, et al., 2011), far less has been published about leadership specifically in dual language bilingual education. While by no means exhaustive, this paper references key available research in the areas outlined above and offers recommendations as well as questions for further education.

¹ Dual language bilingual education programs go by different names in the literature, such as dual immersion programs, two-way immersion programs, two-way bilingual programs, or simply dual language programs. Students in these programs are a combination of speakers of English as a home language, bilinguals in English and the partner language, and students who speak the partner language at home. Also included in the category of dual language bilingual education are one-way immersion programs (or simply one-way programs) in which all students speak the same language at home. Students whose home language is other than English or the partner language may also enroll in DLBE programs.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

School leaders are fundamental to the success of Dual Language Bilingual Education (DLBE) programs; they can support, undermine or dismantle bilingual education efforts.

This white paper from the National Dual Language Forum highlights the need for prepared school leaders for DLBE and outlines the characteristics demonstrated by leaders of successful programs. Effective DLBE leaders are knowledgeable about bilingualism and biliteracy and about their school's emergent bilingual population. They set a clear vision for the success of all students and recognize the critical importance of close school-parent-community partnerships.

Effective leaders also focus on the power of distributed leadership with social justice as a central goal. The paper affirms that effective leadership in DLBE is distributed: it is not concentrated in only one individual, but includes teams of administrators, instructional staff, parents and families impacting decisions which value bilingualism and multicultural perspectives. The paper brings attention to the role of leaders in setting the school's language policy in an English-only environment. Principals, especially, in DLBE settings, must be committed to the goals of bilingual education and willing to plan for a successful program, which sometimes entails negotiating compliance issues related to languages of instruction and assessment.

DLBE leaders need to ensure that the school promotes equal value, status and importance to English and the partner language. As instructional leaders, principals are often called upon to develop teacher capacity and foster learning communities to guide teachers in their understanding of their role as "arbiters" of language policy. The paper also includes approaches for leaders to reflect on the linguistic environment of their schools.

LEADING DUAL LANGUAGE BILINGUAL PROGRAMS WITHIN AN ENGLISH-ONLY CONTEXT

School leaders – particularly principals – are extremely influential in shaping a school's language policy and the overall quality of schooling that emergent bilinguals² receive (Ascenzi-Moreno, Hesson, & Menken, 2015; DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2017; Hunt, 2011; Menken & Solorza, 2014; Reyes, 2006; Rodriguez & Alanís, 2011; Scanlan & López, 2012; Theoharis & O'Toole, 2011; Wiemelt & Welton, 2015). This section addresses what a restrictive language policy context means for school leaders running DLBE programs, because this issue is at the core of many demands that these leaders must manage.

Specifically, U.S. schooling has in recent years been characterized by restrictive language education policies, which limit the use of students' home languages in instruction (Menken, 2013; Wiley, 2010; Wiley & García, 2016). For instance, California,³ Arizona, and Massachusetts passed anti-bilingual education mandates seeking to altogether eliminate bilingual education programs in those states (Arias & Faltis, 2012; Gándara & Hopkins, 2010; McField, 2014). Federal education policy in the recent past has emphasized high-stakes testing, which has had a similar impact, as the demands of monolingual testing in schools directly contradict bilingual education. A causal link has been drawn in the literature between high-stakes testing and the dismantling of bilingual programs (Menken & Solorza, 2014; Palmer, Henderson, Wall, Zúñiga, & Bethelsen, 2015). This means that in most U.S. school systems there will be pressures on school leaders to offer English-only instruction, undermining a school's efforts to provide bilingual education. Successful leaders of DLBE programs must therefore be able to navigate these pressures to preserve and protect their school's provision of dual language bilingual education.

U.S. schooling has in recent years been characterized by restrictive language education policies, which limit the use of students' home languages in instruction.

Going against the current in this way is a form of what Souto-Manning, Madrigal, Malik and Martell (2016) refer to as 'courageous leadership.' For their investigation of courageous leadership in schools serving emergent bilinguals, Souto-Manning et al. (2016) focus on the leadership of Dr. Tori Hunt, who is the principal of a DLBE elementary school where instruction is in English and Spanish. This principal's courageous leadership is described in the following passage:

Dr. Hunt explains: "You can't lead a school if all you are doing is reacting to mandates and compliance issues. You have to have a vision, a plan and then assess how the mandates and compliance issues fit within your vision, your mission." She will not compromise her vision for every child to be regarded as capable, for English and Spanish to be valued equally...This vision is at the core of Dr. Hunt's courageous leadership. (Souto-Manning et al., 2016: 58)

If this school leader were to simply comply with all top-down mandates and policies, which typically encourage English-only instruction, her school's DLBE program

2 Emergent bilinguals (García, 2009) are students who are learning English in school, and in adding English to their linguistic repertoire are becoming bilinguals. Other terms used in the U.S. to describe these students include English language learners, English learners, English as a second language students, and bilingual learners.

3 California's anti-bilingual education policy, called Proposition 227, was repealed in late 2016.



would be undermined. Instead, the principal in this study navigates the pressures to offer English-only instruction by remaining grounded in her school's vision, which focuses on cultivating bilingualism, biliteracy, and multicultural understandings, fostering school-family partnerships, and vigilantly preserving language equity to ensure English and Spanish are valued equally throughout the school.

For school leaders to successfully implement and sustain dual language bilingual education programs, they must be able to negotiate and resist top-down policies and external pressures promoting English-only instruction, as the case of Dr. Hunt's leadership exemplifies. For a bilingual education program to persist, school leaders cannot merely be what Shohamy (2006) terms "soldiers of the system who carry out orders" (p. 78), but instead must by definition be able to *disrupt* prevalent English-only policies. Menken and García (2010) describe how even the most restrictive language education policies are actually interpreted, negotiated, resisted, and ultimately (re)constructed in the process of their implementation by individuals at each level of an educational system in contexts around the world – school leaders are key "arbiters" of language policy implementation.

For school leaders to successfully implement and sustain dual language bilingual education programs, they must be able to negotiate and resist top-down policies and external pressures promoting English-only instruction.

There are several examples in the U.S. literature regarding the crucial role of educational leaders in resisting both state-imposed English-only policies (Combs et al., 2005; Gándara & Hopkins, 2010; Gort, de Jong, & Cobb, 2008) and federal education reforms that promote an English-only agenda (de Jong & Bearse, 2012; Johnson & Freeman, 2010; Menken, 2008). For example, Gort et al. (2008) studied how administrators and principals in Massachusetts school districts that previously implemented bilingual education responded to a new statewide English-only policy being imposed upon their schools. As they wrote,

Rather than simply implement a top-down state law, district- and school-level administrators in three focal districts actively constructed educational policy as they negotiated reform efforts and policy directives. (Gort et al., 2008: 61)

In their manuscript, the authors attribute the actions of these administrators to their knowledge about bilingualism and bilingual education, an essential point addressed in greater detail in the section of this paper on the need for prepared DLBE leaders.

On the other hand, school leaders can also make decisions that passively undermine or even actively dismantle their school's DLBE programs. For instance, researchers found that school principals in New York City eliminated their school's bilingual education programs for the following reasons: a) the pressures of high-stakes testing and accountability, and b) because they lacked formal preparation in bilingual education or about the education of emergent bilinguals (Menken & Solorza, 2015, 2014). Research by Palmer et al. (2015) and Johnson and Freeman (2010) also show how administrators and educators chose to dismantle bilingual education programs in the face of accountability pressures. Moreover, school leaders have great power in supporting or opposing DLBE.

