

**NYSABE**  
**New York State Association for Bilingual Education**

**PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS FOR**  
**BILINGUAL EDUCATORS PreK-12**



**Copyright © 2015; 2018; 2020**

**by New York State Association for Bilingual Education (NYSABE).**

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, or any informational storage and retrieval system, without permission from the author. Permission is hereby granted for personal use only.

## ***NYSABE's Bilingual Educators Standards Project Document***

This document was researched and written by Dr. Aida A. Nevárez-La Torre, Fordham University, on behalf of NYSABE.

### ***Acknowledgments***

Sincere thanks are extended to the following professionals for their support and expertise in the revision of NYSABE's Bilingual Educators Professional Standards. The time, dedication, and expertise contributed to gathering information and commenting on and revising, and editing this document is deeply appreciated.

**Executive Director:** Nancy Villarreal de Adler

### **Members of the NYSABE Board of Directors during 2015:**

Dr. Tatyana Kleyn (President)

Evelyn Arent (President Elect)

Dr. Marguerite Lukes (Vice-President)

Yazmín Torres (Past President)

Dr. Bahar Otcu-Grillman (Secretary)

Dr. Rosa E. Lien (Treasurer)

### **Partnership with New State Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages (NYSED-OBEWL) 2018; 2020:**

Lissette Colón-Collins (Assistant Commissioner)

### **Graduate Assistants:**

Jason Reynolds (Fordham University)

Daynia Vazquez (Fordham University)

Ming Zhu (Fordham University)

### **Team of New York State and National Academicians**

Dr. Maria Brisk (Boston College)

Dr. Angela Carrasquillo (Fordham  
University, Emeritus)

Dr. Ester de Jong (University of South Florida)

Dr. Nancy Dubetz (Lehman  
College, CUNY)

Dr. Miriam Ebsworth (New York University)

Dr. Ofelia García (Graduate Center, CUNY)

Dr. Carmen Martínez-Roldán (Teachers College)

Dr. Kate Menken (Graduate Center, CUNY)

Dr. Francisco Ramos (Loyola Marymount University)

Dr. Yolanda Santiago (Adjunct Professor)

Dr. María Torres-Guzmán (Teachers College, Emeritus)

Dr. Patricia Velasco (Queens College, CUNY)

### **Team of New York State Educators**

Teresa Bachant (New York State United Teachers)

Brandon Beck (Bilingual Teacher)

Iraida Bodré (Bilingual Teacher)

Aileen Colón (NYC RBE-RN)

Andrea Díaz (OBEWL)

Eva García and Staff of Regional

Cynthia Félix (Bilingual Administrator)

Bilingual/Education- Resource Network  
(RBE-RN)

Elizabeth Gostkiewicz (Bilingual Teacher)

Laura Head (Bilingual Teacher)

Thomas Kwai (Bilingual Teacher)

Juliet Luther (Bilingual and ESL Teacher)

Natalie Madison (Bilingual Teacher)

Rebeca Madrigal (Bilingual Teacher)

Suzette Malone (Elementary School Teacher)

José Martínez (Bilingual Teacher)

María Angelica Meyer (Bilingual Administrator)

Melvin Mizhquiri (Bilingual Teacher)

Ana Navaro (Bilingual Teacher)

Evelyn Nuñez (Bilingual Teacher)

Wileydi Peguero (Bilingual Teacher)

Samantha Peralta (Bilingual Teacher)

Karla Ramírez (Bilingual Teacher)

Roman Rivory (Bilingual Teacher)

Takayo Sakai (Bilingual Teacher)

Jennifer Scully (OBEWL)

Dr. Claire Sylvan (Executive Director of

Elina Tarasova (Bilingual Teacher)

International Networks for Public Schools)

Hulda Yau (Bilingual Teacher)

Evelyn Zamora (Bilingual Teacher)

And All Others Who Contributed Anonymously...

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<a href="#"><u>Preface</u></a>	5
<a href="#"><u>Introduction</u></a>	8
<a href="#"><u>Summary of Standards</u></a>	19
<a href="#"><u>Standards with Strategic Practices</u></a>	26
<a href="#"><u>Theoretical and Research Rationale</u></a>	46
<a href="#"><u>Glossary of Terms</u></a>	99
<a href="#"><u>References</u></a>	109
<a href="#"><u>Endnotes</u></a>	132

## **PREFACE**

In 2012 Dr. Aida Nevárez-La Torre (Fordham University) and Dr. Patricia Velasco (Queens College, CUNY) submitted a proposal to the New York State Association for Bilingual Education (NYSABE) for the creation of Professional Standards for Bilingual Educators (the Standards) in the State of New York. On May 29, 2012, after a presentation and discussion the Executive Board of NYSABE approved the proposal unanimously. A charge was given to both members of NYSABE to create and develop the standards.

The process of researching and writing the Standards included consultation of contemporary scholarly literature on bilingual education and multilingualism; review of professional standards documents from the National Association for Bilingual Education (1992); TESOL International Organization (2009), American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (2002), and Queensland's College of Teachers in Australia (2007); and examination of bilingual standards crafted and implemented in other states across the nation including California; Louisiana; New Mexico; and Texas. In addition, the document was sent to state and national academicians as well as educators from across New York State for comprehensive review and their comments were integrated into the final version of the Standards document.

In September of 2015 NYSABE's Board of Directors and Delegate Assembly adopted the Professional Standards for Bilingual Educators. NYSABE entered a partnership with the Office of Bilingual Education and World Language of the New York State Education Department in 2018 to explore ways that the newly adopted Bilingual

Educator Standards could be used to guide the professional preparation and education of bilingual educators in the State of New York.

The current document specifies the Standard Areas and Domains; each Standard with Strategic Practices; and Theoretical and Research Rationale for Standards. As a living document, contemporary research on best practices will be used to continually inform its content and purpose. As such, the scholarly sources discussed in the Introduction and Theoretical and Research Rationale sections of this document were expanded in 2018.

### **A Message from the New York State Education Department**

We at the New York State Education Department Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages (NYSED-OBEWL) are pleased to partner with NYSABE in introducing the professional standards contained herein. The standards will aid in the preparation of teachers of Multilingual Learners/English Language Learners (MLLs/ELLs<sup>i</sup>), the population of students for whom our office works and advocates.

The MLLs/ELLs of New York State are a large and diverse group of students. With more than 200 languages spoken within its borders, New York State is one of the most culturally and linguistically diverse places in the world. The ten most frequently spoken languages of MLLs/ELLs in New York State in the School Year 2017-2018 were Spanish, Chinese, Arabic, Bengali, Haitian Creole, Russian, Urdu, French, Karen and Uzbek. 272,292 MLLs/ELLs attended schools in 585 of the 730 school districts across New York State.

Although the Professional Standards for Bilingual Educators document, was written for educators who use two languages to teach language and academic content,

recognition of other instructional models used to teach language and content is important. Language and content education enacted in school districts, schools, and classrooms in the United States is structured in many ways.

For instance, in New York State, OBEWL oversees three types of language education programs including: Bilingual Education; English as a New Language; and World Languages programs. These programs are briefly defined in the Glossary, with additional definitions for some of the different terminology used to identify the students who participate in each, including: Bilingual Learners; English Language Learners; Emergent Bilinguals; Emergent Multilingual Learners; Former ELLs; Long-Term Learners; Multilingual Learners; MLL/ELL Students that are Differently Abled; Newcomers; Students with Interrupted/Inconsistent Formal Education; and Students with Limited/Interrupted Education.

As you read and use this document and learn more about OBEWL policies and resources, please remember NYSABE and OBEWL joint commitment to meeting the needs of Multilingual Learners/English Language Learners, and our collaborative efforts in preparing them to be college and career ready. We value our partnership with NYSABE and believe that it will only continue to bear fruit for our students in the future.

## INTRODUCTION

For decades now, different national and international teacher professional organizations have identified criteria that define the essential knowledge of teachers in specific disciplines. Several of these professional organizations, in addition to state education departments and accreditation agencies, have been successful in using these criteria to design and evaluate programs that educate teachers in higher education institutions (i.e., American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language, ACTFL; Association for Childhood International, ACEI; Council for Exceptional Children, CEC; International Literacy Association, ILA; National Council of Teachers of English, NCTE; National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, NCTM; National Science Teachers Association; Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, TESOL). The criteria have also guided professional development programs for educators designed by school districts. Presented as professional standards, these criteria are designed to answer two critical questions: (a) What is the essential knowledge teachers must know about educating in a particular field? (b) What are the essential practical skills that teachers must possess to instruct with mastery in a particular field?

Essentially, the *Professional Standards for Bilingual Educators PreK-12* (the Standards) explain what pre-service and in-service educators in the bilingual education profession should know and be able to do in 21<sup>st</sup> century educational settings. A survey of the relevant literature revealed that such criteria do not exist at the national level or in the State of New York in the field of Bilingual Education. Interestingly, there is an abundance of national and international



research about bilingualism, multilingualism, and bilingual/multilingual education that provides a scholarly knowledge base, which frames *bilingual education as a profession* and furthers the *professionalism of bilingual educators* (Baker & Wright, 2017; de Jong, 2011; García, 2008; Reyes & Kleyn, 2010). However, a review of the professional standards developed by national professional organizations in the area of language education (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language, 2002; Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 2009) showed that currently, none specifically addresses educators who teach bilingually in schools with a multilingual student population.

The search conducted for Bilingual Educator Professional Standards revealed three professional organizations with published/disseminated standards (National Association for Bilingual Education, 1992); New York State Association for Bilingual Education, 2015; 2020; and New Mexico La Cosecha, 2018). Different from the Standards, in 1992, the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE) published a set of standards “intended to assist institutions of higher education and other educational institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of *programs* for the preparation of bilingual/multicultural education teachers” (p. 3). At present, only a few states in the nation have professional standards for bilingual education teachers, including Louisiana, New Mexico, and Texas. These states are affiliates of the National Association for Bilingual Education. Distinctively, NYSABE’s Bilingual Educator Professional Standards are designed for educators who work in all types of bilingual education program models (i.e., transitional; maintenance/developmental; two way/dual language; mainstream bilingual; immersion).

A basic assumption and premise made in this document is that Bilingual Educators as professionals possess knowledge that is important and should be validated and counted in 21<sup>st</sup> century education. Yet, in order to be validated, this knowledge needs to be identified, documented, and written. If not, we will perpetuate the lack of professional validation that Alma Flor Ada wrote about three decades ago when she documented that bilingual teachers faced a great deal of criticism:

Bilingual teachers, caught between the accepted practices they are required to follow and the sound theories and research that contradict those practices, are especially vulnerable to attack.... In many instances they themselves have been victims of language oppression and racism; thus, in order to empower their students to overcome conditions of domination and oppression, they must first be empowered themselves (Ada, 1986, p. 386).

Today the need for professional standards for bilingual educators continues to be urgent in light of three fundamental trends. First, the enduring increase in the number of students who are *emergent bilinguals* (García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008) in the United States schools (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy, 2008; Irizarry, 2011; National Center for Educational Statistics, 2014). According to a report written by Casey Foundation (2018), "In 2016, 22% of children in the United States - slightly more than 12 million kids total – spoke a language other than English at home. This rate has risen 2% by 1.2 million kids, in the last decade". More specifically, in New York State, this population

represents 9.8% (272,292 students) of the state preK-12 student population (Sugarman & Geary, 2018) who speak over 200 languages (Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages, n.d.).

Second, along with these demographic changes, New York State, among other states, is experiencing an expansion of school programs that use two or more languages as mediums of instruction (Menken & Solorza, 2014; Veiga, 2018). This expansion is triggered by a variety of factors, including economic interdependency of nations around the world, federal government support for dual bilingual education, a constant influx of new immigrant students into our schools, and a desire of middle and upper-class parents in certain geographical areas to educate their children bilingually (de Jong, 2011). The strategic [\*advocacy\*](#) done by educators, parents, and community groups working with multilingual learners has also been instrumental in the maintenance and increase of bilingual education programs (Dubetz, 2014; Dubetz & de Jong, 2011; Fishman, 1991; May, 2011; Santiago-Negrón, 2012).

At the core of the Standards, the maintenance, expansion, and enhancement of bilingual education in this nation are seen as issues correlated to educational equity and excellence, and language as a human right. For some, social and educational equity are complex and contested, but worthy, goals to strive for in any society. Singleton (2014) observes that equity is “a belief and habit of the mind” instrumental in eliminating “racial achievement disparities” to assure that “all students will have the opportunity and support necessary to

succeed” (pp.55-56). Accordingly, educational equity as a path to educational excellence involves,

“raising the achievement of all students, while narrowing the gaps between the highest and lowest performing students, and eliminating the racial predictability and disproportionality of which student groups occupy the highest and lowest achievement categories” (p. 55).

Expanding on this understanding, de Jong (2011) applies educational equity to multilingualism in education by explaining that equitable school environments are those,

“where each individual feels valued and respected. They work together to ensure that formal and informal language policies and practices at the school, program, and classroom levels fairly represent the diversity in the school and do not discriminate systematically against certain group of students” (p. 171).

Similarly, the promotion of language rights has been a challenged issue in this nation (Wiley, 2013). Many argue that treating every language with respect, rejecting movements to force the abandonment of native languages, and supporting the use of all the linguistic resources learners have to communicate and to learn are basic human rights (Del Valle, 2003; De Varennes, 2001; - excellence May, 2011; Phillipson, 1998; Skutnabb-Kkangas, 2002; 2015; Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1994, UNESCO, 2003; Wiley, 2015). de Jong (2011) clarifies that the linguistic human rights movement, “presents a legal framework of the right to use and maintain the native language, the right to

develop the native language through formal schooling, and the right not be discriminated against for speaking a particular language” (p. 44).

Third, education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century mandates the rethinking of the knowledge and pedagogical skills teachers must exhibit to guide and facilitate learning. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) envisioned evolutionary learning in the new century that is lifelong and that is supported by flexible educational systems that accommodate to ongoing changes in the knowledge base about teaching and learning. There is a necessity to depart from outdated and inflexible educational systems in order to reconceive learning for the future as never ending and ever changing. As they state, “Students who leave school with the autonomy to set their own learning goals are better equipped to become successful lifelong learners” (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2008, p. 6). Among the exemplary designs for lifelong learning they identify as promising, two are meaningfully related to the innovative nature of the Standards document: (a) flexibility in adapting new forms of learning and research and (b) encouraging community and multiple stakeholders involvement (pp. 6-7).

The wealth of investigations conducted on bilingualism and bilingual pedagogy, for over fifty years and those that are ongoing today in the US as well as around the globe, respond to these contemporary trends and provide a scholarly foundation for the publication of the Standards document. Teachers who instruct MLLs/ELLs, now and in the future, should receive evidence-based teacher education and professional development guided by standards conducive

to enhancing their professional knowledge and pedagogical skills in innovative ways. Of importance is that professional standards can be instrumental in underscoring research insights on the educational and cognitive benefits of bilingualism and bilingual pedagogy and in shaping excellence in bilingual education (Adescope, 2010; Bialystok, 2013; Bialystok, Craik, & Luk, 2012; Eisenstein Ebsworth, 2009; Genessee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006; Goldenberg, 2008; Hakuta, Butler, & Witt, 2000; Moore & Zainuddin, 2003; Schweizer, Ware, Fischer, Craik, & Bialystok, 2012). Expressing support for the purposes of this document, one Bilingual teacher in New York, who reviewed it, stated,

It is about time that we have a document that sets the expectations for quality bilingual education....[It] will set the stage for higher education institutions and administrators at all levels as well as for bilingual teachers.

Finally, the ultimate success in educating all students bilingually (García, 2008) and preparing them for bilingualism as a lifelong experience (Alidou, Glanz, & Nikiema, 2011) resides, in part, in the professional knowledge teachers in bilingual education programs possess. Educating bilingual teachers is made more complex given the multiple roles that they are involved including: as pedagogues (of language and content); as linguists (of language, oracy, and literacy); as intercultural communicators (interpreter and teacher of culture); as community members (insiders of the students' cultural groups); and as advocates (of bilingual programs, students and their families, and communities) (Benson, 2004).

Hence, it is imperative to design professional standards that inform the multiple roles that bilingual educators must assume and that speak to innovative and multidisciplinary knowledge and skills that they must possess to demonstrate expertise in educating students bilingually. Recent advances in the scholarly research in content knowledge, language, literacy, and technology demand complex shifts of educational paradigms that can inspire multilingual students to be productive in an increasingly multilingual, multicultural, and networked world (Bryk, 2015; Cummins, Brown, & Sayers, 2007; Hughes & Acedo, 2013; Lesaux & Phillips Galloway, 2017; Nevárez-La Torre, 2014; Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2008; Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills, n.d.; Rodríguez, Carrasquillo, & Lee, 2014; Wagner, 2012). The Professional Standards for Bilingual Educators validates the essential knowledge of bilingual educators and serves to guide their professional preparation and their work with MLL/ELLs.

### ***Goals of Professional Standards***

Professional Standards for Bilingual Educators are needed to accentuate the fact that an informed bilingual educator must have specialized knowledge in a variety of academic and pedagogical fields. The term *educator* in this document is used broadly, referring to all professionals who teach MLL/ELLs directly or indirectly, including teachers, teacher assistants, school tutors, librarians, school specialists, and school administrators, as well as, educational community workers and advocates, policy makers, teacher candidates, and teacher educators. This document is relevant, to

different degrees and in different ways, to the work that all of them perform in the enactment of quality bilingual education.

Given the increasing professional and accountability demands on educators who work with MLLs/ELLs, these Standards can guide professional practice and inform teacher education and professional growth in ways that uniquely respond to the bilingual education field. For these purposes, they can be an insightful tool to shape the work of teachers at all educational levels, as well as that of teacher educators, university and school administrators, and educational policymakers. Equally important is that this document was created to inform the work of educators across all bilingual education program models (i.e., transitional; two way/dual language; mainstream bilingual; immersion). Designing and enacting Professional Standards offer specific benefits to the profession of bilingual education, including

1. Invigorating the [\*professionalization\*](#) (Shulman, 1987) of bilingual education; while at the same time building on the [\*professionalism\*](#) (Herbst, 1989) of bilingual educators.
2. Leading the exploration of ways to advance teacher education and professional development in bilingual education (Alfaro, 2018; Flores, Sheets, & Clark, 2011; Perrone, 1989).
3. Supporting the recognition of the work and contributions that bilingual educators make as professionals (Nieto, 2005).
4. Advancing the specialized knowledge that reflects best practices and research in the field of [\*multilingualism\*](#) and bilingual instruction and promotes exemplary teaching (Ada, 1986; Palmer & Martínez, 2013).



5. Tracing a path for bilingual educators towards professional growth (i.e., adding certification areas; preparing for National Board Certification in bilingual/multilingual education) that is self-inspired, self-led, and self-monitored (Nevárez-La Torre, 2010; Nieto, 2003; Téllez & Varghese, 2013).
6. Promoting excellence in bilingual education and assuring that educators have an ethical framework and an essential knowledge base (de Jong, 2011; Joseph & Evans, 2018).
7. Providing educational and professional goals for pre-service teachers in their education and supervision, and for in-service teachers in their coaching, mentoring, and professional growth (Staehr Fenner & Kuhlman, 2012).
8. Creating a reference point to positively compare bilingual educators with their colleagues throughout the nation and world (TESOL, 2009).

This document specifies the essential knowledge that educators in bilingual education should possess to achieve professional mastery and excellence in teaching.

There are three interconnected *Standard Areas of Knowledge* organized into seven

*Domains*:

- I. *Knowledge of Content*
  1. Bilingualism and Multilingualism
  2. Biculturalism and Multiculturalism
  3. Multilingual Oracy and Literacy
  4. Content and Language of Academic Disciplines
- II. *Knowledge of Pedagogy*
  5. Bilingual Assessment and Decision Making

## 6. Innovative and Transformative Bilingual Pedagogy

### III. *Knowledge of the Profession*

## 7. Professionalism and Advocacy

A final note of the terminology in the document is needed. When referring to students we use the term *English Language Learners/Multilingual Learners* (MLL/ELLs), denoting students who possess more than one language system to learn and to communicate, since it is the term adopted by the New York State Department of Education (Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages, n.d.). Other terms, such as *emergent bilinguals* (García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008) and *plurilingual students* (Canagarajah, 2012), are also used when issues of development of more than one language or inclusion of various language modes and linguistic systems are discussed. When discussing issues related to instruction we use the term *bilingual*.

Specific *Standards* are organized within each *Domain*. *Strategic Practices* identify essential elements of and behaviors that define consummate practice for each Standard. To anchor each Standard a *Theoretical and Research Rationale* section is included at the end of the document. The synthesis of relevant scholarly findings from contemporary research in bilingualism, multilingualism, and bilingual education provides a conceptual and empirical foundation to the standards. The goal is not to present a broad discussion, but to focus on the main knowledge paradigm shifts in each Standard Area and to discuss the most current research and theories framing each. A summary of *the Standards* is included at the beginning of the document and scholarly *References* with a *Glossary* at the end.

# PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATORS

## ***SUMMARY OF STANDARDS***

### **I. STANDARD AREA: KNOWLEDGE OF CONTENT**

#### **DOMAIN 1. Bilingualism and Multilingualism**

Bilingual Educators know and understand languages as systems that work within social contexts, the process of acquiring and developing multiple languages, and the dynamic ways that languages are used to communicate thought.

##### **Standard 1.a. Linguistic Systems**

Bilingual Educators know and understand that languages can be defined as systems that have specific features, functions, and multiple uses and that these can be compared and contrasted to facilitate understanding.

##### **Standard 1.b. Acquisition and Development of Multiple Languages**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the evolution of theories of language acquisition and development and apply them across different languages. They explore contemporary ways of interpreting language(s) development in a globalized society.

##### **Standard 1.c. Multiple Languages in Use**

Bilingual Educators know, understand, and value the diverse linguistic repertoire and background of the MLLs/ELLs in their classrooms; as well as, the reciprocal use of languages in multilingual settings, including home language experiences, the different influences on language choice for communication and instruction, and the ways to create meaning from the integration of symbols, modalities, and environmental resources.

**DOMAIN 2. Biculturalism and Multiculturalism**

Bilingual Educators are culturally self-aware and know and value the multiple student cultures represented in their classrooms. As culturally competent educators, they understand the effects that biculturalism and multiculturalism have on student learning, self-identity, and schooling. To eliminate possible cultural dissonance, they recognize different ways to engage with families and communities and value the funds of knowledge that reside in contexts outside schools.

