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Abstract

LANGUAGE POLICY AND ACCESS FOR ENGLISH LEARNERS: PEDAGOGY, OUTCOMES, AND ACCOUNTABILITY

By

Gustavo Gonzalez

Claremont Graduate University & San Diego State University

2010

English learners in U.S. schools have had a profound impact on policies that determine the method of instruction toward academic achievement and English proficiency. The methods for educating English learners have proven to be complex. The key issues concerning the education of English learners include language policy and how it impacts instructional pedagogy, student outcomes and school accountability (Espinoza & Ochoa, 1992; Gándara et al., 2003; Gay, 2000; Hakuta, 1995, Nieto, 2001, 2002, 2003; Rumberger & Gándara, 2004; Sleeter, 2005).

The research question addressed in this dissertation asks: How is language policy used by California public schools to address the spirit of state and federal language mandates while providing educational access to English learners?

Federal court cases Lau vs. Nichols (1974) and Castañeda vs. Pickard (1981), California state Proposition 227 (1997), and the federal education policy that mandates accountability based performance measure, No Child Left Behind (2001), inform the policy aspect of this research. This study examined how California public
schools have provided educational access to English learners in relation to pedagogy, student outcomes, and school accountability. The pedagogical elements examined included the teacher’s value for students, curriculum, and instruction, along with students’ language and achievement outcomes.

A case study approach (Yin, 2003) of five California schools was implemented to examine how schools provide educational access to English learners. The selected schools in this study implemented distinct instructional language and had varying school achievement levels. Classroom observations, focus groups, interviews, and trend data analysis were used to conduct a comparative analysis of the case studies results. Triangulated approaches were used to verify and support the patterns and trends in the findings.

This study found that (1) NCLB influenced the enactment of subtractive biliteracy language policy, (2) rigorous primary language instruction did not prevent students from reaching English proficiency, and (3) schools with high English learners’ English achievement levels created classroom conditions for critical student engagement. The significance of this study was to contribute to the understanding of effective language policies and educational pedagogy to further improve the conditions and practices that positively impact educational access for English learners.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Introducing the Teacher and Researcher

I taught in diverse urban schools educating Latino students who were learning English as a second language my entire career. My students were intelligent, perseverant, funny, bilingual, and, when provided the best conditions, motivated to learn.

I taught in bilingual programs in which the goal was to prepare students to be bilingual and biliterate individuals. This additive approach to bilingual education contradicts the subtractive approach of bilingual education in which students are prepared to only develop proficiency in their second language, English. Regardless, students learning English as a second language, also referred to as English learners, have struggled to gain the expected state and national academic achievement goals. This is further exemplified as the achievement gap between English learners and English only speaking students continues to widen, thus leading up to the inevitable question, why?

In the last decade the push for student accountability has made an enormous impact on the national educational landscape in terms of defining teacher quality, effective schools, student achievement, and the role of parents in their children’s education. Political agendas and conflicting ideologies on immigration and learning English has not only made in huge impact in California’s educational system but has influenced other states. With higher accountability for student achievement and a surge toward English only policies and ideals for English learners, a close examination of the conditions that impact English learners’ access to the best educational programs,
instruction, materials, and resources is warranted. Educators should be questioning how schools are meeting the academic needs of English learners’ within this era of high stakes testing, higher accountability, and English monolingual approach toward language proficiency.

Are English learners achieving? Are English learners learning? Are we providing English learners access to a meaningful and comprehensible education? Are we holding ourselves accountable to student achievement based on student outcomes? My experiences as a classroom teacher instilled in me the importance of caring about the future of my students and believing that they can meet and exceed any expectations set forth. My attention has always been focused on the success of my students and to provide the best educational program, curriculum, and instruction. Many times that meant battling administrators to defend the existence of our bilingual program. My fellow colleagues and I struggled to educate administrators and teachers of the basic principles of bilingual education and the implementation of an effective bilingual program. We struggled to provide appropriate materials to provide the most effective primary language instructional experience. And most importantly, we constantly battled the bombardment of the push for more English instruction and skills-based curriculum for our English learners. My responsibility as a researcher is to further explore the current educational practices and to challenge our educational leaders to take a critical look at the issues and challenges that English learners face everyday, and to find solutions to allow them to be successful in school and in the world.
Introducing the Research Study

English proficiency for English learners has been an intense and controversial topic in the United States for decades but none more intense than the last decade. Proposition 227 in California and the federal No Child Left Behind Act have made a significant impact on our education landscape as it relates to educating English learners. Historically, issues regarding immigrants and language have been the catalyst for racial, linguistic, political, and social tension in our country (Crawford, 1995; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Valencia, 1997). With the number of English learners growing every year throughout our nation, the tension persists. According to Cosentino De Cohen and Clewell (2007), 70% of English learners in America reside in Texas, Florida, Illinois, New York, and California. The majority English learners in the U. S. speak Spanish at home (Cosentino De Cohen & Clewell, 2007). Other states like Nevada, Nebraska, Georgia, and Arkansas are experiencing up to 200% - 300% growth rates. We are also seeing growth in other, somewhat unexpected areas of the country. Schools in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest region have most recently been experiencing an increase in English learner population (Wozniacka, 2008). The responsibility for school districts to respond to the needs of a diverse demographic of students poses many challenges.

But why is it important to pay close attention to the needs of Latino English learners? The answer lies in the numbers--the critical mass. The data shows that almost half (49%) of the student population in California is Latino. Nearly 25% of students are designated as English learners with 21% of them being Spanish speakers (Ed-Data, 2010). The data also shows that Latino and English learner subgroups are falling behind academically compared to other subgroups (White, Asian, Filipino, Pacific Islander,
American Indian) when measuring state achievement growth (California Department of Education, Ed-Data, 2010).

Figure 1 illustrates the percent of second through sixth grades students in California reaching proficient and advanced levels in the language arts section of the 2009 California Standards Test (CST). The White and English only students have the largest percentage of students scoring at proficient and advanced level, while the economically disadvantaged Latinos and English learners has the least. An average of 77 percent of White students and 61 percent of English only students scored at proficient and advanced levels, followed by Latinos with an average of 58 percent. An average of 52 percent economically disadvantaged Whites, 34 percent of economically disadvantaged Latinos,
and 25 percent of English learners scored at proficient and advanced levels. The trend in Figure 1 shows that by sixth grade the same or higher percentage of White and English only students scored at proficient and advanced levels as compared to second grade. By sixth grade a lower percentage of economically disadvantaged Latino and English learner students scored at proficient and advanced levels on the CST dipping after fourth grade (CDE, Data Quest, 2010). This graph represents the achievement demographics for English learners in the majority of classrooms in the state.

An increase in schools’ English learner populations brings about new challenges and tensions for teachers and administrators. The most common tension involves language and how to best teach second language learners to acquire English proficiency (Gándara, 1997; Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, Garcia, Asato, Gutierrez, Stritikus, & Curry, 2000; Gándara & Rumberger, 2007; Gándara, Rumberger, & Maxwell-Jolly, 2008: Gándara, Rumberger, Maxwell-Jolly & Callahan, 2003). The challenge for schools is to provide English learners with access to a meaningful education. The reality is that most schools with high English learner student enrollment unsuccessfully prepare English learners to meet their intended academic goals. According to Richard Fry (2008) English learners are less likely to score at or above proficiency levels in standardized tests and are concentrated in Title I schools with large student enrollments. A great portion of students in those schools lives at or near poverty and a great portion of those schools have a high teacher-student ratio. The characteristics of such schools promote unacceptable conditions for learning for many English learners, thus maintaining the achievement gap.

Researchers (Baltodano, 2005; Crawford, 1995; Darling-Hammond, 2004; Gándara & Rumberger, 2007; Gándara et al, 2003; Gándara et al, 2008; Gold, 2006;
Guzmán-Johannessen, 2008; Lachat, 1999; Ochoa & Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004) have examined such factors as school policy, programs, instruction, assessment, resources, and teacher quality in schools and have found many inequities that negatively impact English learners outcomes. Gándara, Rumberger, Maxwell-Jolly & Callahan (2003) closely examined the achievement data and the conditions in California schools for English learners. Gándara et al. (2003) reported seven factors that they found contributed to inequitable conditions in schools that perpetuated the achievement gap between English learners and white native English speakers:

1. inequitable access to appropriately trained teachers;
2. inadequate professional development opportunities to help teachers address the instructional needs of English learners;
3. inequitable access to appropriate assessment to measure EL achievement, gauge their learning needs, and hold the system accountable for their progress;
4. inadequate instructional time to accomplish learning goals;
5. inequitable access to instructional materials and curriculum;
6. inequitable access to adequate facilities; and
7. intense segregation into schools and classrooms that place them at particularly high risks for educational failure

These and other factors that foster inequitable conditions in schools for English learners are damaging to students and deny them the right for equal access to a meaningful education. There is little doubt that administrators and teachers are doing all they can to meet the needs of diverse student populations in schools, however, ultimately they are accountable for student achievement. Nevertheless, schools that do meet the academic
and linguistic needs of large English learner populations exist in California. The schools possess characteristics that create optimal conditions for learning and developing language.

Regardless of the controversy surrounding bilingual education, especially under the mist of NCLB and Proposition 227, students in bilingual programs learn English and reach levels of academic achievement equivalent or better than students in English only programs (Ramirez, Yuen, Ramey & Pasta, 1991; Slavin & Cheung, 2005). Norm Gold (2006) studied six successful schools in California. All schools maintained high English learner enrollments and implemented a bilingual program. The purpose of this study was to present clear examples of bilingual schools that were preparing students to achieve at high academic levels. Gold (2006) reported that the English learners in these schools developed English proficiency.

The schools featured in this study illustrated that it is feasible to implement successful bilingual education programs in which English learners develop high levels of academic English proficiency. (p. 48)

This study identified many characteristics of effective schools effective programs for English learners:

- bilingual programs were a school-wide effort;
- teachers collaborated and team taught, particularly for ELD instruction;
- staff demonstrated extensive language and cultural competency;
- staff displayed overall support for language and cultural diversity;
- staff demonstrated a focus on the individual student and differentiated instruction;
- school culture emphasized consistent monitoring of students’ progress and teaching to rigorous academic standards;
• staff articulated rigorous expectations of staff and students;
• consistent leadership supported and benefited program and instruction; and
• staff demonstrated a focus on consistent, coherent program design.

The schools in this study demonstrated that they could provide effective instruction in English and in the students’ primary language and still meet the expected achievement goals for English learners. These findings are consistent with the language acquisition research literature. These schools achieved results for English proficiency, thus meeting the goals for No Child Left Behind and Proposition 227, yet this only represents a small number of school that provide English learners with access to a meaningful academic experience.

The reality is that a small percentage of English learners are being provided with the appropriate conditions to reach high levels of achievement while the majority of English learners are being left behind. Why is this so? How do No Child Left Behind and Proposition 227 impact the ability for schools to provide educational access to English learners? What role do the Lau v. Nichols and Castañeda v. Pickard federal mandates play in impacting the ability for schools to provide educational access to English learners? No Child Left Behind has refocused the attention of school accountability for all students (United States Department of Education, 2002). School and districts are now held responsible for ensuring that students are achieving and showing academic growth on a yearly basis. This aspect of NCLB has put the emphasis on targeting English learner achievement. One concern is that the only measure for showing achievement is standardized test results. This aspect of NCLB has put the pressure on schools to assure that students do well on the standardized test (Wood, 2004). The main concern is that
schools are narrowing their instructional approach for the purpose of preparing students to do well on the test, thus limiting them access to a complete educational experience. Linda Darling-Hammond (2004) argues that simply testing children will not result in being more accountable. Funding needs to be available to provide adequate resources, curriculum opportunities, materials, and improve teacher quality.

Just offering high stakes tests does not provide what parents and children would call genuine accountability. Obviously, students will not learn at higher levels unless they experience good teaching, a strong curriculum, and adequate resources. (p. 26)

With higher accountability on schools to show annual growth for all students, schools have more incentive to prepare students for the test rather than teaching students to learn. All students, regardless of language proficiency, will take the standardized test. Proposition 227 (1997) ensures that students receive instruction in English, and with the pressure for schools to meet expected achievement goals, a majority of schools have reduced or eliminated bilingual classrooms and primary language instruction (Crawford, 2003; Gándara & Rumberger, 2002, 2007; Kerper-Mora, 2000; Parrish, 2006). English learners transition into English-only classrooms sooner which may limit their English development since the research shows that it takes about four to seven year to gain academic English proficiency (Collier, 1987; Cummins, 1981b; Hakuta, Butler & Witt, 2000; Thomas & Collier, 1997). The proposition also has a clause where parents can complete a waiver to request an alternative program for their children. Whether the parents’ rights for due process are being respected is a matter worth examining. The push for more English instruction and high accountability testing has changed the educational landscape over the last decade. These changes raise some interesting issues that concern
student and parent rights to access for a meaningful education, due process, and equal opportunity education.

**Conceptual Framework**

The federal and state mandates, No Child Left Behind, and Proposition 227 (English for the Children), have made a huge imprint on education in California. Other influential federal mandates, Lau v. Nichols (1974) and Castaneda v. Pickard (1981), have historically held districts and schools accountable for providing students of color and English learners with access to a meaningful and equitable education. These federal and state mandates have been influential in determining the language policy that is set by the state, districts and schools.

The Language Policy Accountability (LPA) framework in Figure 2 was created to examine how school language policy impacts teacher pedagogy, student outcomes, and the school accountability. The LPA framework outlines the process of accountability beginning with the language policy for instruction and outcomes. The language policy influences the instructional pedagogy practices in schools. The instructional language, expectations for students, curriculum, and instructional practices are critical pedagogical elements that impact effective implementation in schools (Gay, 2000, Nieto, 2001, 2002, Sleeter, 2005). Further, pedagogy informs student outcomes (achievement scores and language acquisition levels), which reflect the intended goals of the policy.
This research takes the position that the outcomes should determine the type of professional development that will be provided in schools and that policy should be critically examined to assure that it is appropriate and promotes access and achievement for all students, especially for English learners. Districts and schools have a lot at stake with the testing accountability. First, with No Child Left Behind (NCLB) schools bear a greater responsibility to show continuous student academic growth based on students’ state standardized test performance. Failure to do so results may lead to local and/or state public identification of the school’s status and sanctions or withholding of funding (Abernathy, 2007). Second, the California Standards Test (CST) is administered to all students solely in English, regardless of their English proficiency level. This may influence schools with high English learner populations to implement more English instruction and adjust their instructional practices to prepare students to perform well on the state tests. As a result of such pressure to perform possibly influences how district
and school administrators interpret the policy, which will then influence schools’ pedagogy and implementation.

**Significance of Study**

This research will discuss how schools’ language policies address the spirit of the state and federal mandates and provided educational access to English learners. Understanding how language policy informs the selection and implementation programs for English learners can lead to more effective methods for instructional implementation and school accountability. Identifying effective pedagogical elements that positively impact English learner outcomes can lead to developing effective professional development opportunities for teachers, administrators, and school staff. Identifying school characteristics that are beneficial or detrimental to English learner outcomes can assist administrators in (1) creating language policies that promote access and achievement for all students and (2) establishing schools that promote additive language goals, with principles for democratic education, and expectations of student empowerment. These findings will be influential toward further improving the preparation of future teachers to understand the cultural and linguistic complexity of the current American classroom and to effectively implement the best instructional practices that meet the academic and linguistic needs of our diverse student population.
Research Questions

English learners have been impacted by English-only policies, high stakes testing, resources, teacher quality, and condition for learning. Schools are held accountable for student achievement growth, but with Latinos and English learners underachieving, we would have to question whether it is enough. Taking a qualitative and quantitative case study approach, the research questions frame this study examining language policy, pedagogy, outcomes, and accountability in schools:

1. How is language policy used by California public schools to address the spirit of state and federal language mandates while providing educational access to English learners?
   a. How are schools providing educational access for English learners?
   b. How are schools providing effective implementation of programs for English learners based on sound educational theory and with adequate resources?
   c. How are schools providing English learners and their parents due process, access to information, and the option to request for alternative programs?
   d. How are schools holding themselves accountable for English learner achievement and language development outcomes?

The answer to these questions provide a clearer picture of the impact that the language policy in schools have on the overall educational experience for English learners and the process for accountability taken by the parents, teachers, and administrators. The researcher set out not only to examine the impact of language policy on pedagogy, outcomes, and accountability, but also to document the effective
instructional practices that provide educational access for academic rigor and language proficiency in schools.

Methodological Approach

This research study used a qualitative and quantitative methodology. Included in this methodology is a multiple case study approach of five schools in one California school district. A multiple case study approach was selected to conduct an in-depth examination of the instructional practices for English learners in schools (Yin, 2003). The multiple case study approach best meets the purpose of this study. According to Yin (2003), a case study “investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p. 13). When analyzing policy and the reality of the implementation of the policy, many different variables may be presented throughout the investigation. The methods for investigating the relationship between policy, implementation, and outcomes requires the input from different stakeholders and where trends and themes will become the major data points for analysis. Therefore, a multiple case study design was selected to allow the researcher to clarify the qualitative and trend analysis findings in regards to the relationship between policy, pedagogy, and outcomes.

The English Learner Educational Access Continuum in Figure 3 illustrates the essential components for examining schools: biliteracy focus, pedagogy for English learners, student outcomes, and accountability (Gonzalez, 2010). Each construct is defined by a continuum that will be utilized to better explain the context of the
instructional practices implemented in schools for English learners. This continuum is further articulated in chapter three of this dissertation.

This study selected five schools based on English learner enrollment. This main factor is identified as the control variable in the selection of the schools. Data sources for

Figure 3. English Learner Educational Access Continuum
the case studies include school/classroom observations, teacher and parent focus groups, and principal interviews. Interviews and focus groups were conducted to allow the researcher reach a greater depth of response and cover a greater volume of the topics and issues regarding each school’s language policy, structure, curriculum, instruction, and teacher attitudes and beliefs. Observations were conducted in classrooms to gather information regarding teacher instruction, curriculum, learning environment, teacher attitude, and program implementation. Each classroom required a minimum of one visit and a maximum of three visits. Along with the qualitative data, a trend data analysis examined student language arts Content Standard Test (CST) scores, Standards Test in Spanish (STS) language arts scores, and California English language Development Test (CELDT) levels to find trends and patterns for academic achievement and language proficiency development.

**Indicators of Effective Conditions for Learning**

The Indicators of Effective Conditions for Learning (Gonzalez, 2010) in Figure 4 provided the theoretical foundation for effective instructional practices for English learners. This framework illustrates four constructs for effective EL learning: (a) cultural awareness and diversity, (b) authentic learning, (c) collaborative learning, and (d) expectations for learning. Each construct was defined by the pedagogical conditions proven by the research literature focused on the Principles for Life-long Learning, Optimal Learning Environments, and Standards for Effective Pedagogy to be effective for providing educational access for English learners (Banks, Au, Ball, Bell, Gordon, Gutiérrez, et al., 2007; Ruiz, García, & Figueroa, 1996; Tharp, Estrada, Dalton, &
Yamauchi, 2000). These indicators were utilized to observe teachers and classrooms and provide a guide for determining the level of effectiveness for English learners in regards to the classroom environment, instructional approaches, and the teachers’ attitudes and expectations for student learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Awareness and Diversity</th>
<th>Authentic Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates cultural awareness and diversity</td>
<td>Whole texts for explicit teaching of skills/strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop language/biliteracy across curriculum</td>
<td>Scaffolding learning of content and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of home language for developing English</td>
<td>Authentic purpose for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage students with challenging lessons</td>
<td>Meaning first, followed by form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect lessons to students’ lives</td>
<td>Student-centered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4. Indicators of Effective Conditions for Learning**

Assumptions of the Study

Assumptions have been made regarding the selected schools and the participants in this study.

1. The five selected Southern California schools are representative of California schools with similar English learner population.
2. The participants provided factual information and opinions regarding the school practices for English learners.
3. The school district and schools reported accurate and complete results data.

Limitations of the Research

The intention of this study was to draw attention to the impact of language policy on the educational practices in California schools regarding educational access for English learners. The limitations in this study must be noted in order to inform the present study and to guide future research in this area. First, the principal, teacher and parent participants were limited to five school sites in one Southern California school district with a considerable number of English learner student enrollments. Information was gathered only from the participants in these five school sites and therefore cannot be generalized beyond this select sample group.

The results of this study may not reflect the conditions of all California schools with over 50% English learner student population. Schools from different school districts may characterize different conditions for learning for students. Districts’ policies and schools’ structures differ from district to district and school to school, therefore cannot be generalized to the entire state.
The principal researcher previously worked as a teacher in the school district for six years and was a former teacher in one of the five schools in this study. Knowing about the school district has its advantage as far being to make a contextual connection with the schools in this study, but it is also a limitation due to the nature of objectivity in the examination and analysis of the schools.

Finally, this study was conducted from November 2009 to April 2010 and is limited to the data collected during this time only. The information provided by the participants may change over time.

**Organization of the Study**

This dissertation contains seven chapters. Chapter One introduces the researcher, the study, the significance of the study, and the research questions. Chapters Two presents a historical timeline of state and federal mandates and the implications for educational language policy in schools. Chapter Three reviews the research literature pertaining to the education of students learning English as a second language in U.S. schools, which encompasses biliteracy, instruction, curriculum, value for students, student outcomes, and accountability. Chapter Four describes in detail the methodology used in this study, including a description of the participants, the school context, a description of the interview questions, a description of the focus group prompts, the observational approach used, and a description of the student achievement data. Chapter Five presents a case study report on each of the five schools in the study, which illustrates the results from the principal interview, the teacher focus group, the parent focus group, observations, and student achievement data. Chapter Six presents the policy analysis of
the NCLB, Proposition 227, Lau v. Nichols, and Castañeda v. Pickard, juxtaposed with the case study results. Finally, Chapter Seven gives a summary of the study, reflections, lessons learned, recommendations for future research, and final thoughts of the researcher.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms used in this study have the meaning as defined below.

**Alternative Bilingual:** Classrooms where the academic instruction is provided in Spanish with a daily-designated time in English. Specifically designed integrated lessons incorporate English usage and are included throughout the day. These programs require a Parent Waiver at non-charter schools.

**API scores:** Measures the academic performance and growth of schools based on test results of the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program, the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE), and the California Alternative Performance Assessment (CAPA).

**AYP scores:** A measurement defined by the federal No Child Left Behind Act to determine how every public school and school district is performing academically according to results on standardized tests.

**Biliteracy:** Teaching and learning to read, write, speak and listen in two languages.

**BCLAD:** Bilingual Crosscultural, Language, and Academic Development certificate

**CLAD:** Crosscultural, Language, and Academic Development certificate

**CST:** The California Standards Test evaluates student achievement in language arts and math beginning in second grade.
**Dual language:** A form of education in which students are taught literacy and content in two languages.

**ELD (English Language Development):** Instruction designed specifically for English language learners to develop their listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in English.

**English learner:** A child who does not speak English or whose native language is not English and who is not currently able to perform ordinary classroom work in English.

**GLAD (Guided Language Acquisition Design):** Is a model of professional development with proven replicability in schools. Through the training, teachers are provided with research, theory, and practical, effective strategies that promote academic language, literacy, academic achievement, and cross-cultural skills.

**GRR (Gradual Release of Responsibility):** Is a research-based instructional model where the responsibility for task completion shifts gradually over time from the teacher to the student.

**LAS Links:** Assesses English language proficiency for initial placement of English language learners, helps track the progress of English language learners throughout the school year, and the results help teachers adjust instruction to help student gain English proficiency more quickly. It also helps determine whether students are ready to exit a school’s English language program.

**Mainstream English:** A classroom in which the students either are native English speakers or already have acquired reasonable fluency in English.

**Outcomes:** The designated student academic and language assessment results.

**Pedagogy:** Principles and methods of instruction.
Program Improvement: An accountability based status identified for schools that do not make Adequate Yearly Progress to ensure that no group is left behind and improvement or corrective action measures are taken.

SDAIE (Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English): Also known as Sheltered English, is a teaching approach used to provide meaningful instruction in the content area for English learners to make sure they learn academic content while they reach English proficiency.

SEI (Structured English Instruction): An English language acquisition process for young children in which nearly all classroom instruction is in English but with the curriculum and presentation designed for children who are learning the language, also known as Sheltered English immersion.

STS: The Standards Test in Spanish evaluates non-English native student achievement in Spanish language arts and math beginning in second grade.

TPR (Total Physical Response): A method of teaching language using physical movement to make language comprehensible and lower anxiety for students.

Value for learners: Teacher attitudes and beliefs toward teaching, student learning, and understanding of students’ language and cultural resources and assets.
CHAPTER TWO

LANGUAGE POLICY IN THE UNITED STATES

Since the time the European conquerors invaded the Americas the issue of language has been of great importance. The European conquerors converted the native indigenous peoples into Christianity and forced them to learn the dominant language of the church as part of their enlightenment. In the late 1800s the United States government targeted Native American tribes and sent their children away to government boarding schools to learn English and learn American customs as a way of civilizing them (Crawford; 2000, Tollefson, 2000). Language policy is a formal or informal, written or unwritten plan of action intended to influence language acquisition and language use (Spolsky, 2004, Tollefson, 2000). The United State has a rich history of enforcing official and unofficial policies that directly and indirectly impact the attitudes, beliefs and actions toward language. This eventually manifests itself in education that reflect the philosophical, political and social tensions throughout American society. This section will provide a brief historical timeline of state and federal mandates and the implications for educational language policy.

Historical Timeline of U.S. Language Policy

Tension has always existed in America in regards to English and the acknowledgement of other languages. The sense of a multilingual nation have always been tolerated but never accepted as a reality in our country. Minority languages or languages other than English were perceived as inferior thus making English the
preferred language for national unity and hegemonic dominance (Tollefson, 2000). This was historically evident during World War I with the German American communities. The German American communities had established successful German language schools but due to the war, nativist attacks became more prevalent. They were harassed and their patriotism was questioned. Soon policies restricting other language use in school and churches were enacted and eventually impacted other immigrant groups and Native Americans (Wiley, 2000).

According to Tollefson (2000) there were four eras of language policy in U.S. history: restrictive, promotion, tolerance, restrictive. The United States government followed a restrictive language policy from 1880 to the 1950s due to the rise in immigration from northern Europe. From 1958 to 1980 foreign language learning was promoted due to the frightening concern of not being able to technologically compete with the Soviets after they launched Sputnik into orbit in 1957. An attitude of tolerance toward minority language learning was prevalent during the decade of the 1980s with the implementation of bilingual education in schools, but in the 1990s a restrictionist attitude reemerged.

Birth of the official English movement and decreased governmental support for bilingual education amid renewed expectations that newcomers replace their native languages with English. (Tollefson, 2000, p. 48)

Alberto Ochoa (1995) examined the language policy in the United States and provided a clear analysis addressing the issues of “language rights and educational tensions” for immigrant communities in our nation schools (p. 227). Ochoa (1995) focused on six historical milestones in our country that have impacted the struggle for non-native English students to attain equal educational opportunity:
1) 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution 1868;
2) Plessy v. Ferguson Supreme Court Decision of 1896;
3) Brown v. Board of Education Supreme Court Decision of 1954;
4) Civil Rights Act of 1964;
5) Department of Health, Education and Welfare 1970; and

The following state and federal mandate historic timeline in Table 1 will present and discuss the work of Ochoa (1995) along with the current mandates that impact the language policies in schools for culturally and linguistically diverse students.

14th Amendment of the United States Constitution 1869

The implications of the 14th Amendment of the United States to language policy in education is that it provides individuals with equal protection under the law and establishes the principle of equal opportunity (Ochoa, 1995). Section 2 of the 14th Amendment states:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law, which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. (U.S. Constitution, Amendment 14, Section 1, 1868)

These directives have played an integral role in the implementation and evaluation of sound educational practices for ethnically and linguistically diverse students. Race, ethnicity, and language have been key factors for educators in granting or denying students any privileges for a meaningful education.
**Plessy v. Ferguson 1896**

The Plessy v. Ferguson Supreme Court decision was influential in further defining the concept of equal opportunity as meaning separate but equal (Ochoa, 1995). Following the adoption of the 14th Amendment the application of the equal protection clause was unclear, particularly for the newly freed ex-slaves in the south. The Plessy v. Ferguson decision challenged a Louisiana statute that required Blacks and Whites to sit in separate cars or trains on the grounds that it was in discord the equal protection of the law and due process provisions in the 14th Amendment. The Supreme Court interpreted the equal protection clause as separate but equal thus establishing segregation of the races as being constitutional (Ochoa, 1995). This greatly impacted how the concept of equal opportunity was defined and implemented throughout the nation. The separation of a society between people of color and whites in housing, jobs, public accommodations, and schools was law for 58 years.

**Alvarez v. Lemon Grove School Board 1931**

The Alvarez v. Lemon Grove School Board California Supreme Court case (Superior Court of the State of California, Writ of Mandate, No. 66625, 1931), also known as the Lemon Grove Incident challenged the separate but equal doctrine where Latino children were segregated based on their national origin and language (Ochoa, 1995). Latino parents in Lemon Grove, CA were outraged to know that their children were no longer allowed to assist the school that they had attended for years. The principal turned away all the Latino children and told them that they were no longer allowed at the school. The Lemon Grove School District Board made the decision to
separate the Latino children from the white children. The Latino children were ordered to attend school in an old dilapidated two-room schoolhouse on their side of town because of their ethnicity and language. The decision was made without consulting with the parent under the assumption that the parents would be passive and accept the new change. The Latino parents did not stand for the unjust treatment of their children and took the Lemon Grove School District to California Supreme Court and won, thus challenging the *separate but equal* doctrine and “established the rights of their children to equal education” (Alvarez, 1986, p. 116). This was the earliest court decision that challenged school segregation in U.S. History (Alvarez, 1986).

**Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas 1954**

The Brown v. Board of Education Supreme Court decision concluded that the segregation of children in schools solely on the basis of race denies children the equal protection of the law under the Fourteenth Amendment (Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483, 1954). Chief Justice Warren delivered his opinion to the court:

Segregation with the sanction of the law, therefore, has a tendency to [retard] the educational and mental development of Negro children and deprives them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racially integrated school system… Any language in Plessy v. Ferguson contrary to this finding is rejected…We conclude that, in the field of education, the doctrine of ‘separate but equal’ has no place. (347 U.S. 483, 1954)

The significance of the Brown v. Board of Education decision was immense in that it refuted the *separate but equal* doctrine and made clear that the segregation of Black and White students was unconstitutional. Schools and school districts were ordered to desegregate schools with *deliberate speed*. The Brown v. Board of Education decision grounded the principle of equal educational opportunity for all students (Ochoa, 1995).
While it was a giant step toward complete desegregation of public schools that milestone was yet to be reached (Cozzens, 1998).

**Civil Rights Act of 1964**

In response to the Brown v. Board of Education decision the U.S Congress legislated into public law the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Ochoa, 1995). The Civil Rights Act of 1964 called for the desegregation of public education and schools, and nondiscrimination on the grounds of race, color, or national origin (42 U.S.C., cf2 Civil Rights Act of 1964)(cf0)

> No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. (P.L. 88-352, Title VI, Section 601)

The U.S. government was called to forbid discrimination on account of race, color, or nation origin (language) in any federal funded activity and established the foundation for defending non-English speaking students’ language rights under the principle of an equal opportunity education in schools (Ochoa, 1995).

By 1970, the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare informed all school districts with more than 5% national origin minority children how Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 applied to linguistically diverse immigrant students (Ochoa, 1995). The memorandum sent to school districts specified the intent of affirmative steps that needed to be taken to include national origin minority children as active participants in learning. School districts were directed to take positive steps to provide the appropriate instructional programs to improve their language proficiency in English (Ochoa, 1995).
Table 1

United States State and Federal Policy Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>United States Policy</th>
<th>Language Policy Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>The 14th Amendment of U.S. Constitution</td>
<td>Equal opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Plessy v. Ferguson Supreme Court Decision</td>
<td>Separate but equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Alvarez v. Lemon Grove School Board, California Supreme Court Decision</td>
<td>Desegregation regardless of national origin and language—challenge separate but equal doctrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas Supreme Court Decision</td>
<td>Overruled “separate but equal” decisions—established principle of equal educational opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Civil Rights Act</td>
<td>Equal opportunity for linguistically diverse students—forbid discrimination, exclusion or denied benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Memorandum to school districts</td>
<td>Rectify student language needs—equal access—desegregation—inform parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Lau v. Nichols Supreme Court Decision</td>
<td>Equal benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Castañeda v. Pickard Supreme Court Decision</td>
<td>Sound theory—adequate resources—effective implementation for districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Proposition 227-English for the Children</td>
<td>Monolingualism—subtractive bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>No Child Left Behind Act</td>
<td>Accountability—high stakes testing in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Lau v. Nichols Supreme Court Decision 1974**

In San Francisco, CA, 1971, 2800 Chinese ancestry children enrolled in the schools did not speak English but only 1000 children were in English language assistance programs and the rest were in regular English-only classes (National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium, 2004). A class action suit was filed in the name of Kinney Lau’s because his children were failing school because they could not understand what was being instructed (Crawford, 1995). Second language instruction and content instruction in the basic skill areas in the target language of the students were argued in the complaint (Ochoa, 1995). The court ruled in that the school district was denying students a meaningful education by failing to provide English language instruction to non-English speaking students (Crawford, 1995; Ochoa, 1995). Justice William O’ Douglas wrote:

> There is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education. (Crawford, 1995, p. 45)

Ochoa (1995) confirmed that the Lau decision determined a denial of equal educational opportunity, authorized the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and affirmed the validity of the HEW 1970 memorandum. This decision also affirmed the authority of the government to give special attention to the needs of linguistically diverse immigrant students. This action led the Office of Civil Rights to issue the Lau Remedies in 1975.

**Castañeda v. Pickard Supreme Court Decision 1981**

The Castañeda v. Pickard court involved Mexican American children and their parents against the Raymondville, Texas Independent School District in Texas alleging that the district’s policies and practices discriminated against the students thus violating
the rights secured to them by the Fourteenth Amendment, Civil Rights Act of 1964, and Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1974 (648 F. 2nd 989, 5th Circuit, 1981). The school district was charged with racially and ethnically discriminatory process for ability grouping, failing to implement adequate bilingual education, and practices for the hiring and promotion of faculty and administrators. The decision of the courts resulted in outlining a three part criteria for school districts to assure that they are in compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requirements (Crawford, 1995, Ochoa, 1995). The first part of the criteria needs school districts to demonstrate that the instructional programs are based on sound educational theory. The second part of the criteria needs school districts to effectively implement the program practices with adequate resources and personnel. And the third part of the criteria needs schools to evaluate their programs to assure the effective implementation and is based on sound educational theory (648 F.2d 989, 5th Circuit, 1981).

**California Proposition 227 1997**

In 1997, California voters passed Proposition 227, also known as the ‘English for the Children’ initiative. Ron Unz, a wealthy Silicon Valley entrepreneur, spearheaded the campaign to teach young immigrant children “English as rapidly and effectively as possible” (California Education Code, Chapter 3 Article1 Section 300f, 2010) and end bilingual education (Hornblower, 1998).

All children in California public schools shall be taught English by being taught in English. In particular, this shall require that all children be placed in English language classrooms. Children who are English learners shall be educated through sheltered English immersion during a temporary transition period not normally intended to exceed one year. (California Education Code, Chapter 3 Article 2 Section 305, 2010)
Three main components emerged from the initiative: (1) all children will be taught English by teaching them in English, (2) parents will have the right to sign a waiver for an alternative program, and (3) funds will be allocated for adult English classes for parents.

*No Child Left Behind 2001*

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and emphasized an improvement in school performance. The NCLB Act proposed an increase accountability for States, school districts, and schools, greater choice for parents and students, more flexibility in the use of federal education dollars, and stronger emphasis on reading (United States Department of Education, 2004). The increased accountability for states and districts was to be accomplished by (1) adopting challenging academic content standards for all children in language arts/reading, math and science, and (2) implementing a single, statewide state accountability system based on academic standards to measure the adequate yearly progress (AYP). States and schools are required to measure the achievement of students with disabilities, students that are economically disadvantaged, students from major racial and ethnic groups, and students with limited English proficiency (U.S. DOE, Part A Subpart 1 Sec. 1111 b2CvII, 2002). At least 95% of the students in each subgroup are required to take the language arts/reading assessments (U.S. DOE, Part A Subpart 1 Sec. 1111 b2lii, 2002). Students who have attended school in the U.S. for three or more consecutive years are required to take the assessment in English unless determined by the
district or school, on a case-by-case individual basis, that the assessment in another language would yield more accurate and reliable information. Assessment results are disaggregated by gender, racial and ethnic group, English proficiency status, migrant status, economically disadvantaged and disabilities and should be clearly provided to parents (U.S. DOE, Part A Subpart 1 Sec. 1111 b3Cx-xiii, 2002). Districts will publicize and disseminate the results to parents, teachers, principals, schools, and the community. Another part of the NCLB Act encourages schools and districts to offer family literacy services for parents.

The U.S. language policy executed in schools has permeated throughout history, as a result of social, racial, political, and, in some cases, economic developments of our nation. The implications of the state and federal mandates mentioned in this section illustrate the progressive struggle for equity and justice for underrepresented minority and immigrant groups in our history in the courts. To this day, the struggle for equity and justice continues. The battle against the marginalization of culturally and linguistically diverse students in schools continues. The issues concerning language policy for language acquisition and proficiency for English learners remain points of tension for administrators, teachers, students, and parents. Further discussion ensues on the points of tension with language policy and state and federal educational mandates.

Points of Tension with State and Federal Mandates Language Policy

The language of instruction, the expectations of students, and instructional methods for English learners are key elements that should be considered for educating English learners (Banks, 2001; Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004; Gándara et al., 2003; Gándara &

David Corson (1999) stated that language policies in schools could play a role in the following ways.

First, by creating innovative, ingenious, and emancipatory structures in school, language policies can help students from marginal backgrounds to escape the unreasonable pressures to conform that schools often place on them. Second, language policies offer a vehicle for educators to use in challenging unfair practices and structures. Finally, language policies provide a planned way for schools to extend high-quality education to all their students without discrimination. (p. 16-17)

If language policy in school can be a powerful instrument for challenging the status quo and providing structures in schools for emancipatory education, then it can also be used as an instrument for creating oppressive and restricting conditions for already marginalized student populations, as has been the case throughout U.S. history. The potential for meeting the needs of ethnically and linguistically diverse students is present, unfortunately, the institutionalized hegemony is often too powerful and limits teachers’ ability to take action for what is fair for their students (Corson, 1999).

Antonia Darder (1991, p. 36) explains that language domination is sustained in schools by systematically silencing and stripping away their home language through “values and beliefs that support its inferiority to Standard English”.

Even where bilingual programs exist, these values and beliefs are reflected strongly in school policies that encourage the rapid mainstreaming of bicultural students into English-only environments or provide only English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction to students who are limited English speakers. (Darder, 1991, p. 37)
The social and political environment concerning language policy and academic achievement for English learners over the last 45 years has been tense and controversial. The Lau v. Nichols (1974) ruling established that school districts must make the content accessible to all non-English speaking students and comply with title VI of the Civil Rights act of 1964.

Where inability to speak and understand the English language excludes national origin-minority group children from effective participation in the educational program offered by a school district, the district must take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open its instructional program to these students. (VI of the Civil Rights act of 1964)

Title VI Civil Rights Act (1964) section 2000d states that

No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.

Castañeda v. Pickard (1981) provided guidelines of accountability for school districts to show compliance in implementing special programs with sound educational theory and principles, effective implementation, and adequate resources. Schools and districts were being held responsible for providing a meaningful education for their diverse populations and for many schools, this was an opportunity for schools to provide students with instruction and materials in their native language.

The Lau v. Nichols decision did not directly mandate the creation of bilingual programs in schools, but some schools and districts with large populations of non-native English speakers created bilingual programs to support their learning and language development (Crawford, 1995). The goal of bilingual education and language acquisition has been to provide effective content and language instruction in the student’s native language so that they can transfer that knowledge into English (Krashen, 1992). The
predominant language policies, which dictate the language implementation of bilingual education programs, stem from a deficit language model that result in implementation of monolingual and subtractive bilingual language practices that limit students learning English as a second language (Cummins, 2001; Darder, 1991; Krashen, 1992). Monolingual language policies benefit English monolingual students and limit English learners in accessing the core curriculum (Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004; Cummins, 2001).

The alternative to a subtractive language policy model is an additive language model. Additive bilingual models promote the continued development a student’s primary language proficiency while they develop their English proficiency (Lambert, 1987). It adds to their existing language while they learn a second language. This language model promotes biliteracy, promotes first language development, the acquisition of English as a second language, and is accessible to English monolingual students. Currently more schools are providing additive bilingual programs for their students, unfortunately, these services are being offered predominantly to white middle-to-upper class students (Nieto, 2002).

The tensions for teaching English learners in a language other than English in California schools reached its peak in 1997 when the English For The Children initiative, also known as proposition 227, was proposed (Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004). Proponents of the proposition felt that bilingual education had failed and that English learners were being harmed by bilingual education (Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004; Crawford, 1995). Proponents of Proposition 227 believed that English immersion would work better for English learners based on the theory that the more English instruction they received the faster they would learn English. By 2001, the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act further reinforces the
push for more English in California schools through an extensive accountability process. As a result, many schools’ and districts’ language policies manifest themselves as monolingual language policies. The consequences of English-only oriented language policies may possibly contradict the spirit of Lau v. Nichols in terms of providing English learners equality of treatment for a meaningful education. That leads to question the validity of the programs and materials that schools are authorized to implement, thus possibly contradicting Castañeda v. Pickard accountability guidelines for effectively educating English learners.

The Lau v. Nichols, Castañeda v. Pickard, Proposition 227, and NCLB mandates will be further explored to identify the point of tension that exist within each for educating culturally and linguistically diverse students.

**Point of Tension with Lau v. Nichols**

Following the ruling of the Lau v. Nichols court case in 1974, the federal government notified school districts to act in enacting the new mandate to be in compliance. The Lau decision affirmed the authority of the government to require affirmative remedial efforts to give special attention to linguistically diverse immigrant students (Donato, 1997). This posed many issues concerning the legal responsibility for schools to provide more than the minimum educational services (Ochoa, 1995).

In 1975, the U.S. Office of Civil Rights issued the Lau remedies. The Lau remedies were a set of guidelines for schools to in compliance with the Lau decision (Donato, 1997). The Lau guidelines assisted district with determining the minimum
expectation, for evaluation, instruction, teacher preparedness, and monitoring of students (Crawford, 1995; Donato, 1997; Ochoa, 1995). According to Crawford (1995, p. 46):

The guidelines told districts how to identify and evaluate children with limited English skills, what instructional treatments would be appropriate, when children were ready for mainstream classrooms, and what professional standards teachers should meet. They also set timetables for meeting these goals.

The guidelines also provided the necessary push for bilingual education in elementary schools (Crawford, 1995; NAPALC, 2004). The Lau remedies consisted of the following educational practices:

1) identification of student’s primary or home language;
2) diagnostic/prescriptive approach;
3) educational program selection;
4) required and elected courses;
5) instructional personnel requirements;
6) racial/ethnic isolation and/or identifiability of schools and classes;
7) notification to parents of students whose primary or home language is other than English; and
8) evaluation

Schools and districts could no longer continue to be out-of-compliance with the Lau decision particularly with their language instruction practices. Since the Lau decision imposed that and ESL program alone was not appropriate for the effective cognitive development of students, schools were now put in the position of implementing bilingual education and the use of native language instruction. The California Assembly Bill AB-1329 mandated bilingual education in school districts serving English learners.
This bill created political unrest in many school systems and communities. (Donato, 1997, p. 106)

The tensions that the Lau remedies created resulted from enacting bilingual education programs and the prejudicial and racist sentiment for the Latino community.

One tension existed between the goal to transition into English and the maintenance of the native language. What type of bilingual program was wanted and needed in schools for students to excel in school? For many teachers and community members, the concepts of bilingual education was new and unfamiliar, thus their concern and apprehension. For others, it was an opportunity to try something new that could possibly make an impact with the English learner populations. Some saw the development of bilingual programs as an attack on their community and believed that it was harmful to their children (Donato, 1997).

A second tension focused on the school districts’ responsibility for providing effective instructional programs and effective bilingual programs. Just providing a bilingual program was not enough. The effectiveness of the program needed to be proven; otherwise it would be considered the same as if no program was offered (Ochoa, 1995). Alberto Ochoa (1981) proposed an educational framework for developing national guidelines for addressing the educational needs of minority students to uphold the Lau decision. This framework addressed the recommended minimum educational services for culturally and linguistically diverse students attending public schools in the United States. The framework proposed the practice of allowing students to develop proficiency in their primary language regardless of their competency in English.

A third tension involved the availability of qualified teachers to teach in the bilingual programs. In 1976 the California Attorney General determined that it was the
responsibility school districts to employ competent and skilled certificated personnel effectively teach these programs and meet needs of the students (Ochoa, 1995). In his framework, Ochoa (1981) proposed the following requirements that qualified teachers should possess:

1. full proficiency in the target students’ dominant language;
2. knowledge of the process of language acquisition;
3. awareness of and sensitivity to the target students’ culture;
4. competence in teaching basic skills and other academic subjects through the students’ dominant language;
5. competence in teaching general curriculum through English;
6. competence in teaching English as a second language;
7. competence in methods of individualized instruction and working with paraprofessionals;
8. competence to determine the students’ dominant language proficiencies;
9. competence in diagnosing students’ academic achievement for placement in appropriate program curricula; and
10. competences to develop, assess, evaluate, and utilize instructional materials to best meet the needs of Lau students.

A fourth tension involved the prejudicial and racial attitudes of U.S. native community members toward the target minority groups that would benefit from the implementation of bilingual programs. Donato (1997) recalls the concerns coming from citizens in the community of Brownsfield regarding resistance in the changes
occurring in their community with the implementation of bilingual programs and the rising number of Mexican English learners in their community schools.

A citizen stated that bilingual education was going to tempt the infestation of this area with more people from México [and] aid in the deterioration of our society as we know it. (Donato, 1997, p. 108)

Xenophobia and fear against the minority communities for which bilingual education had meant to help had penetrated many communities. Fear, racism, and prejudice are real tensions that impact the effectiveness of policies and practices in education to this day.

**Point of Tension with Castañeda v. Pickard**

The Castañeda v. Pickard ruling required school districts to (1) provide students with programs based on sound educational theory, (2) implement programs effectively and with adequate resources, and (3) determine whether school districts maintain the same educational approach when evident that it is failing (648 F.2d 989, 5th Circuit, 1981). The U.S. office of Civil Rights used the Castañeda v. Pickard requirements to hold schools in compliance for meeting the educational needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students after the Reagan administration withdrew from publishing the proposed Title VI Bilingual Education (Lau) Rules in 1980 (Ochoa, 1995). One tension with the Castaneda requirements is that it does not obligate school districts to implement bilingual programs for English learners. It only required that appropriate action be taken to help English learners overcome language barriers (Kerper Mora, 2005). Despite this omission, schools were held responsible for providing effective instruction for ethnically and linguistically diverse students and assuring them equal educational opportunities in schools.
Point of Tension with Proposition 227

Proposition 227 stated that English learners would be educated through sheltered English immersion for a year or less then transferred to an English language mainstream classroom. Students of different ages but similar levels of English proficiency would be placed in the same classroom. The parental exceptions allowed for parents to request a waiver for an alternative program, or a classroom where they are taught through bilingual education techniques. If twenty or more waivers were requested in schools then the school had to offer such a class or allow the students to transfer to a school that offered such a class (Proposition 227, Initiative statute, article II, section 8, 1997).

The public was ready for the English for the Children initiative because they felt betrayed that the government would allow these anti-American acts (i.e. Bilingual Education) to continue in California schools. Lola Ford, a resident of San Francisco and a grandmother of a school-aged child, was quoted in the San Francisco Chronicle (Asimov, 1998):

We'll have teachers just for Filipino? Just for Spanish? Just for Chinese?…Oh, my heaven above. When I see these people not learning our language when they're in our country, I mean, they're in the USA for God's sake. Learn our ways, please, and respect our ways. (p. A1)

Opponents of the proposition argued that many English learners were already in English immersion classrooms and less than one third of them were in bilingual classrooms.

Wayne Thomas and Virginia Collier (1997) from George Mason University presented their finding from their longitudinal study on second language acquisition that showed that it took seven to ten years to acquire language proficiency. English learners could not acquire academic English in one year, only conversational English or

Many more doors will be open to them with two languages, she said in Spanish. I know only one language and can't communicate with anyone.

Proposition 227 brought concern and confusion for students and parents, thus raising their anxiety that an unfamiliar school system already puts on them. Although parents had the right to complete a waiver so that the school would offer their child an alternate program, many parents were not aware of this option. The passage of Proposition 227 by California voters demonstrated a huge push for Latino immigrant children to assimilate and learn English, but also made clear that they would not have their tax dollars spent on teaching children in a language other than English, regardless if bilingual education benefited them or not.

The tensions created with the passage of Proposition 227 derive from the instructional focus for English learners, the expectations for English learners, and due process for parent choice. One of the tensions with Proposition 227 is directly involves the instructional approach for English learners. Proposition 227 requires schools to instruct students in Structure English Immersion classrooms where the instruction is mainly English with some instructional support for non-English proficient students. Prior to Proposition 227 English learners were designated for instruction in bilingual classes, now parents must request a waiver for an alternative program (primary language instruction) at their child's school (Ochoa & Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004). The goal is English proficiency for English learners.

A second tension involves the expectations for English learners. Students’ native language is deemed a deficit for learning, thus English learners are instructed in English
for the purpose of learning English as quickly as possible. This deficit approach to developing English as a second language violates second language acquisition theory that promote primary language instruction for developing their second language and suggest that it takes seven to ten years to develop second language proficiency (Collier, 1987; Cummins, 1981b; Hakuta, Butler & Witt, 2000; Thomas & Collier, 1997). Monolingual English only instructional approach force students to accept a goal of monolingualism. These subtractive language methods deny English learners the opportunity to reach biliteracy goals.

A third tension derives from the parent waiver option in Proposition 227. When 20 students of a particular grade level receive a parent waiver the school is required to offer a class for those students or allow the students to transfer to another school that offers the class. For a waiver to be granted the child must be proficient in English, be 10 years or older, or have special needs (Chapter 3, Article 3, Section 310-311). In theory parents seem to have the right and the power to select for their child an alternative program. In reality, parents’ right to due process for selecting an alternative program for their child may not exist.

The acceptance or rejection of waiver requests is often governed by prior practice and the predisposition of providers toward particular instructional programs. (Parrish, 2006, p. viii)

Schools and districts neglect to inform parents of this right and/or many parents, particularly non-native immigrant parents, are often unaware of their rights.
Point of Tension with No Child Left Behind

The goal of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) was to hold schools and districts accountable for closing the achievement gap between white and non-white students by establishing standards and an accountability system aligned to the standards. Measuring schools’ adequate yearly progress (AYP) has been the most critical component of NCLB (Abernathy, 2007; Sunderman, Kim, & Orfield, 2005). The AYP component has forced districts to systematically focus its attention on the achievement of Latino English learners, as well as other subgroups identified in schools. However, AYP has also instilled a sense of fear and pressure on administrators, teachers and students towards a sense of urgency to show academic growth on state tests for all students increase every year. As a result of AYP, the point of tension surrounds the issues of testing, language, curriculum and instruction, and accountability for non-performing districts and schools.

Testing

Under NCLB states were required to develop standards and a testing system to measure student academic progress. California developed stringent academic standards for all students and the California Standards Test to meet NCLB requirements. Every year each school is expected to reach their AYP goals.

Making AYP is the defining quest for every school and district under No Child Left Behind. (Abernathy, 2007, p. 5)

Schools need to have a certain percentage of students in distinct subgroups reaching proficient or advanced levels on state tests to achieve AYP. The distinct subgroups in which schools are held accountable vary for each school. Some of the
subgroups include African American, Hispanic or Latino, White, English learners, socioeconomically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and others. Schools may have few subgroups in which they are accountable and some schools may have many subgroups. One of the provisions in NCLB is that the results for all schools and districts must be made public. Schools that achieve AYP only have to worry about achieving AYP the following year. California schools that fail to achieve AYP are hit with sanctions and are labeled as program improvement schools. Program improvement schools that fail to achieve AYP for consecutive years will face sanctions and need to implement corrective measures, which include:

- spending funds on professional development;
- allowing parents to transfer their children to successful schools;
- implement school improvement plan;
- replacing staff, overhauling curriculum, hiring outside experts, lengthening school day/year; and
- reconstituting school as a charter school, replacing most or all staff, contract out for private management. State intervention, or restructuring efforts.

The effects of AYP has made a significant impression in the way schools are educating students in general, and more specifically, English learners. The push for higher test scores and avoiding program improvement status has cause a great many tensions with those directly engaged with students, teachers, and administrators.

One point of tension with testing involves the notion of basing the achievement of students and the effectiveness of a school on one test. Many variables come into play that may cause schools to not meet their AYP goals. The first thing to consider is the
fairness of the test for schools with many subgroups. Schools with more subgroups are at a disadvantage compared to schools with few subgroups because all subgroups must meet yearly progress goals. If one subgroup fails to reach its target goals then the entire school fails to achieve AYP, regardless of student growth made that year.

A second point of tension with testing involves the classification of English learners. Currently, English learners that reach proficiency in English are reclassified as R-FEP and no longer part of the English learner subgroup. This puts more pressure on schools to reach AYP gains with English learners because the English learners that score well on the test no longer represent that subgroup.

The schools that are most successful at moving ELLs quickly out of special programs are punished the most severely by losing the most successful learners from that subgroup. (Keiffer, Lesaux, & Snow, 2008)

Not only does English learners lose students to reclassification, new English learners are constantly enrolling in schools every year. These policy actions contribute to the perceptions that English learners are not learning English (Keiffer, Lesaux, & Snow, 2008).

Language

In addition to the Proposition 227, NCLB mandates that all California students be tested in language arts and math regardless of their proficiency in English (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). As a result, a point of tension has been schools abandoning primary language instruction for non-native English students. Schools with bilingual classrooms have limited it to grades kindergarten, first or second with the goal of transitioning students into English-only classrooms as soon as possible. The reason for
this action is due to the belief that maintaining their primary language will impede their English development (Nieto, 2001). Contrary to second language acquisition theory, many schools are following this trend with the rationale being that more English instruction will result in reaching English proficiency faster. The push for English learners to acquire English proficiency as fast as possible may create *sink or swim* conditions that can lead a substantial number of students to be excluded from the core curriculum (Espinosa & Ochoa, 1992; Nieto, 1992).

**Curriculum and Instruction**

One point of tension with testing involves curriculum and instruction. Since NCLB only measures language arts and math in all grades many schools have narrowed their curriculum and instruction to consist of reading, writing, and math (Abernathy, 2007; Linn, 2008; Tracey, 2005).

The danger is that in their single-minded desire to improve test scores, schools and teachers will damage the breadth and quality of the curriculum. (Abernathy, 2007, p. 12)

Teachers are more likely to “de-emphasize or neglect untested topics and spend more time teaching what is tested” (Tracey, 2005, p. 91). These actions cause concern to critically reflect on what constitutes a meaningful education for students and if limiting students to social studies, science, art, music, and PE is in the best interests of kids.

A second point of tension involves materials and resources. The state adopted materials used in schools are not aligned to the California state standards (Tracey, 2005). This results in teachers having to spend more time and effort planning and developing lessons with insufficient resources. And lastly, the state adopted materials are scripted.
Scripted materials stifle teacher autonomy and creativity to better meet the needs of students.

**Accountability**

Schools are held accountable for meeting student academic goals and achieving AYP. Achieving or not achieving AYP comes at a great cost for schools.

It is high-stakes accountability with teeth, offering consequences for failing schools much more significant than public praise or embarrassment. (Abernathy, 2007, p. 3)

The sanctions and consequences for failing to achieve AYP put much pressure on administrators and teacher to prepare students to do well on the test. Adding to the pressure, one of the NCLB stipulations is to publicize the achievement levels for each district and school in the state. NCLB relies on sanctions to motivate administrators and teachers to make the necessary changes to show achievement results at their schools, thus creating a culture of intimidation and fear.

One point of tension associated with accountability is the sanctions. The NCLB sanctions appear to encourage low achievement standards (Koretz, 2008). With the pressure to meet AYP, administrators and teachers focus more on meeting the minimum standards criteria that students will encounter on the test.

A second point of tension associated with accountability is the responsibility put on administrators to show results. Administrators are put in a position to enforce good teaching rather than support good teaching because they are pressured by the superintendent to show results (Abernathy, 2007). An administrator’s job is on the line.
A third point of tension involves the pressure imposed on teachers to prepare their students to do well on the state test.

No Child Left Behind uses only punishment or the threat of punishment to change the behaviors of teachers and administers. (Abernathy, 2007, p. 37)

Teachers are afraid of losing their jobs (Tracey, 2005). The sanctions seem to discourage high-performing teachers in low-performing schools enough where they revert to teaching to the test. Teacher are uncertain and stressed out because they are accountable for test scores and this makes teachers less willing to be creative and take risks in their classrooms (Abernathy, 2007; Brint & Teele, 2008).

One last point of tension involves closing the achievement gap. No Child Left Behind proposes to close the achievement gap by 2013, yet Latinos are still falling behind. Also, the AYP requirements make it difficult for large schools with diverse student populations to show academic progress (Linn, 2008). Instead of making the conditions better for diverse student populations, it is maintaining status quo conditions conducive to inequitable educational practices.
CHAPTER THREE

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The 1954 ruling of Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 changed the educational landscape for students of color and educators. This Brown v. Board of Education supreme court ruling reversed the decision to segregate students by race, otherwise known as the ‘separate but equal’ doctrine, finding it unconstitutional (Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483, 1954). Ten years later, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 forbade discrimination on account of race, color, or national origin in any federally funded activity (Civil Rights Act, 1964). These monumental decisions forced schools and teachers to respond to the academic needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students. Critical educators had begun to recognize the need to reconceptualize the pedagogy and teacher practices that were appropriate for students from diverse language and cultural backgrounds. A leader in the multicultural education movement, James Banks (2006) developed a multiethnic education concept that addressed the tensions connected with curriculum reform, attitudes and perceptions, strategies, assessment, and testing. This reform movement in education was significant in framing the issues with policy, program development, instruction, and assessment and the affect they had on students’ educational outcomes as it related to ethnicity, culture and language. It also emphasized the dynamics within teachers’ attitudes and beliefs toward teaching students from diverse ethnic and language backgrounds. Gay (2000)
points out that teacher expectations of ethnically diverse students and English learners vary based on the teacher attitudes and perceptions of their students’ cultural identity.

This chapter will present a comprehensive review of the research literature pertaining to the education of students learning English as a second language in U.S. schools. The English Learner Educational Access Continuum, as shown in Figure 5, outlines (1) biliteracy focus, (2) pedagogy, (3) outcomes, and as critical constructs for educating English learners. The following sections will include an in depth discuss of the four constructs found in the review of the research literature.