Related byproducts of the national tendency to favor English-only instruction are language equity issues within DLBE programs, including the lack of home language instructional materials. The importance of high quality academic materials in DLBE program languages has been well-established in the literature, including

School leaders must make special effort and invest the necessary resources to get home language resources for the school's DLBE program, as these are often not provided by local school districts and difficult to obtain.

a wide range of high-quality materials in the language other than English, such as books of different genres that are aligned to the curriculum (Lindholm-Leary 2001, 2005; Howard et al., forthcoming). School leaders must make special effort and invest the necessary resources to get home language resources for the school's DLBE program, as these are often not provided by local school districts and difficult to obtain (Lindholm-Leary, 2005; Palmer et al., 2015; Souto-Manning et al., 2015). When such materials are not available, they usually are replaced with materials in English, and parity between both instructional languages is lost.

Research by Palmer et al. (2015) documents district-wide efforts to implement a Spanish/English DLBE program in Texas, focusing on two schools. The quotation that follows shows how the lack of Spanish materials became an obstacle to DLBE in both schools:

Since neither the model nor the district provided adequate curricular materials, teachers were frustrated due to the lack of appropriate Spanish resources for Spanish-medium content areas. Ms. Burns translated district resources into Spanish, but was often forced to supplement with English resources, especially in science. (Palmer et al., 2015: 403)

Factors including the lack of Spanish curricula and materials and monolingual high-stakes testing ultimately led these two schools to dismantle their DLBE programs. Schools rely on “courageous leaders” (Souto-Manning et al., 2016) who are deeply committed to bilingual education and able to preserve their DLBE programs in the face of English-only pressures.

Not only is English typically privileged in school curricula, but also in ideology, as many schools operate from a paradigm in which students learning English are perceived as more challenging than monolingual students (Cummins, 2000; Brooks, et al., 2010) and wherein there is an assumption that emergent bilinguals lack the social, cultural, and/or linguistic resources required for success in school (Flores & Rosa; Hunt, 2011; Rodríguez & Alánis, 2011). In their critique of this deficit paradigm, Rodríguez and Alánis (2011) recommend that school leaders set and maintain high expectations for their emergent bilingual students. They describe school leaders in DLBE as “risk-takers who ground their decision-making in instructional practices that serve all students as they resist the socio-political pressure to transition children into all English-instruction classrooms” (Rodríguez & Alánis, 2011: 104). Setting high expectations within the context of a DLBE high school, for example, means providing emergent bilinguals with an academic program of study that offers these students access to college preparation courses such as chemistry, physics, and pre-calculus as well as advanced placement courses.

As the research in this section has shown, providing DLBE within the current U.S. sociopolitical landscape by definition requires school leaders who are able to swim against the tide. Setting a clear vision for bi/multilingualism and establishing an official school language policy helps school leaders preserve their bilingual programs in the face of English-only pressures (de Jong, 2011; Johnson, 2013; Menken & García, forthcoming; Menken & Solorza, 2014; Souto-Manning et al., 2016). Field and Menken (2015) point out that developing a school language policy addresses all the decisions about which languages will be used in instruction and how they will be taught. As they write:



A strong language policy will act as an umbrella to protect the educational priorities of a given district or school, rather than leaving them vulnerable to top-down mandates that oppose or undermine their vision (Field & Menken, 2015: 121).

Two main guides have been published for educational practitioners to develop their own school language policies and outline the procedures for them to do so: *Language Policy in Schools: A Resource for Teachers and Administrators* (Corson, 1999), and *Building on Community Bilingualism* (Freeman, 2004).

CHARACTERIZING EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP IN DLBE

In addition to examining school leadership within this complex sociopolitical terrain, researchers have identified characteristics of effective leadership in DLBE through research that seeks to pinpoint cornerstones of effectiveness. Scanlan and López (2012) conducted a narrative synthesis of 79 empirical articles published from 2000 to 2010, and identified the following as core dimensions of effective schooling for emergent bilinguals in general, all of which would also apply to DLBE school leadership: cultivating language proficiency, ensuring access to high-quality curriculum, and promoting sociocultural integration. They note how their core dimensions can serve as goals for building-level and system-level administrators to guide their service delivery decisions (Scanlan & López, 2012). Heineke, Coleman, Ferrell, and Kersemeier (2012) likewise state that school leaders must be able to “negotiate language policy and mandates, lay the necessary ideological foundations, build effective school structures and systems, and foster meaningful collaboration with families and communities” (p. 130).

These elements require resources and the funding needed to run a high-quality DLBE program. School leaders across the U.S. are currently facing budget cuts, and many must determine how to deliver the same range and quality of services to children with reduced funding, as they are “the front-line administrators who manage the scarce remaining resources” (Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning, 2011: 2). Thus, a strong commitment to DLBE and understanding of how to secure and allocate limited funding is essential for a program’s continuity, particularly when leaders must choose which among competing needs to prioritize.

As mentioned previously, Souto-Manning et al. (2016) studied the principal of a DLBE elementary school where the authors argue that children’s resources are valued. They describe the following as key elements of this principal’s leadership: a strong school philosophy based on bilingualism, biliteracy, and multicultural understanding; close relationships with families and communities (e.g., through home visits, an open door policy encouraging families to visit the school, and families having a voice in school leadership decisions); insisting on language equity to ensure English is not “overprivileged” in instruction; supporting nontraditional, formative measures of student growth in English and Spanish rather than relying on the district and state assessments, which are administered in English; serving as an instructional leader (e.g., by observing each teacher twice a month and viewing teachers as “co-learners” with her); and, providing time for educators to engage in professional study and collaborative planning (Souto-Manning et al., 2016: 61). This school leader embodies many of the practices identified as effective in DLBE leadership.

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

- » Program advocacy and communication with central administration
- » Oversight of model development, planning, and coordination
- » Professional development, including the fostering of staff cohesion and collegiality
- » Appropriate allocation of funding (Howard et al., 2007: 34)

Howard, Lindholm-Leary, Rogers, Olague, Medina, Kennedy, Sugarman, Christian
Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education

In the third edition of the *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education*, Howard, Lindhold-Leary, Rogers, Olague, Medina, Kennedy, Sugarman, and Christian (2018) wrote:

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

- » Program advocacy and communication with central administration
- » Oversight of model development, planning, and coordination
- » Professional development, including the fostering of staff cohesion and collegiality
- » Appropriate allocation of funding (Howard et al., 2007: 34)

The work of these authors highlights the central role of school leadership in DLBE.

Research by DeMatthews and Izquierdo (2016) focuses on the development of DLBE programs in six schools in an urban school district along the U.S.-Mexico border. Based on their findings, they identified the following leadership practices in DLBE: laying foundations and valuing all stakeholders; exploring diverse perspectives of language; assessing the context of the school and community while planning; recruiting and building capacity within the school and community; and, implementing a collective approach to monitoring, evaluating, and renewing DLBE. They suggest that each of these practices are essential in DLBE school leadership.

Collaborative leadership is the reason many dual language programs last and continue to develop. Principals support teachers, teachers support their principals, and teachers support other teachers.

Hunt (2011) conducted one of the few studies to date that is specifically about successful leadership in dual language bilingual education, by closely examining the leadership structures of three well-established DLBE programs. She identified four leadership structures she argues are key to the schools' ongoing success: 1) *Mission* (a unified and clear mission rooted in a schoolwide commitment to dual language bilingual education, and focused on the development of bilingualism, biliteracy, and the appreciation and promotion of multicultural perspectives); 2) *Collaborative and Shared Leadership* (all principals view their role as working with teachers to lead the school, and teachers also see themselves as part of the practice of leadership); 3) *Trust* (the principals trust the teachers and vice versa, teachers enjoy working in an environment in which they are trusted, and teachers and administrators all truly believe in DLBE as a means of preparing students linguistically and academically); and, 4) *Flexibility* (structures are not fixed, but rather able to conform to the needs of the students and the program as a whole, especially with regard to implementing language policy, making decisions, and drawing upon a diversity of expertise within the school community) (Hunt, 2011: 202). In her conclusion, Hunt (2011) largely attributes the longevity and success of the DLBE programs she studied to the collaborative aspect of the principals' leadership:

While principals bear the ultimate responsibility of decisions, within this framework decisions are inclusive and easier to uphold because many individuals become stakeholders. Collaborative leadership is the reason why the dual language programs in this study have been able to last so long and continue to develop. Principals support teachers, teachers support their principals, and teachers support other teachers (Elmore 2000; Fullan 2005). When a principal leaves the school, and leadership changes, it is the collaborative work of the teachers that maintains the program. Creating



avenues for leadership to move beyond the principal is critical in promoting the enduring success of a dual language program. (Hunt, 2011: 203)

The significance of collaborative leadership for DLBE arises in other research as well, so is a point returned to below in a section specifically devoted to the topic of distributed leadership.