**Standard 2.a. Bicultural and Multicultural Effect on Student Learning**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the complex and multifaceted correlations between languages, cultural practices, and learning. They comprehend the ways learning may be influenced by ideologies about and attitudes towards languages and cultural practices, and ways in which their perceptions and expectations about students, their languages and culture, may influence learning. They recognize the different factors that impact conditions of local and global migration and mobility and how these shape the learning process.

**Standard 2.b. Bicultural and Multicultural Effect on Student Identity**

Bilingual Educators know and understand how multilingual and multicultural students' sense of self is molded by various cultural factors, individual variables, and discourses on positionality within schools. They investigate the tensions and discontinuities that emerge from navigating various cultures and how cultures and languages function as social practices where identities are negotiated.

**Standard 2.c. Bicultural and Multicultural Effect on Schooling**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the interaction of cultural practices between schools and MLL/ELL students. They discern the ways in which types of communication in classrooms, norms for literacy and language use, policies for language of instruction and choice, mediate bilingual students' negotiation and active construction of their cultural, linguistic, and academic identities. They study the impact of innovative engagement of teachers, families, and communities on schooling.

**DOMAIN 3. Bilingual and Multilingual Oracy and Literacy**

Bilingual Educators know and understand how oral and written language are at the core of the academic learning process in bilingual classrooms and how the interconnected development of [oracy](#) and literacy happens within and across languages at home and at school.

**Standard 3.a. Multilingual Oracy and Communication**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the importance of multilingual [oral language](#) and oracy development for communication and learning, key differences in the way [bilingual](#) and [monolingual](#) students develop and use oral language, and the process students experience in developing oral language proficiency bilingually.

**Standard 3.b. Nature of Literacy in more than One Language**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the importance of [multilingual literacy](#) development for thinking and learning and the key differences from reading and writing in only one language. They see literacy as a [translingual](#) practice that transfers knowledge and skills across languages and values the contribution of bilingual students' home literacy experiences to *advanced* [biliteracy](#) development.

**Standard 3.c. Relationship between Multilingual Oracy and Literacy**

Bilingual Educators are aware of and understand the multiple interconnections between oracy and literacy in all the bilingual student [linguistic repertoires](#); how oracy and literacy develop in more than one language across content areas; and ways that bilingual learners use language strategically and make [cross language](#) connections in multilingual oracy and literacy.

**DOMAIN 4. Content and Language of Academic Disciplines**

Bilingual Educators have depth of academic knowledge, exhibit solid understanding of language and content standards, and demonstrate expertise in making [\*cross-disciplinary\*](#) and [\*cross-linguistic connections\*](#) through multiple [\*academic texts\*](#).

**Standard 4.a. Content of Academic Disciplines**

Bilingual Educators comprehend and demonstrate knowledge of the concepts, skills, and strategies of content in [\*academic disciplines\*](#), the content standards that structure contemporary knowledge within and across disciplines, and the cross-disciplinary skills necessary for [\*depth of learning\*](#).

**Standard 4.b. Language Discourse of Academic Disciplines**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the nuances and uniqueness of oral and written [\*discourse\*](#) in content areas, differences in academic text across varied languages and cultures, and ways bilingual learners make cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary connections among varied content texts.

## II. STANDARD AREA: KNOWLEDGE OF PEDAGOGY

### **DOMAIN 5. Bilingual Assessment and Decision Making**

The Bilingual Educator knows and understands the different purposes of assessment, aligns these with multiple valid and reliable methods to assess language and content, and uses the results to inform decision-making and guide instruction of bilingualism, bi-literacy, and academic content. The Bilingual Educator demonstrates expertise in the purposes, methods, language, content, and processes of implementing assessment.

#### **Standard 5.a. Assessment as Educational Policy**

Bilingual Educators know and understand ethical and valid ways of assessing multilingual students' academic and linguistic knowledge and abilities and critically examine the implications of using assessment as [\*educational policy\*](#).

#### **Standard 5.b. Assessing Bilingualism, Biliteracy, and Content**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the [\*formative\*](#) and [\*summative\*](#) purposes of assessment, align these purposes with effective use of valid and reliable methods, apply the results to design instruction of bilingualism, bi-literacy, and academic content, and guide educational decision-making.

#### **Standard 5.c. Monolingual and Bilingual Assessment of Learning**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the implications of using monolingual and bilingual assessments. They accommodate and modify assessments for bilingual learners and interpret the results of such assessments with discernment.

**DOMAIN 6. Innovative and Transformative Bilingual Pedagogy**

Bilingual Educators know and apply [evidence-based methods](#) to design and enact bilingual instruction across academic disciplines to nurture learning, bilingualism, biliteracy, cross cultural understanding, and critical thought. They assume an introspective and exploratory pedagogical stance and integrate innovative resources to create an active, intellectually demanding, and engaging bilingual learning environment.

**Standard 6.a. Designing Bilingual Instruction**

Bilingual Educators know and understand evidence-based instructional methodologies and use these to design instruction demonstrating knowledge of content disciplines, and cultivate bilingualism and biliteracy. They create paths to innovate bilingual instruction, make learning tasks culturally relevant, intellectually challenging, and responsive to diverse bilingual students and how they learn.

**Standard 6.b. Enacting Bilingual Instruction**

Bilingual Educators know and implement evidence-based bilingual instructional allocations, models, and methods that support active learning and implement these in a variety of bilingual classrooms assuming an investigative pedagogical stance founded upon a strong understanding of bilingualism, biliteracy, and academic content.

**Standard 6.c. Using and Adapting Innovative Instructional Resources**

Bilingual Educators know and understand ways to select, develop, and differentiate innovative and technological resources to design and implement instruction that scaffolds language and content knowledge, promote creative and critical thought, facilitate active [communication](#) in both languages, and respond to diverse abilities and language proficiencies.



### **III. STANDARD AREA: KNOWLEDGE OF THE PROFESSION**

#### **DOMAIN 7. Professionalism and Advocacy**

Bilingual Educators possess a broad scholarly knowledge base on the history, approaches, ideologies, and scholarly discourse that have shaped bilingual education. They use theories and research on bilingualism and bilingual education to grow as professionals and apply them to promote [educational equity](#) and quality in bilingual education.

##### **Standard 7.a. Bilingual Educators as Experts**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the history of bilingual education, the evolution of its laws, policies, and approaches; contemporary scholarly research on bilingual instruction; different theoretical frameworks regarding language diversity; ways ideologies and policies impact bilingual school practices; and processes to be ethical professionals.

##### **Standard 7.b. Bilingual Educators as Investigators**

Bilingual Educators know and understand how to be discerning consumers and producers of research relevant to bilingualism and effective bilingual instruction; and use the knowledge gained to enhance their professional growth and contribute to heightening professional knowledge in this field.

##### **Standard 7.c. Bilingual Educators as Advocates, Activists, and Partners**

Bilingual Educators know and understand how to design and sustain professional collaborations with school, families, and the communities they represent and take action to assume the roles of advocate, [activist](#), and partner to bring about educational equity and quality in bilingual education.

# PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATORS with *STRATEGIC PRACTICES*

## I. STANDARD AREA: KNOWLEDGE OF CONTENT

### DOMAIN 1. Bilingualism and Multilingualism

Bilingual Educators know and understand languages as systems that work within social contexts, the process of acquiring and developing multiple languages, and the dynamic ways that languages are used to communicate thought.

#### Standard 1.a. Linguistic Systems

Bilingual Educators know and understand that languages can be defined as systems that have specific features, functions, and multiple uses and that these can be compared and contrasted to facilitate understanding.

**Strategic Practices** - This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Explore language as a *social construct* and study the performing aspect of language as well as the structural elements of the languages of instruction, including *phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics*.
- (b) Interpret the principles and applications of major theories associated with the fields of psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and applied linguistics.
- (c) Understand and value the development of *metalinguistic* awareness and the importance of fostering its use to learn language and content.
- (d) Study various linguistic repertoires and discourses used by learners to make sense of what they experience at school, at home, and in their communities.

### **Standard 1.b. Acquisition and Development of Multiple Languages**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the evolution of theories of language acquisition and development and apply them across different languages. They explore contemporary ways of interpreting language(s) development in a globalized society.

**Strategic Practices-** This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Comprehend the principles and applications of major historical and contemporary research related to acquisition and development of multiple languages, including bilingualism as continua of acquisition, linguistic dual roles and bidirectional impact, brain research, bilingualism and disability, [\*language ecology\*](#), [\*translanguaging\*](#), and [\*metacognition\*](#).
- (b) Explore the principles and applications of sociolinguistic, sociocultural, psychological, cognitive, and political theories; major influential individual and universal factors; and different theoretical models ([\*subtractive\*](#), [\*additive\*](#), [\*recursive\*](#), & [\*dynamic\*](#)) and ideologies ([\*monoglossic\*](#) and [\*heteroglossic\*](#)) that characterize the development of more than one language.
- (c) Investigate cross-language [\*metacognitive skills\*](#) and the interconnections among language modes (receptive, productive; oracy, literacy) within and across languages.
- (d) Study language learning problems associated with disabilities and develop skill in differentiating language learning differences associated with bilingualism from language impairments.

**Standard 1.c. Multiple Languages in Use**

Bilingual Educators know, understand, and value the diverse linguistic repertoire and background of the MLL/ELL in their classrooms; as well as the reciprocal use of languages and dialects in multilingual settings, including home language experiences, the different influences on language choice for communication and instruction, and the ways to create meaning from the integration of symbols, modalities, and environmental resources.

**Strategic Practices-** This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Demonstrate language proficiency and competence in the languages of instruction and serve as fluent language models for MLLs/ELLs.
- (b) Explore the relationship of language and power, understand the sociolinguistic and cognitive processes of linguaging and translanguaging, and value the learners' reciprocal use of languages in multilingual settings.
- (c) Study the way that different communication methods and social, cultural, economic, and historical contexts influence choices on language use and investigate monolingual, multilingual, linguaging, and translingual competence models of bilingualism in different contexts and for different purposes.
- (d) Understand communication as a process of combining language with other symbol systems (i.e., icons, images), diverse modalities of communication (i.e., aural oral, visual, and tactile), and environmental resources (i.e., social and material contexts) to create meaning.

**DOMAIN 2. Biculturalism and Multiculturalism**

Bilingual Educators are culturally self-aware and know and value the multiple student cultures represented in their classrooms. As culturally competent educators, they understand the effects that biculturalism and multiculturalism have on student learning, self-identity, and schooling. To eliminate possible cultural dissonance, they recognize different ways to engage with families and communities and value the funds of knowledge that reside in contexts outside schools.

**Standard 2.a. Bicultural and Multicultural Effect on Student Learning**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the complex and multifaceted correlations between languages, cultural practices, and learning. They comprehend the ways learning may be influenced by ideologies about and attitudes towards languages and cultural practices, and ways in which their perceptions and expectations about students, their languages, and cultures may influence learning. They recognize the different factors that impact conditions of local and global migration and mobility and how these, shape the learning process.

**Strategic Practices** - This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Understand the cultural, social, economic, historical, and political influences over immigration, migration, and mobility and identify their effects on bilingual students learning.
- (b) Study the impact of globalization and technology as well as virtual transnationalism on learning.
- (c) Explore how cultural beliefs and values of both teachers and students influence teaching and learning.
- (d) Understand the dynamic interrelationship between languages and cultural practices and its effect on learning.

**Standard 2.b. Bicultural and Multicultural Effect on Student Identity**

Bilingual Educators know and understand how multilingual and multicultural students' sense of self is molded by various cultural factors, individual variables, and discourses on *positionality* within schools. They investigate the tensions and discontinuities that emerge from navigating various cultures and how cultures and languages function as social practices where identities are negotiated.

**Strategic Practices** - This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Comprehend the dynamic interrelationship between language, culture, and identity and its effect on learning.
- (b) Understand how cultural factors such as, gender, ethnicity, language, religious beliefs, location, socioeconomic circumstances, and individual needs impact the worldview of students and teachers.
- (b) Investigate the negative impact of *linguicism* and other forms of bias, prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination on students, families, communities, teachers, and the school environment.
- (c) Study the *socio-emotional development* of bilingual/multilingual students; their construction of self as language users and cultural negotiators, and support their right to build their cultural and linguistic identities within multilingual and multicultural schools.

**Standard 2.c. Bicultural and Multicultural Effect on Schooling**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the interaction of cultural practices between schools and MLL/ELL students. They discern the ways in which types of communication in classrooms, norms for literacy and language use, policies for language of instruction and choice, mediate bilingual students' negotiation and active construction of their cultural, linguistic, and academic identities. They study the impact of innovative engagement of teachers, families, and communities on schooling.

**Strategic Practices** - This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Understand bilingualism in light of cultural, social, and political constructs within the educational systems of the United States and in a global society.
- (b) Investigate [\*critical multiculturalism\*](#) and [\*anti-racism\*](#) by exploring multiple manifestations of power difference inside and outside schools, and their impact on endorsing specific [\*language policies\*](#) in schools and society.
- (c) Understand different models of family and community, as well as of [\*parental engagement\*](#), the effects of [\*cultural mismatch\*](#), and develop strategies to bridge the cultural practices of the school and that of families and communities by fostering positive and productive relationships and engagement.
- (d) Demonstrate knowledge of and disposition to learn about the cultural practices of bilingual students and engage them in the exploration of their emerging biculturalism as they acquire a new language and set of cultural practices within and outside school.

### **DOMAIN 3. Bilingual and Multilingual Oracy and Literacy**

Bilingual Educators know and understand how oral and written language are at the core of the academic learning process in bilingual classrooms and how the interconnected development of oracy and literacy happens within and across languages at home and at school.

#### **Standard 3.a. Multilingual Oracy and Communication**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the importance of multilingual oral language and oracy development for communication and learning, key differences in the way bilingual and monolingual students develop and use oral language, and the process students experience in developing oral language proficiency bilingually.

**Strategic Practices:** This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Distinguish between oral language development and oracy in more than one language and differentiate between *simultaneous* and *sequential* oral development in more than one language.
- (b) Understand the role of oral language in learning across languages and of oracy across academic disciplines.
- (c) Differentiate between monolingual and bilingual students' oral language development and identify and use oracy components that facilitate learning in more than one language.
- (d) Understand bilingual oral language development across different age groups in order to address bilingual students' oral language needs in all grade levels and content disciplines.



**Standard 3.b. Nature of Literacy in More than One Language**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the importance of multilingual literacy development for thinking and learning and key differences from reading and writing in only one language. They see literacy as a translingual practice that transfers knowledge and skills across languages and values the contribution of bilingual students' home literacy experiences to biliteracy development.

**Strategic Practices:** This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Examine the knowledge needed to read and write in more than one language, key differences from [\*monoliteracy\*](#), and ways that biliteracy can promote learning in content areas.
- (b) Study the development of reading and writing in each and across languages, the factors that influence these processes, and understand how literacy skills and strategies may be transferred between languages.
- (c) Explore different views of multilingual literacies (e.g., the continua of biliteracy; literacy as translingual practice) and key connections between languages, [\*scripts\*](#), and literacies.
- (d) Consider ways that authentic, translated, and culturally relevant texts can build biliteracy proficiency and investigate multilingual literacy across different media, technologies, symbolic systems (icons, emoticons, graphics), and literary genres of bilingual text.

**Standard 3.c. Relationship between Bilingual and Multilingual Oracy and Literacy**

Bilingual Educators are aware of and understand the multiple interconnections between oracy and literacy in all the bilingual student linguistic repertoires; how oracy and literacy develop in more than one language across content areas; and ways that bilingual learners use language strategically and make cross-language and cross-modal connections in multilingual oracy and literacy.

**Strategic Practices:** This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Explore interconnections between oracy and literacy for learning across languages.
- (b) Compare and contrast the nature and discourses of oracy and literacy across languages.
- (c) Investigate ways that the development of oracy and literacy influence each other across languages.
- (d) Analyze the role of technology as a link between oracy and literacy, as many digital forms span the two.

## **DOMAIN 4. Content and Language of Academic Disciplines**

Bilingual Educators have depth of academic knowledge, exhibit solid understanding of language and content standards, and demonstrate expertise in making cross-disciplinary and cross-linguistic connections through multiple academic texts.

### **Standard 4.a. Content of Academic Disciplines**

Bilingual Educators understand and demonstrate knowledge of the concepts, skills, and strategies of content in academic disciplines, the content standards that structure contemporary knowledge within and across disciplines and the cross-disciplinary skills necessary for depth of learning.

**Strategic Practices:** This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Develop and demonstrate deep understanding of content concepts, skills, and strategies in academic disciplines.
- (b) Understand how language anchors academic learning and explore the interconnections between language and academic content to promote academic learning.
- (c) Analyze the content standards for the discipline taught and connect them to the domain knowledge of that discipline.
- (d) Examine and value the rationale for making content accessible in more than one language and the opportunities bilingual students have as well as the challenges they face when learning content in more than one language.

**Standard 4.b. Language Discourse of Academic Disciplines**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the nuances and uniqueness of oral and written discourse in content areas, differences in academic text across varied languages and cultures, and ways bilingual learners make cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary connections among varied content texts.

**Strategic Practices:** This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Explore social and academic discourses across languages and cultures.
- (b) Demonstrate knowledge of *narrative schemas* and [\*rhetorical structures\*](#) of the languages of instruction across academic disciplines.
- (c) Develop discourse competence by focusing on the organizational features of spoken and written academic texts in different languages and on identifying strategies that bilingual students can use to negotiate the meaning of these texts in different languages.
- (d) Analyze [\*language functions\*](#), and language as an integrative system in the study of academic texts in different languages within multilingual classrooms.

## II. STANDARD AREA: KNOWLEDGE OF PEDAGOGY

### DOMAIN 5. Bilingual Assessment and Decision Making

The Bilingual Educator knows and understands the different purposes of assessment, aligns these with multiple valid and reliable methods to assess language and content, and uses the results to inform decision-making and guide instruction of bilingualism, bi-literacy, and academic content. The Bilingual Educator demonstrates expertise in the purposes, methods, language, content, and processes of implementing assessment.

#### **Standard 5.a. Assessment as Educational Policy**

Bilingual Educators know and understand ethical and valid ways of assessing multilingual students' academic and linguistic knowledge and abilities, and critically examine the implications of using assessment as educational policy.

**Strategic Practice:** This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Understand the history, theory, and research of assessment and evaluation and use it to inform the ethical assessment of multilingual students' knowledge and abilities, with emphasis in overcoming any linguistic, cultural, and cognitive biases for making sound educational decisions.
- (b) Demonstrate knowledge of different purposes of assessment, including [\*assessment of learning\*](#), [\*assessment for learning\*](#), [\*assessment as learning\*](#), strategically matches these purposes to different types of assessment, and critically considers the implications & consequences of inappropriate use of assessments.
- (c) Analyze the impact of [\*high stakes assessment\*](#) on identifying and interpreting the performance of multilingual students; as well as, examine carefully the implications for using testing as educational policy and for designing language policy in bilingual schools.
- (d) Demonstrate knowledge of the effective ways to provide research-based assessment accommodations and modifications for multilingual learners and advocate for their rights when administering standardized assessments.

**Standard 5.b. Assessing Bilingualism, Biliteracy, and Content**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the formative and summative purposes of assessment, align these purposes with effective use of valid and reliable methods, apply the results to design instruction of bilingualism, bi-literacy, and academic content and guides educational decision-making.

**Strategies Practices** - This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Explore how to monitor and evaluate students' bilingualism, identifying strengths and weaknesses in oracy and literacy across languages, as well as, how to differentiate [language variations](#), associated with dialects and bilingualism, from language learning problems, associated with disabilities.
- (b) Understand the appropriate use of different types of assessments to evaluate proficiency in more than one language and design bilingual assessments tasks to evaluate oral and written proficiency for social and academic purposes, including integrated, project-based performance assessments, which require an oral and written defense of work done.
- (c) Assess [communicative competence](#) in more than one language, using multiple sources of information, across different language modes and academic disciplines, as well as, eliciting relevant information from families regarding language development and language practices at home.
- (d) Collaborate with other professionals, such as certified bilingual speech-language pathologists, to differentiate language variations from language disorders and make informed educational decisions.

**Standard 5.c. Monolingual and Bilingual Assessment of Learning**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the implications of using monolingual and bilingual assessment. They accommodate and modify assessments for bilingual learners and interpret the results of such assessments with discernment.

**Strategic Practices** - This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Use monolingual and bilingual assessment to design and modify instruction, which include planning for scaffolding, re-teaching, and extended learning activities, as well as, use findings to evaluate learning experiences and make effective and knowledgeable instructional decisions.
- (b) Know how to assess bilingually, how to use different bilingual forms of assessment, and how to document and interpret the results to record deeper learning and identify support services that further address multilingual students learning needs.
- (c) Develop ability to scaffold monolingual assessments to provide opportunities for bilingual students to demonstrate proficiency and learning in each language.
- (d) Explore the benefits of implementing alternative assessment forms such as dynamic assessment, narrative sampling and analysis, biliterate reading and writing trajectories, and bilingual portfolios. Teach bilingual students to use self-assessment and peer-assessment techniques and provide them with opportunities to monitor their own learning and that of others across languages and academic content and ultimately show independence in their learning.

**DOMAIN 6. Innovative and Transformative Bilingual Pedagogy**

Bilingual Educators know and apply evidence-based methods to design and enact bilingual instruction across academic disciplines to nurture learning, bilingualism, biliteracy, cross cultural understanding, and critical thought. They assume an introspective and exploratory pedagogical stance and integrate innovative resources to create an active, intellectually demanding, and engaging bilingual learning environment.

**Standard 6.a. Designing Bilingual Instruction**

Bilingual Educators know and understand evidence-based instructional methodologies and use these to design instruction demonstrating knowledge of content disciplines, and cultivate bilingualism and biliteracy. They create paths to innovate bilingual instruction, make learning tasks culturally relevant, intellectually challenging, and responsive to diverse bilingual students and how they learn.

**Strategic Practices** - This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Explore the 21<sup>st</sup> century learning competencies and design an innovative and intellectually challenging learning environment which promotes cross language, cross disciplinary, and cross modal (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) connections, and enhances academic metalinguistic awareness.
- (b) Design flexible [\*differentiated instruction\*](#) informed by knowledge of academic disciplines, results of previous assessments, curricular goals and academic standards, students' learning and cultural characteristics, and community context.
- (c) Critically reflect on the interweaving of language and content by examining different instructional methods in a continuum of discourses from [\*assimilationist\*](#) to [\*pluralist\*](#), of pedagogies from [\*separatist\*](#) to [\*integrative\*](#), and of practices supported by current research on language and content discipline teaching.
- (d) Use relevant information from different academic and community-based resources to design culturally relevant instruction that reflects and engages the funds of knowledge that exists in families and communities.