**English Learner Educational Access Continuum**

The English Learner Educational Access Continuum, in Figure 5, defines the pedagogy that is implemented for English learners in schools within the context of an additive or subtractive *biliteracy focus*. This continuum was developed to help identify the educational practices in schools that impact English learners’ outcomes. The pedagogy elements include (1) *value for learners*, (2) *curriculum*, and (3) *instruction*. The outcomes include the students’ *language* development and *achievement* scores. Each element is defined within a continuum to gauge the instructional context of schools (Gonzalez, 2010). The English Learner Educational Access Continuum will promote a dynamic examination of the pedagogical practices and outcomes in each participating school in relation to the biliteracy focus for English learners.
**Biliteracy Focus**

The *biliteracy focus* is the first construct presented in the model. The biliteracy focus continuum extends between an additive biliteracy focus and a subtractive biliteracy focus that has key language, social, cultural, political, and academic implications for non-native English speaking students and students from diverse cultural backgrounds (Baker & Jones, 1997; Darder, 1991; Freeman, 1998; Garcia, 2005; Krashen, 1992; Nieto, 2001; Valdés, 2001).

Mainstream English (ME), Structured English Immersion (SEI), early-exit transitional bilingual, late-exit transitional bilingual, and Dual Language (DL) are the principal instructional language programs that are implemented in schools. In this model structured English Immersion and early-exit transitional bilingual programs are defined through a subtractive biliteracy lens and late-exit transitional and dual language bilingual programs are defined through an additive biliteracy lens along the continuum.

A subtractive biliteracy focus incorporates a deficit-based, assimilationist perspective with monolingual language goals for students (Baker, 1996; Baker & Jones, 1997; Darder, 1991; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). Deficit-based conditions and practices provide students a skills-based, compensatory type curriculum, and immersed in an at-risk learning environment where only a few lucky students will find success (Baker, 1996; Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004; Cummins, 2000; Darder, 1991; Gay, 2000; Nieto, 2001; Wong, 2000). These conditional resemble a *banking model* style of instruction where the teachers *fill* students with the knowledge that schools deem necessary for the students’ success without acknowledging the students’ needs (Freire, 2001).
An additive biliteracy focus incorporates an empowerment-based, culturally pluralistic perspective with bilingual and biliteracy goals for students (Baker, 1996; Baker & Jones, 1997; Brisk, 2006; Brisk & Harrington, 2007; Christian, 1996). Students’ cultural and linguistic diversity are perceived as an asset for their learning in reaching their achievement outcomes and preparing to function in the mainstream society. Students are expected to learn English and develop their native language to reach a high
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level of biliteracy, develop their cultural, social, and political identity within the mainstream society, and value differences and diversity (Baker, 1996; Brisk, 2006, Cummins, 2000; Nieto, 2002). The debate between the goals of English proficiency and the benefits of bilingualism for English learners continues to be emphasized in language policies in schools.

Additive and Subtractive Bilingualism Debate

The philosophical argument between bilingual education and an English-only ideology has influenced how schools educate culturally and linguistically diverse students and native English speakers. The push for English learners to learn English as soon as possible is rooted in an assimilationist ideal for one language (English) to secure national unity and social assimilation into America’s mainstream society, otherwise:

Using some language other than English dooms people to second-class citizenship in American society. (Schlesinger, 1998, p. 115)

Members in the English-Only movement have pushed for legislation to make English the official language under the rationale to unify diverse groups (Cummins, 2001; Peregoy & Boyle, 2005). Contrary to the English-Only ideology, the ideals of bilingual education encompass primary language development, English development, the social and cultural integration into mainstream society, and a secure ethnic identity (Crawford, 1995; Darder, 1991; Nieto, 2001). According to Brisk (1998), bilingual education could be politically defined between quality education and compensatory education. A quality education encompasses using the students’ culture and language as a vehicle for education for an expected outcome of academic achievement, English proficiency, native
language proficiency, and sociocultural integration. A *compensatory education* uses the best model to teach English for an expected outcome of English proficiency.

Wallace Lambert (1987) introduced the concept of additive bilingualism and subtractive bilingualism, regarding immersion language instruction for native and non-native dominant language speakers. He acknowledged that for native English speakers, instruction in their second language does not impede their English development (Gándara, 1997; Lambert, 1987; Thomas & Collier, 2001). In fact, additive bilingualism benefits these students because as they progress through the grades English is being increased as the language of instruction. They are more likely to maintain their primary language while they develop a second language (Gándara, 1997; Lambert, 1987; Thomas & Collier, 2001). Cummins (2000, p. 37) refers to additive bilingualism as “the form of bilingualism that results when students add a second language to their intellectual tool-kit while continuing to develop conceptually and academically in their first language.” An additive bilingualism approach for educating culturally and linguistically diverse students sets the foundation for creating an educational environment that promotes social and language equity and supports students in developing an empowered cultural identity. Darder (1991) insists that language plays a critical role in the lives of bicultural students toward the development of their cultural identity.

It is critical that educators recognized the role that language plays as one of the most powerful cultural transmitters of culture: as such, it is crucial to the survival of a cultural community. Within the student’s native language is contained the codification of lived experiences that provide the avenues for students to express their own realities and to question the wider social order. (Darder, 1991, p. 37)

Educator that promote an additive bilingualism ideology and practice an additive bilingualism pedagogy are apt to exhibit behaviors that empower students to become
biliterate and bilingual, establish a high self-esteem, and feel confident in their own academic and personal talents (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 1995; Krashen, 1992). Additive bilingualism promotes proficiency in at least two languages, high academic expectations, and a strong sociocultural awareness for the empowerment of culturally and linguistically diverse students, where subtractive bilingualism perpetuates a status quo existence for already marginalized students.

According to Lambert’s framework, English-only or transitional language models promote a subtractive bilingualism approach to the acquisition of English for culturally and linguistically diverse students in American schools. Subtractive bilingualism is “the philosophy behind structured immersion in the United States” (Krashen, 1995, p. 143). Subtractive bilingualism limits non-English proficient speakers to receive primary language instruction, which is detrimental toward proficiency in either language (Lambert, 1987; Nieto, 2001). English learners in a subtractive bilingualism model receive instruction in their primary language in the beginning then as they progress through the grades they receive less instruction and until it is eventually replaced with the dominant language. As a consequence of the social and cultural dominance of English, many students will neglect their home language, cultural background, and social identity to acquire English (Darder, 1991; Nieto, 2001). A structured English immersion approach to teaching students English regards students’ primary language as a deficit and interrupts their linguistic development to reach their full cognitive-academic ability levels (Krashen, 1995; Thomas & Collier, 2001).

Baker and Jones (1997) articulate the different bilingual models as weak and strong forms of bilingual education. Weak forms of bilingual education focus on
instructing language minority in the dominant language without utilizing their home language. These *weak* forms of bilingual education are assimilationist in nature where they goal is to transition students from their home language and culture into the dominant language and culture. Submersion and transitional bilingual are each considered a *weak* form of bilingual education (Baker & Jones, 1997). *Strong* forms of bilingual education focus on complete bilingualism and biliteracy where the goal is for students to maintain their home language while they acquire the dominant language, in this case, English. Maintenance bilingual and dual language programs are considered *strong* forms of bilingual education (Baker & Jones, 1997).

Subtractive bilingualism supports the premise that more English for second language learners will lead to English proficiency in a shorter time. Additive bilingualism supports the second language acquisition theories and promotes the development of bilingual and biliterate individuals. Moving beyond just being bilingual, biliteracy emphasizes the ability to listen, speak, read and write in two languages.

*Biliteracy/Bilingualism*

Historically, the primary goal of Bilingual Education in the United States has been to prepare non-English speaking students to reach English proficiency by providing primary language instruction along with instruction in English (August & Hakuta, 1997; Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004; Crawford, 1995; Nieto, 1992). The implementation of distinct bilingual models varies according to the desired language development goal and cultural integration goal of each district or school. In the case of California, all districts and schools are mandated by Proposition 227 to provide instruction to students through a
Structured English Immersion model, with the exception of students who’s parents have signed an exception waiver (Prop. 227, Initiative Statute, Article II, Section 8, 1997).

The goal of Bilingual Education, as seen through the lens of cultural pluralism and equal educational opportunity, has been to prepare non-English speaking students to reach both English proficiency and proficiency in their primary language (Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004; Crawford, 1995; Nieto, 2001).

Hornberger (1991) provided a typology in table 2 of bilingual education model types: transitional, maintenance, enrichment. She defined models as the goals and ideology toward language and cultural diversity in society and defined types to specific contextual and structural characteristics (Freeman, 1998). This typology will provide a model for describing the language instructions programs implemented in California schools in the following sections.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bilingual Education Model Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transitional model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social incorporation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hornberger (1991) shows the transitional model type as a language shift from the students’ primary language to the dominant language for the purpose of cultural assimilation and social incorporation. The objective of the transitional model is move
away from their primary language use toward English-only proficiency and to conform to the American values and ideals. The maintenance model type consists of language maintenance for students’ primary language as they acquire the dominant language for the purpose of strengthening their cultural identity and affirming their civil rights. The objective of this model is to assist students in preserving their primary language as they learn English. The opportunity to maintain their primary language allows the student to nurture their bicultural identity between the home culture and school culture. This also affirms their rights under the principles of an equal opportunity education. The enrichment model is characterized by developing students’ proficiency in both their primary language and dominant language with the goal for cultural pluralism and social autonomy within the mainstream society. The objective of this model is to strive for developing multilingual and multiliterate individual with the personal independence and capacity to strive in a global community.

The bilingual education model types presented by Hornberger (1991) provide a context in which to examine the purpose and goal of distinct instructional language programs implemented in schools. The instructional language programs that are implemented in schools range from a subtractive to an additive biliteracy focus, which include Mainstream English, Structured English Immersion, early-exit transitional bilingual, late-exit maintenance bilingual, and Dual Language.

*Mainstream English*

Students in a Mainstream English instructional program are being provided English instruction in all subjects all day. Usually students that are native English
speakers or have achieved English proficiency are enrolled in Mainstream English classrooms. The instruction may be differentiated and teachers may incorporate strategies and techniques that beneficial for all students but are vital for non-native English speakers. The goal for students in a Mainstream English instructional program is to maintain English proficiency.

*Structured English Immersion*

Non-English proficient students who are taught through a Structured English Immersion program are taught content by means of English instruction and sheltering techniques to make the instruction understandable (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005).

Structured English Immersion is based on the theory that children learn a second language best when they are integrated with other children who speak that language with native-speaker ability. (Haver, 2003, p. 1)

Initially English learners are separated from the native English speakers to receive systematic English and content-area instruction (Haver, 2003). The goal of Structured English Immersion is to develop language, literacy, and content through an English-only approach (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005). English learners in Structured English Immersion classes build on their listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills, along with content, with the goal of moving into mainstream English classes as soon as they are ready. The following principles are recommended as best practices for English learners in Structured English Immersion classes (Haver, 2003):

- some students need to listen to something more times than others through the aid of peer tutors, cassette players, and computer programs and instructional aides;
- students should not be required to speak before they are ready;
• students will remember best if they respond physically to the language through body or hand movement, signals, and drawing pictures;

• students should advance from action responses to one-word verbal responses;

• slow down and simplify language considerably for students to understand;

• use visuals effectively to create memory pictures;

• present lesson in a step-by-step format;

• utilize students to explain isolated words or phrases to other student in their native language so a not to waste time and maintain a good flow of the lesson; and

• Communicate with students using clear and authentic language.

Structured English Immersion is designed to use English as much as possible, so that almost any English learner in Grades K-8 can be moved through the stages of immersion and into mainstream classes in 6 to 18 months at the most.

The rationale for Structured English Immersion is that for some young children immersing them into the mainstream from the beginning can work well. English learners need instruction where each aspect of the language builds on another with many opportunities to practice (Haver, 2003). It provides a structured approach to learning English and discourages students from utilizing their native language. The methods for instruction emphasize the development of skills first, hands-on activities, and student dramatizations, along with blending English grammar and vocabulary instruction with content instruction (Haver, 2003). The content taught in structured English immersion classes should be aligned with the mainstream classes prepare students for when they transition. Some “simplification and condensation” to the curriculum will be necessary as a reasonable plan (Haver, 2003, p. 39).
Structured English Immersion aims for monolingualism and assimilation into the mainstream society (Brisk, 2006; Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004; Crawford, 1995). Nieto (1992) and Brisk (2006), along with other researchers, define Structured English Immersion as compensatory education. Compensatory education regards non-English proficient students as needing compensation to make up for the deficit of not possessing the ability to speak English. Compensatory education does not stop with language deficiency, it also perceives that English learners lack the cultural and social capital needed to be successful in the mainstream society (Brisk, 2006; Nieto, 1992, 2001; Pearl, 1997). The implementation of these language instruction models trigger a deeper sociopolitical tension manifested as additive bilingualism versus subtractive bilingualism for culturally and linguistically diverse students.

*Early-Exit Transitional*

A type of transitional bilingual model is the Early-exit transitional model designed to serve non-English proficient students. An early-exit transitional model uses the students’ home language as part of the instruction to prepare them for English, usually in a time period of one to three years. The goal is to develop English proficiency in a short time. The purpose of implementing this model is to develop the students’ literacy and academic development as they become proficient in English. Once they transition into English instruction, primary language instruction is no longer provided (Cummins, 2001; Hornberger, 1991; Nieto, 2001; Peregoy & Boyle, 2005).
Late-Exit Maintenance

A type of maintenance bilingual models includes a Late-exit maintenance model designed to serve non-English proficient students. A Late-exit model uses the students’ home language as part of the instruction to prepare them for English and to maintain their primary language, usually throughout the elementary grades. Ideally, the purpose of implementing this model is to not pressure students into using only English and to support them to become and remain bilingual and biliterate (Cummins, 2001; Freeman, 1998; Hornberger, 1991; Nieto, 2001; Peregoy & Boyle, 2005).

Dual Language

A type of enrichment model includes a Dual language or Two-way immersion program designed to serve non-English proficient students and native English speakers together. A Dual Language program uses the non-English proficient students’ home language as part of the instruction to prepare them for English and to maintain their primary language, and at the same time develop the native English speakers second language. The goal is for both groups to develop their primary and second language towards complete bilingualism and biliteracy. Enrichment programs are intended to legitimize the minority language for both the non-English speakers and the native English speaker, which in most cases in California is Spanish (Christian, 1996; Freeman, 1998; Hornberger, 1991; Peregoy & Boyle, 2005). Additive bilingualism for both student groups, academic achievement in two languages, and cultural pluralism is the goal of Dual Language programs (Christian, 1996).
Dual Language program types are characterized by the pattern of language allocation manifested through a 90-10 dual-language program or a 50-50 Dual Language program (Cummins, 2001). The 90-10 program utilizes the non-English students’ primary language as the language of instruction for a large portion of the instructional time. In a 90-10 program where the language of instruction is Spanish and English, 90% of the instruction is in Spanish and 10% percent is in English for the primary grades. As the students move along through the grades English instruction increases. Ultimately, in the upper grades, the language of instruction is split evenly. A 50-50 program utilizes the non-English proficient students’ primary language as the language of instruction for half of the time and English for the other half of the time, starting in the primary grades continuing through the upper grades.

The Sociocultural Impact for Bicultural/Biliterate Students

Students from diverse heritage backgrounds, with immigrant parents, and/or immigrants themselves are in a complex situation in terms of navigating their identity and existence in more than one societal context (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). Bicultural students find themselves in a constant negotiation between the school culture and their home culture, where the language, traditions, values, beliefs, and norms may be completely different from one context to the other (Darder, 1991). The push to assimilate and acculturate students into the mainstream society is strong, as is the pull to maintain their cultural and linguistic roots (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). The pressures that are explicitly and implicitly placed on bicultural students may be too
burdensome for them to handle and may eventually need to sway to one side or the other, or find a way to negotiate both worlds.

How bicultural students negotiate their identity and place in society may be determined by a number of factors. Portes and Rumbaut (2001, p. 45-46) mention that some of these factors that need to be considered are (1) the history of the immigrant first generation, (2) the pace of acculturation among parents and children and its bearing on normative integration, (3) the barriers, cultural and economic, confronted by second-generation youth in their quest for successful adaptation, and (4) the family and community resources for confronting these barriers. Immigrants have to be wary of the economic situation in the U.S. and how they will be welcomed (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Another important aspect to consider is how the student’s attitude toward their home culture is affected by the social expectations in school and the mainstream society’s perception of their cultural group.

Relative to the first generation, the process of ethnic self-identification of second-generation children is more complex and often entails the juggling of competing allegiances and attachments. Situated within two cultural worlds, they must define themselves in relation to multiple reference groups (sometimes in two countries and in two language) and to the classifications into which they are placed by their native peers, schools, the ethnic community, and the larger society. (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001, p. 150)

The student’s use of their primary language and how they perceive their home culture are the most noticeable aspects that are impacted. Students may choose to begin to only speak English and purposefully neglect to speak in their home language to acculturate to their existing environment (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). The opposite side to that scenario is that they refuse to speak English and only speak in their home language as a form of resistance to the enculturation. In this case the resistance
observed by students may be considered a form of empowerment, fighting back against oppression (McLaren, 1989). Students may find themselves embarrassed of their parents because they don’t speak English well and are not like the native U. S. born parents (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Or they may find great pride in their parents and their home culture and that they are merging it with the mainstream culture.

Youths may cope with the psychological pressure produced by such differences by seeking to reduce conflict and to assimilate within the relevant social context... An alternative reaction may lead to the rise and reaffirmation of ethnic solidarity and self-consciousness... (Portes & Rubaut, 2001, p. 151-152)

Parents from ethnic groups that experience discrimination may force their children to stop speaking the home language and lean toward speaking only in English and assimilating as a defense mechanism to protect them from further being targets of discrimination. Unfortunately, simply learning English will not automatically facilitate the social mobility into the mainstream society and ethnically diverse students will find that they don’t have a place where they can truly fit-in (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001).

The process of becoming bilingual and biliterate is dependent on variables that are many times unpredictable for many children of immigrants and ethnic and linguistically diverse families. While many can speak, read and write in two languages, few are truly bilingual and biliterate, especially when the push to learn English as fast as possible is so powerful, the urgency to strengthen their primary language is minimized.

A closer look at the components of bilingualism shows that the prime reason for its relative absence is not lack of English fluency but the loss of parent language. (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001, p. 127)

While being bilingual has a connection with better personality adjustment, lose of the parental language can have negative consequences “including poor self-esteem and a
more common sense of shame at their parents’ culture” (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001, p. 134).

For many bicultural students, forging their identity is a complex and often painful process. The tensions arise as students struggle to choose to totally assimilate, resist, or “incorporate selected aspects of both the culture of origin and mainstream American culture” (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001, p. 103). Learning to speak Standard English becomes both a way to communicate and part of the separation from the ethnic family group. It is a method for self-identification in the mainstream culture and possibly a step toward individualistic self-advancement. While students might gain in being accepted into the mainstream culture they may also find a loss in keeping a close bond with their family and ethnic group (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Knowing that language is a huge part of one’s cultural existence, developing one’s bilingualism and biliteracy is an important step toward negotiating one’s biculturalism and defining their identity within multiple social and cultural spaces.

The culturally constructed social structures and the authority of their immigrant parents and elders are seen as legitimate, while learning Standard English and doing well in school are viewed as competencies that do not compromise their sense of who they are. Theses youth easily communicate and make friends with members of their own ethnic group as well as with students, teachers, employers, and colleagues of other backgrounds. (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001, p. 113)

Truly bicultural students benefit themselves, their family ethnic group, and society at large as they become a bridge between two worlds and maintain a sense of pride and self-efficacy that transmits into a form of self-empowerment to be successful.

Antonia Darder (1991) explains that as bicultural students continue through their development, the they are confronted with the issues of negotiating the values and from
two cultural systems the may or may not be in direct conflict and the sociopolitical and historical influences that are only affect non-native European American students. Part of the process of biculturation is obtaining *survival strategies* to negotiate the conflicting hegemonic values and conditions observed and lived by ethnically and linguistically diverse students (Darder, 1991). The issue of bicultural students maintaining their home language is vital to their existence and position within their own lived reality.

It is critical that educators recognize the role language plays as one of the most powerful transmitters of culture: as such, it is crucial to the survival of a cultural community. Within the student’s native language is contained the codification of lived experiences that provide the avenues for students to express their own realities and to question the wider social order. (Darder, 1991, p. 37)

Limiting bicultural students to a monolingual existence marginalizes them to lead an isolated existence and obstructs them from developing critical consciousness and the capacity to strive toward empowerment (Darder, 1991).

The role that educators play is imperative in designing effective school programs, enacting fair policies, and properly preparing teachers to meet the educational, language, social goals for all students, especially for ethnically and linguistically diverse student populations. The following section will feature an overview of the research literature of effective instructional practices that provide ethnically and linguistically diverse students educational access to a meaningful education.

**Effective Practices for Ethnically and Linguistically Diverse Students**

The implications of multicultural education in classrooms all over America lead to establishing conditions and practices that provide equal opportunities for all students (Banks, 2006). The research literature that promotes a multicultural education approach
for raising student achievement, increasing student engagement, and establishing educational equity highlights the significance of teacher ideology, teacher knowledge, the teacher as a cultural mediator, and culturally responsive teaching practices. The traditional paradigm of teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students has consisted of a deficit-based model that has perpetuated academic underachievement (Gay, 2000; Valencia, 1997). These negative oriented practices concentrate on what students don’t have and resort to compensatory academic programs that focus on low rigorous, skills-based curriculums. While good intentioned, these practices may lead to students losing their home language and cultural identity (Gay, 2000).

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy

Classroom teachers and educators maintain an important role in educating culturally and linguistically diverse students in our classrooms today. Yet, a large percentage of Latinos and English learners are underachieving. With such a diverse student population in the majority of classrooms in California schools and in the nation, educators should not dismiss the significance of understanding how the students’ culture and their understanding of their students’ culture can contribute to their students’ success (Pai, 1990; Spindler & Spindler, 1994). Unfortunately, many classrooms educators, including middle-class, European-American educators, claim that they teach all their students the same, regardless of their race, culture and ethnicity. They also claim that good teaching is good teaching for any student and that education has nothing to do with culture and heritage (Gay, 2000).
Effective teaching practices and instructional approaches are important in helping ethnically and linguistically diverse students acquire the skills, knowledge, and confidence to reach their academic, social, and economic success in a diverse society. The conditions for success begin in the school and the classroom. Holding high expectations for all students includes making the content accessible, holding students accountable, and providing them with support, care, and having a genuine belief that they can succeed in school. A teacher’s belief on race and culture, socioeconomic issues, and the abilities of culturally diverse students holds an immense significance on the academic and social success of their students (Darder, 1991; Ferguson, 2003; Nieto, 2001; Sleeter, 2005). The following sections in this chapter will identify and describe various approaches and instructional practices that are rooted in multicultural education principles and language development theories that form the foundation for optimal conditions for learning.

**Effective Conditions for Learning**

Figure 6 shows the indicators that define the effective conditions for learning conditions for English learners. The development of these indicators of effective conditions for learning were principally based on the research by (1) Banks, Au, Ball, Bell, Gordon, Gutiérrez, et al. (2007) Principles for Life-long Learning, (2) Ruiz, Garcia, & Figueroa (1996) Optimal Learning Environments, and (3) Tharp, Estrada, Dalton, & Yamauchi (2000) Five Standards for Effective Pedagogy, but are also inclusive of the research and writing from the leading experts on multicultural education, cultural relevant teaching, bilingual education, and educating English learners (Baker, 1996; Brisk, 2006;
The research shows that the teacher *value for students, curriculum, and instruction* promote the conditions that impact the learning opportunities for ethnically and linguistically diverse students.


*Figure 6. Indicators of Effective Conditions for Learning*
It is important to note that while the indicators are presented as separate components (see figure 6), they interweave as the techniques, strategies, and methods needed for educating student from diverse ethnic and linguistic backgrounds, incorporated within the value for students, curriculum, and instruction.

According to the English Learner Pedagogy and Outcomes Framework (Figure 5), the type of learning environments found in classrooms span a continuum that the multicultural education and culturally relevant teaching research literature states is most effective and least effective for the diverse student populations in our schools. The research presented by Banks et al., 2007, Ruiz et al, 1996, and Tharp et al, 2000 informs the effective conditions that guide the focuses on the teacher value for students, instruction, and curriculum as the pedagogical practices implemented in schools. The following section will provide the foundations for the Optimal Learning Environments, Principles for Life-long Learning, and the Five Standards for Effective Pedagogy.

**Optimal Learning Environments**

The environment that educators establish in their schools and in their classrooms should transcend their knowledge, style, ideology, and approach that they feel will impact student achievement and learning. Ruiz, García, and Figueroa (1996) developed twelve optimal learning conditions for teaching language and literacy for students of color and English language learners. These conditions counter the deficit-based approach to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students that create at-risk classroom environments. Teachers establish optimal conditions for student learning when:
1. students can exercise choice in their learning;
2. the curriculum and lesson are student centered;
3. teachers utilize whole texts for explicit teaching of skills and strategies;
4. students can actively engage in the lessons and in the learning;
5. students can construct meaning first, then focus on correct form;
6. teachers establish an authentic purpose for learning;
7. students are encouraged to take risks and approximate skills;
8. students are immersed in language and print across the curriculum;
9. teachers model to students and students model to peers;
10. teachers respond to students giving timely and personalized acknowledgement of their ideas, experiences, and efforts, that go beyond letter grades;
11. students, parents, and teachers form a community of learners; and
12. teachers, parents, and students themselves have high expectations for academic achievement and support students to reach those expectations.

The conditions presented by Ruiz et al. (1996) that help establish an optimal learning environment for developing language, biliteracy, rigor, and a sense of belonging for students instead of an environment that puts students of color and second language learners in a position to fail.

**Four Principles of Life-long Learning**

The most recent literature to immerge from Banks et al. (2007) introduces four principles that emphasize the importance of learning in formal and informal
environments for students from diverse racial, ethnic, social-class, cultural, and language groups:

1. learning is situated in broad socio-economic and historical contexts and is mediated by local cultural practices and perspectives;

2. learning takes place not only in school but also in the multiple contexts and valued practices of everyday lives across the life span;

3. all learners need multiple sources of support from a variety of institutions to promote their personal intellectual development; and

4. learning is facilitated when learners are encouraged to use their home and community language resources as a basis for expanding their linguistic repertoires.

Banks et al. (2007) introduce a framework of life-long learning that critically examines the concept of stretch, depth, and breadth of learning. This central idea of life-long learning stresses the idea that learning extends beyond the classroom, where students can build on their background identity, experiences, and extended family support as a strength toward their development as a critical citizen in a democratic society. Four principles were developed that enhance the academic learning of culturally and linguistically diverse students. These principles recognize the importance of the rich cultural and social resources that families and students from diverse backgrounds have developed to assist them in creating mechanisms and practices for coping and adapting in risky environments. The context for meaningful learning extends from purposeful experiences acquired in the home and community, the school and eventually to the world and beyond. The learning that culturally and linguistically diverse acquire in their home and community environment is an important dimension that makes an impact on the
academic and personal development for students. While schools provide formal educational opportunities, families and community provide supplementary education (Banks, et al., 2007).

**Five Standards for Effective Pedagogy**

Tharp, Estrada, Dalton, and Yamauchi (2000) introduced the Five Standards for Effective Pedagogy as instructional practices that improve learning outcomes for ethnically, cultural, linguistic and economically diverse students. The Five Standards promote active student learning to be adapted to varying contexts and diverse student needs (Tharp et al., 2000):

1. teachers and students producing together;
2. developing language and literacy across the curriculum;
3. connecting schools to students’ lives;
4. teaching complex thinking; and
5. teaching through conversation.

The purpose of the Five Standards is to incorporate these pedagogy standards with the existing classroom instructional practices to foster complex thinking, develop language and literacy, and attain successful academic outcomes (Tharp et al., 2000). Substantial reliable evidence has been presented that supports that the use of the standards predicted achievement gains in reading comprehension and language development, significantly greater achievement scores on standardized tests, showed greater gains in English, and found that English learners spent more time on task and perceived themselves as better

The Optimal Learning Environments, the Principles for Life-long Learning, and the Five Standards for Effective Pedagogy have directly influenced the emphasis on the pedagogical elements that include the teacher value for students, curriculum, and instruction, as seen in Figure 6. These pedagogical elements that will be examined in schools in this study will inform how students are being taught and what they are being taught.