THE NEED FOR PREPARED SCHOOL LEADERS IN DUAL LANGUAGE BILINGUAL EDUCATION

This section maintains the need for well-prepared school leaders in DLBE, and then draws attention to the unfortunate reality that few school leaders have the preparation they need. Developing, implementing, and sustaining a DLBE program demands school leaders who are knowledgeable about bilingualism, bilingual education, and about their school's emergent bilingual student population (Brooks, et al., 2010; Howard et al., forthcoming; Hunt, 2011; Menken & Solorza, 2015; Scanlan & López, 2012). Clearly, a strong knowledge base is required for anyone to navigate English-only pressures well, and to possess the characteristics of effective leadership in DLBE identified in the preceding sections.

Additionally, DLBE school leaders need to be able to support and oversee teachers. Bilingual teachers in particular carry many demands, as they need to have subject matter expertise and use a range of assessments and teaching strategies to carry out current curricular and assessment requirements in two languages, all while navigating a complex sociopolitical landscape (Calderón & Carreon, 2000; de Jong, 2011; Nieto, 2003). The national shortage of bilingual teachers is ongoing, and poses tremendous challenges for school leaders to staff their bilingual education programs with prepared teachers (Flores, Hernandez Sheets, & Riojas Clark, 2011). This means that school leaders need to engage seriously in a range of efforts to cultivate the bilingual teachers they need (e.g., develop partnerships with institutions of higher education, identify and support parents and other members of the communities they serve - including former bilingual students—to pursue teaching licensure, etc.). What is more, although a teacher may have studied bilingual education and hold specialized teaching licensure in this area, they might not have had prior experience within a dual language bilingual program per se, as nationally these programs are less common than other forms of bilingual education (e.g., transitional bilingual education). Taken together, these issues point to the need for school leaders to develop teacher capacity, provide ample spaces for professional learning, foster learning communities in their schools, and structure those opportunities in ways that are meaningful to DLBE teachers (Hunt, 2011; Jaar, 2017; Torres-Guzmán & Swinney, 2009). All of this requires strong school leadership, and particularly a “strong principal” (Calderón & Carreon, 2000: 54).

Alanís and Rodríguez (2008) identified “knowledgeable leadership” as one of four key factors in the long-term success of DLBE programs, along with linguistic parity, effective bilingual teachers, and active parent collaboration. The authors write the following, documenting the significance of the principal's knowledge base at a DLBE school they studied called ‘City Elementary’:

Developing, implementing, and sustaining a DLBE program demands school leaders who are knowledgeable about bilingualism, bilingual education, and about their school's emergent bilingual student population.

Key Factors of Successful Programs

- » Knowledgeable Leadership
- » Linguistic Parity
- » Effective Bilingual Teachers
- » Active Parent Collaboration

At City Elementary, the principal's level of knowledge about dual language programs and instructional practices for supporting ELs [English learners] was evident through her discussions with parents and faculty. She remained current on dual language research, state law, and parent rights so that she could work with parents as she advocated for the program. She attended conferences with her teachers and read research articles during her own personal time. One teacher commented, "... She knows everything, and it's amazing to me how I might pick up a book and read it today, well, she already knows it. She already read it ... she is very informed." (Alanís & Rodríguez, 2008: 315)

This principal's leadership, grounded in deep understandings of bilingual education, was found to be pivotal in the program's effectiveness and sustainability for over a decade. Key factors of successful programs include knowledgeable leadership, linguistic parity, effective bilingual teachers, and active parent collaboration.

The DLBE school leader described previously whose leadership was studied by Souto-Manning et al. (2016) was also extremely well prepared to be what they term a 'courageous leader.' The leader, Dr. Hunt, is described as holding a master's degree and doctorate in bilingual education. She served for many years as both a DLBE elementary school teacher and then as assistant principal of an elementary school providing a DLBE program, before becoming a principal herself. This school leader is thus knowledgeable, experienced, and passionate about providing DLBE for emergent bilinguals. It is significant to note that she not only knows about bilingual education in general, but she has specialized expertise in dual language bilingual education, giving her the knowledge and skill set to run this type of program effectively.

Like the shortage of bilingual teachers, there is also a shortage of prepared school leaders for bilingual education programs. When a school leader lacks expertise in bilingual education or the education of emergent bilinguals, there can be serious consequences for DLBE programs. For instance, Menken and Solorza (2013, 2014, 2015) examined a trend amongst leaders of New York City schools to close bilingual education programs to meet the demands of federal education policy entitled *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB), which they found pressured school leaders to adopt English-only approaches in instruction. The researchers contrasted the decisions of these leaders to those of school leaders who were able to sustain their bilingual programs during the same time period. In their research, they term schools where bilingual education was eliminated and replaced with English as a second language (ESL) programming "English-only schools" and those where bilingual education programs were sustained "bilingual schools." A key finding in their work was that decisions to dismantle or sustain bilingual education were closely related to school leaders' preparedness in DLBE.

Our research points to the very important role of school leaders, particularly principals, in sustaining or eliminating bilingual education. We found that the leaders of what we term "English-only" schools had received no formal pre-service preparation to work with emergent bilinguals, while the leaders of "bilingual" schools in our sample were well prepared. (Menken & Solorza, 2013: 9)

Specifically, these authors found that the English-only school leaders held a number of misconceptions about language learning, bilingualism, bilingual education, and their emergent bilingual students; negative perceptions of bilingual education

and bilingual teachers; and, they showed strong preference for English-only approaches. As a result, to meet the demands of high-stakes testing in English, they dismantled their schools' bilingual education programs because they believed that doing so would improve emergent bilinguals' test scores, and thereby increase their schoolwide accountability ratings. By contrast, the DLBE school leaders were all found to be knowledgeable about bilingual education theory, practice, and pedagogy, and thus were able to make nuanced administrative and curricular decisions that strengthened and protected their bilingual programs while implementing the same testing programs. Whereas these school leaders “swim against the policy tides” (p. 30) in order to protect and sustain bilingual education, the leaders who dismantled bilingual education programs are described as “reeds blowing in the winds of education reform” (Menken & Solorza, 2014, p. 117) without the capacity or understandings necessary to protect their bilingual programs from top-down policies privileging English.

The national shortage of bilingual teachers is ongoing, and poses tremendous challenges for school leaders to staff their bilingual education programs with prepared teachers.

Central to the issue of preparation is that school leaders in New York, as in most states across the U.S., are not required to have received any formal preparation in the education of emergent bilinguals. The New York State Education Department (2014) currently offers the following credentials to qualify a candidate to serve in an official leadership position in a school, such as principal, assistant principal, or supervisor: School Building Leader certificate and School District Leader certificate. Courses offering understandings of emergent bilinguals are not required. Although many administrators have teaching licensure, a course focused on the education of emergent bilinguals is not required for teacher certification in New York for teachers of areas other than bilingual education or teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL). New York is like the vast majority of U.S. states in this regard, which do not require any preparation for general education teachers, principals, or school administrators about how to educate their emergent bilinguals.

Central to the issue of preparation is that school leaders in many states across the United States are not required to have any formal preparation in the education of emergent bilinguals.

In their research in Indiana, Morita-Mullaney and Burke (2017) note that Indiana also does not require any preparation for school leaders about bilingual education or the education of emergent bilinguals. They attribute this, at least in part, to the omission of emergent bilinguals (referred to in this quotation as EBs) from national leadership standards.