**Standard 6.b. Enacting Bilingual Instruction**

Bilingual Educators know and implement evidence-based bilingual instructional allocations, models, and methods that support active learning and implement these in a variety of bilingual classrooms assuming an investigative theoretical stance founded upon a strong understanding of bilingualism, biliteracy, and academic content.

**Strategic Practice** - This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Use strategically the language of instruction and evidence-based teaching approaches to enhance the development of bilingualism, biliteracy, multiculturalism, and academic learning.
- (b) Understand and implement developmentally appropriate and differentiated instruction across bilingual classrooms that follow culturally relevant curriculum, enact rigorous standards, and enhance the use of multiple languages in integrative ways.
- (c) Explore the changing roles and responsibilities of teachers within innovative learning environments and assume thoughtful and analytical pedagogical views based upon a deep understanding of bilingualism, biliteracy, and content disciplines.
- (d) Support the learning needs of sequential and simultaneous bilinguals and implement pedagogy that promotes active and deep learning, engages families and communities in instruction, heightens students' critical thinking, and ultimately builds independence in and ownership of bilingual students' learning process.

**Standard 6.c. Using and Adapting Innovative Instructional Resources**

Bilingual Educators know and understand ways to select, develop, and differentiate innovative and technological resources to design and implement instruction that scaffolds language and content knowledge, promote creative and critical thought, facilitate active communication in both languages, and respond to diverse abilities and language proficiencies.

**Strategic Practice** - This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Study ways in which bilingual educators can transform information into knowledge and work to challenge both the digital and knowledge divide.
- (b) Structure and design instructional resources to [scaffold languages](#) and support understanding, to actively integrate new knowledge with students' prior knowledge, interests, and cultural backgrounds, and to creatively consider the new demands on literacy, oracy, and learning imposed by the [digital text](#).
- (c) Recognize a continuum of differences in bilingual students' abilities and ways of learning, align instructional materials to the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles, and select, develop, and differentiate resources.
- (d) Critically examine and integrate funds of knowledge that exist in local and global communities, educational networks, digital technologies, new forms of communication (e.g., educational blogs, video platforms), novel symbol systems (i.e., icons, emoticons, and graphics) and modalities (i.e., images, video, and audio) into teaching, assessment, and communicating with diverse families and communities.

### III. STANDARD AREA: KNOWLEDGE OF THE PROFESSION

#### **DOMAIN 7. Professionalism and Advocacy**

Bilingual Educators possess a broad scholarly knowledge base of the history, approaches, ideologies, and scholarly discourse that have shaped bilingual education. They use theories and research on bilingualism and bilingual education to grow as professionals and apply them to promote educational equity and quality in bilingual education.

#### **Standard 7.a. Bilingual Educators as Experts**

Bilingual Educators know and understand the history of bilingual education, the evolution of its laws, policies, and approaches; contemporary scholarly research on bilingual instruction; different theoretical frameworks regarding language diversity; ways ideologies and policies impact bilingual school practices; and processes to be ethical professionals.

**Strategic Practice** - This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Investigate the social, cultural, and historical nature of bilingual education in the United States, with a special emphasis on New York State, and examine the evolution of laws and policies that have shape it.
- (b) Use a global perspective to interpret the principles and goals of bilingual and multicultural education with respect to a continuum of assimilationist and pluralist ideologies and explore different theoretical frameworks of bilingual education including monoglossic (subtractive; additive) and heteroglossic (recursive; dynamic) views.
- (c) Understand how language ideologies and policies impact academic, social, and professional practices, consider their influence on shaping models and methods of language and content teaching, and professional interactions within and across national and international schools and communities.
- (d) Behave, as educators, in ethical and professional ways and explore legal implications regarding students' education and protection.

**Standard 7.b. Bilingual Educators as Investigators**

Bilingual Educators know and understand how to be discerning consumers and producers of research relevant to bilingualism and effective bilingual instruction; and use the knowledge gained to enhance their professional growth and contribute to heightening professional knowledge in this field.

**Strategic Practice** - This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Demonstrate ability to access, read, and interpret educational research to inform practice and support professional learning and self-assessment as educators.
- (b) Commit to introspective, creative, and transformative practice, professional renewal, and lifelong learning by actively participating in teacher research in collaboration with colleagues at the same school, and academic researchers.
- (c) Support, participate in, and conduct professional development in all areas related to bilingual education and develop a systematic plan for continuing growth as a professional and take steps to implement it.
- (d) Be insightful observers and describers of language and cultural practices in school and the communities it serves using a perspective that builds inner reflection, dialogue with parents and families, and linguistic and cultural sensitivity.

**Standard 7.c. Bilingual Educators as Advocates, Activists, and Partners**

Bilingual Educators know and understand how to design and sustain professional collaborations with school, families, and the communities they represent and take action to assume the roles of advocate, activist, and partner to bring about educational equity and quality in bilingual education.

**Strategic Practice** - This standard defines the professional knowledge and competencies of bilingual educators as they:

- (a) Explore theories and research on family and community engagement in schools, design ways to foster positive and productive relationships with these groups, and assume the role of advocate and activist, to ensure that all students have equity of access to knowledge, high quality bilingual education, and a rich and diverse curriculum with high expectations.
- (b) Develop skills in professional collaboration and use them to design and implement learning experiences and curricula that value linguistic and cultural diversity integrated across the content areas.
- (c) Partner with colleagues, professional teams, organizations, and networks to enhance professional learning and self-assessment, as well as, to educate others about the benefits of bilingualism and strengthen the reputation of bilingual education as a profession.
- (d) Support the professional learning of pre-service bilingual teachers by mentoring, coaching, and supervising clinical experiences.

## **THEORETICAL AND RESEARCH RATIONALE**

(Researched and Written by Aida Nevárez-La Torre, Ed.D., Fordham University)

Some scholars have argued that “there is no single and unified knowledge base for the bilingual teaching profession” (Brutt-Griffer & Varghese, 2004, p. 7), since advances in research modify our understandings and create conditions for negotiating knowledge in light of the context where bilingual education happens. Accordingly, the cumulative learning that emerges from historical and contemporary research strongly suggests that bilingual educators must possess broad and deep understanding of a varied and ever-evolving body of knowledge including: content knowledge, transformative pedagogical knowledge, and professional knowledge. In the Theoretical and Research Rationale section of the Standards document I synthesize the scholarly works that point to the development of identifiable, diverse, and far-reaching knowledge as a requisite for the professionalization of bilingual education, valuing the professionalism of bilingual educators; and creating necessary conditions to achieve bilingualism for all students.

I searched for sources in scholarly educational journals, academic books, and unpublished dissertations, using as criteria scholarly discussions which explore paradigm shifts in: (a) bilingualism and multilingualism, (b) learning and instruction in more than one language, and (c) bilingual and multilingual education. Whereas, many of the publications included in the synthesis were published in the current decade, some are older seminal works in the field. The topics discussed are organized under the Standards’ main knowledge areas and domains.

## **I. KNOWLEDGE OF CONTENT**

A paradigm shift about the body of content knowledge that bilingual educators should possess, which traditionally focuses on linguistic and cultural knowledge, is necessary. The content knowledge base for bilingual educators is broad and comprehensively rich, including, at a minimum, advanced learning of language, culture, oracy, literacy, and disciplinary knowledge. The globalized world of the 21<sup>st</sup> century demands that as professionals, bilingual educators integrate an expansive “content knowledge capital” to enhance MLLs/ELLs understanding of diverse and interconnected concepts, skills, strategies, and experiences and of ways to use more than one language to learn and to communicate thinking. To achieve this mastery the scholarly literature points to the understanding that bilingual educators should develop in four key content areas discussed in the first subsection of this synthesis of research: bilingualism and multilingualism; biculturalism and multiculturalism; multilingual oracy and literacy; and academic disciplines and discourses across languages.

### ***Bilingualism and Multilingualism***

Language practices among bilinguals and multilinguals are multifaceted and interrelated and are not always simply linear. Researchers like Escamilla, et al., (2014), point to the reciprocal nature of languages, which may be discovered and reinforced when students process and communicate across languages, and can signal to high degree of bilingualism and biliteracy. Bilingual and multilingual education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is evolving from linear and one-dimensional approaches to innovative models that consider language learning and teaching as multidimensional and dynamic processes.

*Bilingualism* and *multilingualism* are concepts that lead us to reflect on the multiple ways we speak and communicate on a daily basis and their significance for our cultural and linguistic identities (de Jong, 2011). Having proficiency in more than one language is seen as an asset (Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages, n.d.; The University of the State of New York, 2017) and reveals that learning another language is a complex, dynamic, circular, and continuous developmental process (García, 2009, p. 59). Teachers' conceptualization of these two constructs, should align with valuing diversity, exploring the qualities and nature of multilingual ability and multilingual awareness, and distinguishing between language use and communicative competence. These are discussed below.

A myriad of national and international studies, identify the many benefits of bi/multilingualism, including enhanced social and cultural competency; enriched communicative skills, flexible cognitive capacity, and strengthened mental and thinking abilities (Bhattacharjee, 2012; Brown & Larson-Hall, 2012; Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2009; Diller & Moule, 2005; García, 2006; Marian, Chabal, Bartolotti, Bradley, & Hernández, 2014). A review and meta-analysis of research that looked at cognitive correlates of bilingualism (Adescope, et.al., 2010) indicated advantages of bilinguals in areas like, stronger symbolic representation and abstract reasoning skills; stronger control of attention in both linguistic and nonverbal tasks; better learning strategies, enhanced problem-solving skills because of their ability to selectively attend to relevant information and disregard misleading information; enhanced creativity and divergent thinking skills; and greater cognitive flexibility (p. 33).



From a pluralist perspective (Dicker, 2003), language diversity has been both a tool to promote global communication as well as a byproduct of it. To communicate and gain access to global advantages, individuals and groups who migrate or are involved in cultural, social, economic exchanges must expand their linguistic repertoire by integrating new languages and creating new ways to communicate.

As a result of a combination of language contact and the changes that naturally occur in all languages over time, under each language umbrella there is typically a range of language varieties. Interestingly, individuals often have attitudes towards speakers of particular varieties that are socio-linguistically mediated. Eisenstein (1982, 1983a, 1983b) has argued that native speakers and advanced English language learners may develop biases towards New York working class English, African American Vernacular English (AAVE), certain accents and to varieties of Spanish, French, and other languages spoken in the U.S. It is crucial for bilingual teachers to be aware of their own biases as well as those of their communities, and that the variety of languages spoken by students is unrelated to their intelligence, academic promise, or character traits (Eisenstein & Verdi, 1985).

Students' perceptions of their linguistic repertoires and of how others view the languages they use to communicate influences their learning process. For instance, Brisk & Harrington (2000) cites studies conducted by Hakuta and D'Andrea (1992) and Jiménez, García, and Pearson (1995) as indicative of students displaying better performance when "they consider that their bilingual abilities help rather than hinder development of their individual languages" (pp. xi-xii).

Fundamental to effective practice, is teacher's knowledge about language and language development, about content of language learning, and about the specific languages their students use to communicate in and out of schools (Cregan, 2012; Temple Adger, Snow, & Christian, 2018; Wright, 2015). Specifically, an increasing number of investigations about language, in terms of its structure, use, and function, have uncovered novel explanations that challenge entrenched beliefs about efficient ways to teach and learn it. For instance, García (2009) argues for a *linguistic paradigm shift* that offers a new interpretation of *communication* as a process that harnesses all available linguistic repertoires. Canagarajah (2013) expands on this issue by explaining that communication transcends individual languages and words. It is a process of combining language with other "symbol systems (i.e., icons, images), diverse modalities of communication (i.e., aural oral, visual, and tactile), and environmental resources (i.e., social and material contexts)" to create meaning (p. 1).

The fluid use of different linguistic repertoires is not foreign to this recent interpretation of communication. Various codes, dialects, and discourses are part of *linguaging* practices implemented by learners to make sense of what they experience (García, 2009). It is important then, for teachers to know and understand their students' linguistic repertoires in bilingual classrooms (Diller & Moule, 2005).

Bilingual teachers need to be aware of the relationship between language and power so that they can share this knowledge with their students. Several researchers call for a critical understanding of multilingual awareness which can guide us to analyze how languages are used, reproduced, disseminated, used politically, and hierarchically

positioned (Fairclough ,1995, 1999, 2013; García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008; Ivanic & Clark, 1999).

### ***Biculturalism and Multiculturalism***

English Language Learners/Multilingual Learners function in and out of schools in more than one language, while at the same time; they journey through more than one culture. This journey is multidimensional and complex tying issues of culture, identity formation, and social and emotional development to learning (Nieto & Bode, 2012; Reyes & Kleyn, 2010; The Aspen Institute, 2017).

One way of exploring cultural diversity is through a multicultural lens. Colombo, (2014) explains that multiculturalism is a movement that signifies cultural diversity as a positive phenomenon in any society, where different groups of people co-exist and are productive members of society. It calls for the rights of certain groups (e.g. minorities) to be recognized and validated as different from other groups (e.g. majorities). In addition, he argues that the right to be different should not negate the right to have equal access to political, socioeconomic, educational, and other benefits to being a member of the society at large.

An additional way of interpreting cultural diversity is through a biculturalism lens. This construct call into question that the existence of more than one culture does not just happen *across* individuals and groups, but also *within* individual and groups. A person or group may possess a second culture that shapes their understanding, experiences, and behavior. Bhabha (2004) argues that biculturalism acknowledges a duality of cultures, the possibility of hybrid cultural identities. He explains that this duality and hybridity creates opportunities to constantly negotiate the existence of two or

more cultures in individuals, which allows for the emergence of a new culture, a third cultural space, which is defined and shaped by more than one culture.

Cultural diversity that exists in every classroom calls for the recognition that learning experiences should “not privilege any dominant group” (Morell & New York Education Department, 2017, p. 2). Teachers understanding of the cultures represented in their classrooms (Colombo, 2014) and how students negotiate these in their learning process is relevant to expert teaching since “language, is inextricably bound with culture, and cultural factors have an important influence on educational outcomes for all students” (Lessow-Hurley, 2000, p. 92). García adds that languages are culturally mediated; that is, language practices are culturally defined (2005).

Connecting learning to students’ lives is seen as an essential attribute of highly qualified teachers (Nieto, 2005). Important influences shaping the lives of students are their parents and families as well as the community where they reside. Ijalba (2015) acknowledges that, “parents constitute a child’s first and foremost influential teachers” who mediate “language, literacy, and social cultural knowledge for their children” (p. 91). To stress this point, one of the principles of the Blueprint for English Language Learner/ Multilingual Learner Success of the New York State framework on the education of MLLs/ELLs preK-12<sup>th</sup> grades requires that schools and districts value and involve parents and families in the education of their children (Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages, n.d.).

The possible gaps in understanding between the home and school, often described in a narrative of “us” versus “them” (Otero Bracco & Eisenberg, 2016/2017, p. 61) deserve to be addressed and ameliorated. For instance, the work of Ma & Li (2016)

suggests that the “purposes of reading, the resources provided by the home, and the process of parents helping their children to read may differ” from those in school (as cited in Baker & Wright, 2017, p. 322).

As a response, productive and meaningful relationships between parents, their communities, and schools may be developed when schools embrace a multicultural and intercultural approach to education (Cummins, 1996; Nieto 1999). Specifically, Freeman & Freeman (2001) advocate for engagement practices that build bridges between home and school worldviews, such as conducting home visits; working towards the empowerment of parents; and opening the classroom to meaningful participation of parents.

Additionally, Baker & Wright, 2017, identify some features of non-traditional parental engagement programs suggested by Arias (2015):

- (i) Develops reciprocal understanding of school and families.
- (ii) Situates cultural strengths of family and community within the school curriculum.
- (iii) Provides parental education that includes family literacy and understanding school community.
- (iv) Promotes parental advocacy that informs and teaches parents how to advocate for their children.
- (v) Instils parental empowerment through parent-initiated efforts at the school and community level.
- (vi) Implements culturally and linguistically appropriate practices in all aspects of communication (p. 324).

Challenging the notion of “us” versus “them”, Otero Bracco & Eisenberg (2016/2017) describe a community and worker center in a suburban area of New York state, which applies the construct of integration as their guiding conceptual framework. They explain that this construct, “assumes a two-way process in which dynamic exchanges between immigrants and residents in the receiving culture influence and shape both of their exchanges, perceptions, and interactions in shared spaces and create a sense of “we” (p. 61).

Another key insight related to biculturalism and multiculturalism, suggests that the learning process of MLL/ELL students is impacted by educators’ awareness and understanding of cultural practices and the funds of knowledge (González & Moll, 2002) that exist in their local community (Lessow-Hurley, 2000; Pérez & Torres-Guzmán, 2001). According to a report from the National Education Association (2016) a quality teacher, “integrates *cultural competence* and an understanding of the diversity of students and communities into their teaching practice to enhance student learning (p. 9). This type of competence requires educators to develop skills in four areas: (a) valuing diversity; (b) being cultural self-aware; (c) understanding the dynamics of cultural interactions; and (d) institutionalizing cultural knowledge and adapting to diversity (Diller & Moule, 2005; King, Sims, & Osher, 2007 as cited in National Education Association, n.d.). Cultural competency involves “a dynamic and complex process requiring ongoing self-assessment and continuous expansion of one’s cultural knowledge. It evolves over time, beginning with an understanding of one’s own culture continuing through interactions with individuals from various cultures, and extending

through one's own lifelong learning" (American Speech-Language Hearing Association, ASHA, 2017).

Diller & Moule (2005) recommend that culturally competent teachers should develop skills in the following areas:

- (1) Value Diversity
- (2) Being Culturally Self-Aware
- (3) Dynamics of Difference
- (4) Knowledge of Students Cultures
- (5) Institutionalizing Cultural Knowledge and Adapting to Diversity

Related to socio-emotional needs of MLLs/ELLs, research alerts educators to address the types of unique trauma experienced by transnational, immigrant, refugee, and transient students who are part of bilingual classrooms. These students may experience stresses that emerge from fear of deportation, extreme poverty, not having a permanent home, experiences with war torn environments, acculturation processes that push them toward isolation, and others (Zacarian, Alvarez-Ortiz, & Haynes, 2017).

Research also suggests that there are socio-emotional benefits to developing fluency in more than one language. Specifically, students' cultural and linguistic identity and knowledge informs and shapes their learning (Brisk & Harrington, 2000; Reyes & Kleyn, 2010). Nieto (2005) comments that effective educators "place a high value on students' identities (culture, race, language, gender, and experiences, among others) as a foundation for learning" (p. 9). Additionally, building MLL/ELLs socio-emotional wellness by anchoring learning within a safe and comfortable classroom environment, which gives status to and respect for different cultures and promotes fluent bilingualism

is a corner stone of effective education (CECER-DLL, 2011; Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages, n.d.).

Beyond focusing on individual learners, research across a variety of disciplines point to globalization as a main cultural movement, that has significantly influenced education in the early part of the 21<sup>st</sup> century (Cummins et al., 2007). *Globalization* is a process that involves the widening, deepening, speeding up of worldwide interconnections in all aspects of contemporary cultural and social life (Dewey, as cited in de Jong, 2011; also see, Canagarajah, 2012; García, Skutnabb-Kangas, & Torres-Guzmán, 2006). These interconnections have brought different regions of the world closer together through events like migration, transnationalism (moving back and forth across geographic borders), advances in telecommunication, and world trade (de Jong, 2011; García, 2009).

*Digital technologies* cultivate new ways to communicate via oral and written language (Mills, 2011) across geographical borders. For instance, virtual transnationalism (Shklovski, 2011) is a technological avenue that enables individuals and groups to remain connected with social networks and developments in their home countries and abroad. These researchers argue that interactions among and between cultural, ethnic, and linguistic groups in different regions of the world are facilitated through the use of the electronic means (i.e., World Wide Web, texting through smart phones, electronic mail through computer networks, and Voice over Internet Protocols services such as SKYPE and Google Talk). All these are avenues that allow family and friends from similar cultural groups to stay connected and which encourages interactions between individuals from different cultural and linguistic spheres. As a



result, technology may assist in maintaining while at the same time expanding the cultural diversity of students as well supporting their socio-emotional wellbeing.

Bilingual educators should consider how globalization can influence an exchange of ideas, knowledge, culture, and products worldwide and feed the international integration of contemporary economies, societies, and cultures (Cummins et al., 2007; García, 2009). Thus, educators in the 21<sup>st</sup> century should use a global lens to appreciate and comprehend multilingualism and multiculturalism and their effects on education.

### ***Multilingual Oracy and Literacy***

Traditionally, language arts curriculum in elementary school includes the teaching of listening, speaking, reading and writing and in high school it also covers the study of literature and composition (Chamot, 2009). Whereas the separate instruction of each was emphasized, in recent decades the interaction across components of language arts has been recognized (Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006). This has led to a slight increase in the research that explores oral and written language development for bilingual learners. This section describes some of the main findings in recent years.

According to Cregan (2012), “the importance of oral language development among elementary school students is widely acknowledged, both in research and in policy documents world wide” (p. 63). More than a tool for the development of writing and reading (Strickland & Morrow, 1989), it is needed to access the curriculum effectively (Riley, Burrell, & McCallum, 2004, as cited in Cregan, 2012). Oral language has received little but singular attention from researchers (Kayi, 2006; Wright, 2010;

2015; Zwiers & Hamerla, 2018). However, the development of oral language skills is critical to function in society, yet more specifically; oracy (Wilkinson, 1977) is currently seen as important to negotiate the oral academic text in schools (Brown, 2011; Fisher, Frey, & Rothenberg, 2008; Kayi, 2006; Williams & Roberts, 2011; Wasik & Iannone-Campbel, 2012; Zwiers, 2007). Escamilla et al., 2014 explain that oracy academic functions include: talking to learn; expressing comprehension; and understanding and interpreting academic speech (p.184). They explain that oracy has three main components: language structures, vocabulary, and dialogue (p. 21).

August and Shanahan (2006) underline the role of oracy in the development of reading and writing in more than one language. Supporting the influence of oracy on literacy in more than one language, Escamilla, et al., (2014, pp. 20-21) identifies the following findings: (a) oracy is connected to writing (Ferreiro, 2002); (b) oral language skills contribute to reading within and across languages; and (c) oracy is important to MLLs/ELLs development of literacy in biliteracy programs (Pollard-Durodola, Mathes, Vaughn, Cardenas-Hagan, & Linan-Thompson, 2006; Simich-Dudgeon, 1998). Current discussions call for more attention to investigating and instructing oracy in more than one language (Beeman & Urow, 2014; Escamilla, 2014).