**Value for Learner**

Gay (2000) states that when teaching students of color culture counts because it “determines how we think, believe, and behave, and these, in turn, affect how we teach and learn” (p. 9). It is imperative that classroom educators not only view the cultural diversity in our schools as a strength, that they also have the knowledge and skills to affectively work with students with diverse language and cultural needs (Banks, 2001; Gay, 2000, Pang & Branch, 2001). Unfortunately, the importance of standardized test scores and schools attaining a high Annual Performance Index (API) score have targeted English learners, immigrants, and ethnically diverse students as a weak link in the chain (Sleeter, 2005). Students are more successful in school when teachers believe that they can learn, hold high expectations for them, and genuinely care about them (Ladson-Billings, 1994).
Deficit-based Values

While successful schools hold high expectations for all students many educators still perpetuate the myth that low-income culturally and linguistically diverse students are innately unable to excel in school (Banks, 2006). School structures and teacher practices may overtly and covertly inform students of color that they are inferior to European-American students (Pang & Branch, 2001). Some educators believe that the reason many low-income students underachieve is because their parents don’t care about their education and the students themselves hold low expectations toward school (Comer, 1997; Moreno & Valencia, 2002). As part of the deficit myth, non-English speaking, immigrant, low income students are targeted as having a language problem and being culturally deficient (Flores, Cousin & Díaz, 1991). Separating these students from the regular class to receive specialized instruction is also a deficit form of education because the student is identified as having the problem and is not capable of functioning in the same class as the other students (Flores, Cousin & Díaz, 1991). Some teachers blame English learners and their parents for not learning English fast enough because they claim that the parents don’t want to learn English and they also don’t want their children to learn English (Chomsky, 2007; Dalphin, 1987; Valencia, 1997). This ideology reflects some teachers’ deficit-based attitudes toward culturally diverse students and the expectations that they hold for students of color (McLaren, 1989). The terms culturally deprived, culturally disadvantage, intellectually disadvantaged and socially disadvantaged had been introduced in past literature to speak about the family pathology and impoverished home environments (Pearl, 1997). The parents of culturally deprived families were negatively depicted as abusive, neglectful, substance abusers, poor
providers, sexually promiscuous, inadequate, and poor teachers of their children (Pearl, 1997). Havighurst (1966) compared the family characteristics that socially disadvantaged and middle-class children possessed. According to Havighurst (1966), the socially disadvantaged children lacked parents that read to them, showed them the value of education and acknowledged their positive academic achievement. In the 1980’s, low-achieving, low socioeconomic families, including Latinos, were labeled at-risk. This meant that the identified at-risk students were already expected to fail school (Moreno & Valencia, 2002). Culturally deprived children were designated as “irreparably intellectually impaired” because of their limited English proficiency (Pearl, 1997, p. 133).

The culturally deprived child was also described as having pathogenic personality characteristics, was fatalistic; mistrustful; had low self-esteem; poor impulse control; inability to distinguish right from wrong; was anti-intellectual….Thus, with the invention of the culturally disadvantaged/culturally deprived child we see one of the most significant social constructions of the 1960s. (Pearl, 1997, p. 133-134.)

The deficiencies described in the research literature for culturally deprived children justified the deficit-based attitudes of educators toward ethnically and linguistically diverse, immigrant, low-income students and the lowered expectations of achievement outcomes.

**Values of Meritocracy**

The theory of meritocracy is formed on the basis that rewards should be based on merit (Valencia, 1997). The myth or meritocracy persists that “success can be achieved by intelligence, hard work and creativity” (McLaren, 1989, p. 223). In America, the meritocracy myth is fundamentally held true for all individuals, regardless of their race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and language preference (Mclaren, 1989). Everything
that they need to succeed is provided for them and all they have to do is want it and work for it. All individuals have the same opportunities to be successful, finish school, go on to college, and make it when they are motivated and make an effort to accomplish their goals. The fault is placed on the individual if he or she does not succeed (Nieto, 1999). Our society rewards groups and individuals differently according to their ability level and intellect (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004). This worldview of meritocracy fails to take into consideration the implicit system-wide structures and practices that hinder the success for some while guaranteeing the success for others (Darder, 2002). Opportunities for success will remain limited to individuals due to their race, ethnicity, language, gender, and socioeconomic level while racism and discrimination continue to exist.

Educators whom maintain a meritocratic ideology may fall for the myth that non-English speakers and non-white ethnic students are intellectually deficient and will probably not reach the expected achievement goals and expectations (Bartolomé, 2003). They continue to provide a one-size-fits-all education for all students without considering the differing needs that each student requires and the strengths that each student brings to school. Students that do not see themselves as being successful in school will more than likely blame themselves for their failure and resort to dropping out of school and diminishing their self-worth (Darder, 2002). From the lens of a meritocracy perspective, it is not the fault of the teacher or the school (Nieto, 1999). The students failed be success because they weren’t motivated, smart enough, or didn’t work hard enough to finish school and the blame is placed on the students (McLaren, 1989).

Many teachers will say that they look beyond race and ethnicity and treat and teach all students the same. They take a color-blind approach to diversity. While this
may seem like a noble and ethical practice, it may be a dangerous practice that perpetuates a status quo educational practice that maintains culturally and linguistically diverse students to low expectations, limiting their access into the mainstream culture, and denying them the opportunity to develop a sociocultural identity (Darder, 1991; McLaren, 1989). A multicultural education approach toward meeting the educational, sociocultural, and language needs of ethnically diverse students begins with viewing the students’ differences as a positive attribute rather than a limitation (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billing, 1994; Nieto, 2001).

**Values of Equal Encouragement**

All educators should be responsive to the cultural, linguistic, social, gender, and ability needs of all their students. Not only do they need to be responsive, they also need to treat their students with love and dignity (Gay, 2000). Teachers who are culturally responsive to the needs of their students recognize the differences among their students to appropriately meet their needs (Banks, 2006; Gay, 2000; Sleeter, 2005). Some characteristics that foster successful schools include teachers being involved in the decision-making process (in and out of the classroom), implementing instruction founded on developmental and social skill needs of their students, and teachers consistently monitoring and reinforcing the academic performance of their students (Pang & Branch, 2001).

Merton (1968) introduced the term *self-fulfilling prophecy*, meaning that students will perform to the expectation of their teachers. If teachers have low achievement expectations for students then the students will perform at low achievement levels and
vice versa. The expectation for student achievement impacts the school environment and beliefs toward the academic, social, and language outcomes. An alternative to deficit-based and meritocratic values of students is democratic education (Pearl, 1997). Pearl (1990) proposes that knowledge, the guarantee of particular rights, the opportunity to participate with equal power, and equal encouragement are four requirements of democratic education that are needed to combat deficit thinking. Equal encouragement of students is important for teachers to enact toward ethnically and linguistically diverse students. Students should be equally encouraged to take risks, make mistakes, and learn from them. Students who achieve more often than not are more willing to take risks and students who had never taken risks can develop into more secure individuals (Pearl, 1997). Engaging in community building and positively addressing issues that cause students to feel humiliation, boredom, and loneliness helps in providing a positive and stimulating experience for students.

Values of Empowerment

An empowering education encourages a “critical-democratic pedagogy for self and social change” that promotes an active, cooperative, and social process for students (Shor, 1992, p. 15). Empowered students should develop “strong skills, academic knowledge, habits of inquiry, and critical curiosity about society, power, inequality, and change” (Shor, 1992, p. 15). Teachers hold a great deal of power in their classrooms. They can either keep the power, thus sustaining students as spectators in their learning or they can share the power, allowing students to become active participants in their learning (Shor, 1992). This interaction influences the formation of the student identity
and the level of efficacy to make impact in their life and create social change (Cummins, 2001). Cummins (2001) explains that the coercive relation of power defines a dominant group or individual (school or teacher) and a subordinate group or individual (students) where the subordinate group is identified as inferior, automatically identifying the dominant group as superior. This relation of power between the teacher and student could reflect the same “interactions between dominant and subordinate groups in the wider society”, which inhibits the “development and potential” by holding them to low expectations and limiting their opportunities for learning and achieving (Cummins, 2001, p. 15). Teachers who create a shared power relationship with their students can create an environment that breaks the coercive relation of power and helps to shape student identities. Teachers that value students’ potential for empowerment provide a space where power is created with teachers and students through a process of collaboration and where students’ voices can be heard and praised (Pacino, 2008). A process for empowerment is generated through experiences and interactions (Cummins, 2001).

Empowerment embraces competence, accomplishment, confidence, and efficacy. (Gay, 2000, p. 215)

Teachers who internalize a value of empowerment for their students believe that their students can succeed and be empowered individuals. They are committed to seeing that their students succeed and they take risks to create a positive teacher-student relationship (Gay, 2000). Participation by students involves providing active experiences in class, to develop knowledge, reflective understanding, encourage their aspirations and achievements, and treated as responsible, caring human beings (Shor, 1992). Students should be challenged to exceed standards and reach for high expectations through rigorous instruction, critical thought, and negotiating authority in the classroom (Gay,
2000; Shor, 1992). Valuing students’ diversity, cultural pluralism, and multilingualism as a strength is an important aspect in an empowerment approach in education (Banks, 1999; Nieto, 2001). These practices and beliefs extend toward an empowering pedagogy that value empowered students. Nieto (1992) reinforces that ideal where “teachers and schools engaged in the task of challenging social inequities need to do so with an explicit understanding on their part and that of their students that they are involved in a struggle that critiques and questions the status quo not only of schools but of society in general” (p. 249).

Curriculum

Teachers should be critical of curriculum that is geared for European-American students and be knowledgeable to transform curriculum that matches for the learning styles of all students of diverse cultural backgrounds, language background, gender orientation, learning styles, and abilities (Banks, 2006; Gay, 2000; Gay, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Nieto, 2001). Gay (2000) stresses that culturally responsive teaching is an effective approach for meeting the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students because it teaches to and through the strengths of students and it is culturally validating and affirming. She highlights the work of Larry Cuban (1972) and Juan Aragon (1973) whom proposed that educators look to a multidimensional approach to educating students of color. Cuban believed that implementing a curriculum that was inclusive of ethnic content was insufficient. He challenged educators to combine it with instructional strategies that emphasized inquiry, critique, and analysis, instead of continuing a traditional method of rote memorization and reciting facts. Aragon believed that teachers
did not understand or value the cultural heritages of ethnically diverse students and that was caused students to not do well in school. He stressed that teachers begin to change their attitudes toward ethnically diverse students and develop skills for incorporating cultural diversity into classroom instruction to improve student achievement (Gay, 2000). The following sections describe differing approaches to curriculum ranging from a subtractive perspective to an additive perspective.

**Compensatory Curriculum**

A compensatory type of curriculum is designed to build the basic skills for students that are ‘culturally deprived, which includes “rote, unchallenging verbal stimulation in which the child has to adjust to the curriculum” (Pearl, 1997, p. 134). A compensatory education approach acknowledges a deficit perspective toward students that allegedly are in need of intellectual stimulation that can be repaired through focused school interventions (Pearl, 1997). A compensatory curriculum encompasses a basic-skills curriculum where students are exposed to “instruction on rote, skill-drill exercises which typically emphasize (d) cognitive skills of recognition and recall” with workbooks and worksheets (Anyon, 1997, p. 136). New Jersey in the mid 1970s required a compensatory type curriculum to be implemented with minority students in urban areas because it was inexpensive and schools or districts did not need to invest in technology or other curriculum materials (Anyon, 1997). Through a compensatory approach to curriculum development,

Students should become equipped with the cognitive skills, concepts, information, language, and values required by American society to hold a job and function within its existing institutions and culture. (Sleeter & Grant, 1988, p. 36)
Schools undergo special and temporary modification in schooling to support students’ transition to the mainstream culture that White, middle-class children are learning. Not only does a compensatory curriculum limit students to a basic type of education, it limits teachers to a basic type of instructional practice that can be referred to as a *teacher-proofed* curriculum. This type of curriculum design “contributes further to the devaluing and deskilling of teachers by removing them from the decision-making process” (McLaren, 1989, p. 222).

A compensatory approach to curriculum development provides all students with limited access to diversity education where differences are tolerated but not necessarily accepted.

They learn virtually nothing about the contributions, perspectives, or talents of women or those outside the cultural mainstream. U. S. slavery is mentioned briefly in relation to the Civil War, but African Americans are missing thereafter. In English class, the students have begun their immersion in the ‘canon,’ reading works almost entirely written by European and European-American males, although a smattering of women and African-American (but no Asian, Latino, or American Indian) authors are included in the newest anthology. (Nieto, 1998, p. 9)

A monocultural education type of curriculum is implemented where school structures, policies, curricula, instructional materials and even pedagogical strategies are representative of the mainstream, European-American cultural (Nieto, 1998).

Sleeter and Grant (1988) introduced five approaches to multiculturalism have varying levels of social and cultural integration. The Human Relations approach examines the relationships within people from varying race, social class, gender and handicaps. The goals of the Human Relations approach to multicultural education promotes a feeling of unity, tolerance, and acceptance within existing social structure that promote positive feelings among students, students’ self-concepts, and reduces
stereotyping (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). The critique of this approach is that it perpetuates a superficial food, fun and fiesta focus to diversity where the purpose is for everyone to just get along and accept one another.

**Ethnocentric Curriculum**

The term ethnocentrism refers to judging other ethnic groups from one’s own cultural point of view. The deeper issue with ethnocentrism is characterized when we make false assumptions about other ethnic groups, usually from a negative or deficiency perspective, and deems our own ethnic group as superior. Sleeter and Grant (1988) note that when teachers teach content that incorporates cultural diversity, they include people of color but only in a supplementary way. Rarely do they refer to women or people of color in their instruction. White males dominate the content topics while the working- or lower-class experience is excluded (Sleeter and Grant, 1988). An ethnocentric approach to curriculum and education perpetuates the existing hegemony and “effectively block the acquisition and application of new, culturally relevant pedagogical knowledge, skills, and will in teaching African, Latino, Native, and Asian American students” (Gay, 2000, p. 208). The content knowledge and information based on assumptions, expectations, and practices from a European American cultural system is imposed on all students and assumed as being the right way (Gay, 2000). Gay (2000) insists that students achievement improves when the teaching and learning is “filtered through the cultural frameworks of students of color” (p. 208). An ethnocentric curriculum dismisses legitimate issue of culture, language, and gender discrimination and fails to include more information regarding the different ethnic groups in the nation. Limiting students to
different and various perspectives detracts them from being exposed a wide range of information, thus preventing them to build critical thinking and analysis skills, and reach their own conclusions (Diaz, 2001). Through an assimilationist perspective, schools can assist in assimilating ethnic students in the mainstream American culture “that require them to experience a process of self-alienation” (Banks, 2006, p. 131).

A Single-Group approach to multicultural education promotes social structural equality for and immediate recognition of an identified ethnic, language gender or ability group to promote willingness and knowledge among students working toward social change that would benefit the identified group (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). The critique of this approach is that it is usually a superficial add-on to the existing curriculum instead of it being the content focus and this approach is usually only implemented in with students that belong in the identified group. Another critique is that it focuses on revising the curriculum rather than trying to change the school environment (Sleeter & Grant, 1988).

**Multicultural Curriculum**

One aspect of multicultural education involves the creation of knowledge by students and teachers as a process of critical “thinking, discussion, writing, argument or conversation” (Joe Kincheloe, p. 137/ Steinberg, 1995).

Schools can be agents of emancipation for individuals and society. (Gay, 1995, p. 165)

Teachers and students can create new knowledge when they share their experiences, culture, and language background, and mutually confront contradictions and information to generate meaning (Joe Kincheloe/Steinberg, 1995). A multicultural curriculum concentrates on incorporating diverse cultural perspectives, rejecting racism and various
forms of discrimination and oppression, and affirming values of cultural pluralism (Gay, 1995; Nieto, 1992). Banks (2006) identifies five dimensions of multicultural education: (1) content integration, (2) the knowledge construction process, (3) prejudice reduction, (4) equity pedagogy, and (5) an empowering school culture and social structure.

Teachers who envelope content integration with their students, incorporate information from a variety of cultures to make meaning of key concepts, theories, and principles. The approach for the knowledge construction process utilizes discussion, frames of reference, perspectives, biases, and cultural assumptions that emphasize prejudice reduction.

Positive students’ racial and ethnic attitudes are developed when images of racial and ethnic groups are consistently and naturally integrated in teaching materials. Teachers adjust their instruction to cater to the learning and cultural styles of students and engage students in cooperative learning activities (Banks, 2006). Gay (2000) conceptualizes “ethnic identity development, citizenship skills for pluralistic societies, knowledge of ethnic and cultural diversity, cross-cultural interactional competence as well as academic success” (p.28) as vital dimensions to consider when developing multicultural curriculum content. A multicultural approach to curriculum design incorporated the cultures of diverse learners into the social and academic context of schooling that lead to supporting and promoting the students’ sociocultural identity, language development, learning outcomes, and their personal development (Hollins & Spencer, 1990). Students should have opportunities to choose from variety of options in their learning where they can propose a learning task of their own within a content focus provided by the teacher. Through this process students engage in a decision-making process in constructing
meaningful knowledge and authentic learning (Gay, 2000). Diaz (2001) states that the curriculum

…should present the essential elements of the American Creed (dignity, individual freedom, equality of opportunity) as well as instances when society has veered from those lofty values. (p. 220).

James Banks (2006) advocates for a social studies curriculum where history is presented through multiple perspectives and where the truth is told.

Although multicultural education is not opposed to the West, its advocates do demand that the truth about the West be told, that its debt to people of color and women be recognized and included in the curriculum, and that the discrepancies between the ideals of freedom and equality and the realities of racism and sexism be taught to students. Reflective action by citizens is also an integral part of multicultural theory. Multicultural education views citizen actions to improve society as an integral part of education in a democracy: it links knowledge, values, empowerment and action. (Banks, 2006, p. 130)

According to Sleeter and Grant (1988) a Multicultural Education approach promotes social structural equality and cultural pluralism to promote equal opportunity in the school, cultural pluralism and alternative life-styles, respect for those who differ, and support of power equity among groups. A critique of this approach is that it needs to direct more attention to the social structural inequities and support students in acquiring the skills needed to challenge the inequalities (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). It can sometimes become a celebration of differences at a superficial level rather than a call for action and change directed toward the social issues for social justice.

**Transformative Curriculum**

Teachers need to critically analyze the existing curriculum and deconstruct it so that students can learn the existing knowledge and also critically analyze the knowledge they encounter in their learning and construct their own interpretation.
Transformative academic knowledge challenges the facts, concepts, paradigms, themes, and explanations routinely accepted in mainstream academic knowledge. (Banks, 2006, p. 135)

The curriculum adds the lived experiences and realities of all students and the teacher and it becomes a part of the existing curriculum and constructed knowledge, and where a space is created for everyone to express their voice and perspective (Banks, 2006). In this space, multiple perspectives are encouraged and valued where students can

...acquire the skills and abilities they need to examine conflicting knowledge claims and perspectives. Students must become critical consumers of knowledge as well as knowledge producers if they are to acquire the understandings and skills needed to function in the complex and diverse world of tomorrow. (Banks, 2006, p. 160)

Students’ personal empowerment and social transformation developed in school help students to maintain a positive self-affirmation, reach greater academic success, and gain social consciousness (Gay, 1995).

If students are to maximize their potential for personal power and autonomy, they need to believe that they are capable and valued, experience success, and understand how and why the conditions of society directly affect their personal opportunities and possibilities. (Gay, 1995, p. 175)

The social action approached to curriculum reform, presented by Banks (1988) requires students to take a role where they make decisions and take actions related to the themes and topics discussed in the unit of study. The goal of this approach is to educate and empower students to develop decision-making skills and be oriented toward social criticism and social change instead of being socialized to accept the existing practices, ideologies and institutional in society (Banks, 1988). The purpose of providing a transformative approach to curriculum development is to prepare and empower students to participate in democratic social change and to be able to influence the social and political systems in American society (Banks, 1988).
The Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist approach to multicultural education promotes social structural equality and cultural pluralism to prepare citizens to work actively toward social structural equality, promote cultural pluralism and alternative life-styles, and equal opportunity in the school by involving students actively in democratic decision making, building on students’ learning styles, developing students’ skill levels, and using cooperative learning (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). To effectively implement this approach with students, schools and teachers need to recognized that they can provide students a space to become change agents and that the students possess ideas and thoughts that need to be taken seriously. Teachers should be sensitive to the students’ social issues and be prepared to negotiate the tensions that may arise in dealing positively with those issues Sleeter & Grant, 1988). Critical thinking and metacognitive skills are essential for a process of personal empowerment emphasized by “moral dilemma discussions, integrated curriculum and holistic learning, values clarification, concept attainment, cooperative learning, literacy criticism, prejudice reduction, comparative analysis, self-reflection, conflict resolution, inquiry, and problem-solving” (Gay, 1995, p. 179)

**Instruction**

**Banking Method of Instruction**

The banking method of instruction is based on the notion that the school and the teacher are the holders of complete knowledge and the students are empty vessels in which need to be filled with knowledge. The knowledge that is poured into the students is the ultimate knowledge and without it the students will not be successful in school and
as a member of society. The knowledge that the students already carry is insufficient and in many instances considered a detriment to their academic and social success (Freire, 2001). This style of instruction maintains students as mere recipients and not as participants in their learning.

In the banking concept of education, knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing. Projecting an absolute ignorance onto others, a characteristic of the ideology of oppression, negates education and knowledge as processes of inquiry. (Freire, 2001, p. 72)

Paulo Freire (2001) identifies the attitudes and practices that are operationalized in oppressive societies:

- the teacher teaches and the students are taught;
- the teacher knows everything and the students know nothing;
- the teacher thinks and the students are thought about;
- the teacher talks and the students listen—meekly;
- the teacher disciplines and the students are disciplined;
- the teacher chooses and enforces his choice, and the students comply;
- the teacher acts and the students have the illusion of acting through the action of the teacher;
- the teacher chooses the program content, and the students adapt to it;
- the teacher confuses the authority of knowledge with his or her own authority, which she and he sets in opposition to the freedom of the students; and
- the teacher is the Subject of the learning process, while the pupils are mere objects.
A banking method instruction entails a teacher driven instructional practice where the students merely learn remedial skills of rote memorization of facts and decoding without paying attention to meaning. The goal of is to produce an end product that shows mastery in a skill without focusing on the process of learning. Students regurgitate the status quo knowledge that may or may not have any contextual relevance and meaning to the student’s life. The teacher limits students to use their creativity by holding student accountable to scoring well on standardized test instead of utilizing authentic student work and assessment tools to measure academic outcomes. The teacher holds students to low expectation, only to meet the minimum requirements. Students are taught through the use of textbooks and pre-packaged materials, with scripted lessons, learning only procedures instead of concepts.

In reading, students are expected to learn letters and sounds (phonics) and decode using decontextualized reading materials that no relevance to their prior knowledge and experiences. Writing is limited to decontextualized worksheets that follow a sequence of skills from the pacing in the teacher guides, where the students copy letters and words, complete (CLOZE) sentences, and connect the vocabulary word to the picture. The main focus for writing is correct grammar, spelling and punctuation application. In math, the students are taught to know their numbers, memorize their (addition, subtraction, multiplication, division) facts, and know how to follow the procedures to find the answer to basic facts. Little attention is given to understanding the mathematical concepts due to the lack of time to cover the many math standards. Social studies and science content is taught by telling students about the important facts that they need to know to answer the comprehension questions at the end of the unit chapter. Students are limited to reading
the textbook and possibly learning comprehension strategies to better understand how to negotiate the textbook. These are considered vital skills that students need to master to be able to function in middle school and high school and to be successful on the standardized tests. Little critical thinking and higher order thinking problems are posed to students and students are reduced to interacting on the experiences of the teacher instead of including their own experiences and knowledge as part of their learning process. Freire refers to banking education as a dehumanizing and oppressive act (2001).

**Skills-Based Instruction**

A skills-based approach to instruction instills the same principles of the banking method in that the approach to teaching is based on what the school and teacher deems as necessary for the student because they lack the appropriate cultural capital to be successful in school. The focus of this instructional method is to prepare students, especially ethnically and linguistically diverse students, to *catch-up* to the native born, native English speaking students. The teacher may be culturally aware and sensitive to the diverse needs of the students, yet strict curriculum pacing, and clear expectations for high achievement on the standardized tests may hinder their expectations to different the instruction, promote cooperative learning opportunities, and expose students to social issues (racism, discrimination, human rights, gender, language, etc.) that may affect them directly and indirectly. The instruction is primarily in English and students are strongly encouraged to speak in English so that they can gain proficiency at a faster pace.
**Student-Centered Instruction**

Educators and multicultural leaders that promote multicultural education believe that the curriculum in schools with a diverse student population should be accessible and meaningful to the diverse student population that it serves and that teachers should implement instructional practices that best meet the students’ learning styles. Sleeter and Grant (1988) propose a few instructional principles that multicultural education experts promote for schools. One principle is to view students as motivated learners, capable of learning and understanding at a high academic level. A second principle is that teachers should use the students’ unique learning style and methods to build onto their learning. A third principle of multicultural education is for teachers to value the skills, knowledge, and experiences that students bring to school and use it to add on more knowledge. A fourth principle is that teachers have high and realistic expectations for all students. A fifth principle is that teachers utilize cooperative learning approaches and structures in the classroom. A sixth principle of multicultural education is that teachers assist students in developing and cultivating a positive self-concept for success in school.

Along with these principles, teachers that educate ethnically and linguistically diverse students should also be proactive in providing individual instruction when needed to further advance those students that learn best on a one-on-one bases. Teachers should not denigrate a student’s home language but instead embrace it and allow students to use it as a tool for learning English. And lastly, teachers should be alert to acknowledge students for their successful performance in the classroom. These are a few principles, among many, that educators can implement as part of their curriculum and instructional
approach toward creating appropriate conditions and processes that assists all students to be academically successful.

The focus for student learning is on process rather than product. When students can reflect on the process of engagement in their learning they can create and recreate knowledge. In reading, the teacher focuses on meaning first by engaging students on thinking about a story that was read aloud or in small groups. The students, along with the teacher, identify themes and topics, and the students make connections to the story, they share their own experiences and they examine the story through multiple perspectives. They learn vocabulary terms and apply the newly learned vocabulary in their writing. They learn to decode and find meaning in the text and they also engage in small group reading groups where the teacher differentiates the reading instruction to meet the needs of each student while still holding all students to high expectations.

They write about their experiences that are related to the themes in the story and reconstruct the story by naming the new meaning. They practice their grammar, spelling, and punctuation skills by revising their story to complete a final draft for publication. The teacher facilitates this process by engaging in whole-class instruction, small group instruction, and individual student monitoring. Throughout the process, the students engage as a whole-class, in cooperative groups, and in individual work. At the end of the process the students share their published work, articulate their reading skills by summarizing the story, identifying the themes, identifying the character traits, and finding the problem solution to the story. The teacher will also make a real life connection to what is happening in the world, where students can have an opportunity to extend their learning beyond the classroom.
In math, the students are challenged with learning and understanding mathematical concepts before learning the procedures for solving math problems. The teachers challenge students to solve math problems in multiple forms by utilizing various strategies and articulating how they solved the problem, either through writing or oral presentation, or both. The teacher facilitates the learning process by introducing the concepts, working with the students to gain understanding and then challenging the students to expand on the concepts and thus adding to the instruction and the creation of knowledge, where the students take ownership and are held accountable for learning. Allowing students to expand on the instructions gives them a space to use their prior knowledge and learn through exploration, working collaboratively with other, and using their diverse learning modalities.

**Culturally Relevant Instruction**

Culturally competent instructional action is essential to achieving genuine commitment to educational equity, justice, and excellence for students of color. (Gay, 2000, p. 209)

Culturally relevant instruction emphasizes teaching to and through the students’ cultural and personal strengths, their intellectual capabilities, language, and prior accomplishment (Gay, 2000). Educators should engage in educational processes in which the students’ culture is an instructional resource and where students can become contributors in creating knowledge. Gay (2000, p. 29) defines culturally relevant instruction as “using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for
them.” Gay also specifies that culturally relevant instruction include these characteristics:

- acknowledges the legitimacy of the cultural heritages of different ethnic groups, both as legacies that affect students’ dispositions, attitudes, and approaches to learning and as worthy content to be taught in the formal curriculum;
- builds bridges of meaningfulness between home and school experiences as well as between academic abstractions and lived socio-cultural realities;
- uses a wide variety of instructional strategies that are connected to different learning styles;
- values and utilized the students’ primary language to gain access to the core curriculum and become proficient in English;
- teaches students to know and praise their own and each other’s cultural heritages;
- incorporates multicultural information, resources, and materials in all the subjects and skills routinely taught in schools;

Culturally relevant instruction is comprehensive because teachers and students develop intellectual, social, emotional, and political learning (Hollins, 1996; Ladson-Billings, 1992). It is multidimensional because it envelops content, learning context, classroom climate, student-teacher relationships, instructional techniques, and performance assessments (Gay, 2000). It is empowering because students take ownership of their learning and they believe that they can be successful (Shor, 1992). It is transformative because it explicitly teaches about the strengths and accomplishments of students’ culture and it confronts the Eurocentric, status quo school knowledge embedded in the traditional curriculum (Banks, 1991). It is emancipatory because it allows students
to make authentic connections with their learning and their community that can lead them to create their own knowledge about themselves and their world (Crichlow, Goodwin, Shakes, & Swartz, 1990; Hollins, 1996; Ladson-Billings, 1992).

**Achievement Outcomes**

One of the goals of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is “to close the achievement gap with accountability, and choice, so that no child is left behind” (United States Department of Education, Public Law 107-110, 107th Congress, 2002). The achievement gap is between high and low-performing children, between minority and non-minority students, and between disadvantaged children and their more advantage peers, including English learners (Meier & Wood, 2004; Valdez-Pierce, 2003). Another goal is to hold teachers, school, and districts accountable for improving the academic achievement of all students (Abernathy, 2007). Schools are gauged by the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), which is based on the results of students’ scores on standardized tests that they take every year (U.S. DOE, Public Law 107-110, sec. 1111, 2b, 2002). Meeting AYP means that a high percentage of students in a school met the state’s academic proficiency standards or that the school is demonstrating academic improvement for all students, including student subgroups (Abernathy, 2007; Darling-Hammond, 2004). Under NCLB the test results are disaggregated by grade level and in student subgroups by ethnicity, those who are eligible for free and reduced lunch, those identified as English learners and those who qualify for special education services (U.S. DOE, Public Law 107-110, sec. 1111, 2c, 2002). “Schools are judged by the performance of all of their students and by the performance of each of these eight subgroups” and the test participation requirement
for all students (Abernathy, 2007, p. 5). Every year each school’s testing information is presented by the state and is accessible to the public. Schools that fail to meet their yearly AYP mark are sanctioned according to the number of year of not meeting their expected goal (Darling-Hammond, 2004; Valdez-Pierce, 2003). The first year of not meeting AYP results in being identified as not meeting AYP. The second consecutive year of not meeting their AYP goals results in identifying the school as a school in need of improvement. The third consecutive year of not meeting AYP results in using their Title I funds for professional development and begin offering supplemental tutoring, remedial and other academic services to students. By the fourth year of not meeting their AYP goals, schools must take corrective action and replace the school personnel and correct the school’s curriculum, appoint an outside expert to advise the school, lengthen the school day or year, or restructure the entire school organizational structure (U.S. DOE, Public Law 107-110, sec. 1116, b1A, 2002).