Leadership preparation programs for school administrators have no national requirement to address EB needs... This omission of EBs within leadership standards and preparation impacts the programmatic and curricular decision-making made by principals who can become future school leaders of schools with EBs... Moreover, many school leaders across the US do not have significant understanding of the instructional models used to address the needs of emergent bilinguals. (Morita-Mullaney & Burke, 2017: 86)

Brooks, Adams and Morita-Mullaney (2010) found that this gap between teachers and administrators in their knowledge base about educating emergent bilinguals creates an “expert/novice relationship” whereby, in the schools they studied, the education of emergent bilinguals was entirely left up to their specialist teachers. However, these teachers were marginalized within the leadership structures of the schools as a whole.

In states where formal preparation is not required for school leaders, some school districts have explored the provision of in service professional development opportunities to increase the capacity of DLBE school leaders. For instance, Medina (2015) examined mentorship programs for DLBE school principals. He found that although supporting DLBE principals through mentorship programs holds promise to redress some of the issues associated with lack of preparation, such programs should be fully structured, comprehensive, and led by mentors with deep understandings of DLBE leadership.

Some states are exceptions because they do require formal preparation of school administrators in the education of emergent bilinguals. For instance, the Florida Department of Education requires that all teachers take at least one three-credit college or university course about the education of emergent bilinguals for teaching certification (Florida Department of Education, 2011), and all principals must hold a teaching license; this ensures that school principals have at least taken a course in this area. In Massachusetts, knowledge in this area is actually embedded into administrator certification requirements, as principals and assistant principals must possess a Structured English Immersion (SEI) Administrator or Teacher Endorsement (Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2012). While the focus is on English-only instruction rather than bilingual approaches, due to the state's anti-bilingual education law (Gándara & Hopkins, 2010), Massachusetts does require school leaders to have some formal preparation in the education of emergent bilinguals. That said, none of the states that require preparation mandate knowledge specific to DLBE for school leaders. Overall, these examples above offer a bleak picture of the actual preparedness of school leaders to provide DLBE.

DUAL LANGUAGE BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR FAMILIES AND THE COMMUNITY: HOLDING TRUE TO THE ORIGINAL SOCIAL JUSTICE AIMS OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION

As noted in much of the literature already described in preceding sections, close relationships with families are essential in dual language bilingual education (Alanís & Rodríguez, 2008; Ascenzi-Moreno & Flores, 2012; DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2017; Hunt, 2011; Souto-Manning et al., 2016). These close relationships have historically been central in DLBE, as many bilingual programs were opened in U.S. schools in response to pressure and social activism by families and communities seeking greater control over their children's schooling (Ovando, 2003). Specifically, dual language bilingual education started in the U.S. amidst the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s. The first known DLBE program was The Coral Way Elementary School started in 1963 in Miami Dade County, Florida. The school started the program with the goal of maintaining Spanish in response to the pressures of the Cuban political refugee community (de Jong, 2011). During the same time period, the Laredo Unified Consolidated Independent School District in Laredo, Texas started to offer Spanish-English DLBE in response to community pressures (Fishman & Lovas, 1970). New York City's first bilingual elementary school, P.S. 25, was founded in 1968 in response to the Puerto Rican community's demands for bilingual education, spurred by the



educational, political and racial crisis during that time period (García, 2011; García, Velasco, Menken, & Vogel, 2017). This paved the way for the first DLBE program to open at P.S. 84 in the 1980s.

It is important to note that these early programs did not need to attend to the many guidelines we have today about what DLBE is and is not, or how programs should be designed, meaning there was greater flexibility both in terms of language alternation and student composition. Schools of that time period did not, for instance, attempt to engineer student populations to be 50% English monolinguals and 50% speakers of the language other than English in the ways they do today; instead, schools designed programs flexibly in order to meet the needs of the local community – although there were questions even then if the language practices of the DLBE programs actually were well matched to those of the communities they served (Fishman & Lovas, 1970). So if, for instance, there were second or third generation Latinxs coming from homes where mainly English was spoken and where the families wanted their children to learn in and through Spanish, then these children too were served in earlier DLBE programs without so much concern for achieving an even balance of English and Spanish monolinguals. As the former principal of P.S. 84 wrote, the school’s DLBE program was “rooted in the principles of heterogeneity and inclusion of children’s cultural backgrounds” (Morison, 1990: 161), and the school was open to all children in the community.

García et al (forthcoming) critique the ways strict DLBE guidelines impact communities today, including in New York City, as immigrant students are entering U.S. schools at all different points along a continuum of bilingualism with complex home language practices, but where many cannot gain access to DLBE programs because they do not meet admissions criteria:

The “model” as defined by NYC school authorities left little room to be inclusive of the complex sociolinguistic characteristics of a changing multilingual city... Today, although dual language bilingual programs could be an important resource for all communities who want their children to be bilingual and biliterate (the Puerto Rican “dream” in the 1960s and 1970s for their community), the strict interpretation of these programs in the city makes the dream attainable only for very few... (García et al, forthcoming: np)

Immigrant students are entering U.S. schools at all different points along a continuum of bilingualism with complex home language practices.

What these authors argue is that upholding the purity of the DLBE model is currently outweighing a focus on the local community. Other researchers have also increasingly critiqued DLBE guidelines regarding very strict language separation, which they argue are normed on the language practices of monolinguals and likewise lack the flexibility needed to serve local families and communities well (Cummins, 2008; Menken & Avni, 2017; Gort & Sembiante, 2015; Martínez, Hikida, & Durán, 2015; Palmer, Martínez, Mateus, & Henderson, 2014).

Recent research has also drawn attention to the reality that while DLBE programs hold great promise to foster cross-cultural understandings and promote educational equity, because they often combine middle class white students with non-white working class emergent bilinguals, many programs actually fall short of achieving these aims. For instance, Hernandez (2017) conducted two years of ethnographic research of Mexican immigrant families in California, focusing on

families' experiences in a DLBE program. She found that while the school staff presented the program as “level[ing] the playing field” between students because all students are “language learners,” and even though educators presented the program as “anti-racism,” the families had a different perspective. Instead, Hernandez’s (2017) research with families shows how education reform policies and practices can actually undermine aims for equity, particularly due to inequitable testing policies and practices and student labeling.

This is further supported in research showing how white middle class English speakers are privileged within DLBE programs (Palmer, 2009), for instance by

DLBE leaders must explicitly and aggressively address issues of race, class, and immigration status within classrooms and in DLBE program admissions in order to achieve the program’s goals for meaningful integration and equity.

assuming more classroom floor time and receiving more of the teacher’s attention than emergent bilinguals, and are also privileged in DLBE program admissions (Palmer, 2010). Palmer (2010) interviewed educators and parents in a predominately African American and Latinx school which opened a DLBE program that attracted middle class white families, and found that very few non-white children were actually enrolled in the DLBE program. As she concludes:

If the project of TWI [two-way immersion] becomes merely one of offering enrichment foreign-language immersion to middle- and upper-class white children, it will be a lost opportunity for transformation. The structural and attitudinal barriers to true race and class integration that plague many of these schools (just as they do non-two-way schools) must be addressed, or ultimately the wave of two-way bilingual programs will make no real progress at helping us and our children to address the deeper issues of racism and classism in this society. (Palmer, 2010: 111)

Clearly, programs that only benefit students who are already privileged while excluding those who are marginalized is a direct contradiction to the original social justice aims of bilingual education, and to the priority of DLBE to serve emergent bilinguals.