An important aspect of oral language proficiency involves the appropriate use of intercultural pragmatics, matching pragmatic strategies and formulas to the speaker's intended meaning (Kasper & Rose, 1999; Kecskes, 2013). Eisenstein and Bodman (1986), Eisenstein Ebsworth, and Ebsworth (2000) and Eisenstein Ebsworth, and Kodama (2011) have demonstrated that not only do listeners often misunderstand the intentions of non-native speakers; they also make negative judgments about them and

the groups they represent. Indeed, intercultural pragmatics is one aspect of communicative competence that is vital for students to be aware of and learn about (Ebsworth & Eisenstein, 1993). It is crucial that bilingual teachers have a strong command of intercultural pragmatics so that they can deal effectively with the contrasting pragmatic norms and values of their learners and help students to acquire this crucial aspect of successful bilingual communication, including the development of interactional skills in achieving intercultural pragmatic competences (Chiang, 2009).

The term literacy acknowledges the dynamic interaction between reading and writing (Strickland & Morrow, 1989) as language-based competencies (Lesaux & Phillips Galloway, 2017). Additionally, contemporary understanding of literacy frames this construct within the exigencies of life and work in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Given the increasingly complex literacy competencies in order to learn and access better social and economic opportunities in modern societies, basic reading and writing skills are no longer satisfactory (The University of the State of New York, 2017). They argue for *lifelong practices of readers and writers*, “which reflect the changing expectations for what it means to be literate today” (p. 2). Lesaux, Phillips Galloway, & Marietta (2016) conceptualize that *advanced literacies* are needed for effective oral and written communication across contexts with different audiences, using various texts to create and disseminate knowledge in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Beyond acquiring oracy in more than one language, learners who possess the knowledge and skill to read and write in more than one language are considered *biliterate* (literacy in two languages) or *multiliterate* (literacy in more than two languages). These constructs are complex in nature and involve multidimensional

interrelationships between multilingualism (de Jong, 2011) and literacy in teaching and learning. Although research in the field of literacy in one language (monoliteracy) is prolific, there is a dearth of explorations that focus on reading and writing in two or more languages (Escamilla et al., 2014).

According to Brisk and Harrington (2000), multilingual literacy demands that students learn the linguistic and cultural characteristics of the literacy process in each language and develop competence navigating their similarities and differences. Studies on the literacy of bilinguals suggest, “there is a high correlation between native language and second language literacy ability even with languages of dissimilar writing system” (p. xi). She explains that according to studies reviewed by Cummins (1991), reading shows a higher correlation across languages than writing.

Today *biliteracy and multiliteracy* are considered emerging fields in multilingual education (Baker, 2011) that offer provocative alternatives to finite and restricted views about reading and writing. Martin-Jones and Jones (2000) use the term *multilingual literacies* to signify the multiple and varied ways that individuals and groups communicate and signify meaning.

During the past two decades, there has been a gradual evolution in our understanding of the requirements of reading and writing in two or more languages. It is critical to acknowledge the benefits of using the home language, and the literacy skills developed in that language, to enhance the acquisition of another language and the development of oracy and literacy skills in that other language (August & Shanahan, 2006; Beeman & Urow, 2012; Bialystok, 2007, 2013; Edwards, 2015).

Dworin (2003) views biliteracy development as a bidirectional process. He argues that learning more than one language is a process mediated by texts written in both languages. That is, the learner uses the linguistic knowledge acquired in both languages to construct meaning when negotiating oral or written text in either or both languages.

The term *multiliteracies* acknowledges that literacy teaching in the 21<sup>st</sup> century should be more responsive to the diversity of cultures and the variety of languages within societies (New London Group, 1996). *New literacies* have emerged which do not depend solely on print, for instance bilingual digital story telling, online discussions, podcasting, websites, and blogging. These new literacies connect different forms of digital communication with learning to read and write and with using literacy to learn (Castek, Leu, Coiro, Gort, Henry, & Lima, 2007).

Dynamic and multidimensional models of the literacy process consider key connections between language and literacy along a continuum of life stages and experiences. For instance, the *lifelong practices of readers and writers* acknowledge the new exigencies of learning, working, and living in the 21<sup>st</sup> century by anchoring instruction in an interconnected and complex set of oracy and literacy skills that develop and are used longitudinally, during K-12<sup>th</sup> education and after (The University of the State of New York, 2017). Additionally, Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester (2000) designed the *continua of biliteracy* framework, which represents this phenomenon in terms of a range of experiential fields that include: (a) power negotiation (language privileging); (b) contexts (bilingual, monolingual, oral, literate); (c) development (receptive; productive, first language, second language,); (d) content (contextualized,

decontextualized); and (e) media (linguistic structures, genres, convergent and divergent scripts).

Lesaux & Phillips Galloway (2017) argue that bilingual instructional models that advance MLL/ELLs' skills in creating meaning for academic learning and communicating across languages and cultures are advanced literacy models (p. 2). They propose an approach that should be adopted school-wide guided by four hallmarks: (a) Work with engaging texts that feature big ideas and rich content; (b) Talk/discuss to build both conversational and academic language and knowledge; (c) Write to build language and knowledge; & (d) Study a small set of high-utility vocabulary words and academic language structures to build breadth and depth of knowledge (p. 4).

Canagarajah (2012) contends that literacy should be re-envisioned through a "translingual lens" that focuses on literacy as a negotiation of diverse languages and "semiotic resources (i.e., icons and images) for situated construction of meaning" (2013, p. 1). That is why some researchers argue that in bilingual classrooms teachers must engage multilingual students with visual literacies (e.g., through reading wordless texts, or reading of images) as these also help develop oracy and literacy (Arizpe, Colomer, & Martínez-Roldán, 2014).

According to García, Bartlett, and Kleifgen, 2007, the multiplicity of languages, cultural contexts, social structures, and modes used to communicate should be valued equally. They contend that a *pluriliteracy practices approach* allows learners to determine when, how, and for what purposes they will use their rich linguistic and literacy repertoires in order to construct meaning from written text.

The text being read and discussed orally is also important. Bilingual educators need to show care to incorporate in the instruction of bi/multilingual students, quality authentic children's literature, and culturally relevant literature by authors who represent the language and cultural practices of their communities (Ada, 2003). Bilingual teachers should foment a curriculum of talk (Swinney & Velasco, 2011) where academic informational text in more than one language is read and discussed orally across all content areas. Also, important is to recognize the potential of popular culture texts (written, audio, digital, or visual), grounded on the practices of their communities to support their biliteracy. Engaging children in discussion of these texts support not only their literacy development but also their identities (Martínez-Roldán, 2003; Medina, 2010).

### ***Academic Disciplines and Discourses across Languages***

The interdependence of disciplinary knowledge and language has been validated in the research literature. According to Koumje (2018) the acquisition and transmission of knowledge is mediated through language use, that is, “by communication with an expert” (p. 8). Thus, bilingual educators’ knowledge of academic content and language cannot be understated (Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages, n.d.). Deep disciplinary knowledge is a requisite for instructional and curricular innovation (Wagner, 2012).

Teachers, with an in-depth understanding of content and language knowledge and how the two interact to build conceptual learning, can best guide bilingual learning.

Teachers content knowledge have multiple influences, such as, (a) on engaging students with subject matter (Leung & Park, 2002; Llinares, 2000; Wilkins, 2002); (b) on evaluating and using instructional materials (Lloyd & Wilson, 1998; Manouchehri &

Goodman, 2000; Sherin, 2002) and (c) on content students learn (Hill, Rowan, & Ball, 2005). In addition, educators should consider critically classroom discourse in terms of how speech and silence and cultural and linguistic differences reflect issues of power (Cazden, 2001; Goldstein, 2003).

The language used in academic texts influences the development of the academic linguistic repertoires of bilingual and multilingual learners. Multilingual students require content material that is appropriate to their grade level (Reyes & Kleyn, 2010) and in languages they can comprehend.

Another key dimension of teachers' mastery of academic knowledge and understanding its relationship with bilingualism, is stressed by Gajo & Grobet (2008) and Moore, Evnitskaya, & Ramos de Robles (2018). Allowing students to use all the bilingual resources in content learning can promote deep knowledge negotiation in content areas (Gajo & Grobet, 2008). Furthermore, Moore, Evnitskaya, & Ramos de Robles (2018) pose ways in which bilingualism contributes to knowledge building in academic content classes. Related to science education, they explain that language plays a fundamental role in acting, thinking, and transforming ideas in interaction with others, and in creating scientific models of the world. Based on this argument, bilingual teachers then should possess deep academic knowledge as well as be cognizant of how the languages used in the classroom can mediate meaning making and learning of content.

Valdes (2004) contends that bilingual educators, as professionals, should understand the link between bilingualism and the participation and access of immigrant students in academic life (p. 10). To achieve this, they should contest the



marginalization of immigrant students and offer support in their acquisition and use of academic discourse. In addition, bilingual teachers should have skill in examining text discourse, specifically in text organization, syntactic and morphological structure, linguistic functions (Brisk, Kaveh, Scialoia, & Timothy, 2015; García, 2005; Gee, 2012; Palincsar & Schleppegrell, 2014) and language competences needed to navigate text (Brisk & Harrington, 2000; Council of Europe, 2001) written in different languages.

Since bilingual education must incorporate texts written in different scripts, teachers should be aware of the similarities and differences across the scripts used to learn in the bilingual classroom. Scholars argue that bilingual teachers should become familiar with the different scripts and languages so that these may be integrated strategically into instruction of content, oracy, and literacy. For this purpose, García (2009) provides a helpful categorization of types of scripts and languages based on the work of Coulmas (2003) and Rogers (2005). To assist teachers in contrastive analysis of languages, Shatz & Wilkinson (2013) present charts comparing eight languages to English along 22 language features.

## **II. KNOWLEDGE OF PEDAGOGY**

A basic notion in bilingual education is to acknowledge that what bilingual teachers do in the classroom connects to students learning. Thus, bilingual instruction should be envisioned as a dynamic process that merges assessment, planning, and teaching in reflective and innovative ways. Assessment informs planning and teaching in a cyclical and ongoing manner. In this section I present current research pointing to contemporary views about bilingual pedagogy. Specifically, the following main themes are explored: transformative pedagogy; assessment and decision making; bilingual instructional design; and resources and innovations.

### ***Transformative Pedagogy***

The enactment of pedagogical practices that are transformative invites educators to both have clarity about the current contextual issues negatively influencing education and what needs to be done to change them (Greene, 1995). Ominuota (2009) sees it as an, “activist pedagogy combining the elements of constructivist and critical pedagogy that empowers students to examine critically their beliefs, values, and knowledge with the goal of developing a reflective knowledge base, an appreciation for multiple perspectives, and a sense of critical consciousness and agency” (p.1).

According to Brutt-Griffer & Varghese (2004), “pedagogy must be transformed to reflect new understandings of bilinguals” (p. 5). Bilingual Educators must assume an introspective, critical, and exploratory perspective to enact insightful and evidence-based instruction (Dresser, 2007; Kandel-Cisco, & Padrón, 2008) and critically challenge normalized expectations for language use and pedagogy in bilingual education (Solorza, 2019).

For instance, the dialogue that ensues in bilingual classrooms is one issue in need of examination and change. According to researchers this refers to the types of teacher talk, the types of student talk that is promoted, and the ways teachers react to student responses (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Moll & Díaz, 1985; Wong-Fillmore, 1985), and the range of alternatives for providing offering feedback to MLL/ELLs (Eisenstein Ebsworth, 2014).

Investigations by Lindholm-Leary, 2001, reveal the types of classroom talk that dominates multilingual classrooms are factual questions and interactions of low linguistic and cognitive complexity (Lapkin & Swain, 1990; Ramírez, Yuen, & Ramey, 1991; Tarone & Swain, 1995). As transformative educators, bilingual teachers should explore how their discourse patterns and that of students mutually shape learning and how these patterns can be altered to enhance higher levels of language, academic, and cognitive development (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). In this sense, the breadth of linguistic repertoires used by students and the teachers, and the role of silence in classroom dialogue (Goldstein, 2003), are key to understanding how thought and learning are enhanced through classroom talk across languages. In other words, academic conversations in bilingual classrooms can serve as a foundation to teaching and learning (Zwiers & Hamerla, 2018) across different language repertoires.

In recent decades, different scholars have offered provocative discussions on enacting transformative pedagogy that focuses on the needs and realities of bilingual education. Challenging traditional practices, they provide novel understandings of bilingual pedagogy. First, some researchers conclude that if we agree that the education for all students should be grounded on their strengths, that is, what they know and are

able to do (de Jong, 2011), then, instruction should encompass forms of *fluid language use* that serve to create meaning in organized ways. Consequently, they advocate for an educational approach that involves bilingualism and multilingualism not purely as linguistic events, but as observable communicative practices across languages (García & Flores, 2013). Today educators are encouraged to embrace the authentic, intricate, flexible, and valuable *linguaging* practices plurilinguals use and invited to mirror these practices in the classroom (Creese & Blackledge, 2011; García, 2009). Researchers also point out that by promoting this type of instructional transformation; educators support the integration of social and academic languaging practices in the classroom (Canagarajah, 2013) in ways that put students and their linguistic repertoire at the centre of instruction and learning (Solorza, in press).

Second, rather than favor the separation of languages as the only accepted practice in bilingual teaching, scholars propose that languages in authentic multilingual settings are *mixed* (code mixing), *switched* (code switching), *shifted* (code shifting) and *meshed* (code meshing) by teachers and learners so that they may use all the available linguistic capital they have to create and convey meaning (Canagarajah, 2013; de Jong, 2011; Makoni & Pennycook, 2007; Maurais & Morris, 2003). Instruction should facilitate students' understanding of the reciprocal nature of languages, fomenting flexible pedagogical practices that build learners' language competence, as well as diminishing the strict separation of languages (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Gajo, 2007; Wei & Wu, 2009).

*Translanguaging* (García, 2009) and *translingualism* (Canagarajah, 2012), which are constructs centered on an integrative and simultaneous view of language learning,

serve as guiding principles of instruction and policy in transformative multilingual classrooms and schools. Creese & Blackledge (2010) chronicle classrooms in Europe where learning is done in multiple languages; teachers discuss the subject matter in one language and students write about it in another. Celic (2012) suggests using other strategies to teach translingually, such as, implementing multilingual read alouds, multilingual word walls, multilingual writing references, multilingual graphic organizers, multilingual books, the use of technology such as Google Translate to transition between languages, and reading thematically in multiple languages.

Current research on linguistic integrative pedagogical practices challenges previous singular emphasis on maintaining a complete separation of languages. For instance, one study uncovered six instructional strategies, framed by the integration of all the linguistic resources in the multilingual classrooms, that promote both content learning and the development of bilingualism and biliteracy: (a) translation; (b) small group work in a language different from the instructional one; (c) instruction of cognates; (d) no reteaching of concepts across languages; (e) metalinguistic awareness; and (f) code-switching (Nevárez-La Torre, 2017). The study's findings support action steps that transformative bilingual teachers may enact to assume an integrative lens in their instruction:

1. Show linguistic creativity by creating opportunities for students and teachers to translate for one another and code switch to communicate ideas. Be strategic about when and how to translate and code switch. Their implementation should not be done as an instructional routine without a focus on building meaning and generating spaces for students to communicate understanding and thought. Model and reinforce the use of both to enhance students' comprehension of these deliberate purposes.

2. Promote cross-linguistic abilities in instruction by asking students to identify cognates with their meaning. Allow discussions during pair and small group work to be done in either language while guiding students to share findings with the whole class in the language of instruction. In these ways meaning and content learning can be supported at the same time that language development is reinforced. Students will negotiate content learning in their dominant language and they will transfer the knowledge gained to the emerging language in order to communicate it to others.

3. Use strategic instruction by refraining from teaching the same content and skills across languages and by using contrastive analysis of content text to explore similarities and differences between languages and academic discourses. Content knowledge needs to be scaffolded across languages rather than repeated. Identifying language structures, critical to comprehending text, and analyzing them across languages, can support the development of academic vocabulary, morphology, syntax, discourse, and meaning across languages (Nevárez-La Torre, 2017, pp. 52).

Third, innovations in information and communication technologies encourage bilingual educators to reassess instruction in two or more languages (Castek et al., 2007; Daniel & Cowan, 2012). However, mastering the teaching of language and literacy and infusing technology into instruction, alone, is not sufficient to meet the educational, communication, and work demands of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. More importantly, educators are being invited to generate meaningful paths for using language, literacy, and new technologies as *mindtools* (Jonassen, as cited in Cummins et al., 2007). Indeed, the possibilities of the digital age and the use of technology may allow educators to specifically

address the particular cognitive and educational challenges of bilingual learners (Eisenstein Ebsworth & McDonell, 2013).

Bilingual instruction should focus on practices that apply strategically different linguistic designs. For instance, according to García (2009), instructional decisions regarding the language used to transact with text and the language of the text do not need to be limited and rigidly implemented. She offers multiple configurations for language use that can potentially enrich instructional practices in the bilingual classroom. Language transactions with text in a biliteracy class include:

- (a) *convergent monoliterate* – uses the two languages in communication to transact with a text written in one language, usually the dominant one;
- (b) convergent biliterate model - uses the two languages in communication to transact with a text written in each of the two languages, but with minority literacy practices calqued on majority literacy practices;
- (c) *separation biliterate* – uses one language or the other to transact with a text written in one language or the other according to their own sociocultural and discourse norms; and
- (d) *flexible multiple* - uses the two languages in communication to transact with texts written in both languages and in other media according to a bilingual flexible norm, capable of both integration and separation (p. 343).

Education that transforms point to two other essential aspects of bilingual pedagogy: biliteracy development and students with limited or interrupted formal education. In teaching for biliteracy we understand that teachers may instruct using a sequential or simultaneous model of ordering language use (García, 2009). More

recently, Beeman and Urow (2014) and Escamilla et al., (2014) describe models of biliteracy instruction built on studies that point to the benefits of a simultaneous instruction. These researchers suggest practices to develop cross-language metacognitive skills such as: language bridging, meaningful use of translation, cognate instruction, examining language structures across languages, and promoting cross language connections.

Comprehensive curricular projects, such as, the *Seal of Biliteracy*, both values and enhances the multiple linguistic and literacy abilities of students who use more than one language to communicate, learn, and create meaning from written texts (ACTFL, 2015; Morell & New York Education Department, 2017). According to sealofbiliteracy.org, currently, over 32 states in the nation have adopted laws that support awarding the seal to high school students who attain oral and written proficiency in two or more languages upon high school graduation.

Special instructional attention must be given to a particular group of MLLs/ELLs who arrive in the U.S. with limited or interrupted formal education – Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education (SLIFE) (DeCapua & Marshall, 2011). These students need a special scaffolded approach to help them navigate the academic culture, as well as acquire the language and content to meet standards for proficiency, knowledge, and achievement. They must also become familiar with local assessment procedures so they can demonstrate their knowledge successfully (DeCapua & Marshall, 2011; DeCapua, Smathers, & Tang, 2009). The *Culturally Responsive Teaching* approach and the *Mutually Adaptive Learning Paradigm* are specifically designed to help teachers address the needs of these learners by allowing students to demonstrate the knowledge they bring and



showing sensitivity to their community cultural norms and values (Marshall & DeCapua, 2013).

### ***Assessment and Decision Making***

Educational equity calls for the use of reliable, valid, and fair assessment to effectively inform instruction (Gotlieb, 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2007; O'Malley & Valdez-Pierce, 1996). Bilingual Educators should be versed on the multiple types of assessments (Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages, n.d.) and in aligning their use to the purpose for which they were designed (Black, 1998; Earl, 2013). Typically, there are five purposes for student assessments (i.e., identification and placement; monitoring progress; accountability; reclassification; and program evaluation), which could be achieved through the implementation of multiple classroom-based and large-scale assessments (Earl, 2013; Gotlieb, 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2007).

Assessment in the bilingual classroom should have a combined focus on documenting language development, conceptual academic learning, and growth in bilingualism, biliteracy, and multiculturalism (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2009; Escamilla et. al., 2014; García, 2009; Gotlieb, 2006). It should alter traditional interpretation of assessment as summative measures to incorporate ways that assessment can inform instruction and guide students' metacognitive growth. Researchers (Black & William, 1998; 2009; Davison & Leung, 2009; Earl, 2013) conceptualize these alternative views of assessment as:

- (a) Assessment *of* learning-- teachers' grading and reporting of learning,
- (b) Assessment *for* learning—teachers' use assessment to modify teaching and learning activities,

(c) Assessment as learning—students’ use assessment to construct new learning in bilingual academic contexts

(d) In addition to the teacher’s role in designing and implementing assessment, current understandings acknowledge the role of students in monitoring their own learning and creating a personal path for language and academic growth (Butler & Winne, 1995; Clark, 2012; Earl, 2013).

LaCelle-Peterson and Rivera (1994) question the usefulness of assessments, when their design fails to demonstrate the breadth and depth of knowledge and abilities that MLLs/ELLs bring to the learning process. The critical research literature describes assessment and testing as tools to exercise power and control by those in authority; to serve as a gatekeeper; to influence the curriculum, textbooks, and teaching; and to operate as a de facto language policy in the United States (Cummins et al., 2007; Menken, 2008; Rueda, 2005; Shohamy, 2001). Unfortunately, the types of detailed analyses (i.e., analysis of patterns of performance) more useful for instructional purposes are often ignored in statewide testing (Buly & Valencia, 2002; Rueda, 2005).

Historically, most of the assessment conducted in bilingual education has been designed from a monolingual normative perspective (García, 2009) and has been suspect of bias (Valdés & Figueroa, 1994). That is, assessments often ignore students’ bilingualism and assess students’ abilities and knowledge either in the majority language (Menken, 2008) or in each separate language of instruction (Brisk & Harrington, 2000; García, 2005; Moll & Díaz, 1985; 1987; Rueda, 2005; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007).

In the past four decades researchers have proposed novel assessment tools designed to trace the linguistic and content knowledge of MLLs/ELLs, using their rich

linguistic repertoire and aligning the assessment to accountability demands, that informs instruction and curricular design. Some argue for the creation of local norms so the teachers compare students to their own bilingual peers, as well as, linguistic protocols that inform teachers about students' language skills practices within their families. See, for instance, publications by Escamilla et al., 2014; García, 2009; Gottlieb & Nguyen, 2007; Moll & Diaz, 1985; 1987; Morell & New York Education Department, 2017; and Soltero-González, Escamilla, & Hopewell, 2010.