Schools with large numbers of subgroups are more likely to be at a disadvantage in terms of meeting its yearly achievement targets. Darling-Hammond (2004) points out that schools with a great number of subgroups are more susceptible to failing to meet yearly AYP targets. Schools meet their yearly AYP target when all the subgroups meet their selected targets. If one subgroup fails to meet its target the entire school fails and is identified as needing improvement. The schools that are more homogeneous have a greater opportunity to meet all their subgroups targets. This makes it more difficult for larger, more diverse school districts, which are more likely to receive less federal funding as a consequence for not having students and subgroups meet their target goals. This
then leads to the discussion involving standards and administering state tests to students who are not proficient in English.

Ironically, states that use more ambitious tests and have set higher standards will experience greater failures than those with low standards. (Darling-Hammond, 2004, p. 15)

A state’s standardized test is the principal and only form of formally evaluating students’ academic achievement, including English learners. Utilizing alternative forms of assessing the language and academic development of English learners to “find out what students can do with what they know and how well they respond to instruction, rather than to determine only how well they can function in English” (Valdez-Pierce, 2003, p. 9). Valdez-Pierce (2003) presents some implications that need to be taken into account when testing English learners. The first is to acknowledge that the fluency in speaking skills does not necessarily mean that the students are ready to take standardized tests. The second implications is to acknowledge that English learners need time for processing and thinking as they develop English, and allow for flexible time limits to relieve anxiety and promote self-confidence. The third implication is to make sure that English learners are not placed in special education programs if they do not score well on standardized tests. And the fourth implication is to make sure that teachers have realistic expectations for student performance on standardized tests.

According to the No Child Left Behind Act (2002), English learners are to be provided with reasonable accommodations while they take the standardized tests. States are encouraged to develop tests in other languages and use alternate assessments to measure English learners’ progress in reading, writing, listening and speaking skills in English. With all students being required to take the state standardized test, English
learners are at a disadvantage when you consider their development of English proficiency. While holding them to high expectation that they can perform well on the test, English learners will have to outperform their native English speaking peers to close the achievement gap (Valdez-Pierce, 2003). Another aspect to consider is the quality of education the English learners may or may not be receiving as a result of their test results (Lachat, 2004).

**California Standards Test**

California utilizes the California Standards Test (CST) to measure students’ language arts, math, and science achievement. The CST is a component of the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program. California educators and test developers specifically for California develop the CST. The CST measures students’ progress toward meeting California’s state-adopted academic content standards. The test describes what students should know and be able to do in each grade and subject tested (Standardized Testing and Reporting Program, 2009). All second through sixth graders take the test. According to the California Department of Education (2008) and the CST English language arts blueprint, the test consists of 65 multiple-choice questions for grades two and three. In grade four through eleven, the test consists of 75 multiple-choice questions. A writing component is added in grades four and seven. In 2009 the Standards-based Test in Spanish (STS) in reading/language arts will be administered to Spanish-speaking English learners in grades two through seven who either received instruction in Spanish or had been enrolled in the United States for less than 12 months, in addition to taking the CST. Districts have the option to administer the STS to students.
who had been enrolled in school for 12 months or more and were not receiving
instruction in Spanish (California Department of Education, 2008). The STS replaced the
APREnda 3 test.

The students’ scores are compared to preset criteria to determine whether the
students’ performance on the test is advanced, proficient, basic, below basic, and far
below basic. The goal is for all students to score at the proficient and advanced levels
(California Department of Education, 2008). In 2007, 15% of all English learners in
California scored at Proficient and above, compared to 52% of all English Only students,
and 29% of all Latino students. In 2008, 17% of all English learners in California scored
at Proficient and above, compared to 54% of all English Only students, and 32% of all
Latino students (California Department of Education, 2008).
CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study examines the effect of language policy on how English learners are educated, what they are taught, and the driving sociopolitical values and beliefs involved in educating them. The connection between policy and practice in districts and schools requires a clear methodological approach to reveal two educational dimensions: (1) that the structural and pedagogical elements that impact English learner outcomes and (2) each schools’ accountability measures and practices are used to provide all students with a meaningful educational opportunity. To examine the main research question, How is language policy used by California public schools to address the spirit of state and federal language mandates while providing educational access to English learners?

This study incorporated policy research within a case study approach to investigate four different areas of this research: (a) the influence of Lau v. Nichols, Castañeda v. Pickard, Proposition 227, and No Child Left Behind on language policy in schools (b) the impact language policy in selecting the biliteracy focus, instruction, curriculum, and value for learners, (c) the impact instructional pedagogy makes on English learner outcomes, and (d) the approach taken for accountability by schools and districts. The multiple case study approach best meets the purpose of this study.

Policy research is defined as research or analysis of a fundamental social problem in order to provide policymakers with pragmatic, action-oriented recommendations for alleviating the problem. (Majchrzak, 1984, p. 12)
Within the realm of policy research a social problem or tension is examined to identify and provide viable solutions and information, in which case the researcher needs to have a clear understanding of the policy and the implications for all stakeholders (Majchrzak, 1984).

Case Study Approach

A case study approach (Yin, 2003) was utilized to examine five schools in one California school district. The schools examined in this study (a) implemented distinct program models in addressing educational access for English learners, (b) demonstrated varying school achievement levels, based on Annual Progress Index (API), and (c) enrolled a high percentage of English learners and students receiving free and reduced lunch. Data sources included school/classroom observations, focus groups, and interviews. Trend data analysis examined English learners’ language arts Content Standard Test (CST) scores, Spanish Test in Spanish (STS) scores, and California English Language Development Test (CELDT) scores to identify student achievement trends and patterns. Finally a comparative analysis of the case studies findings was performed to provide a clear understanding of the findings. Triangulated approaches were utilized to verify and support the patterns and trends in the findings.

According to Yin (2003), a case study investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident (p. 13)
When analyzing policy and the reality of the implementation of the policy, many different variables may be presented throughout the investigation, thus a case study approach best meets the needs for this research. The policy aspect in this study adds a process of action toward a defined issue or tension (Majchrzak, 1984). The action will be proposed as part of the result to the issue or tension.

The case study approach supports processes that allow the researcher to observe schools’ everyday educational practices and become familiar with the policies and structures they implement. Meeting with teachers, administrators, and parents provides stakeholders a voice that represents a true and honest picture of each selected school site. The qualitative data juxtaposed with the student achievement scores gives a clear portrait in which the researcher is able to clearly articulate the issues, tensions, and educational practices that are effected by NCLB and Proposition 227, and how it impacts English learners’ outcomes.

The methods for investigating the relationship between policy, implementation, and outcomes require the input from different stakeholders. The identified trends, patterns, and themes become the major data points for analysis.

The case study inquiry copes with the technically distinctive situation in which there will be many more variables of interest than data points and as a result relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion, and as a result benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis. (Yin, 2003, p.13-14)

Therefore, a case study design was selected to allow the researcher to clarify the qualitative and trend analysis findings in regards to the relationship between policy, pedagogy, and outcomes. In this study, the case study approach was utilized as a comprehensive research approach, which permitted the implementation a variety of
research strategies—interviews, focus groups, observation, descriptive students

achievement data analysis (Yin, 2003).

**Research Questions**

With the push for more English instruction for English learners and the accountability pressure to meet student achievement goals, the expectation for English learners to excel is great and so are the stakes for schools to avoid sanctions and/or corrective action taken by the school district or state agency. A comprehensive examination of education practices in schools with large English learner populations is essential in addressing how NCLB, Proposition 227, Lau v. Nichols, and Castañeda v. Pickard influence how English learners are taught and what they are taught. This study aims to examine these issues, tensions and outcomes in schools. The following main research question and four sub-questions framed this study:

1. How is language policy used by California public schools to address the spirit of state and federal language mandates while providing educational access to English learners?
   a. How are schools providing educational access for English learners?
   b. How are schools providing effective implementation of programs for English learners based on sound educational theory and with adequate resources?
   c. How are schools providing English learners and their parents due process, access to information, and the option to request for alternative programs?
   d. How are schools holding themselves accountable for English learner achievement and language development outcomes?
Research Tools

It was necessary to utilize multiple tools and processes to address the main research question of the study and conduct the appropriate investigation. The tools utilized in this study included: (a) interviews, (b) focus groups, (c) observations, and (d) student achievement data analysis. The following provides a rationale for utilizing these research tools.

The qualitative data was collected through interviews, focus groups, and school/classroom observations. The principal from each school was interviewed using structured interview questions for three reasons: (1) to become acquainted with the principals and gain their trust, (2) to gain a greater depth of the topics and issues regarding state and federal mandates, language policy, pedagogy, student outcomes and school accountability, and (3) to gather a clearer perspective of the lived experiences of each principal.

Teachers and parents from each school engaged in focus groups for three reasons: (1) to allow the researcher to meet with numerous participants at one time and observe them as they interact throughout the focus group, (2) to promote an engaging discussion between the participants involving issues and topics that are meaningful to their lived experiences, and (3) to gain a clearer understanding of the participants’ opinions, likes, and concerns regarding the type of education the school is providing students.

School and classroom observations were conducted: (1) to record the daily instruction, language policy, and curriculum implemented in the classrooms, (2) to observe the teachers’ approach and style to educating students; and (3) to triangulate the observation findings with the interview and focus group findings.
In addition, student longitudinal achievement data was analyzed: (1) to find trends and patterns for English learners and native English speaking students’ language arts and language achievement, (2) to compare the student achievement scores between schools, and (3) to triangulate the trends and patterns with the interviews, focus groups, and the observation for each school.

**Methodological Framework**

As shown in Figure 7, the research questions were designed to examine the educational practices, processes, and structures that contribute to the educational access for English learners as a result of the language policy implemented in schools. The review of the literature in this study included effective pedagogy for English learners, culturally relevant pedagogy, biliteracy, NCLB, Proposition 227, Castaneda v. Pickard, and Lau v. Nichols. To investigate the research questions a school district with a consistent accountability record for serving EL students was selected. Five K-6 schools within the school district were selected based on English learner enrollment. The participants for each school included the principal, four to eight teachers, and four to eight parents. The data collection process included interviews, focus groups, observations and student achievement scores. The data was used to develop a case study for each school and report the findings. A comparative analysis of the case studies was performed, utilizing the literature review. Finally, a triangulation of the data was performed and referred to the main research question and sub-questions for the study. The final findings were then reported and utilized in formulating recommendations that address the research question, action to be taken, and the implications for future research.
Research Questions

Literature Review
- Effective pedagogy for ELs
- Culturally Relevant Pedagogy
- Biliteracy
- NCLB -- Proposition 227
- Castañeda v. Pickard
- Lau v. Nichols

Selection of School District
- 25% or more EL enrollment
- 800+ API score
- Met EL AYP goals

Selection of Case Study Participants
- Five (K-6) schools
- 50 % or more EL enrollment

Process
- Principal interview
- Teacher focus group (4-8 teachers)
- Parent focus group (4-8 parents)
- School Observations (1-3 visits)
- CST, STS, CELDT 3rd-6th grade student data

Case Study #1
Case Study #2
Case Study #3
Case Study #4
Case Study #5

Comparative Case Study Analysis
Analyze relationship between language policy, pedagogy, outcomes, & accountability

Triangulation of data & formulation of findings

Figure 7. Methodological Framework
Selection of School District

An important detail to the study was selecting a school district that had substantial numbers of English learner enrollment and showed evidence of having a consistent accountability record for serving English learners. The Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) goals for English learners and the California base Annual Performance Index (API) score determined the consistent accountability record. In addition to a consistent accountability record the school district needed to implement a specific instructional programs for English learners. The set criteria for selecting a school district included: (1) having more than 15 kinder through sixth grade schools, (2) having more than 50% Latino student enrollment, (3) having 25% or more English learner enrollment, (4) having an 800 or higher API score, and (5) having met the English learner subgroup AYP goals. It was important to select a school district that had more than 15 kinder through sixth grade schools to be able to have enough schools from which to include in the study. It was important that the school districts serve a substantial English learner population and have data showing progress in the achievement of English learners. Using the DataQuest and the Ed-Data options in the California Department of Education website, four California school districts that met the criteria were identified. Two of the identified school districts were located in northern California and two were located in southern California. Two of the four school districts were contacted based on the geographical access for the researcher and one volunteered to participate in this study.
Participating School Selection Process

Selecting the school samples based on English learner enrollment was an important detail to the research methodology because it provided a clear perspective to the distinct educational approaches that impact educational access for English learners. This allowed for a more comprehensive examination of the schools pertaining to biliteracy, program development, instruction, curriculum, and student outcomes in their primary language and in English. The selected participant schools all reside in one southern California school district. Selecting schools from one school district was beneficial to this study because all the schools were concentrated within the context of the same district vision, mission, and goals.

Fifty percent or more of English learner enrollment was the set criteria used to select the participant schools for this study focused on language policy and educational access for English learners. Eleven schools were identified in this school district that met the selection criteria. All eleven schools were contacted and five schools volunteered to participate in this study.

Description of Participating School District

This school district is located in southern California just a few minutes from the California-México international border. It is a fairly large district with more than 40 elementary schools. Five schools are charter schools, four schools are in program improvement status, and the schools’ 2009 Annual Performance Index (API) score range from 891, the highest in the school district to the lowest at 761. The Annual Performance Index (API) measures the academic performance and growth of schools based on test
results of the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program. Table 3 shows that the district serves more than 27,000 students where 36% of the students receive free or reduced price lunch (economically disadvantaged). There are over 9,000 English learners, which make up 36% of the student population. Latino English learners comprise of 33% of the student population.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating School District Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong># Schools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 illustrates that more than 60 percent of the students enrolled are Latino, followed by White (14%), Filipino (9%), African American (5%), and 3% Asian. Table 4 shows the diverse student languages present in the district include Spanish, Tagalog, Japanese, Korean, and Arabic. The district currently has about 1500 certificated employees. Almost 400 of them bilingual teachers with a Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language in Academic Development (BCLAD) certification and a little over 900 of them are certificated Cross-Cultural Language in Academic Development (CLAD) teachers (School District’s Department of Language Acquisition and Development Services and Support, 2010).
Table 4

*Percentage of School District Student Ethnicity Enrollment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Ethnicity</th>
<th>% Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

*School District Instructional Programs and Students’ Home Languages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Programs</th>
<th>Students’ Home Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured English Instruction</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Bilingual</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Language</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the district’s Department of Language Acquisition and Development Services and Support (2010), the school district provides students with a variety of instructional programs: English Language Development (ELD), Structured English Immersion (SEI), Mainstream English (ME), Alternative Bilingual (AB), and Dual
English Language Development (ELD) provides formal lessons to develop students’ English fluency and proficiency. ELD instruction is an essential component of all programs for English learners. In a Structured English Immersion (SEI) program students receive specially Designed Academic Instruction in English in all content areas with teachers using strategies that make the lessons more comprehensible. The purpose of the SEI program is to prepare English learners to enter a Mainstream English program with the appropriate English development. Primary language support may be provided if available. The Mainstream English program is for English learners who have the appropriate English development or whose parents have specifically requested this placement. All subject areas are taught in English. In an Alternative Bilingual (AB) program the instruction is provided in Spanish with a daily-designated time in English. Specifically designed integrated lessons incorporate English usage and are included throughout the day. Parents are provided the option of student placement in these programs and require a parent waiver at non-charter schools. In a Dual Language program English proficient students and English learners have the opportunity to become fluent in English and Spanish and at the same time develop cross-cultural understanding.

**Description of Participating Schools**

Five K-6 schools with 50% or more English learner enrollment from one southern California school district agreed to participate in this study. Table 6 outlines the characteristics of each school. Pseudonyms were used to identify all of the participant schools in this study in an attempt to keep the information confidential. Lincoln School
is a charter school and implements a Dual Language program from kindergarten through seventh grade for all students, while Kennedy School implements a Structured English Immersion (SEI), Mainstream English (ME), and English Language Development (ELD) in all grades and an Alternative Bilingual (AB) program in grades kinder through first. Roosevelt, Jackson and Washington Schools all implement an SEI and ELD programs in all grades. Roosevelt offers an AB program in grades kinder through second, while Jackson School implements an AB program in grades kinder through first and Washington School provides an AB program in grades kinder through third. The schools’ 2009 API scores ranged from 761, the lowest in the district to almost one of the highest at 876. The percentage of English learner enrollment for the five schools ranged from a low of 50% to a high of 72%.

Table 6

Participating Schools’ Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>% EL</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>% Latino Students</th>
<th>API 2008-09</th>
<th>Instructional Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln*</td>
<td>K-7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>Dual Language (K-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>SEI, ME, ELD, AB (K-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>SEI, ELD, AB (K-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>SEI, ELD, AB (K-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington**</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>SEI, ELD, AB (K-3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Charter school; ** Program Improvement
Procedure

My first step was to contact the school district and get authorization to conduct my research by presenting them with a proposal of my intended research. After they approved my proposal and gave me authorization to conduct my research (see appendix H) I met with the Executive Director of Language Acquisition & Development Services at the school district to gather more information about the school that met my selection criteria. In addition, the 2008-09 School Accountability Report Card (SARC) for each of the four schools was retrieved from the Ed-Data link in the data and statistics section of the California Department of Education website. Some of the data extracted from the SARC provided initial district level and school level information including student enrollment, student ethnicity, student language data and teacher information (Ed-Data, 2010). The next step was to contact the principals of the selected schools in the district that met the selection criteria. The principals were contacted first via email and phone calls and then in person. Lincoln, Washington, and Roosevelt Schools agreed right away to participate in this study. The principals were extremely supportive in allowing me access to the school, classrooms, teachers, and parents. Initially it was more difficult to contact the principals Jackson and Kennedy and to find a time to meet due to delays in responding to my emails and phone calls. With persistence the two principals finally agreed to meet with me after I visited the school. Of these two schools, one had an assistant principal and the other had a projects coordinator. The assistant principal and the project coordinator from each of these two schools were the main contact persons and were found to be very supportive in allowing me to gain access to the school, classrooms, teachers, and parents. The principal from each of the five participating schools each
wrote a letter stating that they authorized the research study to be conducted at their school.

After confirmation to conduct the study with the five participant schools, I began by interviewing the principal from each school. After all five principals agreed to participate I communicated with the principal from each school via email and/or by telephone to make an appointment to conduct the initial interview. I informed the principal to reserve a time of one hour and a half for the interview. The interviews lasted no more than 90 minutes and were conducted in the principal’s office (see Appendix A for interview questions).

Table 7 shows that out of the five principals one had the longest tenure as principal in the same school with twelve year, one had been in the same school for four years, two had each been at their school for two years, and for one this was their first year at the school. Their years experience as an administrator ranged from 2 years to 20 years and their years as educators ranged from 12 years to 32 years.
Table 7

*Principal Interview Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th># Years at the School</th>
<th># Years as an Administrator</th>
<th># Years as an Educator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, teachers from each school were invited to participate in a focus group. A formal letter was inserted in each of the teacher’s mailboxes at school. The letter provided a brief description of the researcher and the study and invited teachers to participate in a focus group. Interested teachers were asked to contact the researcher via email or phone provided in the letter. The teacher focus groups were conducted in a classroom at each school site (see Appendix B for teacher focus group prompts and Appendix F for teacher letter).

Table 8 shows that seven teachers at Lincoln School participated in the focus group. They taught in third, fourth and fifth grade, their years teaching at the school ranged from two years to twelve years, and their years as educators ranged from 1 year to 20 years. Four teachers at Kennedy School participated in the focus group. They taught in kinder, third, and fifth, their years as teachers at the school ranged from one year to six years, and their years as educators ranged from 5 to 10 years. Six teachers at Roosevelt School participated in the focus group. They taught in kinder through fourth grade, and
ELD multiple grades, their years teaching at the school ranged from one year to ten years, and their years as educators ranged from 1 year to 15 years. Four teachers at Jackson School participated in the focus group. They taught in first through sixth grade, their years teaching at the school ranged from 1 year to 17 years, and their years as educators ranged from 1 to 17 years. Three teachers at Washington School participated in the focus group. They taught in fourth through sixth grade, their years teaching at the school ranged from three to eight years, and their years as educators ranged form 3 years to 14 years.

Table 8

Teacher Focus Group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th># Years at school</th>
<th># Years as educator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; - 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2 – 12</td>
<td>1 - 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>K - 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 – 6</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>K – 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, ELD</td>
<td>1 – 10</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; - 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 – 17</td>
<td>1 - 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; – 6th</td>
<td>3 - 8</td>
<td>3 - 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then parents from each school were invited to participate in a focus group. A formal letter (written in Spanish and English) was sent home with each student from all participating schools. An envelope was attached to each letter. The letter provided a brief description of the researcher and the study and invited parents to participate in a focus group (see Appendix F for parent letter). Interested parents were asked to contact the researcher via email or telephone provided in the letter. They also had a third option.
in which they could return the bottom portion of the letter to their child’s teacher in the
unmarked envelope. The bottom portion of the letter provided a space where they could
write their name, their children’s name, school name, and email. There was also a space
where they could select the days and times of their availability. Each teacher was
provided with a clasp envelope, with instructions, in which to collect the returned
envelopes. The clasp envelopes were collected after one week. Parent focus groups were
conducted in a classroom, the school lounge, school cafeteria or a coffee shop (see
Appendix C for guiding questions).

Table 9 shows that five parents from Lincoln School participated and had children
in third grade through fifth grade. Five parents from Kennedy School participated and
had children in grades kinder through sixth. Five parents from Roosevelt school
participated and had children in grades kinder through fifth. Three parents from Jackson
School participated and had children in grades kinder through sixth grade. And four
parents from Washington School participated and had children in grades kinder through
sixth.
Table 9

*Parent Focus Group Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th># Parents</th>
<th>Grade of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3rd – 5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>K - 6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>K - 5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>K - 6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consent to Observe School/Classrooms**

All five principals participated in the interview. The majority of the teachers who participated in the focus group gave the researcher consent to observe their classrooms during instructional time, with the exception of two teachers. One of those teachers participated in the focus group but requested not to be observed. One teacher did not want to participate in the focus group but did give consent to be observed.

Observations were also conducted in each school. The observations were conducted in the classroom of consenting teachers. Data was collected using an anecdotal approach and a classroom observation checklist (see Appendix D for observation anecdotal record). A minimum of one visit and a maximum of three visits were required for each classroom observation. A time of one-hour minimum up to three hours were spent for each classroom observation.
All the participants engaged in the interviews and focus groups signed consent forms according to the guidelines of Claremont Graduate University and San Diego State University (See Appendix G for consent forms).

**Description of Research Approach Instruments**

This study used all of the following approaches (interview questions, focus group prompts, observation anecdotal record, and a classroom observation tool) that assessed the biliteracy focus, value for learners, curriculum and instruction for students at each school.

**Interview Questions**

Interviews were conducted with each principal from the five schools. The principal from each of the five schools were asked sixteen questions. The interview questions were designed to collect the information that would answer the research questions. Table 10 shows the correspondence between the research questions and the principal interview questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Interview questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1: Use of language policy by California public schools address the spirit of state and federal language mandates</td>
<td>What is the language policy in your school? Describe how NCLB impact the way this school educates students, and more specifically, English learners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1a: Educational access for English learners</td>
<td>Is this a good place to be a student? What can I expect to see at your school that promotes learning for English learners? How does the school establish an environment that promotes learning and a sense of belonging for students, parents, and school staff? What are the expectations you set for yourself, teachers, parents and students? What are the teacher expectations for English learners in this school? What are the parent expectations for their children in this school? What are the parent expectations for teachers and administrators? Describe how the school provides appropriate educational access to that meets the needs of its diverse student population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1b: Effective implementation of programs for English learners based on sound theory and with adequate resources</td>
<td>Describe the instructional programs that are implemented at this school. How are they effectively implemented to meet the needs of English learners’ literacy/biliteracy development, instructional goals, value for learners, and academic achievement? What was the rationale for selecting this program(s)? What research supports the program implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1c: Due process, access to information, and the option to request for alternative programs for parents</td>
<td>Regarding proposition 227, what types of alternative programs are offered at this school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1d: Schools hold themselves accountable for English learner achievement and language outcomes</td>
<td>What student outcomes are used to measure English learners’ academic and language achievement in this school? What other methods or criteria are used to measure student achievement? What indicators guide your process for school accountability? Describe the approach for holding this school accountable for learning?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus Group Prompts

The focus groups were conducted with consenting teachers and parents at each school. The teachers were presented with five focus group prompts (with sub-questions to further guide the discussion) and the parents were presented with seven focus group prompts (with sub-questions to further guide the discussion) (see Appendix B). The parent focus group prompts were also provided in Spanish (see Appendix C).

The focus group allowed the researcher to meet with numerous participants at one time and observe them as they interact throughout the focus group. The focus group prompts promoted an engaging discussion between the participants involving issues and topics that are meaningful to their lived experiences. The focus group prompts also provided the opportunity to gain a clearer understanding of the participants’ opinions, likes, and concerns regarding the type of education the school is providing students. Table 11 illustrates the correspondence between the research questions and the focus group prompt for teachers and table 12 illustrates the correspondence between the research questions and the focus group prompts for parents.
Table 11

Correspondence Between Research Questions and Teacher Focus Group Prompts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Focus Group Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1: Use of language policy by California public schools address the spirit of state and federal language mandates</td>
<td>Describe how NCLB impact the way this school educates students, and more specifically, English learners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1a: Educational access for English learners</td>
<td>Is this a good place to be a student? How do you offer the best environment that promotes learning and a sense of belonging for students and parents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1b: Effective implementation of programs for English learners based on sound theory and with adequate resources</td>
<td>What can I expect to see in your classroom/program that promotes learning for English learners and your diverse student population? What has this school done to improve the education of students and the involvement of parents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1c: Due process, access to information, and the option to request for alternative programs for parents</td>
<td>How do parents become involved at this school? How does this school inform parents? What information has been shared to parents concerning the education of their children? What other information should be shared?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1d: Schools hold themselves accountable for English learner achievement and language outcomes</td>
<td>How are students’ academic achievement measured at this school? What indicators guide your process for school accountability? What else would you like to see the school do that would improve the education of all students, the quality of the teachers, and the involvement of parents?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Focus Group Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1: Use of language policy by California public schools address the spirit of state and federal language mandates</td>
<td>Is this a good place to be a student? What do teachers at this school do to create an environment that promotes a sense of belonging for students and parents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1a: Educational access for English learners</td>
<td>What do teachers at this school do to promote learning for students who are learning English as a second language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1b: Effective implementation of programs for English learners based on sound theory and with adequate resources</td>
<td>What do teachers at this school do to promote learning for students who are learning English as a second language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1c: Due process, access to information, and the option to request for alternative programs for parents</td>
<td>Describe how this school provides information to parents. What information has been shared to parents concerning the education of your children? What other information should be shared? How do parents become involved at this school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1d: Schools hold themselves accountable for English learner achievement and language outcomes</td>
<td>How are students’ academic achievement measured at this school? What has this school done to improve the education of students and the involvement of parents? What else would you like to see this school do that would improve the education of all students, the quality of the teachers, and the involvement of parents?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observation Anecdotal Record

The researcher developed the classroom observation anecdotal record, based on his 15 years of teaching experience (see Appendix D). The classroom observation anecdotal record enabled the researcher to record the daily instruction, classroom environment, materials, and implementation of the school’s language policy in the classrooms. The observation record had a space to describe the time and instruction that occurred. There was a space to note any evidence of instructional and curricular materials, charts, student work, etc., observed on the classroom or any part of the classroom. And there was a section to note the standards, objectives, goals, daily schedule or any other observations made by the researcher. It also allowed the opportunity to note the teachers’ approach and style to educating students. Using the observation anecdotal record the researcher recorded the following:

- grade level, date, time, number of students, daily schedule;
- instructional language focus (English, bilingual, Spanish, etc.);
- detailed account of teacher instruction and lesson;
- detailed account of student engagement throughout instruction;
- description of student body language and facial expressions;
- teacher demeanor toward students (smiling, frowning, yelling, calming, etc.);
- teacher expectations;
- displayed standards and objectives;
- content being taught;
- evidence of effective strategies, techniques, approaches; and
- materials utilized
Along with the observation anecdotal record, the researcher also utilized a classroom observation checklist to gauge the level of the instructional language focus, instruction, curriculum, and the value for learners in the classrooms and is described in more detail below (see Appendix E).

**Classroom Observation Continuum**

The classroom observation continuum (see appendix E) was utilized during the classroom observations to gauge the level of the instructional language focus, instruction, curriculum, and the value for learners in the classrooms. The English Learner Educational Access Continuum in Figure 8 defines the pedagogy that is implemented for English learners in schools within the context of an additive or subtractive biliteracy focus (Gonzalez, 2010). The pedagogy elements include (1) value for learners, (2) curriculum, and (3) instruction. The classroom observation continuum was designed to operationalize the pedagogy elements featured in the study framework. The continuum for the biliteracy focus element ranges from (1) subtractive biliteracy focus to (5) additive biliteracy focus. The continuum for the value for learners’ element ranges from (1) deficit based to (5) empowerment. The continuum for the instruction element ranges from (1) banking method to (5) culturally relevant. And the continuum for the curriculum element ranges from (1) compensatory to (5) transformative.