Valdez, Freire, and Delavan (2016) offer further support for Palmer’s (2010) concerns. Their mixed-methods study of Utah’s initiative to widely expand DLBE statewide examined which student groups were benefiting the most, by looking at three types of privilege: white racial privilege, wealth, and English privilege. Their discourse analysis of policy documents showed how privileged groups were being discursively targeted by this initiative. What is more, their study of DLBE program enrollment in Utah from 2005-2014 showed a statistically significant drop in access for those without the three forms of privilege under study. Valdez et al. (2016) conclude that Utah’s mainstreaming of DLBE programs has resulted in their ‘gentrification’ (p. 601).

This concern is shared by Flores (2014, 2015) who, citing examples from Miami, Holyoke, Philadelphia, and New York asks if bilingual education is being “Columbused” as a result of the growth in popularity of DLBE, particularly amongst middle class white families. As he writes:

To be clear, I am not suggesting that White parents should not want their children to become bilingual. What I object to is the individualistic narrative that is often associated with their support for bilingual education. It is about how bilingual education can benefit “my child” through providing marketable skills and cognitive advantages. If there is any acknowledgement

of benefits for minoritized students it is framed as an afterthought. Minoritized children are depicted as the benefactors of altruistic White families who bring cultural and financial capital that would not otherwise be available to them (Flores, 2014: n.p.).

While these scholars clarify their strong support for DLBE, their work highlights mounting concern about marginalization occurring within DLBE. DLBE leaders therefore must explicitly and aggressively address issues of race, class, and immigration status within classrooms and in DLBE program admissions in order to achieve the program's goals for meaningful integration and equity.

PARENT AND FAMILY LEADERSHIP IN DLBE

Research about leadership in DLBE maintains the importance of close school-community partnerships (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2016, 2017; Hunt, 2011; Howard et al., forthcoming; Olivos, Jiménez-Castellanos, & Ochoa, 2011; Rodríguez & Alánis, 2011; Scanlan & López, 2012; Souto-Manning et al., 2016). Although school leaders are well aware that parental and community support for DLBE is critical for the longevity of a program (Howard et al., forthcoming; Menken & Solorza, 2014) as sufficient numbers of students must enroll for a program to be maintained, many struggle to engage parents of emergent bilinguals (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2017). In their survey of 49 school principals in five states, for example, Rivera et al. (2010) found that when asked about their perceptions of challenges they face in serving emergent bilinguals effectively, the challenge they most frequently identified was parent-school connections.

Research about leadership in DLBE maintains the importance of close school-community partnerships.

A new line of research argues that low levels of parent involvement may be due to deficit perspectives of the parents, and actually suggests moving beyond a mere “involvement” paradigm to instead consider meaningful family engagement or even family leadership in schools. For instance, Olivos et al. (2011) show how what is perceived as poor parental involvement, evident in low attendance at parent-teacher conferences or school meetings, is attributed to home language and literacy practices that differ from those of the classroom, and other “deficiencies in bicultural children’s academic and social achievement [that] are often presumed to originate in the home (i.e., with the parents) and in their social upbringing” (p. 3). As a consequence of such deficit views, to improve parental involvement, schools focus on changing parental behaviors and expectations to be more like those of educators, and help the schools meet the goals that educators and administrators have set. These goals reflect school values and priorities rooted in the assumption that “the goal of all parents and families should be to emulate middle-class Euro-American values” (Olivos et al., 2011: 4).

Research argues that low levels of parent involvement may be due to deficit perspectives of parents, and actually suggests moving beyond a mere “involvement” paradigm to instead consider meaningful family engagement or even family leadership in schools.

Challenging such deficit views, researchers note how immigrant families are actually deeply involved in their children’s schooling, though at times in ways that may go unrecognized within schools. Based on qualitative research in the San Francisco Bay Area for which 24 interviews with Latinx immigrant parents were conducted, Poza, Brooks, and Valdés (2014) write:

[T]his study finds among those interviewed numerous alignments with the parent involvement strategies that prior research (e.g., Pomerantz,

Moorman, & Litwack, 2007) describes as most beneficial. Specifically, we have identified three particular behaviors that immigrant parents undertake: asking questions about schooling and education, altering or augmenting children’s schooling experience, and attending events related to children’s education, albeit often through organizations and social networks outside the school—thus not receiving recognition from teachers or administrators for their efforts. (Poza et al., 2014: 120)

In other words, the immigrant parents who were interviewed were found to be extremely involved in their children’s schooling, just often in ways that may bypass the school itself. For instance, the authors found that families attended workshops and informational sessions by nonprofit and community-based organizations, the public library, or their church and enrolled their children in after school activities for further academic and English language learning.

Like Poza et al. (2014), Warren, Hong, Rubin and Uy (2009) found that many families turn to community-based organizations (CBOs) instead of schools in order to be engaged with their children’s schooling and advocate for them. Warren et al. (2009) uncover how CBOs cultivated family leadership in schools in ways that moved far beyond the bake sales and other less meaningful or powerful forms of involvement that are more commonly found in schools. Moreover, CBOs offer many families access to school engagement when the schools themselves fail to do so.

Research conducted within the context of a DLBE school likewise found that many parents were deeply involved in their children’s schooling in spite of deficit views implying parent apathy, and in ways beyond the parameters of the school itself. Durand and Perez (2013) found from their interviews of 12 Latinx parents of children attending a DLBE PreK–8 school in the Northeastern U.S. that “the majority of parents espoused the cultural value of *educación*, engaged in learning activities at home, and viewed themselves as living models of behavior for children, regardless of their education or immigrant status” (p. 49). *Educación*, as defined

by the authors, extends beyond formal schooling to include moral and interpersonal goals as well as academic ones.

Researchers have begun to challenge the limitations in the ways parent involvement is traditionally framed in schools, noting how school leaders actually prevent meaningful family engagement and opportunities for families to truly be involved in leadership decisions within their children’s schools. For instance, Fernández and López (2017) offer an example of how a group of Latinx parents organized around particular issues of importance to them, such as their fear of deportation and separation of families. However, as the parent group gained members and became more active, they were increasingly

marginalized by the school administration for their grassroots efforts. The authors maintain that their case exposes the power dynamics of parental involvement in schools and show how the role, function, and meaning of involvement is prescribed for parents and well-delimited. Dyrness (2010) also found that parent critiques of schooling are silenced, and critical parents are positioned as troublemakers. She examined a case in which this typical scenario was confronted and overcome when a group of immigrant parents in the Oakland public schools were at first marginalized from school reform efforts, and eventually were able to assume roles in

Researchers have begun to challenge the limitations in the ways parent involvement is traditionally framed in schools, noting how school leaders actually prevent meaningful family engagement and opportunities for families to truly be involved in leadership decisions within their children’s schools.



the design and creation of a new community school because of their involvement in a participatory research group of parents called Madres Unidas (Mothers United).

Evidence in favor of shifting the paradigm in DLBE such that families of emergent bilinguals are able to assume significant leadership roles in schools can particularly be found in the research on social justice leadership (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2016, 2017; Scanlan & López, 2012; Wiemelt & Welton, 2015). Rodela (2016) examines a group called *Vamos al kinder* (pseudonym), a preschool and parent education program in Bampton, Oregon for Spanish-speaking children and their parents. While their children attended preschool, mothers attended weekly workshops during the school year focused on early literacy, child development, culture, and parent-school engagement. The aim of these workshops was to cultivate parent leadership. Mothers often began as volunteers, then worked as teaching assistants or parent facilitators, and some over time became lead teachers or facilitators.

Vamos al kinder's staff and participants demonstrate the potential role of community-based parent education and leadership programs in promoting emergent social justice leadership knowledge, skills, and dispositions for diverse parents and communities. (Rodela, 2016: 30)

In this instance, parent leadership is fostered from the outset to ensure parents play a central role in school leadership. Social justice leadership is examined further in the next section of this paper.

Parent-teacher associations often simply offer financial support to schools through fundraisers and other activities to help schools achieve the goals set by educators, so some families – particularly in progressive schools – have replaced their parent-teacher associations with what are called parent action committees (PACs). In addition to supporting the schools, PACs also raise issues or challenge school policies that are problematic. There are examples of schools serving emergent bilinguals, and specifically DLBE schools, with active PACs (Malsbary, 2016; Potowski, 2007)..