Assessing bilingual students should consider both language proficiency and content proficiency (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2009; Gottlieb, 2006). García (2009) identifies the need to:

- (a) Include bilinguals as part of the norming sample
- (b) Consider the threat of content bias
- (c) Use assessment according to the purpose for which it was designed
- (d) Develop scoring criteria sensitive to differentiating between content knowledge and abilities and language.

To address the documented shortcomings of testing, emergent bilingual students have traditionally been given test accommodations (Rueda, 2005). However, research clarifies that, a reduction in the performance gap between bilinguals and other students is observed only when linguistic modification of questions is done (Abedi, 2004; Abedi, Hofstetter, & Lord, 2004; Abedi, Lord, & Plummer, 1997). This argument is also posed by Butler and Stevens (1997) when they recommend that for accommodations to work they must be matched to the specific characteristics and needs of students taking the test.

The notion of testing bilingually is a viable alternative in effectively assessing the knowledge and abilities of multilingual students. Studies have identified some weaknesses in relying on test translations as a way to assess MLL/ELL students (August & Hakuta, 1998; García, 2009). Abedi (2004) argues that the language of instruction needs to be the language used for assessment. Therefore, if two languages are used to teach students, these languages should also be used to assess them (Peña & Bedore, 2011).

García, 2009 suggest three ways to assess bilingually:

- (1) *Translanguaging mode* – questions are presented in one language and answers in the other language are accepted
- (2) *Bilingual tap mode* – instructions and questions are given in the home language and answers are only accepted in the additional language; and
- (3) *Performance-based mode* – show knowledge through a project, activity, or demonstration.

Other work provides novel assessment tools designed to trace the linguistic and content knowledge of MLL/ELs, considering their rich linguistic repertoire and aligning the assessment to accountability demands; see, for instance, Escamilla et al., 2014; Moll & Diaz, 1985; 1987; and Soltero-González et al., 2010). For instance, Gotlieb & Nguyen (2007) suggests some guidelines to design comprehensive assessment and accountability system for schools with a multilingual student population (p. 21):

1. document student's [additional language] growth and proficiency, including listening, speaking, reading, & writing;

2. Document student's [home language] growth and proficiency, including listening, speaking, reading, and writing;
3. Document students' academic learning growth and achievement in core academic subjects;
4. Report student learning growth, proficiency, and achievement to parents and establish accountability;
5. Inform and guide classroom instruction on an ongoing basis, and shape the school improvement plan.

### **Bilingual Instructional Design**

Bilingual instructional design must incorporate evidence-based teaching practices (Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Keiffer, & Rivera, 2006) that strategically use monolingual and bilingual instruction (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011). In addition, instructional design must be informed by previous multiple assessment, curricular constructivist goals, and language and academic content standards (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2010; Earl, 2013; Lindholm-Leary, 2007; Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages, n.d.; Reyes & Kleyn, 2010).

Since the 1990s, school districts and states across this nation have worked to improve instruction for all students through the creation of learning standards for students. According to Valdés, Menken, and Castro (2015) learning standards outline, "what students should know and be able to do at the end of each grade so that they can make progress on their journey to becoming college and career ready" (p. 1). Within the field of Bilingual Education, researchers and educators recognize the need to design instruction which prepares MLLs/ELLs to achieve the high expectations of learning standards designed for all students. These researchers suggest that specific attention must be given

to the language and literacy demands of academic content highlighted in the standards. Another key component of learning standards, is the learning progressions. These present, “a specific sequence of knowledge and skills that students are expected to learn as they progress through their education”, emphasizing age-appropriate material for students and preventing any repeated material from earlier grades (Great School Partnerships, 2014).

Specific to New York State, the OBEWL develops regulations, policies and resources for the education of MLLs/ELLs. Part 154 of the Commissioner's Regulations holds all school districts accountable for identifying and serving MLLs/ELLs. The Next Generation Learning Standards (NGLS) are defined as the knowledge, skills, and understanding that individuals can and do habitually demonstrate over time when exposed to high-quality instructional environments and learning experiences. These describe the expectations for all students across grade levels in New York State. The New Language Arts Progressions (NLAP) and Home Language Arts Progressions (HLAP) provide a framework for teachers to ensure that students in Bilingual Education programs and English as a New Language programs are meeting New York State Standards. The Progressions include five levels of language proficiency and demonstrate a trajectory of language learning and teaching (Velasco, 2019).

The Blueprint for MLLs/ELLs Success was created to support all teachers, as NYSED believes that all teachers are teachers of MLLs/ELLs. The principles were carefully developed as a statewide framework aimed to clarify expectations for administrators, policymakers, and practitioners to prepare MLLs/ELLs for success, beginning in Prekindergarten, to lay the foundation for college and career readiness.

These principles are intended to provide guidance, resources, and support to districts, schools, and teachers, as well as to promote a better understanding and appreciation of Bilingual Education, English as a New Language (ENL), and World Language Studies.

The awareness that bilingual teachers have of the pedagogical philosophies and theories of practice they hold is also key to informed instructional design and implementation (Brisk 1998; Dubetz, 2002, 2012; Geneshi, Dubetz, & Foccarino, 1995; Reyes & Kleyn, 2010). The instructional decisions that teachers in bilingual classrooms make are multiple and are always complex including language choice for instruction and interaction, instructional methods and strategies, and assessment. For instance, García (2009) calls attention to how teachers make decisions as to the time allotments given to one language or the other. She reminds us that decisions need to be made about how languages will be used in the classroom and organized in the curriculum (i.e., strict separation; flexible convergent; and flexible multiplicity).

Contemporary scholarly discussions identify some of the ideologies that influence schooling and education today. de Jong (2011) discusses bi/multilingual education with respect to assimilationist discourses that emphasize language separation in instruction and pluralist discourses, which in turn favor integrative language practices. Lindholm-Leary (2001) contends that historically, an assimilationist perspective is tied to “compensatory educational models based on linguistic, academic, and socio-cultural deficit model and result in English monolingualism” (p. 20). Mills (2011) asserts, “historically, schools have emphasized teachers as experts, learners as novices, and learning as the reproduction of disciplinary knowledge and decontextualised skills” (p. 2).

In contrast, a *reflective pedagogy* will lead educators to “question mainstream knowledge” (Nieto, 2005, p. 208) that highlights assimilationist views, compensatory monolingual instruction, and decontextualized, skill-oriented practices. A pluralist and intercultural pedagogical orientation (Freeman & Freeman, 2001) incorporates students’ languages and cultural practices into the fabric of the educational process. Such orientation should value diversity as an asset to learning and inspire educators to promote “respect for how children may be different from one another as well as for what they may have in common” (Morell & New York Education Department, 2017).

Educators, who critically reflect on their practice and its context (Nevárez-La Torre, 2010), and the scholarly evidence that support them, will be better equipped to enact multiculturalism and multilingualism as the accepted norm. Specifically, they will create ways for multilingualism to enrich the learning experience of students and respond to the “communicative exigencies of an increasing interdependent and technologically enriched world” (García, 2009, p. 55).

An assimilationist and skills-oriented ideology of pedagogy is no longer sustainable in light of a global economy, which requires a new type of workforce and work environments (de Jong, 2011). Therefore, bilingual instructional design requires a pedagogical orientation based on global and integrative perspectives, in addition to one that promotes critical and creative thinking (Cummins et al., 2007; Mills, 2011).

In addition, attention to integrative models of instruction that enhance both language and content learning have been proposed to counter the tradition of skills based instruction. For instance, as part of a study on science instruction, Mercuri & Ebe (2011) suggested five essential guidelines for promoting effective instruction of MLL/ELLs:



- a. Develop a standards-based, challenging, and enriching inquiry-based curriculum.
- b. Have high expectations for all students, capitalizing on their background knowledge and experiences.
- c. Use a variety of strategies to foster the development of both language and content.
- d. Create an environment that values and supports primary language development.
- e. Focus on students' academic language development in both languages.

Another example is an instructional framework proposed by Velasco (2012) that delineates how bilingual teachers may deconstruct the linguistic features of academic text when teaching MLLs/ELLs. According to this researcher, “the cycle of planning, exposure (through Interactive Read Aloud); analysis (through Shared Reading); and implementation (through Shared Writing) affords opportunities for leaning about language in the context of using language to learn academic content.

Lastly, Musanti & Celedón-Pattichis (2013) suggested characteristics for instructional design to engage MLLs/ELLs in a mathematics discourse community:

1. Design instruction to support mathematics and language development.
2. Support of mathematical thinking through language: Using [home language] as a resource for learning and bridging the languages to support meaning making.
3. Integration of multimodal ways to represent meaning: Connection of language with mathematical representations (e.g., pictures, symbols, tables, graphs,

equations) and encouragement of student to orally explain the different ways they find to solve the problems.

4. Emphasis on meaning and the multiple meanings of words.
5. Collective construction of problem solving strategies and arguments to explain thinking.
6. Enactment of a pedagogy of confidence and care: value students' answers and their use of language resources.... (pp. 57-58).

### ***Resources and Innovations***

While authentic texts in different languages should be included in the curriculum across disciplines and grade levels, we must also adapt the ways we use them for instruction. Cummins, Brown, and Sayers (2007) offer that in addition to asking students to read or write text in different languages to learn content and develop vocabulary and fluency, educators should use text as tools to develop critical thinking (i.e., by evaluating the content and quality of translation). Escamilla et al., (2014) also point out that bilingual texts may be used to develop skills in making cross-language connections, fostering the development of metalinguistic awareness and the use of metalanguage.

It is evident, that to confront educational and social challenges and transform them into possibilities bilingual educators must embrace reflective pedagogy built on contemporary knowledge and critical capabilities. Researchers today contend that renovating language education in this manner requires the resourceful integration of linguistic, literate, and technological competencies (Cummins et al., 2007; Farrell, 2007; Mills, 2011; Nevárez-La Torre, 2010; Nunan & Lam, 1998).

Effective programs integrate technology into curriculum and instruction (Berman et al., 1995; Castellano, Stringfield, & Stone, 2002) in both languages. Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) offer new resources for teaching and learning, as well as more opportunities for individuals to self-guide their education (Cummins et al., 2007). New resources are also available for meshing languages with other symbol systems (i.e., icons, emoticons, and graphics) and modalities (i.e., images, video, and audio) on the same “page” (Canagarajah, 2012).

However, Cummins and colleagues (2007) question how schools today integrate technology into the teaching and learning processes. More than simply teaching how to use technology or to learn facts in isolation and transmitting knowledge, bilingual education must adopt current technologies as tools for critical analysis and transformation. In particular, bilingual educators should take action in challenging the digital divide and resourceful to provide access to web-based resources for families and their children.

Moreover, taking into account the multiplicity of languages and languaging practices of classrooms, educators should be inspired to consider “the increasing range of text forms associated with information and multimedia technologies” (Mills, 2011, p. xiii). García and Kleifgen (2018) pose that the same way that technology allows us to use different modes to communicate and learn, it invites educators to embrace the full semiotic repertoire that students possess in how they design teaching and learning.

In addition to integrating the use of bilingual texts, current social practices rely on multiliteracy by combining language, literacy, and technology, and could easily be tapped in bilingual classrooms. For instance, a study conducted by Vogel, Ascenzi-Moreno, & García (2018) looked at students use of machine translation software (Google Translate)

as part of translanguaging practices. Also important is the variety of technological skills needed to be taught in bilingual classrooms, which include “reading books [in print and electronically], resisting advertisements, using machines (scanners, printers, voicemail), interpreting public transport information, writing memos, following directories and maps, conducting internet transactions...SMS messaging, word processing....internet relay chatting, internet navigation, critiquing websites, digital photography, slide-show presentations, computer programming, website design....using spreadsheets and databases,” among others (p. 3).

Innovation in bilingual education is an opportunity to harness the variety of languages, cultures, and abilities in today’s inclusive classrooms. This comprehensive approach calls for designing and implementing instruction with novel resources, led by a critical analysis of language and content standards, as well as the Universal Design for Learning principles (UDL). Gargiulo and Metcalf (2012) highlight essential connections between bilingual instruction and the use of UDL principles, which benefit MLLs/ELLs learning processes (NYSED, 2017). This type of design "allows learning goals to be attainable by individuals with wide differences in their abilities to see, hear, speak, move, read, write, understand English, attend, organize, engage, and remember" (Orkwis, 1999, p. 1). The Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST) developed the Universal Design for Learning framework (2018) and explains its learning principles in their website (<http://udlguidelines.cast.org>).

The types of books, their richness, and complexity are additional dimensions of resources for innovative instruction. Bilingual books of many genres, varied types of materials (e.g., visual, audiovisual, art), and multicultural perspectives are required to meet

the goals of multiculturalism, bilingualism, and biliteracy (Montecel & Danini, 2002; Morell & New York Department of Education, 2017). While authentic texts in different languages should be included in the curriculum across disciplines and grade levels, we must also adapt the ways we use them for instruction. Cummins et al. (2007) offer that in addition to asking students to read or write text in different languages to learn content and develop vocabulary and fluency, educators should use text as tools to develop critical thinking (i.e., by evaluating the content and quality of translation). Escamilla et al., (2014) also point out that bilingual texts may be used to develop skills in making cross-language connections, fostering the development of metalinguistic awareness and the use of metalanguage.

Additionally, choosing rich text which provide different levels of readability and varied perspectives on a topic are foundational for MLL/ELLs learning in contemporary classrooms. According to Lesaux & Galloway (2017) traditional instructional practices emphasize content text that is either at or above their grade level, limiting comprehension or below grade level limiting learners' engagement with content and interest in learning activities. These researchers signal that innovative 21<sup>st</sup> century instructional practices provide multiple texts at different levels to build MLL/ELLs rich understanding of topics and develop their reading comprehension skills. They suggest the use of texts sets that can support the gradual access of grade level texts with ease (p. 3).

### **III. KNOWLEDGE OF THE PROFESSION**

In this last section, I discuss views, supported by the scholarly literature, about the expertise of bilingual educators, and their roles as advocates and activist; teacher researchers; and teacher collaborators.

#### ***Bilingual Educators as Experts***

Developing the professional knowledge and skills of bilingual educators is key to their role as educational experts (Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages, n.d.). It is important to identify, value, and document the accumulated knowledge about content and pedagogy that bilingual educators possess from their practice and education. The breadth and depth of this knowledge validates their comprehensive and authoritative understanding of instruction that can enhance learning bilingually (Nevárez-La Torre, 2017).

#### ***Professionalism as Advocacy and Activism in Bilingual Education***

Discussions about bilingual education in the United States often revolve around issues of politics, ethnicity, and immigrant rights (Baker, 2011; Cummins, 2000; Crawford, 2004), rather than focus on language, the benefits of cross cultural understanding and cross-linguistic communication, and globalization (Reyes & Kleyn, 2010). Given this trend, Nieto concludes that teaching, for many of the teachers she worked with, is a “vocation in the service of social justice” (2005, p. 213).

Mignolo (2015) argues that teachers’ theories of language and teaching MLLs/ELLs often align with pedagogical practices that reproduce social hierarchies and oppressive instruction. Teachers as professionals should then see activism and advocacy as tools for transforming these unproductive practices and policies in education. By assuming these

roles educators create spaces where (1) pluralist discourses may be activated to alter assimilationist and monolingual approaches to education (de Jong, 2011) and (2) sociopolitical dimensions of language and language education are explored and validated (Fairclough, 2014; Freire, 2016; McGroarty, 2002; Ricento, 2000; Ruiz, 1984; Schieffelin, Woolard, and Kroskrity, 1998; Wiley, 2002).

Advocacy and activism have complementary characteristics. Specifically, they both refer to the act of supporting a cause (*Merriam-Webster Learners' Dictionary*, 2016). Each task requires collaboration with all who are invested in multilingual education including parents, students, teachers, community leaders, government officials, and members of the media (Fishman, 1991; Hamayan & Freeman, 2006; Reyes & Kleyn, 2010) and the need to take action at all policy levels (de Jong, 2011).

Interestingly, some differences between these constructs are also evident in the scholarly literature. For instance, while advocacy may be done by individuals on behalf of others, activism can be done by groups working together and focuses on integrating the voices of those being advocated for, in the activism work. In other words, advocacy work evolves into activism when, rather than speaking for others, those in need of advocacy speak for themselves as one voice (Santiago-Negrón, 20012).

Still others in the literature attribute characteristics of both to the work of advocates. Specifically, Dubetz and de Jong (2011) summarized advocacy approaches by highlighting that, "definitions of advocacy emphasize acting on behalf of others and encompass individual and collective efforts to shape public policy in ways that ensure that individuals are treated equitably and have access to needed resources" (p. 251).

The activism of teachers and students in multilingual schools should lead them to question assumptions, recognize oppressive attitudes and behaviors, identify and challenge educational inequities, and build discourses of possibilities in the teaching and learning process (Tollefson & Tsui, 2014). Santiago-Negrón (2012) also proposes a type of activism where teachers, students, and the community work in accord to “create situations that allow the community to speak together loudly and allow the community to be understood regardless of the language spoken” (p. 239).

Bilingual education is a highly-contested political space won through community activism and continuously defended thereafter (Solorza, 2019, p. 1). In the United States, it is common to witness bilingual instruction surrounded by controversy, incongruities, and uncertainties and bilingual instructional practices not being endorsed by administrators, policy makers, and the general public (Freire & Valdez, 2017; Nevárez-La Torre, 2010; Parra, Combs, Fletcher, & Evans, 2015). One example of an oppressive act, discussed by Flores & Rosa, (2015), is enacted when educators fail to account for the role of white listening subject in instruction, allowing the over determination of MLL/ELLs language practices as deficient.

In many instances, these oppressive conditions cannot be avoided, but are a daily reality in the work environment of bilingual educators (Freeman & Freeman, 2001; Menken, 2008; Menken & Solorza, 2014; Reyes & Halcón, 2001). Dubetz (2014) argues that confronted with this reality, educators must advocate for their right to teach bilingually and for the right of students to receive an instruction that uses and enhances all their linguistic repertoires without the threat of being judged as deficient (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Flores, 2017).



Reyes & Kleyn (2010) propose that as advocates for education equity, bilingual educators must recognize the benefits that bilingual education offers “for enhanced communication, advantages in the job market, cognitive and academic benefits, stronger connection with family and community, and positive identity construction” (p. 143). They require that bilingual educators interpret teaching and learning in more than one language through a social justice lens to recognize oppressive and marginalizing influences on this form of education, and to create opportunities to uncover, challenge, and eradicate them (Linton & Franklin, 2010; Valdez Freire, & Delavan, 2016). Similarly, Solorza calls for bilingual educators to fight for the educational rights of our students by constantly questioning our pedagogies and the ideologies that created them (2019, p.2).

Acts of advocacy and activism should be designed to address inequality inside as well as outside classrooms walls and school buildings. With this in mind, Chubbuck (2010) developed a continuum of advocacy activities for the socially just educator. At one end are “private, individual acts of mercy or service to meet the needs of each individual child” and on the other end are “public acts of advocacy and reform to address inequitable structures and policies” (p. 207). Agreeing with this perspective, Dubetz (2014, p. 19) concludes that:

- 1) Advocacy for bilingual learners begins in the classroom;
- 2) Advocacy knowledge and skills can be learned;
- 3) Effective advocacy for emergent bilinguals and bilingual programs requires action beyond the classroom; and
- 4) Teacher advocacy must be understood as a political act.

Dubetz and de Jong (2011) conducted a critical research synthesis, which confirmed a variety of spaces where this work can be done. They found that advocacy in the classroom might entail teaching in ways that affirm students' linguistic and cultural identities, facilitating critical explorations of issues of discrimination, equality, and social justice, serving as linguistic and cultural role models, and explicitly teaching strategies to negotiate the norms of mainstream society without losing native cultural and linguistic identities (pp. 251-254). Outside the classroom their critical synthesis showed how teachers worked with families in helping them navigate bureaucratic systems to gain access to financial and social services, and communicating the benefits of bilingual education. In working with colleagues, teacher advocates also served as mentors, offering expertise in developing coherent bilingual programs, and in serving as resources for mainstream colleagues and administrators (pp. 254-255).

Other examples of ways that educators can enact advocacy and activism roles as part of their professional lives are suggested in Krashen (2006). He invites teachers and administrators to participate by informing others within and outside schools about the evidence supporting bilingual education and effective instructional practices. In his view educators should:

- (1) *Become informed* by reading professional literature;
- (2) *Share with allies*, which results in a rapid diffusion of ideas;
- (3) *Express their own point of view, based on their experience and expertise* so that others may hear from those who have been in the classroom through listserv posts, letters to the editors, op-eds, blogs, articles in professional journals, general-interest magazines, and newsletters (pp. 228-229).

Reyes and Kleyn (2010) adapt an advocacy model – Heuristic for Advocacy Among English Language Professionals (Mallet, 2009) -- to guide the advocacy efforts of bilingual educators. They summarize the five non-sequential stages as:

- (1) Inquiry: Recognizing a problem that is negatively affecting ELLs and or ELP's at the local, state, and/or national level;
- (2) Consciousness: Gathering information related to the recognized problem that is negatively affecting ELLs and/or ELPs at the local, state, and/or national level;
- (3) Critique: Addressing the recognized problem that is negatively affecting ELLs and/or ELPs at the local, state, and/or national level;
- (4) Vision: Constructing a plan to ameliorate the recognized problem that is negatively affecting ELLs and/or ELPs at the local, state, and/or national level;  
and
- (5) Action: Communicating with decision makers a specific plan designed to address the recognized problem that is negatively affecting ELLs and/or ELPs at the local, state, and/or national level (pp. 155-156).