A collection of strategies, techniques, approaches, processes, and methods help to identify and define the educational environment for each element presented in the English Learner Educational Access Continuum. The classroom observation continuum is designed to assist the researcher to identify and define the biliteracy focus being
implemented, the value for learners being demonstrated, and the instruction and curriculum being presented to students. For each element a continuum, ranging from one to five, assists the researcher in rating the overall perception of the teaching and learning as observed in the classroom. A five on the continuum signifies the optimal educational environment and a one signifies the least desirable educational environment.
The classroom observation tool design was adapted from the Teaching and Learning Form ONE, developed by Dr. Ruben W. Espinosa in 2003. The Teaching and Learning Form was a tool designed to rate the overall perceptions of teaching and learning. Not only did it provide a list of teaching and learning elements, which included strategies, methods, techniques, approaches and processes, it also included a rating scale...
of the overall perception of the teaching and learning, ranging from 1 lowest to 5 highest.

The teaching and learning elements present in the checklist included:

- instructional language approach;
- collaboration techniques and processes;
- instructional methods;
- learning process;
- inclusion strategies;
- discipline;
- student learning;
- learning methodology;
- assessment approach;
- classroom arrangement;
- multiple intelligences; and
- classroom environment

Dr. Ruben Espinosa provided feedback and input during the development and design of
the classroom observation tool.

**Student Achievement Data**

Descriptive analysis of student California Standards Test (CST) language arts
scores, Standards Test in Spanish (STS) scores, and the California English Language
Development Test (CELDT) was conducted to find trends in patterns in students’
language and achievement development. The data is representative all the third through
sixth grade students enrolled in the five participating schools ranging from a five year
period from the 2005-06 school year to the 2009-10 school year. The most recent CST language arts levels and scores reflect the 2008-09 school year testing results. The most recent STS language arts levels and scores reflect the 2008-09 school year testing results. The most recent CELDT levels and scores reflect the testing results of the 2009-10 school year. The CST and STS student performance levels are based on the scale scores in each grade: far below basic, below basic, basic, proficient, advanced. The CELDT assesses student language proficiency levels in the areas of listening, speaking, reading and writing. The CELDT language proficiency levels are identifies as beginning, early intermediate, intermediate, early advanced, advanced. A more detailed explanation regarding the student performance level and the scale score for each grade level in each test will be provided in Chapter 5.

**Data Collection Procedures**

The approach for collecting the qualitative data began with interviewing the principals, followed by conducting the teacher focus group, conducting the observations, and finally conducting the parent focus groups. In order to collect the quantitative data, I contacted the assistant superintendent and requested the data for the participating schools.

When the principals agreed to participate in this study, I scheduled individual meeting times with each of them. To best accommodate their schedules, all the principal interviews took place in their office at their availability.

The first part of the data collection process began by interviewing the principal from each of the schools. Following the interview protocol, each principal voluntarily signed the consent form after it had been explained. Each interview began with asking
them the first question and following through with the other questions. Throughout each interview, probing questions and comments were included to gain more clarity and detail to the information provided by each principal. Sixteen interview questions were used to conduct the interview. I developed the interview questions that would answer the research questions guiding this study. Each interview lasted approximately 1 hour and was audio-recorded for accuracy and to be transcribed.

I transcribed the interview myself to be better familiarize myself with each principal’s response and to be able to identify the themes and trends. The completed written transcription was emailed to each principal participant so they could review it and check to see that all the information was correct and accurate. Following the focus group protocol, each teacher participant voluntarily signed the consent form after it had been explained. Each focus group began by introducing a prompt to begin the discussion. Throughout the focus group, probing questions and comments were included to gain more clarity and detail to the information provided by each teacher participant. The teacher participants were given an opportunity to participate in the discussion at any time. Five prompts with guiding questions were used to conduct the focus group. I developed prompts that would answer the research questions guiding this study. Each focus group lasted approximately 1 hour and was audio-recorded for accuracy and to be transcribed.

I transcribed each focus group myself to be better familiarize myself with the teachers’ responses and to be able to identify the themes and trends. The completed written transcription was emailed to each teacher participant so they could review it and check to see that all the information was correct and accurate.
Following the teacher focus groups, I asked to see which teachers would allow me to observe their classroom. Prior to visiting their classrooms I sent them an email or telephoned them to establish a date and time for which I could observe their classroom. Each teacher volunteer was observed at least once and no more than three times. Each observation ranged from approximately one hour to three hours. I tried to be as unobtrusive as possible so as not to disrupt the natural classroom occurrence. I observed and took an anecdotal record of the classroom environment (walls, student arrangement, resources, materials, etc.), the actual lesson, teaching, and/or activities that were occurring. During the observation I also entered notes on the classroom observation tool and rated it accordingly on the continuum. Prior to completing the classroom observation, I wrote the participating teacher a message regarding my observation with some feedback, which also included me thanking him or her for allowing me to visit their classroom.

The last part of the data collection was to conduct a focus group with parents from each school. Following the focus group protocol, each parent participant voluntarily signed the consent form after it had been explained. Spanish consent forms were available if needed. All the parent participants were Spanish speakers. Each focus group began by introducing a prompt to begin the discussion. All the prompts were written in Spanish. Throughout the focus group, probing questions and comments were included to gain more clarity and detail to the information provided by each parent participant. The parent participants were given an opportunity to participate in the discussion at any time. Seven prompts with guiding questions were used to conduct the focus group. I developed
prompts that would answer the research questions guiding this study. Each focus group lasted approximately 1 hour and was audio-recorded for accuracy and to be transcribed.

I transcribed each focus group myself to be better familiarize myself with the parents’ responses and to be able to identify the themes and trends. The completed written transcription was emailed to the parent participants who had access to email so they could review it and check to see that all the information was correct and accurate. I directly took the completed written transcription to the parents who did not have email.

The school district provided me access to the quantitative data. I contacted the assistant superintendent via email and he provided me with CST language arts scores, STS language arts scores, and CELDT) scores for the last five years for all the students currently enrolled in the schools participating in this study.

**Evaluation and Analysis**

The research design integrated both a quantitative and qualitative approach, as seen in Figure 6, Research Design Framework. This study examined the relationship between the language policy and the implementation of instructional practices that impact English learner educational access and language outcomes. First, trend analyses were conducted to show trends and patterns based on various descriptive analyses. Second, a qualitative analysis (case studies) was conducted to yield findings that show insight into the instructional practices indicators for each school. Third, a comparative analysis of the findings from the participating schools was conducted. Lastly, a triangulation of the quantitative data, observations, qualitative data, and research literature was utilized to
validate trends and patterns in both qualitative and quantitative results and yield final results.

**Analysis of Data**

The initial piece to the methodology involved selecting the school sample and establishing a clear communication with each principal. The data collection followed by acquiring student achievement data from the district, interviewing principals, conducting focus groups with teachers and parents, and observing classrooms. The next piece was organizing the data, coding it, and conducting the appropriate analysis for each individual school and between the different schools. This process facilitated the triangulation of the qualitative data and the observations with the quantitative data and the research literature. This process is illustrated in the research design framework in Figure 9.
Figure 9. Research Design Framework
Pedagogy for English Learners

After collecting all interview, focus groups, and observations data, it was then coded to according to the four pedagogical elements (biliteracy focus, value for learners, curriculum, instruction) and the effective conditions for learning (principals for life-long learning, five standards for effective pedagogy, optimal learning environments). The evidence in the data that informed about the biliteracy focus was colored in gray; value for learners was colored in blue, curriculum in green and instruction in red. The evidence that supported the Four Principals was highlighted in yellow, Five Standards were highlighted in blue, and Optimal Learning Environment were highlighted in gray (see table 13).

Table 13

Color Coding Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Highlight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biliteracy Focus</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for learners</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Principals</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Standards</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLE Environments</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Gray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The evidence in the data that supported the pedagogical elements and the effective conditions for learning were both colored and highlighted. Figure 10 shows an example of the 3x4 thematic narrative matrix that was utilized to synthesize the coded data, triangulate the data, and begin to develop the themes that emerged from the data. Appendix H includes a sample data set from one case study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Biliteracy Focus</th>
<th>Value for learners</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLE Environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 10. 3x4 Thematic Narrative Matrix Color Coding Sample*

The 3x4 thematic narrative matrix assisted the researcher in triangulating the interviews and focus group data with observational data and the research literature. This 3x4 matrix also provided the researcher with a structure from which to find themes that allowed for the clear articulation of each case study.

*Comparative Analysis*

A comparative analysis between the five schools was conducted to further understand the relationship between the language policy, the implementation of pedagogy, and the impact on student outcomes. This comparative analysis was driven by the themes that were extracted from individual school analysis for each case study.
Triangulation of Results

The researcher triangulated the analysis of the data sources from each case study to verify and support the patterns and trends of the previous findings. In addition, triangulation allowed for the clear articulation of the findings, recommendations and implications for emerging research.

This chapter described the methodological approach utilized in this study, the research questions, the participant selection process, the research instruments used, the coding of the data and the approach for analyzing the data. The case studies report and Results are presented in Chapter Five and the results are analyzed and discussed in Chapter Six.
CHAPTER FIVE
RESULTS

This study examined the influence of language policy on the pedagogical practices that impact the educational access for English learners in five elementary schools in one southern California school district. Principals, teachers, and parents from each school participated in this study. The following research question and sub-questions framed this study:

1. How is language policy used by California public schools to address the spirit of state and federal language mandates while providing educational access to English learners?
   a. How are schools providing educational access for English learners?
   b. How are schools providing effective implementation of programs for English learners based on sound theory and with adequate resources?
   c. How are schools providing English learners and their parents due process, access to information, and the option to request for alternative programs?
   d. How are schools holding themselves accountable for English learner achievement and language outcomes?

Getting To Know the School District

The case studies consist of five schools from one southern California school district. The school district is a large school district with more than 40 elementary schools and over 27,000 students located near the California-México international border.
(see Table 14). Thirty six percent of the students are English learners (EL) and 33% of all English learners are Latinos (School District Department of Language Acquisition and Development Services and Support, 2010).

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating School District Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of School District Student Ethnicity Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 shows that the school district has a large Latino student population (60%) followed by 14% White, 9% Filipino, 5% African American, and 3% Asian student population. Spanish-speaking EL students represent the largest language group. Table 16 presents the other language groups represented in the district, which include
Tagalog, Japanese, Korean, and Arabic (District Department of Language Acquisition and Development Services and Support, 2010). This is a decentralized school district, which means that each school has some autonomy in making decisions at their school site while following district-mandated programs. The district also supports the schools in implementing Mainstream English (ME), Structured English Immersion (SEI), Alternative Bilingual (AB), and Dual Language (DL) instructional programs (see Table 16)

Table 17 school district supports the schools in preparing teachers to implement district-wide instructional strategies. These strategies and programs include the Houghton-Mifflin language arts adoption. Every classroom teacher utilizes the Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR) framework as part of his or her daily instruction. The Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR) framework is an instructional model that includes four components: (1) teacher modeling, (2) shared and guided practice, (3) student collaborative group practice, and (4) student individual practice (Fischer & Frey, 2008). Teachers across the school district have been prepared to utilize the Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD) strategies and the language frames in their daily instruction. GLAD is a model of professional development that provides teachers with research, theory, and practical, effective strategies that promote academic language, literacy, academic achievement, and cross-cultural skills. GLAD is based on areas of research and strategies that focus on (1) teaching to the highest standards and expectations, (2) brain research—metacognition, (3) brain research and second language acquisition, (4) reading and
Table 16

*School District Instructional Programs and Students’ Home Languages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Programs</th>
<th>Students’ Home Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured English Instruction</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Bilingual</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Language</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17

*School District Instructional Practices, Strategies, and Materials*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin LA adoption</td>
<td>Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language frames</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18

*Participating School District Teacher Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>BCLAD</th>
<th>CLAD</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>African Am</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1433</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
writing to, with and by students, and (5) active student participation (Project GLAD, 2010).

The school district employs over 1400 teachers. The great percentages of teachers are White (55%) and Latino (32%) as illustrated in table 18. The remaining teachers are Filipino (3%), Asian (1.7%), and African American (1.4%) (Ed-Data, 2010). According to the school district Department of Language Acquisition and Development Services and Support, 981 teachers are CLAD (Cross-cultural, Language, and Academic Development) certified and 383 are BCLAD (Bilingual Cross-cultural, Language, and Academic Development) certified.

**School District’s Vision and Values**

According to the school district’s website, their shared vision and values set the foundation for student learning through a clear vision of

a. providing a safe, challenging and nurturing education experience;

b. developing multiliterate, self-reliant, and confident life-long learners;

c. valuing diversity;

d. meaningful and relevant learning;

e. working collaboratively with school community; and

f. creating dynamic learning experiences by supporting and encouraging excellent teaching.

The district values diversity and has a vision for developing multiliterate learners. They serve to enact this mission by supporting the implementation of primary language support in almost all the schools Alternative Bilingual programs, including Dual Language in
some schools. Out of 44 schools in the district 16 offer Alternative Bilingual via an early-exit bilingual model and 9 offer Dual Language via a 90/10 and 50/50 model (see Table 19).

Table 19

Dual Language and Alternative Bilingual Programs Offered in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Alternative Bilingual</th>
<th>Dual Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School District’s Student Achievement

The school district’s 2009 API score is at 830. The graph in Figure 11 shows the percentage of second through sixth grade students in the school district that scored proficient and advanced on the language arts section of the 2008-2009 CST. The achievement is broken down by ethnicity and economically disadvantaged status for each grade. Similar to the states second through sixth grade CST results in Figure 1, there was a dip in the percentage of students scoring proficient and advanced on the CST language arts in third grade and an increase in fourth grade. White students and English Only students have the highest percentage while economically disadvantaged Latinos and English learners have the lowest percentage.
Sixth grade English learners had a smaller percentage of students scoring proficient and advanced on the CST than second graders, which is also similar to the state’s results. The district results show an overall higher percentage for all ethnicities compared to the state results. In sixth grade 81% White, 68% Latino students, and 71% English only students scored proficient and advanced. Sixty-six percent of economically disadvantaged White and 48% economically disadvantaged Latino students scored at proficient and advanced. And 36% English learners scored at proficient and advanced levels on CST.

These results confirm the disparity between White and Latino students, between economically disadvantaged Whites and Latinos, and between English Only and English learners. Economically disadvantaged Latino and English learners have much ground to cover to reach the academic gains made by White and English Only students, or even
non-economically disadvantaged Latino students. This fact suggests that socioeconomic status is indeed a factor in this district for student achievement on the CST. The participating schools in the study all had a high percentage of English learners (52% to 72%), a high percentage of economically disadvantaged (receiving free or reduced price lunch) students (46% to 76%), and all offered a type of Alternative Bilingual program. A close examination of the participating schools in the study revealed the language policy, the pedagogy implemented, and the school leadership had on the impact on English learner student outcomes for each school.

**Participating Schools in the District Context**

Five schools in the school district were selected for the study. Table 20 shows that four schools have kinder through sixth grade and one school has kinder through seventh grade. All the schools have a high percentage of Latino students with 80% or more. Roosevelt School has the least with 80% and Lincoln School has the most with 95%. All the schools have 50% or more English learner enrollment. Roosevelt has the lowest percentage of EL students with 50% and Kennedy has the highest with 72%. Lincoln School has the lowest percent of students receiving free or reduced price lunch with 46% and Jackson School has the highest with 76%. With the exceptions of Lincoln School, all the schools have more than 64% of students that receive free or reduced price lunch. The Annual Performance Index (API) for the schools ranged from 761, the lowest in the district, to 876, one of the ten highest in the district. And the instructional program at four of the schools included Structured English Immersion (SEI), Mainstream English (ME), and Alternative Bilingual (AB) and at one school included Dual Language (DL).
Table 20

*Participating Schools Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>% EL</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>% Latino Students</th>
<th>API 2009</th>
<th>Instructional Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln*</td>
<td>K-7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>Dual Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>SEI, ELD, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>SEI, ELD, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>SEI, ELD, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington**</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>SEI, ELD, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Charter school; **Program improvement

From the five schools Lincoln School is a type of charter school, has the lowest percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch with 46%, and has the highest 2009 API score, as seen in table 20. Lincoln is the only school in the school district that implements a school-wide 50/50 dual language program. From the five schools Washington School is in program improvement, has the second highest percentage of students on free or reduced lunch with 68%, and has the lowest 2009 API score in the school district with 761. Washington School implements Structured English Immersion (SEI), Mainstream English (ME), and Alternative Bilingual (AB) programs. The AB classrooms are offered up to third grade. All the schools, with the exception of Lincoln, implement ELD during part of their day for 30 to 45 minutes.

Lincoln, Kennedy, Roosevelt, Jackson, and Washington Schools are five out of 44 schools in the school district. The following section provides an overview of the schools
in the school district to gain a clearer perspective of the five schools in this study within the context of the school district.

**Alternative Bilingual Schools**

There are 16 schools in the school district that offer Alternative Bilingual programs. The type of Alternative Bilingual programs implemented at each school varies but they all offer some type of primary language support for non-native English speakers. Table 22 outlines the demographic information for these 16 schools, which include Kennedy, Roosevelt, Jackson, and Washington Schools. This group of schools includes two charter schools and three schools in program improvement status at the time of the study. The highest 2009 API score is 845 and the lowest is 761 and all the schools except for five met the 2009 AYP goals. All the schools except for two implement SEI and 13 schools also implement ME as part of their instructional program. Jackson and Roosevelt only implement SEI along with the AB program. Kennedy and Washington implement SEI and ME along with the AB program. Seven schools have 35 or more teachers on staff, which includes Kennedy and Roosevelt Schools, each with 35 teachers, and Jackson School with 45 teachers. The most of this group of schools is 57 teachers at School W. All the schools except two have 80% or more Latino enrollment. Roosevelt has one of the lowest with 80% and Washington has one of the highest with 90% Latino enrollment. The percent of EL enrollment ranges from 38% in School N to 75% in School S. Kennedy and Jackson Schools have the next highest EL enrollment with 72% and 63%. All the schools except for one have more than 50% of students receiving free or reduced
Table 21

District Alternative Bilingual Schools Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>% EL</th>
<th>% Latino</th>
<th>% Free</th>
<th>API</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>Instructional Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Y</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School N</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>SEI, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School P</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School R*</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>SEI, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School S</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School T</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School W*</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School U</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Z</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School AA</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School X</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School V</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Charter school; **Program improvement
price lunch. The lowest is School AA with 44% and the highest are Jackson School and School S with 76%.

**Dual Language Program Schools**

There are nine schools in the school district that offer a Dual Language program arranged by 2009 API score. Table 22 outlines the demographic information for the 9 schools, which includes Lincoln School. According to the school district’s Department of Language Acquisition and Development Services and Support, the type of Dual Language program implemented at each school varies. All the schools, except Lincoln School, offer Dual Language as one of the instructional programs to compliment the SEI and ME programs. The different schools implement varied styles of Dual Language from a 90/10 model to a 50/50 model. Lincoln School offers a 50/50 Dual Language model and is the only school to implement it school-wide. The Dual Language schools include two charter schools, Lincoln School and School C. The highest 2009 API score is 883 and the lowest is 805 and all the schools with Dual Language programs met the 2009 AYP goals. Seven schools have 30 or more teachers on staff. Lincoln has one of the lowest numbers with 32 teachers. The most of this group of schools is 46 teachers at School D. Six schools have 50% or less Latino enrollment. School H has 72%, School G has 57%, and Lincoln has the highest at 95%, Latino student enrollment. The percent of EL enrollment ranges from 16% in School F to 57% in Lincoln School. The next highest EL enrollment is 38% at School H. Seven Dual Language program schools have less than 25% of students receiving free or reduced price lunch. The lowest is School B with
Table 22

*District Dual Language Schools Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>% EL</th>
<th>% Latino</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>API 2009</th>
<th>Met AYP</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>Instructional Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SEI, ME, DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>SEI, ME, DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lincoln</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>876</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>DL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>SEI, ME, DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>SEI, ME, DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>SEI, ME, DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>SEI, ME, DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School G</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>SEI, ME, DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School H</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>SEI, ME, DL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Charter school

7% and the highest is Lincoln School with 46%. Within the context of the other Dual Language program schools in the school district, Lincoln School has the highest percentage of English learners, Latino students, and students receiving free and reduced price lunch. Lincoln also has the same or comparable API score as the other school that have a considerably lower percentage of ELs, Latino students, and students on free and reduced price lunch.
Participating Schools Student Achievement

The CST assessment is the predominant measure for student achievement in California. A measure of achievement is indicated by the percent of students scoring at proficient (level 4) and advanced (level 5) levels on the CST. Table 23 illustrates the percent of students that scored at proficient and advanced levels on the CST from the 2005-06 to the 2008-09 school year for each of the five schools participating in the study.

Table 23
Percent Students Scoring at CST LA Level 4 and 5, Years 2006-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2005-06 level 4---level 5</th>
<th>2006-07 level 4---level 5</th>
<th>2007-08 level 4---level 5</th>
<th>2008-09 level 4---level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proficient = level 4; Advanced = level 5

Since the 2005-06 school year all five schools have shown some gains in the percent of students scoring at a level 5. From 2006 to 2009 Washington School maintained nearly the same percent of students scoring at a level 4 but had an increase in students scoring at a level 5 from 9% to 14%. From 2006 to 2009 Jackson School showed growth in the percentage of students scoring at a level 4 from 14% to 32% and showed an increase in students scoring at a level 5 from 8% to 15%. Roosevelt School maintained nearly the
same percent of students scoring at a proficient level but had an increase in students scoring at a level 5 from 7% to 17% from the 2006 school year to 2009. Kennedy School showed the same percent of students as Roosevelt. From 2006 to 2009 Lincoln School showed growth in the percentage of students scoring at a level 4 from 24% to 37% and showed an increase in students scoring at a level 5 from 24% to 30%. In 2006 Kennedy and Roosevelt Schools had the highest percentage of students that scored at a level 4 with 34% and Lincoln School had the highest percentage of students that scored at a level 5 with 24%. In 2007 Lincoln had the highest percentage of students that scored at a level 4 and level 5 with 32% and 13% and Jackson had the lowest with 17% scoring at a level 4 and 3% scoring at a level 5. In 2008 Lincoln School had the highest percentage of students that scored at a level 4 and level 5 with 36% and 27% and Jackson School had the lowest with 25% scoring at a level 4 and 8% scoring at a level 5. And in 2009 Lincoln School had the highest percentage of students that scored at a level 4 and level 5 with 37% and 30% and Washington School had the lowest with 27% scoring at a level 4 and 14% scoring at a level 5. In the 2008-09 school year Jackson, Roosevelt and Kennedy School had 32% and 33% of students scoring at a level 4, which is comparable to Lincoln School with 37%, but a disparity was evident with the percentage of students scoring at a level 5. Lincoln had 30% of students scoring at a level 5 compared to Kennedy and Roosevelt with 17%.

Case Studies Report

To gain a comprehensive understanding of the educational experience for English learners, principals from each of the participating schools were interviewed. Second,
teachers and parents participated in focus groups. The interview questions and focus group prompts were developed based on the main research question and sub-questions. Third, classrooms in each of the participating schools were observed during instructional time. Fourth, student achievement data (CST, STS, and CELDT test scores) was collected from the district office. Finally, the data collected from the interviews, focus groups, observations, and student achievement data placed each school on the continuum to further define biliteracy focus, value for learners, curriculum, and instruction for English learners in the English Learner Educational Access Continuum.

The data collected for each school was designated as a case study. The following section will include case study reports on the five participating schools. Each case study will provide a description of the school, which includes:

- school demographics;
- participants;
- pedagogical practices;
- school/teacher strengths, concerns insights, revelations, tensions;
- participants’ voices; and
- emerging themes

A full description of the results will also be included as part of the case study report. The themes that emerged from the analysis of the data and the principal, teacher, and parent voices guided the narrative structure of the case study. Vignettes from the interviews and focus groups were used to clearly articulate the themes within each case study report. The trends and patterns that emerged from the student achievement data
analysis was included in the case study report to support, validate, or contradict any themes or findings.
Case Study 1: Washington School

I’m going into my second year so I can say I have three semesters here. I know that it will take at least 5 years for that achievement to show but certain things need to be in place for a school to run orderly—procedures, schedules, systems—and my first years was just tackling just that; everything from having children get in line and get through lunch and have recess in only 45 minutes. I was laughed at when I came out with the schedule.

(Washington School Principal Interview, 2010)

Introduction

On my first visit to Washington School I met with the principal. Our meeting was scheduled after the school day ended. I went to check in with the secretary at the office and it was extremely busy with parents, students, and teachers. The principal was in a meeting so I waited for a while. It seemed like the principal was a very busy person so I was grateful that she made time to meet with me. The secretary was very nice and very helpful. She made sure to keep the principal aware of her appointments. I waited about 20 minutes before I got a chance to meet with her. The principal was very open and answered the interview questions honestly in my opinion. One of the first things the principal told me about Washington school was that it was a big union school and that she would be surprised if any teachers would volunteer to participate in this study because they rarely do anything more than they have to beyond their contract day. I guess I was lucky that three teachers volunteered to participate. She also spoke in the interview about a scandal that occurred at the school where the PTA embezzled about $10,000. She said that it had been difficult for her to gain the trust of the parents, and teachers at the school. Apparently the issue of trust was evident because no parents volunteered to participate in the parent focus group despite various attempts to invite
parents without approaching them individually while they picked up their children after school.

This Washington School case study description utilized data from the principal interview, teacher focus group, and the observation anecdotal record. While the data may be limited due to no participation on the part of the parents and limited participation on the part teachers, this lack of participation is considered a key indicator regarding student achievement.

**Getting to Know Washington School**

I spent four weeks at Washington School observing the classroom instruction and meeting with the principal and teachers. Table 24 shows that I met with three fourth through sixth grade teachers to discuss the various elements and educational practices implemented at Washington School. Their years teaching at the school ranged from three one to eight six years. Following the methodology protocol for selecting parent focus group participants no parents responded to the invitation. After a follow-up attempt to invite parents to participate in the focus group, no parents responded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Washington School Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>#</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25

*Washington School Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>% EL</th>
<th>% Free</th>
<th>% Latino Students</th>
<th>2009 API</th>
<th>Met AYP</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>Instructional Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>SEI, ME, ELD, AB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Washington School is a kinder through sixth grade elementary school in a southern California school district, located 6 miles from the California-México international border. Table 25 shows that 467 students are enrolled with 90% Latinos, 52% English learners, and 54% socioeconomically disadvantaged (receiving free and reduced price lunch). The school employs 25 fully credentialed classroom teachers to teach in the Structured English Immersion, Mainstream English, and Alternative Bilingual instructional programs. Washington school had a 2009 API score of 754 and did not meet its 2008-2009 AYP goals. The school district has a base API score of 830 (CDE, 2010).

Of the 312 students that were included in the 2009 API, the Latino, socioeconomically disadvantaged, and English learner subgroups were numerically significant. Table 26 shows the Latino, English learner, and socioeconomically disadvantaged subgroups 2009 API scores. The Latino subgroup included 281 students with a 747 API score. The school district’s 2009 API score for Latinos was 803 and for the state it was 736. The Latino students met the state academic performance goals as compared to their subgroup counterparts but not for the school district. The English
Table 26

Washington Student Subgroups 2009 API Scores 2nd - 6th Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student subgroups</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>API Scores</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington Subgroup</td>
<td>School District</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomically disadvantaged</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CDE, Data Quest, 2009-10 Accountability Progress Reporting

The English learners subgroup included 175 students with a 723 API score. The school district’s 2009 API score for English learners was 774 and 726 for the state. The socioeconomically disadvantaged subgroup included 202 students with a 729 API score. The 2009 API score for socioeconomically disadvantaged students in the school district was 775 and 732 for the state. According to these API scores, the English learners and the socioeconomically disadvantaged students at Washington School did not meet the state academic performance goals compared to their subgroup counterparts in the district and state. (CDE, 2010)

One school in the district had a 2009 API score comparable to Washington School. Table 27 displays the demographic information for Washington School and School V. The API score ranged from a high of 770 to a low of 761. Washington School had a 761 API score, the lowest in the school district, did not meet its AYP goals, and is currently in program improvement. Both schools offered SEI, ME, and AB programs. School V had the most teachers with 38 and Washington School had considerably less
Table 27

*District Schools Demographics with Similar API 761*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>% EL</th>
<th>% Latino</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>2009 API</th>
<th>Met AYP</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>Instructional Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School V</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washington</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>761</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>SEI, ME, AB</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Improvement

with 25 teachers. Washington School had the slightly higher percentage of Latino enrollment, EL enrollment, and students receiving free or reduced price lunch. School V had 80% and Washington School had 90% Latino student enrollment. Washington had 52% EL enrollment while School V had 48%. Washington School also had 54% of students receiving free or reduced price lunch compared to 53% at School V. Both schools had comparable student demographic but School V had a slightly higher API score than Washington School.