The Cypress Hills Community School, a DLBE public school located in Brooklyn, New York, offers a further example of meaningful family leadership. The school was founded in 1997 when families joined forces with a local CBO to found the school and offer DLBE to all students. Strong parent leadership is central to the school's mission, and the school has on staff a full time principal as well as a full-time co-director who is a parent (Ascenzi-Moreno & Flores, 2012; Cypress Hills Community School, 2017). Distributed leadership, examined in greater detail below, allows for families to have a formal role in school leadership structures.

While DLBE programs seem to do well in addressing some social justice aims, such as bilingualism, other nonlinguistic dimensions of diversity are often left unexplored.

SOCIAL JUSTICE LEADERSHIP IN DLBE

Research to date sets social justice as a central goal in DLBE and associates it with effective leadership in DLBE.

A body of research about social justice leadership in DLBE has emerged in recent years (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2016, 2017; DeMatthews, Izquierdo & Knight, 2017; Fierro & Rodríguez, 2006; Scanlan & López, 2012; Scanlan & Palmer, 2009; Theoharis & O’Toole, 2011; Wiemelt & Welton, 2015) wherein school leaders “keep at the center of their practice and vision issues of race, class, gender, disability, sexual orientation, and other historically and currently marginalizing conditions in the United States” and aim their leadership at “addressing and eliminating such marginalization in schools” (Theoharis, 2007: 223). According to this perspective, improved student learning outcomes are attributed to school efforts and structures that explicitly aim to reduce these marginalizing conditions.

Within DLBE, the argument for social justice-oriented principals in schools serving Latinx emergent bilinguals is described as follows:

While these principals may still confront deficit thinking and problematic state and district policies, a small body of research suggests particular leadership orientations, actions, and knowledge can contribute to the creation of DL [dual language] schools that meet the academic, social, and emotional needs of Latina/o EBs [emergent bilinguals]... The purpose of this framework is to highlight the principal’s role in creating more equitable schools for Latina/o EBs and to foster a multi-dimensional social justice perspective that focuses on closing achievement gaps while equally valuing meaningful parent engagement and the rich cultural and linguistic assets of students and their community. (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2017: 2)

Wiemelt and Welton (2015) also draw explicit links between social justice leadership and DLBE. They argue for what they term ‘critical bilingual leadership’ or liderazgo for emergent bilinguals. Focusing on the work of a bilingual Latinx school principal leading a schoolwide DLBE program, they conclude the following (note that ‘EBLS’ in this quotation refers to emergent bilinguals):

First, the daily work of critical bilingual principals and school communities must facilitate and implement a transformative vision of schools that acknowledges inequities that impact EBLS (e.g., racism, linguisticism, and monolingual standards)... Second, critical bilingual leaders must draw on the experiential knowledge of the communities they serve... Third, we must critically analyze how we approach and foster a culture of care that allows for students to develop their unique identities as borderlanders... Lastly, school leaders who serve EBLS must understand the research and theoretical foundation for bilingualism and biliteracy and how they foster academic achievement and social justice. (Wiemelt & Welton, 2015: 96-97)

This is not without its challenges. As Scanlan and Palmer (2009) note, while DLBE programs seem to do well in addressing some social justice aims, such as bilingualism, other nonlinguistic dimensions of diversity are often left unexplored. For instance, Valdiviezo and Nieto (2015) assert that while bilingual education lends itself to multicultural education, the two are not necessarily intertwined. In fact, there are many bilingual programs – including DLBE programs – that pay little attention to culture (Freire & Valdez, 2017). That said, research to date sets social justice as a central goal in DLBE and associates it with effective leadership in DLBE.



DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP IN DLBE

There is a body of research arguing for collaborative or distributed leadership in bilingual education (Ascenzi-Moreno et al., 2015; Brooks et al., 2010; DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2017; Hunt, 2011; Scanlan & López, 2012; Tupa & McFadden, 2009). While taking this approach would not eliminate the need for school administrators to have a knowledge base in DLBE, it would share the responsibilities of the school principal with others, and bring educators with expertise in bilingual education as well as families and community members into positions of leadership within a school's leadership structure. Rather than thinking of leadership as concentrated in one individual, distributed leadership considers leadership interactive and shared among multiple official and unofficial leaders (Leithwood, Mascall, & Strauss, 2009). According to Spillane (2006), distributed leadership is defined as “leadership practice generated in the interactions of leaders, followers, and their situation; each element is essential for leadership practice” (p. 4).

Rather than thinking of leadership as concentrated in one individual, distributed leadership considers leadership interactive and shared among multiple official and unofficial leaders.

[V]iewing leadership from a distributive perspective means that education policymakers must acknowledge that the work of leading schools involves more than the leadership of the school principal. (Spillane, 2006: 101)

Thus, leadership according to this perspective is not limited to the principal, and for some decisions in schools offering DLBE the bilingual teacher may serve as leader with the principal as follower. Brooks et al. (2007) examine formal and informal school leaders, and their work suggests a connection between distributed leadership and social justice leadership.

The role of teachers as unofficial school leaders is significant, as teachers often act as language policymakers (de Jong, 2011; Menken & García, 2010; Palmer et al., 2015; Malsbary, 2016). Research findings show that when teachers of emergent bilinguals interpret and implement policies in their classrooms they create new policies in the process, and are thereby language policymakers in their own right (Menken & García, 2010). One clear example of teacher policymaking occurred when teachers of emergent bilinguals removed district-mandated testing from their classrooms (Malsbary, 2016). Recognizing their significant role in language policy making, distributed leadership repositions teachers from being unofficial school leaders to official ones.

In her investigation of successful DLBE programs that have been sustained over time, as noted above, Hunt (2011) found collaborative and shared leadership to be one of the four leadership structures (along with mission, trust, and flexibility) that she found were essential in the ongoing success of the schools she studied. Similarly, in their case study of a DLBE public school, Ascenzi-Moreno and Flores (2012) found that distributed leadership involving shared decision making among school leaders, teachers, parents, and students allowed for the development of a flexible and responsive language education policy that the authors argue reflected the academic and social needs of students.

Ascenzi-Moreno et al. (2015) examined the process of school reform in three schools engaged in efforts to develop and implement multilingual language education policies that would replace monolingual ones. Interestingly, they found that these efforts were associated with changes in school leadership practices as well.

Specifically, they found that distributed leadership replaced hierarchical leadership in schools seeking to support bi/multilingualism and adopt policies promoting multilingualism.

In all three schools, notions of leadership widened to move beyond just the principals as they worked to develop and adopt new language policies and practices for their emergent bilingual students. What is more, our research suggests that language policy shifts within schools might necessitate changes in school leadership structures from hierarchical to collaborative... [W]hen charged with the task of making changes to their school's language policies and practices to better serve emergent bilinguals, this school - like the other schools in our sample - found that distributive leadership structures became necessary. (Ascenzi-Moreno et al., 2015: 15-16)

Prior to their efforts in school improvement, leadership practice in all three schools tended to be top-down, with the principal as the primary or sole decision maker. However, especially because in most schools the principals did not have as much expertise in the education of emergent bilinguals as the teachers, leadership needed to be distributed more widely..

Researchers recommend that schools serving emergent bilinguals form emergent bilingual leadership teams comprised of the school principal, other key administrators, bilingual and ESL teachers, general education teachers, skill and content specialists, special education teachers, and parents/families of emergent bilinguals.