Finally, de Jong (2011) calls into question the usefulness of engaging with dominant discourses (i.e., bilingual vs. English-only education debate) without a detailed examination of the impact of English-only practices on key long-term achievement indicators (i.e., drop-out rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance, and unemployment). Alternatively, she suggests an additional advocacy strategy to transform assimilationist ideologies. Advocacy and activism efforts, for her, should be designed to articulate a multilingual discourse framed by four principles for language policy in education. According to this researcher, the following principles can serve well to

scrutinize policies and practices in ways that advance a multilingual agenda taking a holistic and context-sensitive approach:

- (a) *Principle of Educational Equity* – educators respond to inequities by making them visible through critical inquiry, and by looking for systemic solutions rather than blaming students and their families
- (b) *Principle of Affirming Identities* – educators validate diverse cultural experiences in their school policies and classroom practices, and create spaces for diverse voices in the curriculum
- (c) *Principle of Promoting Additive Bi/Multilingualism* – educators make languages, in addition to the standard language of the school, visible, using them as resources for teaching and learning, and validate functional hybrid language practices as the norm in multilingual environments
- (d) *Principle of Structuring for Integration* – educators work to transform mainstream programs and classrooms into integrated, heterogeneous learning environments in which multilingualism, multiculturalism, and equal access for linguistically and culturally diverse populations are the norm (pp. 245-250).

### **Teacher Inquiry as Professional Development**

The idea of teacher research as a professional development tool has provoked stimulating discussions in the scholarly literature. For instance, Fueyo and Neves (1995) propose that as professionals, teachers should do research in their own classrooms. Fueyo and Koorland (1997) cite the work of Henson, 1996, when they state, “Participation in research is a direct route to increased expertise and is a way for teachers to improve their self-confidence as professionals” (p. 341).

Effective professional development in contemporary education is characterized by teacher-guided, ongoing enhancement of instructional knowledge and skills, with intentional questioning of policies and ideologies that guide practice (Caro-Bruce, Flessner, Klehr, & Zeichner, 2007; Dresser, 2007; Kandel-Cisco & Padrón, 2008; Lindholm-Leary, 2007). The process of enacting teacher research can achieve these features about best ways to design professional development for teachers.

For instance, according to studies done on classroom-based inquiry, teachers who pursue critical reflection and inquiry projects in their multilingual schools and classrooms are equipped to create new knowledge about teaching and learning (Christian & Genesee, 2001). They, in turn, share this information to clarify misconceptions, change entrenched practices, and eradicate unhelpful and misguided instructional and language policies (Nevárez-La Torre, 2010).

Also, Fueyo and Koorland (1997), argue that teachers as researchers can analyze their plans and actions; ask questions and systematically find answers; question instructional practices and student outcomes; and they implement change (p. 337). Educators can transform language teaching by creatively exploring practice in classrooms and schools. These investigations should be collaborative efforts with practitioners from different educational settings. Together, language educators can document and examine the process of integrating multilingualism, multiliteracy, and technology to enhance communication across languages, and build critical thinking capacities of students.

Nevárez-La Torre (2010) proposed the *Teacher Inquiry Model* that can guide educators to use inquiry as a tool for professional growth. The three main components of the model invite educators to

- (a) *Engage in a process of introspection* – self-discovery by reflecting on personal school experience, previous teacher education, philosophical beliefs about teaching and learning, and knowledge about multilingualism;
- (b) *See Inquiry as a Process* – appreciate the development of teachers’ voices, critical analysis of different educational contexts, reflective and insightful collaboration, and cultivation of creative problem solving and theorizing; and
- (c) *Transform* – challenge any obstacles for growth in teaching and learning and provide productive and novel alternatives to improve practice, sustain meaningful professional renovation, and actualize pluralist perspectives in educating all students (pp. 25-33; 137-148).

### ***Professional Collaboration in Bilingual Schools***

Collaboration has been identified as a 21<sup>st</sup> century competency for effective teaching and productive learning. One of the principles of Innovative Learning Environments (ILE) promotes, ‘horizontal connectedness” across areas of knowledge and subjects as well as to the community and the wider world” (OECD, 2013, p. 16). The construct of *pedagogical content knowledge* (Schulman, 1987) emphasizes knowledge interconnection. The dynamic integration of knowledge of content, students, pedagogy, and educational contexts (Schulman & Schulman, 2004) cannot happen in isolated spaces where the exploration of content and pedagogy are separated but in environments that allow for the examination of teaching activity in dynamic, integrated, contextual, emergent, and communal ways (Worden, 2015; also see van Driel & Berry, 2012). Johnson (2009) values the opportunity of teachers learning collectively and by interacting with other experts.

Teacher professional collaboration is seen as “an ongoing process of teacher learning that occurs as teachers do their work” (Martin-Beltran & Peercy, 2014, p. 2); as a process to sustain productive change in teaching practice (Butler, Novak Lauscher, Jarvis-Selinger, & Beckingham, 2004); and as a way of ongoing professional development (Franke, Carpenter, Levi, & Fennema, 2001). Conversations among educators about what they have learned is critical to effective professional learning and collaboration (Leo & Cowan, 2000). Teachers who collaborate, as part of professional networks or collaborative research, have been shown to use more active teaching practices which in turn positively influence students’ engagement in more thoughtful learning (Burns & Darling-Hammond, 2015).

Burns & Darling-Hammond (2015) conclude that, “Good teaching doesn’t happen in isolation. Effective teaching environments are those that provide the time, conditions, and resources for teachers to interact, collaborate, learn from their colleagues, and play a role in school decision-making” (n.d). Acknowledging the deficits of teacher isolation, Wright argues that the most effective instruction in multilingual schools happens when bilingual, English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Teachers, and mainstream teachers work collaboratively (2015). Professional collaboration can be a conduit to build teachers’ knowledge of both language development and acquisition and academic content (Deli Carpini, 2009; Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010).

Honigsfeld & Dove (2010) identify common themes among definitions of collaboration synthesized from the scholarly literature. They found that professional collaboration engages voluntary participation; designing a common goal; participating in interdisciplinary endeavors; and finding multiple creative solutions (p. 6). As a form of

professional collaboration, co-teaching, “involves the distribution of responsibility among people for planning, instruction, and evaluation for a classroom of students” (Villa et al., 2008, p. 50; as cited in Honigsfeld & Dove, 2010). Friend et al (2010) describes six types of co-teaching approaches:

- (1) *One teach, One observe*: one teacher leads large-group instruction while the other gathers academic, behavioral, or social data on specific students or the class group;
- (2) *Station Teaching*: instruction is divided into three non-sequential parts and student, likewise divided into three groups, rotate from station to station, being taught by the teachers at two stations and working independently at the third;
- (3) *Parallel Teaching*: two teachers, each with half the class group, present the same material for the primary purpose of fostering instructional differentiation and increasing student participation;
- (4) *Alternative Teaching*: one teacher works with most student while the other works with a small group for remediation, enrichment, assessment, preteaching, or another purpose;
- (5) *Teaming*: both teachers lead large-group instruction by both lecturing, representing opposing views in a debate, illustrating two ways to solve a problem, and so on; and
- (6) *One teach, One assist*: one teacher leads instruction while the other circulates among the students offering individual assistance (pp. 11-12).

The complexities of collaborative pedagogical relationships are acknowledged in the literature (DelliCarpini, 2009; Friend et al, 2010; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2010). Hornberger (2006) points out that often times collaborative projects are mandated from administration without considering the stresses and potential problems in collaborating among teachers.



Scholars identify some of the potential difficulties in doing professional collaboration and in co-teaching (DelliCarpini, 2009; Friends et al, 2010; Hornberger, 2006; Wright, 2015):

- a. collegial relationships built in unequal and hierarchical ways,
- b. teacher isolation,
- c. teacher positioning and marginalization;
- d. the interactional complexity of partnership teaching;
- e. lack of time to co-plan and resources;
- f. lack of commitment to collaborate by the administration and teachers;
- g. lack of understanding about mediating disagreements related to instructional methodology, student behavior, communication with students and parents, and evaluation of student progress;
- h. teachers' lack of knowledge about academic content and language acquisition and development;
- i. increased workload; and
- j. lack of skills in collaborating

Despite the potential barriers to effective professional collaboration among teachers, researchers also highlight the benefits that can be obtained from implementing it. Bilingual educators may partner with other bilingual educators, teachers in general education and in special education, as well as teachers of English as a new language, administrators, counselors, social workers, and other support staff and professionals in schools. Given the multiple and necessary opportunities to collaborate in bilingual education programs, it is imperative to recognize the potential advantages of well-designed professional collaboration and co-teaching opportunities.

We know for instance, that sustained collaborative practices may create a model of teacher support for novice teachers and create opportunities for teacher leadership development for more experienced faculty (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010). DelliCarpini (2008) identifies other advantages including: advances in language and content learning for MLL/ELLs; educators enhance their understanding of content knowledge and curricular goals across content areas as well as develop deeper and more meaningful understanding of the unique learning needs of MLLs/ELs; and the classroom is seen as a community of learning which uses diversity to build academic achievement and language acquisition (n.d.). Similarly, Honigsfeld and Dove (2010) outline several gains of implementing effective professional collaborative practices for students across grade levels, content specialists and teachers in general education, teacher assistants and nonteaching staff, and school administrators (pp.47-54).

A study conducted by Martin-Beltrán & Peercy (2014) revealed that collaborating teachers used several tools (i.e., district's curriculum framework; collaborative dialogues; shared rubrics and student assessments) to support their professional learning by communicating and clarifying goals; co-constructing their expanding knowledge base for teaching linguistically diverse students; and negotiating ownership of space, students, and voice within a shared teaching activity (p. 5). A report discussing findings of data collected from the *Teaching and Learning International Survey of 2013* (TALIS) concluded that professional activities such as team teaching, joint activities across classes, and collaborative professional learning (among others) are connected to teachers' sense of self efficacy, job satisfaction, and student achievement by engaging students in deeper learning (Burns & Darling-Hammond, 2015).

Much is still needed to be investigated about collaborative and co-teaching practices in bilingual education classrooms. We echo Hornberger's assertion that only through further research,

can we gain a better understanding of what works and doesn't work for learners' (biliterate) development in collaborative language/content teaching, moving beyond policy and into practices for the benefit of those for whom it is intended – multilingual learners in classrooms (2006).

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS

(Explanations were taken from different scholarly sources included in the references.)

**Academic Disciplines** – Areas of knowledge that form the foundation of school curriculum and specific content areas.

**Academic Text** – Written and oral material that follows a specific organization and structure related to areas of academic study. It has specific features including being complex, formal, precise, objective, explicit, and accurate.

**Activists** – Individuals and groups who work to bring about change. The work involves activists and those for which the activism is being conducted.

**Additive Model** – Framework that focuses on a bilingual acquisition context in which learning an additional language does not imply the replacement of the first language but is added onto first language repertoires. The two languages are maintained in separate and compartmentalized ways.

**Advanced Literacies** – Refer to skills and competencies that enable oral and written communication in increasingly different ways and promote the understanding and use of text for a variety of purposes with increasingly diverse audiences. They make way for participation in academic, civic, and professional communities, where knowledge is shared and generated.

**Advocacy** – Work done by individuals and groups supporting a cause on behalf of others. It refers to any organized efforts and actions to create a just, decent society.

**Anti-racism** – Any activity that is conducted to oppose racism and oppression based on race.

**Assessment as Learning** – When learners self-monitor and self-correct their own work and the work of other students in the classroom. Its purpose is to develop and enhance students' metacognitive skills and their ability to take ownership of their own learning.

**Assessment for Learning** – Formative and diagnostic assessment conducted by teachers; a powerful learning tool that teachers can use to enhance student learning and achievement. The process of seeking and interpreting evidence for use by learners and their teachers to decide where the learners are in their learning, where they need to go and how best to get there.

**Assessment of Learning** – Summative assessment conducted by teachers; measuring learning and using it for grading and categorizing students as well as for reporting achievement results.

**Assimilationist Discourses** – Ways of thinking and talking about the world that view linguistic and cultural diversity as a hindrance to sociocultural, economic, and political development.

**Biculturalism** – The combination of two cultures by individuals or societies, which may impact language use, value systems, identity, and cultural behaviors.

**Bilingual Learner** – Knowledge of and use of two languages to communicate. Competence in two languages developed by individual speakers along a continuum that includes variations in proficiency in expressive (speaking and writing) and receptive (listening and reading) language; differences in proficiency between the two languages according to the functions and purpose of use of each language; and changes in proficiency of each language over time.

**Bilingual Education** – An educational approach that uses two languages strategically to teach academic content. Different program models of bilingual education vary the amount of each language used for instruction depending on the ideology and education goals of the program model.

**Bilingual Instruction** – Teaching of academic content done in two languages. It is informed by educational theories, research, and ideologies.

**Biliteracy** – The ability to read and write with high levels of proficiency in two languages through the appropriate and effective use of grammatical, syntactic, graphophonic, semantic, and pragmatic systems of the two languages. It involves using a reservoir of bilingual competencies, strategies, and knowledge in interaction and collaboration with others to comprehend and produce text.

**Communication** – Conveying ideas, thoughts, feelings, and information in mutually understood ways.

**Communicative Competence** – Knowing a language and using it to communicate effectively and meaningfully. Language is used appropriately according to context.

**Competence** – It is what a speaker can do under the best conditions; it represents an idealized underlying best ability. Performance seldom matches competence.

**Critical Multiculturalism** – Pedagogy that examines the interrelationship of culture, race, ethnicity, identity, and power, it studies oppressive forces in education and exposes ways to bring about educational and social change that improves the economic and social conditions of diverse students and society in general.

**Cross-disciplinary** – It involves two or more areas of knowledge and fields of study; transferring knowledge or making associations across different areas of knowledge.

**Cross-language** – It involves two or more languages; the two-way transfer of knowledge. Connections are made across different languages.

**Cross-linguistic Connections** – Connections that associate what is learned in one language and apply it to a new situation in the other language. The process uses one language to analyze and understand an additional language. These connections

are bidirectional and enable students to develop metacognitive abilities and knowledge about their two languages and how they are the same and different.

**Cultural Competence** – Is having an awareness of one’s own cultural identity and views about difference, and the ability to learn and build on the varying cultural and community norms of students and their families. It is the ability to understand the within-group differences that make each student unique, while celebrating the between-group variations that make our country a tapestry. This understanding informs and expands teaching practices in the culturally competent educator’s classroom.

**Cultural Diversity** – the existence of more than one culture around the world and across societies and our understanding of cultures different from our own.

**Cultural Mismatch** – When the culture of the school contrasts the culture of the students’ home and community; it is a factor that influences the academic achievement of linguistically and culturally diverse students.

**Depth of Learning** – Pedagogy that promotes profound learning in great detail, deep thinking, and interdisciplinary connections.

**Developing MLLs/ELLs** – Students who have received ELL services for 4 to 6 years.

**Digital Text** – Any document that is presented and used in digital form; an electronic version of text.

**Differentiated Instruction** – Pedagogy that offers different students diverse ways to learn; tailoring instruction to meet the individual learning needs of students.

**Discourse** – Written or spoken extended expression of ideas and thought; normally longer than sentences; it follows specific structure and function. Ways of talking and writing within a context, which frames the text created. It is a form of social practice that occurs in connected speech and written text with those who participate in the event.

**Dynamic Model** – A framework of bilingual education that allows and promotes the simultaneous coexistence of different languages in communication, the development and flexible use of multiple linguistic repertoires and identities, and contexts that value efficiency, equity, and integration.

**Educational Equity** – Equity in education means that personal or social circumstances such as gender, ethnic origin or family background, are not obstacles to achieving educational potential. It promotes the notion that education fairly represents the diversity in schools and do not discriminate systematically against certain groups of students.

**Educational Policy** – The collection of laws and rules that govern the operation of education systems. It involves laws, legislative statutes, regulations, and bureaucratic practices design to shape educational practices.

**Emergent Bilinguals (EBs)** – Learners, ages three and above, whom speak a native language and are adding another language to their linguistic repertoires. It refers to learners who are in a dynamic process of developing bilingual and biliterate competencies with the support of their communities. This label draws attention to the importance of educational programs to support the continued attainment of high levels of proficiency in both languages.

**Emergent Multilingual Learner (EMLL)** – Refers to the preschool population of children whose home language is not English. This term recognizes that all language is emerging for children at ages three and four, but like their K-12 counterparts, EMLLs have the potential to sustain the home language as they learn English and benefit from becoming bilingual or multilingual individuals.

**English Language Learners (ELLs)** – A label for students who are non-native speakers of English and are in the process of attaining proficiency in English.

**English as a New Language Program (ENL)** – An academic subject, course, or program designed to teach English to students who are not yet proficient in the language.

**Evidence-based Methods** – Instructional methods and strategies derived from or informed by objective evidence, such as educational research, and findings from scholarly synthesis of studies on instruction.

**Formative Purpose of Assessment** – This purpose focuses on using assessment data to provide immediate feedback to students, to determine what and how students are processing the information they are being taught, and inform instruction to build on students strengths and address their needs.

**Former ELLs** – Is a student who was identified as an MLL/ELL and has met the criteria for exiting ELL status. Upon exiting ELL status, Former ELLs are entitled to receive at least two years of Former ELL services.

**Funds of Knowledge** – Essential cultural practices and bodies of knowledge that are embedded in the daily practices and routines of families and that are essential for household or individual functioning and well-being. They include the learner's knowledge and skills developed in their homes and the community and language and the ways of conveying meaning.

**Globalization** – The process in which people, ideas, and goods spread throughout the world, spurring more interaction and integration between the world's cultures, governments and economies. It is the worldwide movement toward economic, financial, trade, and communications integration and interconnectedness.

**Heteroglossic Ideology** – Views that accept multiple coexisting language norms, which characterize bilingual speech including translanguaging. Multilingualism is recognized and valued along a continuum of proficiencies, functions, interrelationships, and languaging capabilities.

**High Stakes Assessment** – Any test used to make important decisions about students, educators, schools, or districts, most commonly for the purpose of accountability. Tests used for this purpose have important consequences for the test taker, teachers, schools, and school districts.

**Ideologies** – A set of opinions or beliefs of a group or an individual. It also refers to a set of political beliefs or a set of ideas that characterize a particular culture. With respect to language ideologies it refers to views on what is acceptable and not acceptable about language, language acquisition, and language use. They may influence which policies and practices are considered appropriate and legitimate and which are valued within a particular context.

**Integrative Pedagogy** – Instructional practices based on the multiple bidirectional and flexible relationships between languages used by bilingual learners. The interaction among languages is seen as strategic and as responding to functional needs.

**Language Competence** – It is the system of linguistic knowledge possessed by native speakers of a language. It is distinguished from linguistic performance, which is the way a language system is used in communication.

**Language Ecology** – The study of interactions between any given language and its environment; it examines languages in relation to one another and to various social factors. It refers to the study of language within the context of linguistic and cultural diversity in relation to economic, political, sociohistorical, and sociocultural systems.

**Language Functions** – The way in which language is used to communicate a message. The different formal and informal purposes that guide the ways we use language to communicate. There are specific grammatical structures and vocabulary used with specific language functions.

**Language Policy** – Formal and informal decisions about language use; includes laws, regulations, and statutes, as well as practices.

**Language Variations** – Different ways people speak using the same language; linguistic aspects that may vary include pronunciation (accent), word choice (lexicon), or morphology and syntax (sometimes called "grammar"). Some factors that may influence differences include regional, social, or contextual.

**Languaging** – Social practices that we perform including academic language, code-switching, dialects, creoles, and pidgins. It refers to the multiple and flexible ways language is used to communicate meaning.

**Learning Standards** – are concise, written descriptions of what students are expected to know and be able to do at a specific stage of their education. These standards are broad conceptualizations of the learning that students should achieve in specific grades and academic areas. They do not describe any particular teaching practice, curriculum, or assessment method.



**Linguicism** – Discrimination based on a person’s language and language use.

**Linguistic Repertoires** – The set of language varieties used in the speaking and writing practices of a speech community and of individuals.

**Literacy** – The process of reading and writing in an academic context.

**Long-term ELLs** – Students who have completed at least six years of ELL services in a New York State school and continue to require ELL services.

**Metacognition** – Awareness and understanding of one's own thought processes. It requires critical awareness of one's thinking and learning and of oneself as a thinker and learner.

**Metacognitive Skills** – Ways to assist learners to understand the learning process, how they learn, and their learning strengths and needs.

**Metalinguistic/Metalanguage** – Related to the awareness and control of linguistic components of language. It refers to thinking and talking about language as well as understanding the relationships between and within languages. Its development includes the ability to identify, analyze, and manipulate language forms and to analyze sounds, symbols, grammar, vocabulary, and language structures between and within languages.

**MLL/ELL Students that are Differently Abled** – MLLs/ELLs served by an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). An IEP team determines a student’s eligibility for special education services and the language in which special education services are delivered.

**Mobility** – Related to opportunities to move between different levels in society or employment.

**Monoglossic Ideology** – Views that focus on developing proficiency in two languages according to monolingual norms for both languages, or proficiency in the dominant language according to monolingual norms. It assumes that the only legitimate linguistic practices are those that are enacted by monolinguals.

**Monolingual** – Able to communicate orally and in writing in only one language.

**Monoliteracy** – Able to read and write in only one language.

**Morphology** – The study of the structure of words. The central unit of study is the morpheme, the smallest unit of meaning or grammatical function.

**Multiculturalism** – The view that the various cultures in a society merit equal respect and scholarly interest. It also refers to the co-existence of diverse cultures, where culture includes racial, religious, or cultural groups and is manifested in customary behaviors, cultural assumptions and values, patterns of thinking, and communicative styles. It refers to the acknowledgement of the existence of different

cultures within a social space, where each culture represented by individuals is validated as unique and as important to be preserved.

**Multilingual Learner** – Students who possess or are in the process of developing proficiency in more than two languages (both in oral and written text).

**Multilingual Literacy** – Development of literacy in more than two languages. It involves using a reservoir of bilingual competencies, strategies, and knowledge in interaction and collaboration with others to comprehend text.

**Multilingualism** – The development of linguistic repertoires in more than two languages; speaking and understanding several languages.

**Narrative Schema** – All the knowledge a reader has about a particular narrative: the reader's own version of a text.

**Negotiated (Negotiation of Identity)** – It is a process by which learners use diverse, critical, and at times contradictory information to construct their identities. Issues of ideology, social contexts, language, and culture and the multiple interrelationships among them are considered in this process.

**Newcomers** – Students who have been in our schools for three years or less and are English Language Learners. MLLs/ELLs in our schools one year or less are exempt from the ELA.

**Oracy** – The development of academic oral skills through formal education. It requires talking to learn and the capacity to understand speech and use it to express academic knowledge.

**Oral Language** – The system through which we use spoken words to express knowledge, ideas, and feelings.

**Parental Engagement** – Ongoing process that increases active participation, communication, and collaboration between parents, schools, and communities with the goal of educating the whole child to ensure student achievement and success.

**Peer-assessment** – It is a process whereby students grade and provide feedback on the work of their classroom peers based on a teacher's benchmarks for the purpose of enhancing understanding of the academic material and metacognitive skills.