The achievement trends for Washington School in Table 28 have shown a slight growth in the percentage of students achieving proficient and advanced levels on the CST and a decrease in students scoring at far below basic on the CST from 2006 to 2009. The percentage students scoring at far below basic decreased from 15% to 6% and the students scoring at advanced increased from 9% to 14%. In 2006, 63% of the students scored at basic, below basic, and far below basic levels and in 2009 59% students scored at basic, below basic, and far below basic levels. More students have shown improvement but almost 60% of the students are achieving at a basic level or below. Since 2006 the
Table 28

Percent Washington Students Scoring at CST LA level 1 – 5, Years 2006-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far below basic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below basic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

percentage of students scoring at proficient and advanced levels at Washington School increased by 4% from 37% to 41% in 2009. The most significant trend showed no change in the percentage of student scoring at a basic level from 2006 to 2009. More than one third of students scored at a basic level on the CST. The same trend was shown for the students scoring at a proficient level. In 2006, 28% of students scored at a proficient level and 27% scored at a proficient level in 2009, showing an increase of 1%.

Table 29 shows the achievement trends for English learner students at Washington School on the CST from 2006 to 2009. In 2006, 100% of the English learners at Washington School scored at basic, below basic, and far below basic and 97% in 2007. In 2008, 82% of English learners scored at basic, below basic, and far below basic and 73% in 2009. No EL students at Washington School scored at a proficient and advanced level on the CST in 2006. Only 3% scored at a proficient and none at an advanced level in 2007. In 2008, 18% of EL students scored at a proficient and advanced level and 27% of the English learners scored at a proficient and advanced level.
Table 29

Percent Washington ELs Scoring at CST LA Level 1 – 5, Years 2006-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far below basic</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below basic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in 2009. Three percent of EL students scored at an advanced level in 2008 and 5% in 2009. The percent of EL students scoring at a basic level decreased from 58% in 2006 to 43% in 2009. The most noticeable trend at Washington School was the decrease in the percentage of EL students scoring at a far below basic level from 26% in 2006 to 9% in 2009. Despite this achievement gain, more than half of English learners are scoring at a basic level and lower.

Observing the instructional practices at Washington School and talking to the principal, teachers, and parents allowed me to identify elements and themes regarding the instruction, curriculum, instructional program, and attitudes and beliefs toward student learners. Further insight into the school will be articulated in the following sections of this case study report.

Washington School Structure

Washington School has a principal, a resource specialist and an instructional support teacher. Them, along with one teacher from each grade level make up the
Instructional Leadership Team (ILT). The ILT makes decisions concerning the school’s instructional focus and support teachers by providing professional development. One classroom in kinder through third grade has an AB classroom. The other classrooms are SEI or ME classrooms.

Washington School Mission, Vision, and Values

The Washington School mission, vision, and values are centered on the student directly. The students will (a) behave in a peaceful and caring manner, (b) demonstrate honesty in all situations, (c) respect the rights and property of others, and (d) take responsibility for his or her actions.

Washington School Biliteracy Focus

The Washington School secretary is very nice and made me feel welcomed every time I visited the school. She treated parents and other visitors the same way she treated me. She welcomes every visitor with a smile and a gentle greeting. She speaks Spanish and English and we communicated in both languages. She interacted with parents and students in both languages and in a respectful manner.

The upper grade classrooms I visited were located toward the back of the school, past the endless classroom buildings, as it seemed. The students in the classrooms received English instruction. Unfortunately I was unable to observe any of the Alternative Bilingual (AB) classrooms in the school. Washington School offers AB classrooms from kindergarten up to third grade. There is one bilingual classroom in each of these grades. The other classrooms provide students with Structured English
Immersion or Mainstream English instruction. The principal stated that the bilingual teachers in the primary grades are strong educators.

The nature of the program is by the strength of the teacher and the strongest teachers I have, in terms of effective practices, are in those classes…That’s where I put my strongest teachers. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

But the principal also acknowledged that there is one teacher that she feels is ineffective to teach in the bilingual classrooms. She feels that it would be in the best interests of the students for the teacher to teach outside the AB program (Washington School principal interview, 2010).

The AB program begins in kinder and transitions in third grade. This means that third grade teachers utilize more English instruction by mid-year because they need to prepare students for testing in English.

It’s transitional in nature. We know testing occurs in second grade and it’s in English. Although, I may have not articulated it to teachers, but my expectation is that about mid semester they start bringing in that English. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

The principal has seen the students in the AB classrooms outperform the rest of the students. She attributes it to the strong Spanish instruction and transitioning students into English to meet their language needs.

I have it all the way up to third. So it’s almost like some unmentioned maintenance in there. But I know that the test is in English. That particular teacher, for example, at third grade, her scores were the highest of the four third grade classes and those children had been in Spanish since kinder….She knows the need exists. We have not talked about the use of language in the classrooms. They know not to translate. That’s about all I could probably tell you that they know and their strongest language is Spanish. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

I asked the teachers if there were any AB classrooms in the upper grades and they said no, but one teacher said that in her grade level she receives all of the native Spanish
speaking students because she is bilingual and can provide them with some primary
language support, but otherwise, the other classrooms provide English instruction with
English Language Development (ELD) (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010).

English Language Development instruction is implemented for English learners everyday
for 30 minutes in the primary grades and 45 minutes in the upper grades. According to
the principal, implementing ELD instruction in the classroom has been a struggle for the
teachers at Washington School.

**Washington School Value for Learners**

The students in the sixth grade classroom I observed were challenged to clearly
articulate their responses to a problem. The teacher gave group points and positive
reinforcement for their effort (Washington School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

She explained that she expects her students to be engaged in the process of thinking and
learning.

I hold them to high expectations. I don’t even care if they give me the right
answer, really, what I care about is the reasoning behind it and that they are
discussing it. If they got the answer wrong I’m fine with it as long as there is good
logic behind it. I don’t care if the answer is wrong. If they are engaged and really
trying to reason and dialogue. I’m huge on that. (Washington School teacher
focus group, 2010)

I asked the principal what are the teachers’ expectations for English learners and her first
response was that she wasn’t sure.

We’d have to ask the teachers. They vary. Some have very high expectations.
“You will and I’m going to make sure you get it done and I’m going to do
whatever it takes”, in terms of what ever I need to bring into the classroom.
Others will do the minimal. “I taught it once. That’s all I should have to teach it.
I’ve assessed it. The child failed. I give them a little bit of a second chance,
occasionally, and then I’m moving on.” Low expectations are still very prevalent.
(Washington School principal interview, 2010)
The teachers feel that they work hard and that is a reflection on their commitment to their students. One teacher stated that she tries to focus on the positive as much as possible and is well read on the research guiding the practice of positive reinforcement. Another teacher said that she constantly talks to her students about going to college and utilizing what they are learning in the classroom in the real world.

I talk to the kids a lot about how you’re not going to get a job someday and go into a cubicle probably and work by yourself. Most likely you will have to work in teams. So, that is why I promote so strongly in the classroom how to work as a team…so you have to learn to work together. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

I observed this particular teacher remind students of how they would be able to utilize what they were learning when they went to college (Washington School observation anecdotal record, 2010). The teacher also recognized the students’ effort and reinforced their engagement with statements of acknowledgement: “Very smart what you’re saying.” All the teachers were respectful to their students and expected them to be on task and engaged in the lesson (Washington School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

I asked the teachers to tell me about the school culture and one teacher said that discipline had always been a problem at Washington School.

The discipline outside is chaos, chaos. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010).

An area of concern on the part of the teachers and the principal was that of student discipline. New to the school, the principal found that students were being sent to the nurse’s office for disciplinary measures.

So when I got here and the nurse didn’t have children in the office [for health reasons]. She said that she never not had children in the office because they would sit them down with boards and have them write _I will not_ 100 times, so all
this area was full of children doing discipline. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

The principal immediately began to change the existing structures and practices she felt were bad for students and teachers. The teachers see a need for more emphasis with discipline and enforcing the expected behaviors with students. A tension exists with the student behaviors on the playground and how it may influence their academic performance in the classroom (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010). One issue they expressed was the lack of consistency with the discipline by teachers and particularly the yard duty personnel.

They [yard duty personnel] are high fiving them, talking to them in Spanish all the time instead of practicing their English, and the best interest of the students are just…giving them lollipops. How can you give them lollipops and candy outside and you know…They have no authority over the kids, the kids do not respect them at all. So…I think that effects the classroom too. The chaotic behavior goes into the classroom…the school environment. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010).

This sixth grade teacher felt that the rest of the school is not supporting the expected behaviors for which she holds students accountable in the classroom when the students are outside her classroom. When the teacher expressed her concern and dissatisfaction with the actions of the yard duty personnel to the principal, the principal defended them by stating that they get paid less than teachers (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010).

*Washington School Curriculum*

The instruction at Washington School is guided by the California state standards and the Houghton Mifflin language arts adoptions is the curriculum utilized by teachers. According to the teachers and the principal there is an emphasis and focus for teaching
and learning at Washington School. The first question I asked teachers was if
Washington School is a good place for students and they agreed that it was to be taught
the standards if the goal is to learn the standards.

Yes and no. I would say it’s definitely a good place as far as being taught the
standards because that’s what we’re completely focused on. So, a great place if
you want to be exposed to California state standards because that is our focus.
(Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

The instructional approach, the curriculum, and the teacher implementation at
Washington School begin with teachers understanding the standards and identifying the
needs of their students.

Right now promoting learning for English learners has been extremely difficult to
tackle. Number one, identify them and know who they are. That’s where we start.
It’s like, “how am I supposed to know who they are?” So you should be able to
by now have identified them. Secondly, teach to the standards. That should be
for all children. It harms English learners more so when you’re not, but teach to
the standards. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

The goal for the principal is similar in that she expects teachers to use the standards to
drive their instruction. She also expects teachers to identify the needs of their English
learner students. The goal for the principal is to change the culture of the school that
reflects a focused emphasis for English learners and appropriate structures to support
teachers to take advantage of their instructional time for learning (Washington School
principal interview, 2010).

The teachers teach the reading, writing, and math standards. Some of the stories
they utilize for language arts have social studies themes but the focus is on meeting the
language arts standards, not the social studies standards. The teachers would like to teach
social studies and science daily because they feel that it would benefit students’ learning.

But as far the school, I think there needs to be a better balance among all the
standards not just language arts and math standards, but also the science, music,
and arts standards. So as far as a well-rounded school, this is not the place. But as far as teaching to the standards, Oh yes! They are learning the standards for sure. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

The science and social studies curriculum is lacking and music and art is non-existent.

The teachers are concerned because they feel that these are missed opportunities for student learning (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010).

Another point of concern for teachers is the misalignment of the Houghton Mifflin language arts adoption with the standards. Teachers are required by the school district to use the Houghton Mifflin language arts adoption as part of the language arts curriculum but they also need to use other resources to compensate for it not correlating to the standards, according to the principal.

We’re still using it. I’ve allowed some changes if the teacher could justify. The Teacher’s Edition to the Houghton Mifflin is not written to the standards, which becomes very problematic because now I’m making you do something and now you’re discovering that, “Oh! Maybe I shouldn’t be teaching this.” Well what were you doing before if you weren’t even using that you don’t know the standards, so the need to become familiar so you could actually ask the question, “Is this the standard? (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

The principal acknowledges the challenges for teachers, but also holds teachers responsible for knowing and understanding the standards regardless of the Houghton Mifflin language arts adoption is aligned or not. To her that is just being a good teacher (Washington School principal interview, 2010). The teachers disagreed and stated that they can’t use any of the lessons in the Houghton Mifflin language arts adoption and create their own lessons. I commented to them that having the opportunity to create their own lesson was a better approach, in my opinion. One teacher agreed but she also explained that she is working long hours.

Let me say this. Yes its better. But I’m working 10 to 15 hours every day. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)
What has helped the teacher in better understanding the standards and developing lessons is an internet program called *Inspect*. The *Inspect* program provides teachers with tests that are correlated to the standards.

And without this program there’s no way for me to truly understand the standard without memorizing the CST, which we are not allowed to do. There is no way. Now that we have these tests that are related to the CST, I can take those questions and develop my own lessons based on them. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

One teacher went to her classroom to show me an example of the many tests the *Inspect* program offers.

Now there’s tests that clearly give us questions that we can analyze, you know, to understand what it means and what it’s going to look like on the CST. So, I take that and I create my own generic, this one is a different one, I got lots of them. This one. I create a generic worksheet that we can work on with chapter books or any selection in Houghton Mifflin and they can practice over and over and over again. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

The teachers feel grateful to have access to this resource because they fear that they would be working longer hours or their lessons would not be as focused on preparing students to do well on the CST (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010).

One of the changes the principal made this year was to make the language arts block at one time for every classroom. The language arts time is from 8:00 am to 10:00 am daily. Before she arrived each teacher decided when they would teach language arts. The ELD time follows the language arts time, immediately after recess.

I put ELD with the transition, so I did it right on line up time. So the kids finished recess they lined up for ELD class. The teachers didn’t like it. They hated it. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

The principal explained that she had encountered much resistance to the changes that she felt were necessary to implement to begin to see higher student achievement. Structuring
the ELD program has been one of her biggest challenges (Washington School principal interview, 2010). According to the principal, there was no sense of schedule for ELD time. The first thing she did was to determine the time devoted to ELD. Kinder through third grade classrooms dedicate 30 minutes daily to ELD and fourth through sixth grade classrooms dedicate 45 minutes daily. During that time the principal expects to find evidence of instructional methods that are appropriate for English learners (Washington School principal interview, 2010).

The principal also grouped the students according to their proficiency levels in the upper grades to have more focused instruction. This was another change that the teachers resisted but ultimately accepted and seemed to like (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

So then what I did, I had to take from fourth to sixth grade and I separated them. So they had different children so they were forced. They didn’t like it. They fought it, they fought it, they fought it. The teachers now seem to like that grouping so now we’re in to the second year. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

The principal explained that scores increased with the English learner population and she attributes it to the grouping and her persistence in making sure that teachers are living up to the expectations.

Our program, upper grade is different from the lower grade, the upper grade do a switch around. The kids are all…we take a certain group of kids per class based on the CELDT scores and CST scores….teachers have the [level] one’s, two’s, three’s, or the four’s. They use whatever curriculum we have and ELD techniques, teaching methods. They are leveled and we are very….we have to rotate everyday. It forces us to be religious to the schedule. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

The principal is diligent in making sure the teachers are doing ELD. She said that she is walking around during that time checking that teachers start on time.
I have an alternate office and it’s right in that hallway. They hate to see me in it but sometimes I just have to open the door. It’s transition time and some teacher will keep the door closed and the kids are lined up outside and I have to go open the door. “It’s time”. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

The teachers confirmed that the principal is definitely holding them accountable to the implementation of ELD and meeting the needs of the students by teaching the standards.

This principal has, most feels like she has a whip. She is really walking around with the district people and they’re with a fine tooth comb going through your walls and plans making sure you’re not teaching anything that is not a standard. I mean, it is really strict. It is beyond. I mean it really is micromanaging. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

The teachers feel that the focus on the part of the principal is strict. The principal feels that it takes constant attention to teaching and learning to improve the instructional program and she can’t let up (Washington School principal interview, 2010).

Washington School Instruction

The California state standards guide the instruction at Washington School. The teachers are expected to identify the English learners in their classroom and teach to the standards (Washington School principal interview, 2010). They are supposed to clearly articulate the purpose to the students by writing the content and language objectives on the board (Washington School principal interview, 2010). I asked the principal if I would see the standards if I visited the classrooms and she said that for comprehension and math, teachers are required to write the standards (Washington School principal interview, 2010). The standards identifiable around the classroom walls and the language and content objectives were written on the board or on the classroom walls (Washington School observation anecdotal record, 2010).
The Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR) framework frames the instructional process in the classroom. I asked the principal if I would see GRR going on in the classroom and she told me yes.

The teachers have been trained on that. Right now they’re working on the piece of the small group instruction. They’re working on instructional routines. And many of these are good teaching, effective methods, but for English learners they’re almost a requirement. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

An important piece of the GRR is the opportunity to model the concept to students, provide guided instruction and collaborative group time where students can articulate and practice using language.

But the big piece, for example, for instructional tools, is just getting the children to articulate what they are doing with a partner and the need for the language development, which is what I found upon my arrival, that it was teacher directed—85% teacher talk, 15% auditory, the child just had to be still. So that was the mode of instruction. We’re honestly, in some cases we might be doing some group work, but I’m happy with just pairs. If we can do pairs we’re doing a good job because we cut down the ratio already, from teacher talk to students having that interaction. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

The crucial pieces for the principal was minimizing the teacher talk time and maximizing the student talk time. She would like to see more student group work but at the stage of their process she is happy with students just working in pairs (Washington School principal interview, 2010).

Instruction is key. The lesson roll out and we’re using the GRR model that Dr. Fischer has been teaching us, and it’s very, to me, I feel like I’m going back many, many years. It’s so basic, but then I’ve often asked, “Why do we need something so basic?” Well we need it because the basics are not happening. The children don’t know the purpose of the lesson. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

According to the principal, the GRR framework is a basic teaching framework but she feels that it is needed at her school to provide teachers a focus for instruction. A teacher
explained that she implements collaborative groups in her classroom because it allows for students to utilize a variety of learning styles: visual, kinesthetic, and auditory.

I have all my kids all organized per very specific reasons. Their groups are multi-leveled for when I’m doing whole group so they can help each other. I’m really, really detailed in how I do that...I’ve got high, medium, and low in all the tables so it’s evened out as much as possible. I teach kids how to be leaders and at the same time how to get help from other students. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

The students have responsibilities as group leaders and acquire skills and strategies to support each other in the collaborative groups. The sixth grade teacher explained that she utilized the sentence frames to support her students be engaged during collaborative group work (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010).

I do utilize peer pressure to try to keep them on check by themselves. Uh. I tend to put up student work to get the sense of belonging. You know. Everything that we’ve done in the class is because we’ve done it together. I do the modeling but the kids help write a lot of it. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

Her students also have responsibilities during group work and she tries to engage with her student during whole group instruction by modeling and guiding their learning because it gives the students a sense of belonging in the classroom.

The main resource used to meet the standards is the Houghton Mifflin even though it is not aligned to the standards. The teachers can use the stories in the books but they are not supposed to use the teacher’s guide.

We are supposed to follow this pacing guide and we have to give them these tests that are based on the stories in the HM. The problem with that is that they don’t correlate with the standards. What my teachers guide tells me to teach is not what is on the CST, so I’m supposed to use the stories, but I’m not allowed to teach what, the use of the teacher’s guide, I have to create my own lessons. It is very, very laborious. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010).

This important detail has caused the Washington School teachers many hours of planning (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010).
Washington School Accountability

The Washington School principal told me that when she was hired as the new principal people that knew about the school were in shock because it had a bad reputation.

And so when people said to me, “Oh my god you got [Washington]?” I honestly didn’t know the notoriety of this school. I didn’t and when the superintendent pulled me aside he said, “But we’re going to help you.” He kept saying we’re going to help you and I thought, well, why do I need so much help? It took me a while to grasp what it meant. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

Washington School is in program improvement and has the lowest 2009 API score in the school district. The principal is puzzled that the school has the lowest achievement in the school district, considering that it doesn’t have the lowest percentage of students receiving free or reduced price lunch (Washington School principal interview, 2010). Accountability is a big concern for the principal, particularly since she doesn’t see why Washington School is underachieving. She holds the teachers to high accountability standards and is very critical. She said that she has some excellent teachers, particularly in sixth grade.

Now, some of my stronger teachers are in the upper grades, so as the little ones are moving up they have better teachers but the teachers that were at the lower grades did such havoc that we’re going to start feeling it and we’re feeling it in fourth grade right now, but at fifth grade you can see the differences in their expectations. And then we can look at sixth grade, another excellent teacher. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

She also explained that she has some bad teachers. Some of the bad teachers she has been able to get rid of but some are still in classrooms.

There are some horrific teachers here. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)
I asked the principal what the school would look like when they reach their desired goal and she said that it would be a place where the nature of the instruction reflects high achievement. She has a vision of teachers teaching to the standards with high rigor, where students are challenged, culture is used, and parents are involved (Washington School principal interview, 2010).

The instructional accountability at Washington School is directed on the achievement of English learners. One key element for accountability is to teach to the standards. Another element for accountability is the need for collaboration in planning and preparing lessons and a third key element is insuring that the teachers are working and have ownership of the change to implement the GRR framework (Washington School principal interview, 2010). A continuous assessment regiment is utilized to measure student growth and to assist teachers in preparing to meet the needs of their students. Students are assessed every six to eight weeks with language arts and math benchmarks. The teachers administer the tests, score it, and then turn in to the principal for review. Teachers then identify the targeted English learners and set instructional goals (Washington School principal interview, 2010).

They all looked at the scores. We forced them to look at the profile. They didn’t know you had to read these things. They had to get the profile. They had to get a grid. They had to look at, ok, where are they in listening? Where are they in speaking? (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

The goal for teachers has been to collaborate and work together on identifying the needs of their students and planning so that they have consistency and clarity.

The principal and sometimes school district administrators do walkthroughs to observe the instructional practice and the classroom environment. The walkthroughs are done about twice a month and the teachers are then given feedback (Washington School
teacher focus group, 2010). I asked the teachers what do the administrators focus on when they do the walkthroughs and they said:

They are looking that we have all our content objective, language objectives they are looking at process charts, they are looking at if we are teaching the standards, can they see the standards throughout the room, they’re looking at are we pulling small groups, they’re looking are we implementing GRR while we are teaching. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

Some of the teachers said that the walkthroughs make them work harder in preparing their room and their walls, particularly when they know that there is going to be a walkthrough.

The last thing I asked the teachers in the focus group was if the Washington School students were achieving. That question made them think a little. They wanted me to clarify the question.

The whole school! How do you define that? What does that mean? Are they passing the CST? I’m not sure how you define that or how I would even know as far as the whole school. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

They were finding it difficult to define what it meant to achieve and what it looked like when their students achieved.

All I know is that we didn’t meet our goals for API and we went to program improvement. So, that’s all I can tell you about the whole school. Are kids learning in each classroom? My only…the only thing I can say is…I don’t know. It doesn’t appear. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

The teachers agreed that based on the current achievement measures the students at Washington School are not achieving.

Washington School NCLB and Proposition 227

We have to know exactly what English language learners, the ones, which students will turn the table to make us pass so that we are no longer in program
improvement. We have to know them by name. We have to know them exactly. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

Teachers at Washington School believe that NCLB has strengthened the focus on English learners and their needs. They don’t think that students will show academic gains because they are generally teaching any better, although they may be implementing effective instructional strategies.

I think we will see it on the CST this year, huge gains. I’m not going to say its necessarily because I’m teaching them better because I’m utilizing really the same strategies but I’m teaching to what’s on the CST more than ever. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

Regardless of the outcomes, they do agree that they know more about their English learners’ needs than they have in the past and they attribute it to NCLB.

They know everything about the English learners in their classrooms and they use that information to prepare instruction that will benefit their English language development. Within that process, the students that are on the verge of showing considerable growth on the CST received more specialized instructional time by the teachers.

I always felt that is unfair, been unfair. It forces us to take on unfair strategies, I feel, in terms of every student should have an equal right. We shouldn’t be focusing on just those four because we are going to make the school come out of program improvement. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

They don’t like this practice because they feel that all the students should receive their attention regardless of their level but they have to show proof that they providing these students with more instructional time. They said they just do their best to meet with all their students needs (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010).
No parent was involved in this study and parents are rarely involved at Washington School, according to teachers and the principal. The teachers stated that parents are rarely in the classrooms or involved. The sixth grade teachers said that they could really use the parents’ help for fundraising for sixth grade camp, sixth grade promotion, and other activities.

Every year we struggle with the lack of parents, who will even help us with the graduation ceremony. Coming to classes, I’ve never, well I’ve only been here three years, in this school, this district. I’ve never had a parent come to me and say, “Well gosh can I help out or is there something I can do?”.

(Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

They attribute it to the fact that the parents are working and they don’t have time to be involved at the school or go to the classroom to talk to the teacher. The teachers said that they have to do a lot of their parent conferences over the telephone (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

The principal believes that having parents involved would increase student achievement at the school. She would like to see the school embrace parents being on campus and have space for them to be part of the school community (Washington School principal interview, 2010). The school didn’t have PTA when she arrived as the new principal and has not had one for 3 years.

It was almost like parents were asked, “do not come on this campus”.

(Washington School principal interview, 2010)

Parents are not part of the school community and they haven’t been for a few years. There is history of bad relations with parents ever since the PTA embezzled more than $10,000 a few years ago and outspoken parents bullying other parents into making unwanted decisions (Washington School principal interview, 2010).
The principal said that the parents she has spoken to are positive about the school and their children’s academic growth. About 85% of the parents attend parent conferences and the teachers are responsible in communicating with the parents and making sure they meet with them and inform them of their child’s progress (Washington School principal interview, 2010). Informing parents is important to the principal because she said the level of their involvement is very complacent, probably due to the fact they are complacent with the school.

Many of them didn’t even know we were in program improvement. Our letter just went out on Friday. We have hearsay of one parent asking questions on who is the person that they should address per the letter to go to the district because now they can go and transfer to another school, and we’re at 433. That’s not very many. If I was told, “Oh, I think my child is succeeding in school”, and suddenly, no, your school is in program improvement, you can transfer. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

Since the school is in program improvement the parents have the right to transfer their child to another school in the district, as part of NCLB.

The challenge for the principal was getting the PTA started and the first thing they wanted to do was make an altar for Día de los Muertos. The parents got together and made an altar, brought food, sold calaveras and pan de muerto at the Halloween festival (Washington School principal interview, 2010).

I think this particular community the need to use cultural roots is extremely important….They did it all. They did absolutely everything. They brought a couple pictures and they brought the velas, before I knew it they were bringing mole and food. And they came out of the woodwork. And one told another one and they told another one and before you know it we had an altar. It just took on a life of its own. It got big. We even had a Halloween festival around it. You could come and see it. We sold calaveras. We sold pan de muertos. It was a first. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

The principal commented that she noticed the need for parents to go to the school and bring that cultural piece to the forefront (Washington School Principal interview, 2010).
The school site council and the English Learning Advisory Committee are some ways that parents can be involved at Washington School. The principal said that it had been difficult to keep parents involved in these committees because they keep dropping out (Washington School principal interview, 2010).

One thing I do with parents is that we have a chat with the principal. I’m beginning to see a need to put more structure in to it. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

The chat with the principal is a time for the principal to share information concerning the school with the parents and to listen to parents concerns and questions. They now discuss topics that deal with testing and accountability goals for students.

We gave them their CELDT scores so they could review their child’s test results. We talked about the CST. I’ve gone through how we’re ranked and the scores of the AYP. Did we meet our targets? Did we not make our targets? But in many instances I’m talking to parents that are not aware or quite understand any of this, to an extreme where I was trying to find ELAC members and I was talking about ELs and their children and how they were progressing and how they were doing, and they had no idea that they were classified as ELs. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

The principal also showed them their child’s CUM folder with all their academic and personal information from when they entered school. She said that this process was helping in building trust with those parents because she feels that the parents don’t trust her yet (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

This year a parent of a newcomer student from Tijuana submitted a waiver for the CST. The principal came to the conclusion that somebody had told the parent of the option and helped her write the note (Washington School principal interview, 2010). The student was the only waiver child.
**Washington School Summary**

Washington has shown some student gains on the CST but over 70% of English learners are scoring at a basic level or below and only 5% of English learners are scoring at an advanced level. Washington also failed to meet the 2009 AYP goals. The principal has been at the school for two years and is the second most experience administrator and educator in the study.

Washington school offers AB classrooms from kinder to third grade. The language policy is to prepare students to reach English proficiency. The curriculum is guided by the state standards and teachers are required to utilize the Houghton-Mifflin language arts adoption even though it is not aligned to the state standards. The instructional approach is to teach the standards while following the GRR framework. The school is in a reorganization phase with a new principal where progress is minimal and slow (Washington School principal interview, 2010). The teachers I observed are implementing the instructional plan set by the principal. Some teachers are engaging students and using appropriate instructional strategies and some are doing less in the classroom (Washington School observation anecdotal record, 2010). Some Washington School teachers hold high expectations for students to achieve and others hold minimal standards (Washington School principal interview, 2010). Teachers are exp NCLB has forced the teachers to focus on the needs of the English learner students but that has also pushed the school to focus more on teaching students the standards in order to achieve on the CST (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010). The principal is fairly new to the school and is trying to establish structures that will facilitate student achievement but the teachers are have been resistant to the new changes (Washington School principal
interview, 2010). The teachers acknowledge that the principal is strict with the implementation of the instructional programs, particularly the ELD program (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010). The principal and teachers agreed that the parents are not involved at the school and have not been for a few years. The principal acknowledges that due to events that transpired in previous, parents are distrustful with her and will probably take some time to build that trust, but she feels that having parents a part of the school will make a difference with the student achievement (Washington School principal interview, 2010).
Case Study 2: Jackson School

Students’ Spanish language is valued and respected, but for most students, school is the only opportunity to speak and practice their English…too few opportunities in the community and home for most students to speak and practice English (Jackson School Principal Interview, 2010)

Introduction

The first thing I noticed about Jackson School was that it was a big school with a large campus. It is needed to accommodate over 700 students. My first visit to the school was when I interviewed the principal. After the interview we visited the teacher collaboration classroom toward the back of campus next to the blacktop. Just outside the principal’s office is an open quad area with a planter in the middle. Upper grade classrooms were located across from the office and to the right. The cafeteria and teachers lounge was to the left. To reach our destination we walked through a hallway leading us to the primary grade classrooms and out toward the blacktop and the field. The teacher collaboration room was located in one of about four attached portable classrooms. The teacher collaboration classroom is where grade level teachers meet once a week to look at student data, plan units and lessons, and receive professional development. The reading coaches facilitate the collaboration meetings. The principal invited me to attend the teachers collaboration meetings as an opportunity to introduce myself and give a brief presentation regarding my study in an effort to invite teachers to participate.
Getting to Know Jackson School

I spent four weeks at Jackson School observing the classroom instruction and meeting with the principal, teachers, and parents. Table 30 shows that I met with four first through sixth grade teachers to discuss the various elements and educational practices implemented at Jackson School. Their years teaching at the school ranged from 1 year to 17 years. I also met with four parents to obtain their perspective regarding the educational practices at the school. Their children were enrolled in grades kinder through sixth.