This research support for distributive leadership in DLBE schools is an important consideration for school leaders. Researchers recommend that schools serving emergent bilinguals form emergent bilingual leadership teams comprised of the school principal, other key administrators, bilingual and ESL teachers, general education teachers, skill and content specialists, special education teachers, and parents/families of emergent bilinguals (García & Menken, 2015; Movit, Petrykowska, & Woodruff, 2010). The purpose of such leadership groups are to collectively focus on the education of emergent bilinguals and ensure shared decision making.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the range of issues discussed here, the following are recommendations for school leadership in dual language bilingual education:

- » DLBE school leaders must be courageous and stand up to English-only policies that undermine their DLBE program, vigilantly pursuing language equity to ensure English is not over-privileged. To do so, it is recommended that school leaders set a clear vision for bi/multilingualism and establish an official school language policy to protect DLBE that is implemented evenly across the school.
- » School leaders must be well prepared in DLBE. As such, states must mandate formal preparation of all school leaders to work with emergent bilinguals, and leaders of DLBE programs should receive specialized preparation in this area; this requirement should also extend to the licensure requirements of all teachers. Institutions of higher education need to ensure all teacher and leader candidates are knowledgeable about bilingualism, emergent bilinguals, and bilingual education. This is certainly not to suggest that certification would guarantee the expertise and stance that leading schools with DLBE demands, but would be a step in the right direction.
- » DLBE school leaders must prioritize the needs of local families and the community, not the purity of the program model. School leaders must hold true to the original social justice aims of DLBE by explicitly and aggressively addressing issues of race, class, and immigration status in order to achieve meaningful integration and equity.
- » DLBE school leaders should foster parent and family leadership, actively moving far beyond a mere parental involvement paradigm.
- » Working to achieve social justice should be a central aim of DLBE school leaders.
- » DLBE school leadership should be distributed among diverse members of the school community, rather than concentrated solely in the principal. DLBE leadership should involve an emergent bilingual leadership team comprised of the school principal, other key administrators, bilingual and ESL teachers, general education teachers, skill and content specialists, special education teachers, and parents/families of emergent bilinguals – for shared decision making.

REFLECTIONS AND QUESTIONS TO TAKE AWAY*

Leadership of DLBE programs requires a clear vision and dedication to pursue language equity: language equity means that both English and the partner language receive equal value, status and importance in the school environment.

How can you determine if your school reflects and promotes language equity?

Here are some questions you might ask:

Equal value in the school:

Does the school present a welcoming linguistic environment to parents and community members? Some features of a welcoming linguistic environment include an engaging office staff and school signage in English and the partner language. Access to information through print, internet and community meetings should be translated and/or available in the partner language. Are there school events which highlight the importance of bilingualism, for example, spelling bees, writer's workshops, plays or presentations? Do guest speakers reflect English and the partner language?

Equal value in the classroom:

Are English and the partner language allocated equal time daily? Is students' partner language and culture valued by the teachers? Is students' discourse valued in the classroom? Are student groupings made with consideration for students' language proficiency? Are students rewarded comparably for their progress in English and the partner language?

Equal value in the curriculum:

Are the textbooks and supplementary materials for the DLBE classrooms of similar complexity and quality as those in non DLBE classrooms? Are assessments given in English and the partner language? Are Advanced Placement classes available to students in the partner language?

Principal as language leader:

Does the school leadership model bilingualism and multiculturalism? Is bilingualism/multilingualism mentioned in the school's mission statement? Are all documents, such as report cards, translated? Are school staff informed of the school's language policy? Are opportunities for DLBE professional learning shared? Is DLBE parental and family leadership fostered?

Teacher as arbiter of language policy:

Does the partner language have at least equal value, status, and importance in the classroom in terms of the instructional time allocated to each, the languages of assessment, the quality of the instructional materials and the opportunity for student interaction?

Thoughtful consideration of questions like these help focus DLBE leadership on the many components that come together to create successful a successful program.

* These reflections and questions were written by CAL staff, not the author.

REFERENCES

- Alanís, I., & Rodríguez, M. (2008). Sustaining a dual language immersion program: Features of success. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 7(4), 305–319.
- Arias, B. & Faltis, C. (Eds.). (2012). *Implementing educational language policy in Arizona: Legal, historical and current practices in SEI*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ascenzi-Moreno, L., & Flores, N. (2012). A case study of bilingual policy and practices at the Cypress Hills Community School. In García, O., Octu, B., & Zakharia, Z. (Eds.), *Bilingual community education and multilingualism: Beyond heritage languages in a global city* (pp. 219-231). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (5th edition). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Corson, D. (1999). *Language policy in schools: A resource for teachers and administrators*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In J. Cummins & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 5. Bilingual education* (2nd ed., pp. 65–75). Boston, MA: Springer.
- Cypress Hills Community School (2017). About. New York: Author. Retrieved 8/17/17 from <http://www.cypresshills.org/chw/about/>
- Ascenzi-Moreno, L., Hesson, S., & Menken, K. (2016). School leadership along the trajectory from monolingual to multilingual. *Language and Education*, 30(3), 197-218.
- Brooks, J., Jean-Marie, G., Normore, A., & Hodgins, D. (2007). Distributed leadership for social justice: Exploring how influence and equity are stretched over an urban high school. *Journal of School Leadership*, 17, 378-408.
- Brooks, K., Adams, S., & Morita-Mullaney, T. (2010). Creating inclusive learning communities for ELL students: Transforming school principals' perspectives. *Theory Into Practice*, 49(2), 145-151.
- de Jong, E. (2011). *Foundations for multilingualism in education: From principles to practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- de Jong, E. & Bearse, C. (2012). Dual language programs as a strand within a secondary school: Dilemmas of school organization and the TWI mission. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 17(1), 15-31.
- DeMatthews, D. & Izquierdo, E. (2016). School leadership for dual language education: A social justice approach. *The Educational Forum*, 80(3), 278-293.
- DeMatthews, D. & Izquierdo, E. (2017): The importance of principals supporting dual language education: A social justice leadership framework. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, published online, 1-18.
- DeMatthews, D., Izquierdo, E., & Knight, D. (2017). Righting past wrongs: A superintendent's social justice leadership for dual language education along the U.S.-Mexico border. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 25(1), 1-32.
- Durand, T., & Perez, N. (2013). Continuity and variability in the parental involvement and advocacy beliefs of Latino families of young children: Finding the potential for a collective voice. *School Community Journal*, 23(1), 49-79.
- Dyrness, A. (2010). Cultural exclusion and critique in the era of good intentions: Using participatory research to transform parent roles in urban school reform. *Social Justice*, 36(4), 36-53.
- Fernández, E. & López, G. (2017). When parents behave badly: A critical policy analysis of parent involvement in schools. In Young, M. & Diem, S. (Eds.), *Critical approaches to education policy analysis* (pp. 111-130). Boston, MA: Springer.
- Field, R., & Menken, K. (2015). What might the process of language education policy development look like at the district and school levels relative to the Common Core State Standards? In G. Valdés, K. Menken, & M. Castro. (Eds.), *Common Core bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators* (pp. 121–122). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Fierro, E., & Rodríguez, M. (2006). Leadership for bilingual education: Reflections on social justice. *Journal of School Leadership*, 16, 182-196.
- Fishman, J., & Lovas, J. (1970). Bilingual education in sociolinguistic perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 4(3), 215-222.
- Flores, B., Hernandez Sheets, R., & Riojas Clark, E. (Eds.). (2011). *Teacher preparation for bilingual student populations: Educar para transformar*. New York: Routledge.
- Flores, N. & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149-171.
- Flores, N. (2015, Jan. 25). Has bilingual education been columbused? Blog. Retrieved 8/18/17 from <https://educationallinguist.wordpress.com/2015/01/25/columbising-bilingual-education/>
- Flores, N. (2014, Nov. 9). Is bilingual education inherently anti-racist? Blog. Retrieved 8/18/17 from <https://educationallinguist.wordpress.com/2014/11/09/is-bilingual-education-inherently-anti-racist/>