**Phonology** – The study of the sound systems of languages.

**Pluralist Discourses** – Ways of thinking and talking about the world that consider linguistic and cultural diversity as a resource for sociocultural, political, and economic development.

**Plurilingual** – Functional competence across communicative modes in various languages.

**Positionality** – Having a position in relation to other things. People are defined not in terms of fixed identities, but by their location within shifting networks of relationships, which can be analyzed and changed. As applied to schools, it alludes to discursive practices that signal hierarchical differences in status and power within schools and among different members of the school culture.

**Pragmatics** – The study of language in use, that is, how individuals produce and interpret language in social interaction in specific contexts.

**Professionalism** – The recognition that teachers and other educators have expert knowledge about academic content and pedagogy, rather than just craft and technical knowledge.

**Professionalization** – Comprises the elevation of teaching to a more respected, more responsible, more rewarding and better rewarded occupation. It recognizes that there is a knowledge base for teaching that can guide the education and performance of teachers. However, this knowledge must be clearly articulated through standards that define teaching as a learned profession and not as the result of random acts performed by teachers.

**Reciprocal Use of Languages** – Shared language use within multilingual contexts.

**Recursive Model** – A framework that acknowledges that bilingualism can take different directions at various times from that of language shift, language addition, or language maintenance. It values language revitalization and the going back and forth between discourse modes of communities.

**Rhetorical Structures** – Ways written, and oral text is organized and structured to communicate ideas and convey meaning.

**Scaffold Languages** – Providing contextual supports for meaning through the use of simplified language, teacher modeling, visuals and graphics, cooperative learning and hands-on learning.

**Scripts** – Writing systems.

**Self-assessment** – It is a process whereby students grade and monitor their work based on a teacher's benchmarks for the purpose of enhancing understanding of the academic material and metacognitive skills.

**Semantics** – The study of the meaning of words, phrases, and sentences.

**Separatist Pedagogy** – Instructional practices based on separate language systems in bilinguals.

**Sequential** – Relates to the acquisition of a second language after the acquisition of a first language.

**Students with Limited/Interrupted Education (SLIFE)** – MLLs/ELLs who experienced events who impeded their education because of war, civil unrest, or migration; because they never had the opportunity to participate in any type of schooling before entering school in the United States; or because of a lack of resources or trained teachers in their home countries.

**Students with Interrupted/Inconsistent Formal Education (SIFE)** – MLLs/ELLs who have attended schools in the U.S. for less than twelve months and who, upon initial enrollment in schools are two or more years below grade level in literacy in their home language and/or two or more years below grade level in math due to inconsistent or interrupted schooling prior to arrival in the U.S.

**Simultaneous** – Relates to the acquisition of two languages at the same time. The learner is exposed to and acquires two languages before the age of five as a result of circumstances or by election.

**Social Construct** – Jointly constructed understandings of the world that form the basis for shared assumptions about reality. Social reality and our interaction with it shape our view of the world, language, and communication.

**Social Practices** – Theoretical construct that connects practice and context within social situations. It emphasizes a commitment to change, social practice occurs in two forms: activity and inquiry.

**Socio-emotional Development** – Includes the child's experience, expression, and management of emotions and the ability to establish positive and rewarding relationships with others. It encompasses both intra- and interpersonal processes.

**Subtractive Model** – A framework that focuses on the acquisition of a second language that occurs at the expense of maintaining and developing the first language.

**Summative Purpose of Assessment** – This purpose focuses on using assessment data to provide a summary of student performance, determine student achievement, and measure program effectiveness.

**Syntax** – The study of the rules governing the relationships between words and the ways they are combined to form phrases and sentences.

**Translanguaging** – It refers to the multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their world. It includes code switching as it is used for different communicative purposes and meaning making.

**Translingual** – Hybrid language use across the different linguistic repertoires of bilinguals.

**Transnationalism** – It is a social phenomenon of back & forth movement between the home country and other countries, supporting identification with multiple national identities. A social phenomenon and scholarly research agenda grown out of the

heightened interconnectivity between people and the receding economic and social significance of boundaries among nation states.

**Universal Design for Learning** – A framework to improve and optimize teaching and learning for all people based on scientific insights into how humans learn. This approach offers instructional flexibility to accommodate individual learning differences and support the learning of all students. This approach offers multiple means of representation, of expression, and of engagement.

**World Languages Program** – Designed to prepare students to succeed in a multilingual and multicultural global society by promoting cultural understanding and teaching languages other than English.

## REFERENCES

- Abedi, J. (2004). The No Child Left Behind Act and English language learners: Assessment and accountability issues. *Educational Researcher*, 33(1), 4-14.
- Abedi, J., Hofstetter, C.H., & Lord, C. (2004). Assessment accommodations for English language learners: Implications for policy-based empirical research. *Review of Educational Research*, 74, 1-28.
- Abedi, J., Lord, C., & Plummer, J. (1997). *Language background as a variable in NAEP mathematics performance* (CSE Tech. Rep. No. 429). Los Angeles, CA: University of California National Center for Research and Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- Ada, A. F. (1986). Creative education for bilingual education teachers. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(4), 386-405.
- Adescope, O.O., Lavin, T., Thompson, T., & Ungerleider, C. (2010). A systematic review and meta-analysis of the cognitive correlates of bilingualism. *Review of Educational Research*, 80, 207-245.
- Alfaro, C. (2018). The sociopolitical struggle and promise of bilingual teacher education: Past, present, and future. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41, 4, 413-427.
- Alidou, H., Glanz, C., & Nikiema, N. (2011). Quality multilingual and multicultural education for lifelong learning. *International Review of Education*, vol. 57(5/6), pp. 529-539. doi: 10.1007/s11159-011-9259-z
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL). (2002). Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers: Initial Level Undergraduate and Graduate (For K-12 and Secondary Certification Programs). Retrieved from <http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/ACTFLNCATEStandardsRevised713.pdf>
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL). (2015). *Seal of Biliteracy Guidelines Released*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Arias, M.B. (2015). Parent and community involvement in bilingual and multilingual education. In W.E. Wright, S. Boun, and O. Garcia (eds.) *Handbook of bilingual and multilingual education* (pp.213-234). New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

- Arizpe, E., Colomer, T., & Martínez-Roldán, C. (2014). *Visual journeys through wordless narratives: An international inquiry with immigrant children and The Arrival*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (2017). *Issues in ethics: Cultural and linguistic competence*. Retrieved from [www.asha.org/Practice/ethics/Cultural-and-Linguistic-Competence/](http://www.asha.org/Practice/ethics/Cultural-and-Linguistic-Competence/).
- August, D., & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (1998). *Educating language-minority children*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- August, D., & Shanahan, T. (2006). *Developing literacy in second language learners: Report of the national literacy panel on language minority children and youth*. Center for Applied Linguistics. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. & Wright, W. E. (2017). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ballantyne, K. G., Sanderman, A. R., & Levy, J. (2008). *Educating English language learners: Building teacher capacity*. (Roundtable Report). Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition & Language Instruction Educational Programs. (ERIC No. ED521360).
- Beeman, K., & Urow, C. (2014). *Teaching for biliteracy: Strengthening bridges between languages*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Benson, C. (2004). Do we expect too much of bilingual teachers? Bilingual teaching in developing countries. In J. Brutt-Griffer and M.M. Varghese, *Bilingualism and language pedagogy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, LTD.
- Berman, P., Minicucci, C., McLaughlin, B., Nelson, B., & Woodworth, K. (1995). *School reform and student diversity: Case studies of exemplary practices for LEP students*. Santa Cruz, CA: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning & B. W. Associates.
- Bhabha, H.K. (2004). *The location of culture*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Bhattacharjee, Y. (2012, March 17). Why bilinguals are smarter. *New York Times*. Retrieved from [http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/18/opinion/sunday/the-benefits-of-bilingualism.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/18/opinion/sunday/the-benefits-of-bilingualism.html?_r=0)

- Bialystok, E. (2007). Acquisition of literacy in bilingual children: A framework for research. *Language Learning*, 57(1), 45-77. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00412.x.
- Bialystok, E. (2013). The impact of bilingualism on language and literacy development. In T.K. Bhatia and W.C. Ritchie (eds). *The handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 624-648). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I., & Luk, G. (2012). Bilingualism: Consequences for mind and brain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16(4), 240–250.
- Black, P. (1998). *Testing: Friend or foe? Theory and practice of assessment and testing*. London: UK: Falmer.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7–74.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 5–31.
- Brisk, M. E. (1998). *Bilingual education: From compensatory to quality schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.
- Brisk, M. E., & Harrington, M. M. (2000). *Literacy and bilingualism: A handbook for all teachers*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Brisk, M. E., Kaveh, N. Y., Scialoia, P., & Timothy, B. (2015). Teaching argument writing in multilingual classrooms informed by systemic functional linguistics. In C. Proctor, A. Boardman, & F. Hiebert, *English learners and emergent bilingualism in the common core era* (pp.138-156). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Brown, S. (2011). *Listening myths: Applying second language research to classroom teaching*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Brown, S. & Larson-Hall, J. (2012). *Second language acquisition myths: Applying second language research to classroom teaching*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Brutt-Griffer, J. and Varghese, M. M. (2004). *Bilingualism and language pedagogy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, LTD.
- Bryk, A. S. (2015). Accelerating how we learn to improve. *Educational Researcher*, 44(9), pp. 467-477.



- Buly, M. R., & Valencia, S. (2002). Below the bar: Profiles of students who fail state reading assessments. *Education Evaluation & Policy Analysis, 24*(3), 219-239.
- Burns, D. & Darling-Hammond, L. (2015). *Teaching around the world: What can TALIS tell us?* Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education (SCOPE).
- Butler, D. L., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 65*(3), 245-281.
- Butler, F., & Stevens, S. (1997). *Accommodation strategies for English language learners on large-scale assessments: Student characteristics and other considerations*. Center for the Study of Evaluation (CRESST), National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing, Graduate School of Education). Los Angeles, CA: University of California, Los Angeles.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2012). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (Ed.). (2013). *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and classrooms*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Caro-Bruce, C., Flessner, R., Klehr, M., & Zeichner, K. (Eds.). (2007). *Creating equitable classrooms through action research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Casey Foundation. (2018). The Number of Bilingual Kids in America Continues to Rise (January 11, 2018). *Kids Counts Data Center: A Project of the Annie E. Casey Foundation*. Retrieved from: [datacenter.kidscount.org](http://datacenter.kidscount.org)
- CAST (2018). Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 2.2. Retrieved from <http://udlguidelines.cast.org>
- Castek, J., Leu, D. J., Jr., Coiro, J., Gort, M., Henry, L. A., & Lima, C. (2007). Developing new literacies among multilingual learners in the elementary grades. In L. Parker (Ed.) *Technology-mediated learning environments for young learners: Connections in and out of school* (pp. 111-153). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Castellano, M., Stringfield, S., & Stone, J. R. (2002). *Helping disadvantaged youth succeed in school: Second-year findings from a longitudinal study of CTE-based whole-school reforms*. Columbus, OH: National Dissemination Center for Career and Technical Education.
- Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Celic, C. (2012). *Translanguaging: Strategies for the classroom*. NYSIEB Seminar March 16, 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.nysieb.ws.gc.cuny.edu/files/2012/03/Translanguaging-PPT-Christina-Celic.pdf>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). A holistic approach to multilingual education: Introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, iii. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01204.x
- Center for Early Care and Education Research-Dual Language Learners (CECER-DLL) (2011). *Research brief #7. Social-emotional development in dual language learners: A critical review of the research*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina, FPG Child Development Institute, Author.
- Chamot, A. U. (2009). *The CALLA Handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach* (2<sup>nd</sup>. Ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Longman.
- Chiang, S. (2009). Mutual understanding as a procedural achievement in intercultural interaction. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6(3), 367–394. doi: [10.1515/IPRG.2009.019](https://doi.org/10.1515/IPRG.2009.019)
- Christian, D., & Genesee, F. (Eds.). (2001). *Bilingual education*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Chubbuck, S. M. (2010). Individual and structural orientation in socially just teaching: Conceptualization, implementation, and collaborative effort. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(3), 197-210.
- Clark, I. (2012). Formative assessment: Assessment is for self-regulated learning. *Education Psychology Review*, 24, 205-249.
- Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2009). *Literacy instruction for English language learners: A teacher's guide to research-based practices*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Colombo, E. (2014). Multiculturalisms. *Sociopedia. International Sociological Association (isa)*, pp. 1-17. DOI 10.1177/2056846014101

- Coulmas, F. (2003). *Writing systems: An introduction to their linguistic analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching and assessment*. Strasbourg, France: Author.
- Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners: Language diversity in the classroom* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Educational Services.
- Cregan, A. (2012). Empowering teachers to promote oral language in culturally diverse classrooms in Ireland. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*, 2, pp. 63-88.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94, 103-115.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2011). Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: Multiple language practices in interrelationship. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1157-1160.
- Cummins, J. (1991). Conversational and academic language proficiency in bilingual contexts. *AILA Review*, 8, 75-89.
- Cummins, J. (2000) *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J., Brown, K., & Sayers, D. (2007). *Literacy, technology, and diversity: Teaching for success in changing times*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Daniel, M., & Cowan, J. E. (2012). Exploring teachers' use of technology in classrooms of bilingual students. *GIST Education and Learning Research Journal*, 6, 97-110.
- Davison, C., & Leung, C. (2009). Current issues in English language teacher-based assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(3), 393-415.
- De Jong, E. (2011). *Foundations of multilingualism in education. From principles to practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- DeCapua, A., & Marshall, H. W. (2011). *Breaking new ground: Teaching students with limited or interrupted formal education*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

- DeCapua, A., Smathers, W., & Tang, F. (2009). *Students with limited or interrupted schooling: A guide for educators*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- DelliCarpini, M. (2008). Teacher collaboration for ESL/EFL academic success. *The Internet TESL Journal*, XIV (8).
- DelliCarpini, M. (2009). Dialogues across disciplines: Preparing English-as-a-Second-Language teachers for interdisciplinary collaboration. *Current Issues in Education*, 11(2), Retrieved from, <http://cie.ed.asu.edu/volume11/number2/>
- De Varennes, F. (2001). Language Rights as an Integral Part of Human Rights. *IJMS: International Journal on Multicultural Societies*. 2001, vol. 3, no.1, pp. 15-25. UNESCO. ISSN 1817-4574. [www.unesco.org/shs/ijms/vol3/issue1/art2](http://www.unesco.org/shs/ijms/vol3/issue1/art2)
- Dewey, M. (2007). English as a lingua franca and globalization: An interconnected perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17(3), 323-352.
- Dicker, S. (2003). *Languages in America: A pluralist view* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Díaz-Rico, L. T., & Weed, K. Z. (2010). *The crosscultural, language, and academic developmental, handbook: A complete K-12 reference guide* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Diller, J.V. & Moule, J. (2005). *Cultural competence: A primer for educators*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Dove, M. & Honisfeld, A. (2010). ESL coteaching and collaboration: Opportunities to develop teacher leadership and enhance student learning. *TESOL Journal*, 1(1), pp. 3-22.
- Dresser, R. (2007). The effects of teacher inquiry in the bilingual language arts classroom. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34(3), 53-66.
- Dubetz, N. E. (2002). Teacher as negotiator: The evolution of a teacher's theory of practices in an urban school. In L. Catelli & A. Diver-Stames (Eds.), *Commitment to excellence: Transforming teaching and teacher education in inner-city and urban settings* (pp. 229-243). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Dubetz, N. E. (2012). Understanding the language choices of novice bilingual teachers during sheltered English instruction. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*, 3, 43-62.
- Dubetz, N. E. (2014). Enacting advocacy-oriented visions of bilingual education: Lessons from experienced bilingual educators. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 5, 1-26.

- Dubetz, N. E., & de Jong, E. J. (2011). Teacher advocacy in bilingual programs. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 34, 248-262. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2011.623603
- Dworin, J. (2003). Insights into biliteracy development: Toward a bidirectional theory of bilingual pedagogy. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 2, 171-86.
- Earl, L. M. (2013). *Assessment as learning: Using classroom assessment to maximize student learning* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Edwards, V. (2015). Literacy in bilingual and multilingual education. In W.E. Wright, S. Boun, & O. Garcia (eds.), *Handbook of bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 75). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ebsworth, T & Eisenstein, M. (1993). Sensitizing learners to sociocultural aspects of L2: A critical incident activity. *Idiom*, 23(2), 1-6.
- Eisenstein, M. (1982). A study of social variation in adult second language acquisition. *Language Learning*. 32(2), 367-392.
- Eisenstein, M. (1983a). *Language Variation and the ESL Curriculum*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Eisenstein, M. (1983b). Native reactions to non-native speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 5(2), 160-176.
- Eisenstein, M., & Bodman, J. (1986). I Very appreciate: Expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 167-185.
- Eisenstein, M., & Verdi, G. (1985). The Intelligibility of social dialects for working class adult learners of English. *Language Learning*, 35(2), 287-298.
- Eisenstein Ebsworth, M. (2009). True progress is bilingualism for all: A Response to Porter. *Puerto Rico TESOLGram*, 35(3), 24-25.
- Eisenstein Ebsworth, M. (2014). The many faces of feedback on writing: A historical perspective. *Writing and Pedagogy*, 6(2), 195-221. doi: 10.1558/wap.v6i2.195
- Eisenstein Ebsworth, M., & Ebsworth, T. (2000). The pragmatics and perceptions of multicultural Puerto Ricans. *The International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 142(3), 119-155. Reprinted in *Mouton Classics: From Syntax to Cognition. From Phonology to Text*. (2002). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. (pp. 731-770. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter Mouton. doi: [10.1515/9783110886009.731](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110886009.731)

- Eisenstein Ebsworth, M., & Kodama, N. (2011). The pragmatics of refusals in English and Japanese: Alternative approaches to negotiation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 208, 95-117.
- Eisenstein Ebsworth, M., & McDonell, T. (2013). Native and emergent bilingual university-level English speakers reading online: The influence of hypertext on comprehension. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*, 4(1), 61-86. Available from <http://fordham.bepress.com/jmer/vol4/iss1/5>
- Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., Butvilofsky, S., Sparrow, W., Soltero-González, L., Ruiz-Figueroa, O., & Escamilla, M. (2014). *Biliteracy from the start: Literacy squared in action*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. London, UK: Longman Group Limited.
- Fairclough, N. (1999). Global capitalism and critical awareness of language, *Language Awareness*, 8(2), 71–83.
- Fairclough, N. (Ed.). (2013). *Critical language awareness*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2014). *Language and power*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Farrell, T. (2007). *Reflective language teaching: From research to practice*. London, UK: Continuum.
- Ferreiro, E. (2002). *Relaciones de (in)dependencia entre oralidad y escritura*. Mexico City, Mexico: Gedisa Editorial.
- Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Rothenberg, C. (2008). *Content area conversations*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Fishman, J. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Flores, B.B., Sheets, R.H., & Clark, E.R. (2011). *Teacher preparation for Bilingual student populations: Educar para transformar*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Flores, N. (2016). A tale of two visions: Hegemonic whiteness and bilingual education. *Educational Policy*, 30(1), 13-38.
- Flores, N. & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149-171.

- Francis, D. J., Rivera, M., Lesaux, N., Keiffer, M., & Rivera, H. (2006). *Practical guidelines for the education of English language learners: Research-based recommendations for instruction and academic interventions*. Portsmouth, NH: Center on Instruction. Retrieved from <http://www.centeroninstruction.org/files/ELL1-Interventions.pdf>
- Freeman, D. E., & Freeman, Y. S. (2001). *Between worlds: Access to second language acquisition* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Freire, J. A. (2016). Nepantleras/os and their teachers in dual language education: Developing sociopolitical consciousness to contest language education policies. *Association of Mexican American Educators (AMAE) Journal*, 10(1), pp. 36-52.
- Freire, J. A. & Valdez, V. E. (2017). Dual language teachers' stated barriers to implementation of culturally relevant pedagogy. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 40(1), pp. 55-69.
- Friend, M., Cook, L., & Hurley-Chamberlain, D. & Shamberger, C. (2010). *Co-Teaching An illustration of the complexity of collaboration in special education*. *Journal of education and psychological consultation*, 20, pp.9-27.
- Fueyo, V., & Koorland, M. A. (1997). Teacher as researcher: A synonym for professionalism. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 48(5), 336-344.
- Fueyo, V., & Neves, A. (1995). Preservice teacher as researcher: A research context for change in the heterogeneous classroom. *Action in Teacher Education*, 16(4), 39-49.
- Gajo, L. (2007). Linguistic knowledge and subject knowledge: How does bilingualism contribute to subject development? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5), 563-581.
- Gajo, L. & Grobet, A. (2008). Interagir en langue étrangère dans le cadre de disciplines scolaires: Intégration et saturation des savoirs disciplinaires et linguistiques dans l'élaboration des définitions. In Filliettaz, L. & Schubauer-Leoni, M.-L. (Eds.), *Processus interactionnels et situations éducatives* (pp. 113–136). Brussels: De Boeck. doi:[10.3917/dbu.filli.2008.01.0113](https://doi.org/10.3917/dbu.filli.2008.01.0113)
- García, E. (2005). *Teaching and learning in two languages: Bilingualism and schooling in the United States*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- García, E. (2006). What is bilingualism worth and how much should I invest in it? In E. Hamayan & R. Freeman (Eds.), *English language learners at school: A guide for administrators* (pp. 242-244). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- García, O. 2008. Multilingual language awareness and teacher education. In J. Cenoz & N. Hornberger, N. (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Vol 6. *Knowledge about language* pp. 385-400). Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: A global perspective*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., Bartlett, L, & Kleifgen, J. A. (2007). From biliteracy to pluriliteracies. In P. Auer & L. Wei (Eds.). *Handbooks of Applied linguistics*, vol. 5: *Multilingualism* (pp. 207-228)., Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- García, O., & Flores, N. (2013). Multilingualism and common core standards in the United States. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and Bilingual Education* (pp. 147-166). New York, NY: Routledge.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2018). *Educating Emergent Bilinguals: Policies, Programs, and Practices for English Language Learners* (2nd Edition). Teachers College Press.
- García, O., Kleifgen, J.A., & Falchi, L. (2008). From English language learners to emergent bilinguals (*Equity Matters: Research Review No. 1*). New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- García, O., Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Torres-Guzmán, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Imagining multilingual schools: Languages in education and globalization*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Gargiulo, R. M., & Metcalf, D. (2012). *Teaching in today's inclusive classrooms: A universal design for learning approach*. Independence, KY: Cengage Learning.
- Gee, J. P. (2012). *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W. M., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.



- Geneshi, C., Dubetz, N. E., & Focarino, C. (1995). Reconceptualizing theory through practice: Insights from a first-grade teacher and second language theorists. In S. Reifel (Ed.), *Advances in early education and day care* (vol. 7, pp. 121-150). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Goldenberg, C. (2008) Teaching English language learners: What the research does and does not say. *American Educator*, 80(23), 42-44.
- Goldstein, T. (2003). *Teaching and learning in a multilingual school: Choices, risks, and dilemmas*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- González, N., & Moll, L. (2002). Cruzando el puente: Building bridges to funds of knowledge. *Educational Policy*, 16(4), 623-641.
- Gotlieb, M. (2006). *Assessing English language learners: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Gotlieb, M., & Nguyen, D. (2007). *Assessment and accountability in language education programs: A guide for administrators and teachers*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Great Schools Partnerships (2014). *The Glossary of Education Reform*. Portland, ME: Author. Retrieved from: [edglossary.org](http://edglossary.org).
- Hakuta, K., Butler, Y. G., & Witt, D. (2000). *How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency?* (Policy Report 2000-1.) Santa Barbara, CA: University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute. Available from [http://lmri.ucsb.edu/publications/00\\_hakuta.pdf](http://lmri.ucsb.edu/publications/00_hakuta.pdf)
- Hakuta, K., & D'Andrea, D. (1992). Some properties of bilingual maintenance and loss in Mexican background high-school students. *Applied Linguistics*, 13, 72-99.
- Hamayan, E., & Freeman, R. (Eds.). (2006). *English language learners at school: A guide for administrators*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Henson, K. (1996). Teacher as researchers. In J. Sikula, Y. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp.53-64). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Herbst, J. (1989). *And sadly teach: Teacher education and professionalization in American culture*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

- Hill, H. C., Rowan, B., & Ball, D. L. (2005). Effects of teachers' mathematical knowledge for teaching on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 42(2), 371–406.
- Honisfeld, A. & Dove, M. G. (2010). *Collaboration & co-teaching: Strategies for English learners*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2006). Discursive approaches to understanding teacher collaboration: Policy into practice. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(4), 495-499. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2167/beb338.0>
- Hornberger, N. H., & Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2000). Revisiting the continua of biliteracy: International and critical perspectives. *Language and Education*, 14(2), 96-122.
- Hughes, C. & Acedo, C. (2014). *Guiding principles for learning in the twenty-first century*. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and International Bureau of Education. New York, NY: United Nations.
- Ijalba, E. (2015). Understanding parental engagement in Hispanic mothers of children with Autism Spectrum Disorder: Application of a process-model of cultural competence. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*, Vol 6, pp. 91-110.
- Irizarry, J. G. (2011). *The Latinization of U.S. schools: Successful teaching and learning in shifting cultural contexts*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Ivanic, R., & Clark, R. (1999). Raising critical awareness of language: A curriculum aim for the new millennium. *Language Awareness*, 8(2), 63-70.
- Jiménez, R. T., García, G. E., & Pearson, P. D. (1995). Three children, two languages, and strategic reading: Case studies in bilingual/monolingual reading. *American Education Research Journal*, 32, 67-97.
- Johnson, K.E. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Joseph, T. & Evans, L.M. (2018). Preparing preservice teachers for bilingual and bicultural classrooms in an era of political change. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41, #1, 52-68.
- Kandel-Cisco, B., & Padrón, Y. (2008). Using a resiliency erspective to inform bilingual teachers' classroom inquiry. *Scholarship and Professional Work – Education*. Paper 83). Retrieved from [http://digitalcommons.butler.edu/coe\\_papers/83](http://digitalcommons.butler.edu/coe_papers/83)

- Kasper, G. & Rose, K. (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 81–104.  
doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190056>
- Kayi, H. (2006). Teaching speaking: Activities to promote speaking in a second language. *The Internet TESL Journal*, XII (11).
- Kecskes, I. (2013). *Intercultural pragmatics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S. (2006). What are some key elements in advocating for educational programs for English language learners? In E. Hamayan & R. Freeman (Eds.), *English language learners at school: A guide for administrators* (pp. 227-229). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Koumje, G. F. (2018). The didactics of Bilingual Education: Disciplinary teaching and language. *International Journal of Educational Technology and Learning*, 4, 1, 8-12.
- LaCelle-Peterson, M., & Rivera, C. (1994). Is it real for all kids? A framework for equitable assessment policies for English language learners. *Harvard Educational Review*, 64, 55-75.
- Lapkin, S., & Swain, M. (with Shapson, S.). (1990). French immersion research agenda for the 90s. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 46(4), 638-374.
- Lesaux, N.K., Phillips & Galloway, E. (2017). *Advanced literacies for academic success*. Linguistically Diverse Learners and the NYS Next Generation P-12 Learning Standards: Brief 1 of 8. New York: New York State Education Department.
- Lesaux, N.K., Phillips & Galloway, E. (2017). *Hallmark 1 of Advanced Literacy instruction: Engaging, content-rich texts*. Linguistically Diverse Learners and the NYS Next Generation P-12 Learning Standards: Brief 3 of 8. New York: New York State Education Department.
- Lesaux, N.K., Phillips, Galloway, E. & Marietta, S.H. (2016). *Leading Advanced Literacy instruction in linguistically diverse schools: A guide for education leaders*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Lessow-Hurley, J. (2000). *The foundations of dual language Instruction* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Leung, F., & Park, K. (2002). Competent students, competent teachers? *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(2), 113–129.

- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2007). *Guiding principles for dual language education*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Llinares, S. (2000). Secondary school mathematics teacher's professional knowledge: A case from the teaching of the concept of function. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 6(1), 41–62.
- Linton, A., & Franklin, R. C. (2010). Bilingualism for the children: Dual-language programs under restrictive language policies. In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language* (pp. 175–191). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Lloyd, G. M., & Wilson, M. S. (1998). Supporting innovation: The impact of a teacher's conceptions of functions on his implementation of a reform curriculum. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 29(3), 248–274.
- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Mallet, K. E. (2009). *Educational language policy and the role of advocacy among English language professionals in the United States: An historical and case study analysis*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.
- Manouchehri, A., & Goodman, T. (2000). Implementing mathematics reform: The challenge within. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 42, 1–34.
- Marian, V., Chabal, S., Bartolotti, J., Bradley, K., & Hernández, A. (2014). Differential recruitment of executive control regions during phonological competition in monolinguals and bilinguals. *Brain and Language*, 139, 108-117.
- Marshall, H. W., & DeCapua, A. (2013). *Making the transition to classroom success: Culturally responsive teaching for struggling language learners*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. doi: [10.3998/mpub.4625213](https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.4625213)
- Martin-Bertrán, M & Peercy, M.M. (2014). Collaboration to teach English language learners: opportunities for shared learning. *Teachers and teaching: Theory and practice*. Doi: [10.1080/13540602.2014.885704](https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2014.885704)

- Martin-Jones, M., & Jones, K. (Eds.). (2000). *Multilingual literacies: Reading and writing different worlds*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Martínez-Roldán, C. M. (2003). Building worlds and identities: A case study of the role of narratives in bilingual literature discussions. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 37(4), 491-526.
- Maurais, J. & Morris, M. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Languages in a globalising world*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- May, S. (2011). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism, and the politics of language* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- McGroarty, M. (2002). Evolving influences on educational language policies. In J. W. Tollefson (eds.) *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 17-38). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Medina, C. (2010). Reading across communities in biliteracy practices: Examining translocal discourses and cultural flows in literature discussions." *Reading Research Quarterly*, 45(1), 40-60.
- Menken, K. (2008). *English language learners left behind: Standardized testing as a language policy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Menken, K., & Solorza, C. (2014). Where have all the bilingual programs gone?! Why prepared school leaders are essential for Bilingual Education. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*, 4, 9-39.
- Mercuri, S. & Ebe, A. E. (2011). Developing academic language and content for emergent bilinguals through a science inquiry unit. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*, 2, pp. 81-102.
- Merriam-Webster Learner's Dictionary (2016). Available from <http://learnersdictionary.com/>
- Mignolo, W.D. (2015). Sylvia Wynter: What does it mean to be human? In McKittrick, K. (Ed.), *Sylvia Wynter: On being human as praxis* (pp. 106-123). NC: Duke University Press.
- Mills, K. A. (2011). *The multiliteracies classroom*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Moll, L. C., & Díaz, S. (1985). Ethnographic pedagogy: Promoting effective bilingual instruction. In E. E. García & R. V. Padilla (Eds.), *Advances in bilingual education research*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

- Moll, L. C., & Díaz, S. (1987). Change as the goal of educational research. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 18, 300-311.
- Montecel, M. R., & Danini, J. (2002). Successful bilingual education programs: Development and the dissemination of criteria to identify promising and exemplary practices in bilingual education at the national level. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26(1) 1-21. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2002.10668696
- Moore, E., Evnitskaya, N., & Ramos de Robles, L. (2018). Teaching and learning science in linguistically diverse classrooms. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 13, 341-352.
- Moore, R. A., & Zainuddin, H. (2003). *ESL learners, writing and the acquisition of academic language*. (ERIC No. ED475746).
- Morell, Z. & New York State Department of Education (2017). Emergent multilingual learners in prekindergarten: A protocol for identification, instructional planning, and programming. New York, NY: New York Department of Education.
- Musanti, S. I. & Celedon-Pattichis, S. (2013). Promising pedagogical practices for emergent bilinguals in kindergarten: Towards a mathematics discourse community. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*, 4, pp. 41-62.
- National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE). (1992). *Professional standards for the preparation of bilingual/multicultural teachers*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2014). *The condition of education 2014*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Nevárez-La Torre, A. A. (2010). *The power of learning from inquiry: Teacher research as a professional development tool in multilingual schools*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Nevárez-La Torre, A. A. (2014). Necessary Ideological Shifts in Teaching Language. *Cuaderno de Investigación en la Educación*. Rio Piedras, PR: Centro de Investigaciones Educativas, Universidad de Puerto Rico.
- New London Group (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60-92.
- Nieto, S. (1999). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press

- Nieto, S. (2003). Challenging notions of “highly qualified teachers” through work in a teachers’ inquiry group. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(5), 386-398.
- Nieto, S. (Ed.). (2005). *Why we teach?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Nieto, S. & Bode, P. (2012). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (6<sup>th</sup> edition). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Nunan, D., & Lam, A. (1998). Teacher education for multilingual contexts: Models and issues. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds.), *Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- NYSED (2017). *Preface to the New York State next generation English language arts and mathematics learning standards*. New York, NY: The University of the State of New York.
- Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages. (n.d.). *Blue print for English language learner/Multilingual learner success*. New York, NY: The State Education Department/The University of the State of New York. Retrieved from [www.nysed.gov/common/nysed/files/nys-blueprint-for-ell-success.pdf](http://www.nysed.gov/common/nysed/files/nys-blueprint-for-ell-success.pdf)
- O’Malley, J. M., & Valdez-Pierce, L. (1996). *Authentic assessment for English language learners*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Omiunota, U. (2009). The practice of transformative pedagogy. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 20(2), pp.43-67.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, OECD. (2008). *21<sup>st</sup> Century learning: Research, innovation, and policy. Directions from recent OECD Analyses*. Paris, France: Author. Retrieved from, <http://www.oecd.org/site/educeri21st/40554299.pdf>
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, OECD. (2013). *Innovative learning environments, Educational Research and Innovation*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264203488-en>.
- Orkwis, R. (1999). Curriculum access and universal design for learning. ERIC /OSEP Digest #E586, retrieved from, <http://ericec.org/digests/e586.html>
- Palincsar, A., & Schleppegrell, M. (2014). Focusing on language and meaning while learning with text. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(3), 616-623.

- Palmer, D. & Martínez, R. M. (2013). Teacher agency in Bilingual spaces: A fresh look at preparing teachers to educate Latina/o Bilingual Children. *Review of Research in Education*, 37, 269-297.
- Parra, E. B., Combs, M. C., Fletcher, T., & Evans, C. A. (2015). The psychological impact of English language immersion on elementary age English language learners. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*, 5, 33-66.
- Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills (n.d.) Framework for 21<sup>st</sup> century learning. Retrieved from <http://www.p21.org/our-work/p21-framework>
- Peña, E. D., & Bedore, L. M. (2011). It takes two: Improving assessment accuracy in bilingual children. *The ASHA Leader*, 16(13), 20-22.
- Pérez, B., & Torres-Guzmán, M. E. (2001). *Learning in two worlds: An integrated Spanish/English biliteracy approach* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Longman/Pearson.
- Perrone, V. (1989). *Working papers: Reflections on teachers, schools, and communities*. New York, NY: Teacher College Press.
- Pollard-Durodola, S., Mathes, P. G., Vaugh, S., Cardenas-Hagan, E., & Linan-Thompson, S. (2006). The role of oracy in developing comprehension in Spanish-Speaking English language learners. *Topics in Language Disorder*, 26, 365-384.
- Phillipson, R. (1998). Globalizing English: Are linguistic human rights an alternative to linguistic imperialism? *Language Science*, 20(1), 101-112.
- Queensland College of Teachers (2007). *Professional Standards for Queensland Teachers*. Queensland, Australia: Author.
- Ramírez, J. D., Yuen, S. D., & Ramey, D. R. (1991). *Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit programs for language-minority children*. (Report submitted to the US Department of Education). San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.
- Reyes, M., & Halcón, J. (2001). *The best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino children*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Reyes, S. A., & Kleyn, T. (2010). *Teaching in two languages: A guide for K-12 bilingual educators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Ricento, T. (2000). Historical & theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4(2), 196-213.



- Rodríguez, D., Carrasquillo, A., & Lee, K. S. (2014). *The bilingual advantage: Promoting academic development, biliteracy, and native language in the classroom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Rogers, H. (2005). *Writing systems: A linguistic approach*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Rueda, R. (2005). Student learning and assessment: Setting an agenda. In P. Pedraza & M. Rivera (Eds.), *Latino education: An agenda for community action research* (pp. 185-204). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 7(2), 15-34.
- Santiago-Negrón, N. (2012). How can we move from advocacy for English language learners to activism by English language learners and their families. In E. Hamayan & R. Freeman (Eds.), *English language learners at school: A guide for administrators* (pp. 239-242). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishers.
- Schieffelin, B.B., Woolard, K.A., & Kroskrity, P.V. (1998). *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (vol. 16). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schweizer, T. A., Ware, J., Fischer, C. E., Craik, F. I., & Bialystok, E. (2012). Bilingualism as a contributor to cognitive reserve: Evidence from brain atrophy in Alzheimer's disease. *Cortex*, 48(8), 991–996.
- Shatz, M., & Wilkinson, L. C. (2013). *Understanding language in diverse classrooms: A primer for all teachers*. New York, NY: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Sherin, M. G. (2002). When teaching becomes learning. *Cognition and Instruction*, 20(2), 119–150.
- Shklovski, I. (2011). *Virtual transnationalism: Technologically supported social network phenomenon*. Position Paper for the Transnational HCI workshop Conference on Human Factors in Computing. Montreal, Canada. Retrieved from [http://www.princeton.edu/~jvertesi/TransnationalHCI/Participants\\_files/Shklovski.pdf](http://www.princeton.edu/~jvertesi/TransnationalHCI/Participants_files/Shklovski.pdf).
- Shohamy, E. (2001). *The power of tests: A critical perspective on the uses of language tests*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

- Short, D., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for English language learners*. (A Report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York). Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Shulman, L. S. & Shulman, J. H. (2004). How and what teachers learn: A shifting perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(2). 257-271.
- Simich,-Dudgeon, C. (1998). Classroom strategies for encouraging collaborative discussion. In *Directions in Language and Education* (ED 435 188). Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (ERIC No. ED435188)
- Singleton, G. E. (2014). *Courageous conversations about race: A field guide for achieving equity in schools* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2002). Marvelous human rights rhetoric and grim realities: Language rights in education. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 1(3), 179-205.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2015). Language rights. In W.E. Wright, S. Boun, and O Garcia (eds.) *Handbook of bilingual multilingual education* (pp. 186-202). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Phillipson, R. (Eds.) (1994). *Linguistic human rights: Overcoming linguistic discrimination*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Soltero-González, L., Escamilla, K., & Hopewell, S. (2010). A bilingual perspective on writing assessment: Implications for teachers of emerging bilingual writers. In G. Li & P. A. Edwards (Eds.), *Best practices in ELL instruction* (pp. 222-244). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Staehr Fenner, D., & Kuhlman, N. (2012). *Preparing effective teachers of English language learners: Practical applications for the TESOL P-12 Professional Teaching Standards*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL Press.
- Strickland, D. S., & Morrow, L. M. (Eds.). (1989). *Emerging literacy: Young children learn to read and write*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

- Sugarman, J. & Geary, C. (2018). English Learners in New York State: Demographics, outcomes, and state accountability policies. *Migration Fact Sheet of the National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Swinney, R., & Velasco, P. (2011). *Connecting content and academic language for English learners and struggling students. Grades 2-6*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Tarone, E., & Swain, M. (1995). A sociolinguistic perspective on second-language use in immersion classrooms. *Modern Language Journal*, 79(2), 24-46.
- Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). (2009). *Standards for the recognition of initial TESOL programs in P-12 ESL teacher education*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Télez, K. & Varghese, M. (2013). Teachers as intellectuals and advocates: Professional development for bilingual education teachers. *Theory Into Practice*, 52, #2, 128-135.
- Temple Adger, C., Snow, C., & Christian, D. (Eds.) (2018). *What teachers need to know about language* (2<sup>nd</sup>. Ed.) Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- The Aspen Institute (2017). How learning happens: Supporting students' social, emotional, and academic development: An interim report. Washington, DC: National commission on social, emotional, & academic development.
- The University of the State of New York. (2017). *Introduction to the New York State next generation English Language Arts learning standards*. New York, NY, Author.
- Tollefson, J. W., & Tsui, A. B. M. (2014). Language diversity and language policy in educational access and equity. *Review of Research in Education*, 38, 189–214.
- UNESCO (2003). Education in a multilingual world. UNESCO Education Position Paper. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved from:  
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001297/129728e.pdf>
- UNESCO (2010). Educational equity for children from diverse backgrounds: Mother tongue-based bilingual or multilingual education in the early years: Literature Review. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.unesco.org/en/languages-in-education/publications/>

- Valdés, G., & Figueroa, R. A. (1994). *Bilingualism and testing: A special case of bias*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Valdés, G., Menken, K., & Castro, M. (Eds.) (2015). *Common core bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing.
- Valdes, G. (2004). Between support and marginalization: The development of academic language in linguistic minority children. In J. Brutt-Griffer and M.M. Varghese, *Bilingualism and language pedagogy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, LTD.
- Valdez, V. E., Freire, J. A., & Delavan, M. Garrett (2016). The gentrification of Dual Language Education. *The Urban Review*, 48(4), pp. 601-627.
- Van Driel, J. H. & Berry, A. (2012). Teacher Professional Development Focusing on Pedagogical Content Knowledge. *Educational Researcher*, 41(1), 26-28.
- Veiga, C. (2018). New York City to add almost 50 bilingual programs, the latest in a push to help English learners. *Chalkbeat: Education News in Context*. Retrieved from: chalkbeat.org
- Velasco, P. (2012). Integrating content and academic language using Balanced Literacy structures: A framework ofr instruction of Emergent Bilinguals. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*, 3, pp. 9-42.
- Vogel, Ascenzi-Moreno, & Garcia. (2018). An expanded view of translanguaging: Leveraging the dynamic interactions between a young multilingual writer and machine translation software. In J. Choi & S. Ollerhead (Eds.) *Plurilingualism in teaching and learning: Complexities across contexts* (pp. 89-107). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Wagner, T. (2012). *Creating innovators: The making of young people who will change the world*. New York, NY: Scribner.
- Wasik, B., & Iannone-Campbell, C. (2012). Developing vocabulary through purposeful, strategic conversations. *Reading Teachers*, 66(2), 321-332.
- Wei, L., & Wu, C. (2009). Polite Chinese children revisited: Creativity and use of code-switching in the Chinese complementary school classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(2), 193-211.

- Wiley, T. G. (2002). Accessing language rights in education: A brief history of the U.S. context. In J. W. Tollefson (ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 39-64). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wiley, T. G. (2015). A brief history and assessment of language rights in the United States. In J. W. Tollefson (ed.), *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues* (2<sup>nd</sup>) (pp. 61-90). Taylor & Francis Group.
- Wiley, T. G. (2015). Language policy and planning in education. In W.E. Wright, S. Boun, and O Garcia (eds.) *Handbook of bilingual multilingual education* (pp. 164-184). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wilkins, J. L. M. (2002). The impact of teachers' content knowledge and attitudes on instructional beliefs and practices. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education*, (24th, Athens, GA, October 26-29, 2002) pp. 1-10, 1579-1587. (ERIC No. ED471775)
- Wilkinson, A. (1977). The concept of oracy. *English Education*, 17(4), 11-15. doi: 10.1080/0013191770170401a
- Williams, C. C. & Roberts, D. (2011). *Strategic oral language instruction in ELD: Teaching oracy to develop literacy*. Brea, CA: Ballard & Tighe Publishers.
- Wong Fillmore, L. (1985). When does teacher talk work as input? In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 17-50). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Wright, W. E. (2010). *Foundations for teaching English language learners: Research, theory, policy & practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Wright, W. E. (2015). *Foundations for teaching English language learners: Research, theory, policy & practice* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Zacarian, D. Alvarez-Ortiz, A. & Haynes, J. (2017). *Teaching to strengths: Supporting students living with trauma, violence and chronic stress*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Zwiers, J. (2007). Teacher practices and perspectives for developing academic language. *International journal of applied linguistics*, 17(1), pp 93-116.
- Zwiers, J. & Hamerla, S. (2018). *The K-3 guide to academic conversations: Practices, scaffolds, and activities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

---

<sup>i</sup> Students who speak languages other than English and who are acquiring English as well as other languages are known by many different terms within our field. OBEWL wants to highlight our choice of the official term “MLLs/ELLs” while recognizing that researchers, practitioners and others in the field use terminology other than this. Within this document, a variety of these terms are used because they appeared in the original publications referenced herein; however, in NYSED documents and in references culled from them, our students are referred to as MLLs/ELLs. We feel this term acknowledges the rich linguistic repertoire learners bring to and use in the important process of acquiring an additional language, such as English.