- Freeman, R. (2004). *Building on community bilingualism*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Freire, J. A. & Valdez, V. E. (2017). Dual language teachers' stated barriers to implementation of culturally relevant pedagogy. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 40(1), 55-69.
- Gándara, P., & Hopkins, M. (Eds.). (2010). *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- García, O. & Menken, K. (2015). Cultivating an ecology of multilingualism in schools: Building interindividuality of voices and ideologies. In B. Spolsky, O. Inbar & M. Tannenbaum (Eds.), *Challenges for language education and policy: Making space for people* (pp. 95-108). New York: Routledge.
- García, O., Velasco, P., Menken, K., & Vogel, S. (forthcoming). Dual language bilingual education in New York City: A potential unfulfilled. In M. Arias & M. Fee (Eds.), *Perspectives on dual language programs*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Gort, M., de Jong, E. J., & Cobb, C. D. (2008). Seeing through a bilingual lens: Structural and ideological contexts of sheltered English immersion in three Massachusetts districts. *Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 8(2), 41-66.
- Gort, M., & Sembiante, S. (2015). Navigating hybridized language learning spaces through translanguaging pedagogy: Dual language preschool teachers' languaging practices in support of emergent bilingual children's performance of academic discourse. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 7-25.
- Howard, E., Sugarman, J., Christian, D., Lindholm-Leary, K., & Rogers, D. (2007). *Guiding principles for dual language education* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Howard, E., Sugarman, J., Christian, D., Lindholm-Leary, K., & Rogers, D. (Forthcoming). *Guiding principles for dual language education* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Heineke, A., Coleman, E., Ferrell, E. & Kersemeier, C. (2012). Opening doors for bilingual students: Recommendations for building linguistically responsive schools. *Improving Schools*, 15(2), 130-147.
- Hernandez, S. (2017). Are they all language learners?: Educational labeling and raciolinguistic identifying in a California middle school dual language program. *The CATESOL Journal*, 29(1): 133-154.
- Jaar, A. (2017). *Professional development of dual-language teachers: Learning communities as potential sites of teacher identity, agency, and advocacy*. Doctoral Dissertation. Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Johnson, D.C. (2013). *Language policy*. New York, US: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leithwood, K., Mascall, B. & Strauss, T. (Eds.). (2009). *Distributed leadership according to the evidence*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2001). *Dual language education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2005). *Review of research and best practices on effective features of dual language education programs*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved from http://www.lindholm-leary.com/resources/review_research.pdf
- Malsbary, C. (2016). The refusal: Teachers making policy in NYC. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 29(1), 1326-1338.
- Martínez, R., Hikida, M., & Durán, L. (2015). Unpacking ideologies of linguistic purism: How dual language teachers make sense of everyday translanguaging. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 26-42.
- McField, G. (Ed.). (2014). *The miseducation of English learners: A tale of three states and lessons to be learned*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Medina, J. (2015). *Campus principals' perceptions of how principal mentorship influenced their ability to lead a dual language campus in one Texas school district*. Doctoral Dissertation. Beaumont, TX: Lamar University.
- Menken, K. & Solorza, C. (2015). Principals as linchpins in bilingual education: The need for prepared school leaders. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(6), 676-697.
- Menken, K. & Solorza, C. (2014). No child left bilingual: Accountability and the elimination of bilingual education programs in New York City schools. *Educational Policy*, 8(1), 96-125.
- Menken, K. & Solorza, C. (2013). Where have all the bilingual programs gone?: Why prepared school leaders are essential for bilingual education. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*, 4, 9-39.
- Morison, S. H. (1990). A Spanish-English Dual-Language Program in New York City. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 508, 160-169.
- Movit, M., Petrykowska, I., & Woodruff, D. (2010). *Using school leadership teams to meet the needs of English language learners*. Issue Brief. Washington, DC: National Center on Response to Intervention.



- Olivos, E., Jiménez-Castellanos, O., & Ochoa, A. (2011). *Bicultural parent engagement: Advocacy and empowerment*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Ovando, C. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27(1), 1-24.
- Palmer, D. (2009). Middle-class English speakers in a two-way immersion bilingual classroom: "Everybody should be listening to Jonathan right now..." *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(2), 177-202.
- Palmer, D. (2010). Race, power, and equity in a multiethnic urban elementary school with a dual-language "strand" program. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 41(1), 94-114.
- Palmer, D., Henderson, K., Wall, D., Zúñiga, C., & Berthelsen, S. (2015). Team teaching among mixed messages: Implementing two-way dual language bilingual education at third grade in Texas. *Language Policy*, 15(4), 393-413.
- Palmer, D., Martínez, R., Mateus, S., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on language separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(3), 757-772.
- Potowski, K. (2007). *Language and identity in a dual immersion school*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Poza, L., Brooks, M., & Valdés, G. (2014). Entre familia: Immigrant parents' strategies for involvement in children's schooling. *The School Community Journal*, 24(1), 119-148.
- Reyes, A. (2006). Reculturing principals as leaders for cultural and linguistic diversity. In K. Tellez & H. Waxman (Eds.), *Preparing quality educators for English language learners: Research, policy, and practice* (pp. 145-165). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rivera, M., Francis, D., Fernandez, M., Moughamian, A., Lesaux, N., & Jergensen, J. (2010). *Effective practices for English language learners: Principals from five states speak*. Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.
- Rodela, K. (2016). Undocumented educational leadership: The development of Latina mothers into emergent social justice leaders. *National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal*, 29(1&2): 21-33.
- Rodriguez, M., & Alanís, I. (2011). Negotiating linguistic and cultural identity: One borderlander's leadership initiative. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 14(1), 103-117.
- Scanlan, M., & López, F. (2012). ¡Vamos! How school leaders promote equity and excellence for bilingual students. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(4), 583-625.
- Scanlan, M., & Palmer, D. (2009). Race, power, and (in)equity within two-way immersion settings. *Urban Review*, 41(5), 391-415.
- Souto-Manning, M., Madrigal, R., Malik, K., & Martell, J. (2016). Bridging languages, cultures, and worlds through culturally relevant leadership. In S. Long, M. Souto-Manning, & Vasquez, V. (eds.), *Courageous leadership in early childhood education: Taking a stand for social justice* (pp. 57-68). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Spillane, J. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42, 221-258.
- Theoharis, G., & O'Toole, J. (2011). Leading inclusive ELL: Social justice leadership for English language learners. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(4), 646-688.
- Torres-Guzmán, M., with Swinney, R. (2009). *Freedom at work: Language, professional, and intellectual development in schools*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Tupa, M., & McFadden, L. (2009). Excellence is never an accident. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90, 554-556.
- Valdez, V., Freire, J., & Delavan, M. (2016). The gentrification of dual language education. *The Urban Review*, 48(4), 601-627.
- Valdiviezo, L. & Nieto, S. (2015). Culture in bilingual and multilingual education: Conflict, struggle and power. In Wright, W.E., Boun, S., & Garcia, O. (Eds.). *The handbook of bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 92-107). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Warren, M., Hong, S., Rubin, C., & Uy, P. (2009). Beyond the bake sale: A community-based relational approach to parent engagement in schools. *Teachers College Record*, 111(9), 2209-2254.
- Wiemelt, J., & Welton, A. (2015). Challenging the dominant narrative: Critical bilingual leadership (liderazgo) for emergent bilingual Latin@ students. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 17(1), 82-101.
- Wiley, T. (2010). Language policy in the USA. In Potowski, K. (ed.), *Language diversity in the USA* (pp. 255-271). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiley, T. & García, O. (2016). Language policy and planning in language education: Legacies, consequences, and possibilities. *Modern Language Journal*, 100(S1), 48-63.





Members of the National Dual Language Forum (NDLF) consist of a growing cadre of organizations committed to dual language and bilingual education and supporting high-quality effective programs.

We invite you to visit our website to learn more.

Tel: 202-362-0700

www.cal.org/ndlf



The Center for Applied Linguistics facilitates activities of the National Dual Language Forum including the website and White Papers as part of its ongoing commitment to dual language education and mother tongue literacy.