Jackson School is a kinder through sixth grade elementary school in a southern California school district, located 7 miles from the California-México international border. Table 31 shows that 755 students are enrolled with 86% Latinos, 63% English learners, and 76% socioeconomically disadvantaged (receiving free and reduced price lunch). The school employs 45 fully credentialed classroom teachers to teach in the Structured English Immersion, and Alternative Bilingual instructional programs. Jackson school had a 2009 API score of 786 and has met its 2008-2009 AYP goals. The district has a base API score of 830 (CDE, 2010).

Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jackson School Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 31

*Jackson School Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>% EL</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>% Latino Students</th>
<th>2009 API</th>
<th>Met AYP</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>Instructional Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>SEI, ELD, AB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32

*Jackson Student Subgroups 2009 API Scores 2nd - 6th Grade*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Subgroups</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>API Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jackson Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CDE, Data Quest, 2009-10 Accountability Progress Reporting

Of the 459 students that were included in the 2009 API, the Latino, socioeconomically disadvantaged, and English learner subgroups were numerically significant. Table 32 shows that the Latino, English learner, and socioeconomically disadvantaged subgroups met their 2009 API targets. The Latino subgroup included 408 students with a 770 base API score. The school district’s 2009 API score for Latinos was 803 and for the state it was 736. The English learners subgroup included 320 students with a 748 API score. The school district’s 2009 API score for English learners was 774 and 726 for the state. The socioeconomically disadvantaged subgroup included 368
students with a 769 API score. The 2009 API score for socioeconomically disadvantaged students in the school district was 775 and 732 for the state. According to these API scores, the students at Jackson School met the state academic performance goals compared to their subgroup counterparts in the state but not compared to their subgroup counterparts in the school district (CDE, 2010).

Four schools in the district had a 2009 API score comparable to Jackson School. Table 33 displays the demographic information for the four schools including Jackson School. The API score ranged from a high of 798 to a low of 779. Jackson School had an API of 786. All the school except one met their 2009 AYP goals. One school was a charter school and was the only school that did not offer SEI. Jackson School had the most teachers with 45 followed by School R with 42 teachers. The other schools had considerably less teachers. All five schools have more than 75% Latino student enrollment. School S and Jackson School have the highest percentage of EL enrollment with 75% and 62% respectfully and 76% of students receiving free or reduced price lunch. The schools with an API score higher than Jackson School had a lower percentage of English learners and students receiving free or reduced price lunch and one of them is a charter school.
Table 33

*District Schools Demographics with Similar API 786*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>% EL</th>
<th>% Latino</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>2009 API</th>
<th>Met AYP</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>Instructional Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Q</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>SEI, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School R*</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jackson</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>786</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>SEI, ME, AB</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School S</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School T</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Charter school

The achievement trends for Jackson School in table 34 have shown a growth in the percentage of students achieving proficient and advanced levels from 2006 to 2009. In 2006, 22% of the students scored at proficient and advanced levels and 78% scored at basic, below basic and far below basic. In 2009, 48% of the students scored at proficient and advanced levels and 52% scored at basic, below basic and far below basic.

Table 35 shows the achievement trends for English learner students at Jackson School on the CST from 2006 to 2009. In 2006 and 2007, 100% of the English learners at Jackson School scored at basic, below basic, and far below basic with 60% scoring at far below basic in 2006 and 43% in 2007. In 2008, 89% of ELs scored at basic, below basic, and far below basic and 72% in 2009. In 2009, 26% of the English learners scored at a proficient level and 3% scored at an advanced level. The percent of ELs scoring at a basic level increased from 7% in 2006 to 39% in 2009. The greatest gains for English
learners at Jackson school were shown in students scoring at the basic level. An increase in ELs scored at a proficient level with 26% and 3% scored at an advanced level in 2009.

Observing the instructional practices at Jackson School and talking to the principal, teachers, and parents allowed me to identify elements and themes regarding the
instruction, curriculum, instructional program, and attitudes and beliefs toward student learners. Further insight into the school will be articulated in the following sections of this case study report.

Jackson School Structure

The key contact at Jackson School was the associate principal. He was knowledgeable of the school and made himself available to respond to my emails and assist in any way he could. His presence facilitated my visits and allowed me to gain access to the teachers and other school information. The school has one principal, one associate principal, a literary resource specialist, and a reading coach. The teachers meet for grade level collaboration meetings weekly. As part of the teachers’ professional development, teachers form professional learning communities. The purpose is to further develop the implementation of the school’s academic focus. The literacy resource specialist and the reading coach facilitate the sessions with the teachers and support them in looking at student data and developing instructional methods for implementing in the classroom.

Jackson School has students in grades kinder through sixth. The school offers Alternative Bilingual (AB) classrooms in kinder and first grade otherwise students are in SEI classrooms from kinder through sixth grade. The instruction in the AB classrooms is in Spanish. More English instruction is implemented in the first grade AB classrooms. Students in the SEI classrooms receive English instruction and all students in the entire school receive ELD instruction daily for 45 minutes.
Jackson School Mission, Vision, and Values

Jackson School is child-centered and strives to prepare students to be literate, responsible citizens, and enthusiastic lifelong learners. The school embraces the diversity of the community and values the students, staff, and community members. The essential elements of the Jackson School program are: (1) high expectations, (2) rigorous curriculum driven by state standards, (3) instruction that engages students and reflects best practices including learning styles and multiple intelligences, and (4) multiple data sources to promote student achievement.

Jackson School Biliteracy Focus

I had a meeting scheduled with the associate principal and was waiting in the office area. The office was busy that morning with parents who were asking the office secretary about kindergarten registration. Another parent was asking about enrolling her child. The secretary was attentive to the parents and was able to communicate with them in Spanish and English. Many of the teachers that I met were bilingual in Spanish and English.

The Jackson School language policy sets the expectation for students to reach English proficiency (Jackson School principal interview, 2010). Students are placed in SEI classrooms in kinder through sixth grades. Alternative Bilingual classrooms are offered in kinder and first grade. When parents enroll their children at the school they complete a home language survey. Parents who don’t speak English are encouraged to enroll their children in the Alternative bilingual classrooms (Jackson School principal interview, 2010). The principal said that the school was in program improvement when
she first arrived and there was a high student mobility rate. At that time there were bilingual classrooms up to up to sixth grade. The first thing she did was to reduce bilingual classrooms and transition students sooner into the English classrooms.

Students’ Spanish language is valued and respected, but for most students school is the only opportunity to speak and practice their English...too few opportunities in the community and home for most students to speak and practice English. (Jackson School principal interview, 2010)

One of the parents described how the bilingual program was structured when she enrolled her children at Jackson School. She said that there wasn’t a bilingual program all the instruction was in Spanish.

No, anteriormente, cuando yo vine a segundo [grado], hace cinco años, no estaba el programa. Era puro español y mínimo era inglés. Hasta, creo que se las hacían la transición hasta quinto. Entonces iban muy atrasado en el idioma y ahorita ya desde segundo, o sea, desde primero y segundo ya es puro inglés. [No, before, when I came in second [grade], about five years ago, there was no program. It was pure Spanish and minimal English. Until, I think that they would do the transition until fifth grade. So they were way behind in the language and now in second, or, from first and second is now pure English.] (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010)

Another parent stated that before there was no English instruction in the bilingual classrooms and now the school has improved since the principal came to the school.

Era casi español, no había casi nada de inglés. Ahora con el programa que la directora tiene ha subido la escuela y realmente si están, como, son bilingües porque están ahorita más enfocado. [It was mostly Spanish, there was hardly anything in English. Now with the program that the principal has the school has improved they are really, like, they are bilingual because they are more focused]. (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010)

The principal said the school values and respects English learners’ home language but acknowledged that the opportunities for students to learn and practice English happen at school. Teachers are the English models for students at school and the emphasis for the ELD instruction is to have English only teachers teach Level 1 ELD and Spanish
emphasis teachers teach other levels (Jackson School principal interview, 2010).

Teachers support students in learning English by immersing them with English in the classroom. An SEI classroom teacher explained her approach with students in the classroom.

While I understand Spanish, I won’t even attempt to speak it in the classroom with them because, ok, you can speak to me in Spanish, that’s fine, but I’m going to speak back to you in English, and that’s how it’s always going to be because I want you constantly surrounded by the language. (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010)

The expectation for teachers at school is to engage students with as much English as possible inside and outside the classroom (Jackson School principal interview, 2010).

Jackson school has seen growth on their achievement on the state measures with the readjustment to their bilingual program. Some of the teachers are disappointed that the bilingual classrooms have been minimized. They feel that the driving forces of NCLB and the demands to do well on CST are to blame.

NCLB has led to the near destruction of bilingual education at [Jackson]. Since test scores are a driving force behind NCLB, bilingual education classrooms only exist in kinder and first, both of which are not testing grades. (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010)

Parents have mixed feelings concerning their children’s biliteracy proficiency. One parent is speaking to her son more in Spanish but he prefers to speak in English because he has difficulty understanding Spanish. She has been able to support him in English but wants him to learn Spanish.

No le gusta el oir el español. Prefiere el inglés pero como nosotros somos Mexicanos, ahorita le estoy diciendo que escuche el español y si tiene una duda que pregunte. Eso es la manera en que yo trabajo pero estás hablando que la tarea es en inglés, las explicaciones son en inglés, las clases son en inglés, todo es en inglés entonces cada vez es menos español que pueden recibir de nosotros. [He doesn’t like to hear Spanish. He prefers English but since we’re Mexican, now I’m telling him to listen to Spanish and if he is not sure to ask. That is the
Another parent said that she supports her son in English because he has struggled with English. She has focused on English with her son because he doesn’t like English and she fears that he will resort back to only speaking Spanish (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010). Another parent said that she speaks to her children in Spanish at home and they focus on English at school but they don’t want to speak Spanish at home.

*Hay un cambio cuando se van de quinto a sexto, como que no quieren hablar español, o sea, se quieren olvidar como del idioma, y me dicen “Hay no, yo no hablo español.” Entonces yo les digo, es que quieren como ya cortar todo lo que han aprendido en español y seguir nadamas en inglés. Les digo, no. “Es tu cultura y hay que tratar de mantenerla en tu escuela lo que vas a estudiar y en la casa tu español”. [There’s a change when they go from fifth to sixth, like they don’t want to speak Spanish, or, they want to forget about the language, and they tell me “Oh no, I don’t speak Spanish.” So I tell them, it’s like they want cut ties with everything they have learned in Spanish and only continue only in English. I tell them, no. “It’s your culture and try to maintain what you’re learning at school and Spanish at home”].* (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010)

The parents in the focus group all shared the same sentiment that they support the school language policies but they at home they focus on Spanish with their children because they want to their children to speak Spanish and maintain their heritage (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010).

**Jackson School Value for Learners**

The teachers in the teacher focus group stated that most of the teachers and both administrators at this school hold extremely high expectations for each and every student (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010). According to the principal interview (2010), Jackson School is a great place for students because the teachers are advocates for
students and there are high expectations for all students. Teachers are dynamic, motivated, eager to learn and eager to push. Parents stated that teachers support students and motivate them.

Los motivan, los apoyan. Están allí siempre para ellos. Cuando ellos necesitan preguntar un poquito más ellos [maestros] están allí. Cuando tienen algún problema ellos tiene la confianza de acercarse a ellos [maestros]. [They motivate them. They support them. They are always there for them. When they need to ask a little more they [teachers] are there. When they have a problem they have the confidence to approach them [teachers]. (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010)

Jackson School teachers positively affirm students’ thinking and hold students to academic standards that go beyond meeting the standards.

I don’t expect the students to have the answers by themselves but to be able to find a way to get the answer is what I try to focus on….Having your students be able to think critically and to be able to respond to real life situations, not multiple-choice questions, I think that is more of a measure of a successful student. (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010)

The teachers stated that a measure of student success is when they have opportunities to think critically and make connections to their lives.

The students are expected to achieve and to gain proficiency in English (Jackson School principal interview, 2010). The principal said that one thing that has always been engrained in her and in the school is that they value the students’ home language and see it as a positive factor with students to learn English. And even more important than that for students is how the principal models success to the students because she came from a Spanish speaking family, she studied hard, went to school, and was successful. She models to them everyday that if she was able to “make it” and be successful would then be able to make it and be successful (Jackson School principal interview, 2010).
The teachers and their attitudes toward students’ abilities were have gone from the school. The way some teachers perceived student and their parents in previous years at Jackson School was deficit-based.

I can recall with horror the comments made by some teachers who have left this school. Comments like, "These type of kids will never reach the standards. They can't learn. They do not have the brains. The parents or community just doesn't care about education…” It's been at least five years since I have not heard any such comment. (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010)

The attitudes and beliefs that the administrators and teachers have toward students were positive and encouraging. A veteran teacher said that the way teachers view students has changed in most recent years.

**Jackson School Curriculum**

The teachers are responsible to teach the standards for language arts and math. The daily schedule is focused on reading and writing, including vocabulary, spelling, and grammar. The sixth grade classrooms include 25 minutes of social studies (Jackson School observation anecdotal record, 2010). The writing focus this school year included two-column notes and summaries incorporated in two content areas. Students were focused on summary writing in all the classrooms I observed. In a fourth grade classroom the teacher guided a lesson focused on the summary of a narrative story. The teacher read the story aloud to and in groups, the students had to identify the character and setting and record on their t-chart. As she read they had to identify the problem and how the problem was solved (Jackson School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

The instructional day is divided into three parts in the day: (1) reading and writing, (2) math, and (3) ELD. Other content that is taught in between and before or
after school includes a computer program for language arts and math (Imagine Learning, Reading Plus, Success Maker) and social studies and science.

We have computer programs that help students be successful in a multiple-choice kind of format. (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010)

Grammar is included as part of language arts (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010; Jackson School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

The standards guide the instruction and the teachers have the appropriate resources to provide good instruction. Teachers need to utilize other resources for language arts because the Houghton Mifflin language arts adoption is not correlated to the standards. The school does have some ELD materials available for teachers to use. The teachers do not utilize a specific ELD curriculum but the emphasis is on content and language objectives (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010). Teachers did not state the effectiveness of the ELD program for English learners. Science and social studies themes are included as part of the ELD curriculum. In a fourth grade classroom I observed the fourth grade ELD curriculum integrate science content covering the parts of a volcano (Jackson School observation anecdotal record, 2010). The teachers implement ELD everyday for 45 minutes, including Fridays. English only teachers teach the students at level one and Spanish emphasis teachers teach the other levels (Jackson School principal interview, 2010).

Jackson School Instruction

The teachers implement a variety of instructional methods to teach students. The principal said that what you should see in the classrooms that promotes learning is sheltered and scaffolded learning in second through sixth grade. Teachers should be
modeling, utilizing sentence frames, visuals, and realia, along with vocabulary development.

Differentiation in instruction is utilized to ensure that each student is making progress and is moving toward reaching their academic goals (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010). Along with differentiation, students are engaged in productive group work to identify the character in a story, completing storyboard or editing each other’s summaries (Jackson School observation anecdotal record, 2010). The classrooms have a print-rich environment with many teacher generated charts and graphic organizers for spelling, grammar, and math. Some were GLAD charts (Jackson School observation anecdotal record, 2010). Teachers utilize the GRR framework to structure the instructional process in the classroom, structured as an I do, we do, you do model where students are responsible for learning and are harmoniously working together (Jackson School principal interview, 2010). GLAD, Specifically Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE), and Total Physical Response (TPR) help scaffold lessons for the students who need the support (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010). A teacher said that the GLAD strategies are beneficial for students, especially English learners but is finding it hard to utilize GLAD strategies in the classroom.

We don’t do very many GLAD strategies anymore simply because we don’t have time and you can’t test on it. Only if we could figure out a way to make GLAD multiple-choice. (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010)

Parents think that the instruction in kinder is effective for students learning English. One parent said that she noticed a sequence to the instruction and they use more visuals. What parents would like to see more of is music, art, and more drawing in kinder
to motivate the students and to help them develop their motor skill for writing (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010).

Jackson School has a structure for identifying the needs of each student and providing teachers the support to implement effective instruction. The teachers in the AB program are well prepared and dedicated (Jackson School Principal interview, 2010). The academic expectations are limited in that students are taught to meet the goals of the CST. Teachers prepare appropriate lessons for students and challenge students to excel (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010). The GRR framework provides teachers a structure for instruction where the teacher models, does guided instruction with students, students engage in small groups, and then engage independently. Teachers are held accountable for implementing this instructional method with every lesson (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010). It is a basic lesson plan structure that is implemented in all school in this school district.

**Jackson School Accountability**

There is a sense of urgency at Jackson School. I asked the principal how the principals are held accountable in the district and she explained that the superintendent constantly holds the principal accountable and the instructional leaders at the school district push principals to hold teachers accountable to teach the standards and to meet the state and federal accountability goals. There is a tension among principals of being replaced if a school does not reach its academic goals (Jackson School principal interview, 2010). This supports the research that states, administrators are put in a
position to enforce good teaching rather than support good teaching because they are pressured by the superintendent to show results (Abernathy, 2007).

I asked the principal how the principal, teachers, students and parents are held accountable for supporting students in reaching their academic goals. She first explained that the principal is held accountable for holding teachers, students, and parents to high expectations and meeting academic goals, promoting collaboration, promoting data driven instructional focus, and providing space and time for strategic professional development. She then explained that teachers are held accountable for holding students to high expectations, meeting students’ reading, writing, math, and language goals, collaborating with own grade level teachers and other grade level teachers, and utilizing data to guide instructional process. Students are held accountable for going to school everyday, being engaged, meeting academic goals, and becoming proficient in English. And parents are held accountable for making sure children come to school everyday (Jackson School principal interview, 2010).

According to the principal, her leadership has been important in holding teachers and students accountable by showing a presence and being in classrooms (Jackson School principal interview, 2010). Teachers, in particular, are held accountable for the progress of each and every student.

We have weekly collaboration meetings where we design and analyze assessment data to better meet our diverse population. (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010)

Each teacher is encouraged and supported to plan with his/her grade level to ensure that teachers are teaching grade level standards (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010). The parents explained that all the second and third grade teachers meet and talk about
whether programs are working or what is missing (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010). On-going teacher collaboration focuses on writing results, data, instruction, planning, and collaboration. A variety of assessment measures are utilized to evaluate student progress. They utilize the CELDT for English language proficiency. The OARS is a battery of assessment as part of the Houghton Mifflin language arts adoption series, which measures reading comprehension, fluency, and writing. The students are also evaluated on the math benchmarks and the LAS (Language Assessment Scales) Links assessment that assess English language proficiency.

Professional development is provided to principals and the Instruction Learning Team (ILT) with a focus on reading and writing. The ILT includes a member from each grade level. Teachers also meet during the year as professional learning teams and have professional learning cycles (PLC). This is a type of professional development on a school-wide instructional focus. They use student data to determine an academic focus. This school year summary writing & two-column note taking was the focus. The professional learning cycle occurs in six-week cycles and then the professional learning teams determine the next steps (Jackson School principal interview, 2010).

**NCLB and Proposition 227 at Jackson School**

Teachers, in particular, are held accountable for the progress of each and every student. There have been many demands placed on teachers and higher expectations for students to meet proficiency.

We are constantly looking at classroom data to figure how to modify our instruction to raise student achievement. (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010)
The school’s focus has shifted since NCLB came to be. Now students are aware that each day counts. Everyday the principal looks for quality assignments and greater rigor in the classroom. Everything in the classroom is based upon California standards (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010). Data informs instruction and preparation for instruction.

In my opinion, the No Child Left Behind law, even though it has many flaws, has changed the way some teachers view and treat our diverse students. (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010)

Whether by choice or not, teachers are more responsive to the needs of English learners and have a purpose for making sure they teach them effectively. NCLB has focused the attention of schools to meet the needs of all students and the CST is the measure for success or failure.

Testing and an awareness of test scores is apparent in the culture of the school from the 350 shirts that teachers and students wear to the morning announcements. I think the intention was to promote an awareness of the gravity of these tests. (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010)

The gravity of the tests has brought major concerns on the part of teachers and parents.

One concern by teachers regarding testing is the emphasis placed on multiple-choice type questions and assignments.

There is a tremendous amount of emphasis placed on testing. A tremendous amount of emphasis placed on the ability to respond to multiple-choice questions, and in that regard, I think that this particular site really conditions the students to be successful in that avenue. (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010)

Parents are concerned about the amount of time students spend testing, practicing, and preparing before and after school. They can tell that the students and the teachers are pressured.

Hay puros pretest y los niños ya traen una presión y las maestras traen una presión. [There are pure pretests and the children feel the pressure and the
teachers feel the pressure. (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010)

Parents are also concerned about the students’ motivation particularly when certain students receive medals at the end of the year for meeting the CST goals and others don’t. They feel that all the students who show improvement should receive a medal (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010).

Teachers and parents have felt and seen the changes in content and instruction in the classrooms due to testing. Parents said that students are focused on learning math and language arts but don’t focus on science and project type activities anymore because the school is focused on the CST (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010).

We are encouraged to work with our basics because those are the ones that have a chance. So unfortunately while no children are supposed to be left behind, a vast majority of my classroom now suddenly is going to be, That in my opinion is one of the worst things that have happened because now, and it has been for the last two months. Fates have already been decided. (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010)

Teachers said that the closer they get to the CST the more they need to focus on working with the basic students who could make greater gains on the CST and pay less attention to the far below basic students.

**Jackson School Parent Involvement**

The parents that participated in the focus group are interested in the well being of their children and the school. Almost all of them volunteer or have volunteered at the school in one way or another. They said that they like being at the school helping teachers in the classrooms.

*En los salones me involucro en la forma de que le pregunto a la maestra primero que ella me indique que le puedo ayudar. A veces me pone a chequear tareas. En segundo si ayudo a chequear tarea o sarcarle copias, hacia libros o hago las
tareas. [I get involved in the classroom by first asking the teacher to tell me what
I can help her with. Sometimes she puts me to check homework. In second grade
I help to check homework or make copies or make books or make the homework.]  
(Jackson School parent focus group, 2010)

The benefit in volunteering in the classroom for parents is that they get to know what
their children are being taught and they can use it to support them at home with
homework. This group of parents knew a lot about the curriculum the instruction, and
the accountability. A parent was able to describe the instructional method a kinder
teacher uses to teach ELD. The parents said that they know more than most parents
because they are at the school more, but most parents are not well informed about the
school.

En nuestro caso, pues sabemos más porque somos voluntarias pero hay muchos
papás que no tienen idea de que es lo que hacen o que hace una maestra dentro
del salón porque nada mas tenemos dos presentaciones al año, a lo que le llaman
Open House. [In our case, well we know more than most because we’re
volunteers but there are many parents the have no idea what they do or what the
teacher does in the classroom we only have two presentations a year, what they
call Open House.] (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010)

The school informs parents by sending home a newsletter and inviting parents to attend
informative meetings like the PTA and the English Learners Advisory Committee
(ELAC). Parents are invited to the ELAC meetings via a flyer that is sent home but if
you don’t attend you cannot access the information because that information is not sent
home to parents.

No sé si sepa, hay una junta que se llama ELAC. En esa junta se da mucha
información…estás son las nuevas cosas que se están viendo en el distrito, por
ejemplo, lo del censo, pero un poquito mas información pero hay se queda. Se
queda con la persona que fue y ahí se quedó. Y lo triste es que siempre son pocos
quien se dan cuenta de la información. [I don’t know if you know, there’s a
meeting that is called ELAC. A lot of information is given in that meeting…these
are the new things that the district is viewing, for example, about the census, but a
little bit more information, but it stays there. It stays with the person who
attended and that is it. And the sad thing is that there are always only a few persons who are informed.) (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010)

The same with the PTA but those meeting are held at the school district offices. This group of parents said that they see the PTA name but are not sure what its function is or role is at the school.

Jackson School works towards reaching out to parents to further support classroom learning. The school has about three math and literacy nights throughout the school year. Parents are also encouraged to come and read with their students in the morning for at the READ IN (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010). Parents attend parent conferences and they can attend Coffee with the Principal. This is a time to meet with the principal, become informed, and possibly engage in discussions about topics that concern students and the school. A parent commented that at that Coffee with the Principal meeting the principal shared information about the school but it was the same information that was on the newsletter. At the end time ran out and there was no space for the parents to speak or engage in other topics (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010).

The principal said that the she has worked to establish an open door policy and build trust with parents. A strict parent policy is also in place and parents are expected to send their children to school everyday and parents are expected to attend the parent nights to receive support from the teachers (Jackson School principal interview, 2010). Jackson School also uses a messenger that makes an automatic phone call to parents to provide them with school information. Regardless of the efforts from the school the parents feel that more needs to be done to get more parents to be involved.
Me gustaría que hubiéramos más, que hubiera más comunicación, que hubiera más convivencia para que los papás también estuvieran más envueltos en la educación. [I wish there was more, there was more communication, there was more sharing so that the parents were more involved in their children’s education.] (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010)

According to the parent focus group, fewer parents are involved at Jackson School, as compared to past years, because there is a lack of communication on the part of the school with parents and the parents don’t trust or feel the confidence to be able to go and volunteer at the school. Parents would like the school to invite help to volunteer and help with some specific group or event.

Uno como voluntario está dispuesto a ayudarles o no sé, cualquier cosa que ocupen pero que nos den esa confianza. [As a volunteer, one is willing to help or something, anything that they need but give us that confidence.] (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010)

Another reason parents don’t go to the school is because they fear that they won’t be able to communicate with teachers because not all the teachers speak Spanish (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010).

The parents also brought up a couple incidents that they feel were inappropriate for parents and students. One of these incidents had to do with the police officer assigned to the school and the message that the principal was sending to students about the perceptions of law enforcement officers. According to the parents, the principal was going to every classroom with the police officer talking to them about following rules and the message that was being conveyed was that if they did something wrong the police officer was going to take them away. The parents felt that the principal was using the police officer to scare the students into exhibiting good behavior in school.

Los niños cuando pasa algo no se van a acercar a una policia porque es malo y eso es miedo. [When something happens the kids will not approach a police officer because he is bad and that is fear.] (Jackson School parent focus group,
The parents felt that it was inappropriate of the principal to use the image of a police officer in this manner because they were worried that the students would perceive the police as people that were there to punish them instead of helping them (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010).

Parents would like to see more attention with the students at school on the part of the yard duty personnel because they see that there is bullying going on. They feel that more noon duties are needed. A parent said that you see kinder students fighting in the bathroom and those types of incidents (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010). The parents said that they believe that these issues would be resolved if the communication between the parents and the school were more open.

**Jackson School Summary**

Jackson has shown some student gains on the CST but over 70% of English learners are scoring at a basic level or below and only 3% of English learners are scoring at an advanced level. The principal has been at the school for four years and is the most experienced administrator and educator in the study, with 32 years as an administrator.

The language policy is directed at students reaching English proficiency. The AB program is offered in kinder and first grade and the teachers are the English models for students (Jackson School principal interview, 2010). The teachers that have been at the school feel that NCLB and the push for more English instruction has destroyed the bilingual program at the school (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010).
The curriculum is guided by the state language arts and math standards and teachers utilize the Houghton Mifflin language arts adoption. Teachers feel that the narrowed curriculum and expectations to show academic gains on the CST has resulted in teaching students to do well on the test as opposed to authentic learning (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010).

Teachers hold students accountable for learning and teachers are held accountable to looking at data and identifying the needs of English learners. Teachers are expected to scaffold and differentiate the instruction for English learners. Teachers utilized the GRR framework to guide their classroom instruction (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010).

Parents are concerned that students test too much throughout the year. Parents feel that they are informed about basic school information but parents that attend more school-sponsored events are better informed, but they don’t trust the principal (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010).
Case Study 3: Roosevelt School

Yes, this is an excellent place to be a student. Many of the families here and the staff have been at this school for many years and that knowledge of the family history, and the brothers, and those that came before them, really helps to identify the students’ needs and where they’re coming from and really be able to see the whole child and be able to address any issues or needs (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010)

Introduction

I arrived early in the morning, before the school day began, to meet with teachers, and the school was bustling with students and parents. Roosevelt School is located in the middle of a neighborhood and is surrounded by homes and apartment buildings on the urban fringe of the city. As I approached the front of the school, looking for the entrance to the office, I couldn’t help but notice the name of the principal on the marquee. I stopped at the office first to sign in and get my visitor pass. The office was a small with enough space to fit about four or five persons. The principal office and the nurse’s office are located in this area and the door to the teachers’ break room was located behind the secretary’s desk. The secretary greeted me and she directed me to the classroom where I was going to meet with the teachers. On most visits I had to walk through the nurse’s office to reach the classrooms because the front gate was locked but in the morning and afternoons, when the students are arriving to school or leaving school, the front gate is opened.

I walked through the outdoor quad-like area to reach the classroom. To my right, under a cover next to the cafeteria, the lunch tables were filled with students eating breakfast and some accompanied by their parents. On the walls in the hallways were beautiful murals that added a bit of life to the school. I waited outside the classroom for a few minutes until the teachers finally arrived.
Getting to Know Roosevelt School

I spent three weeks observing the classroom instruction and meeting with the principal, teachers, and parents at Roosevelt School. During all my visits everyone in the office staff was nice and attentive but I didn’t feel a sense of being welcomed. The demeanor seemed to the point and unattached compared to other schools. Teachers and school staff members did greet me in the hallways and were very accommodating to direct me to a classroom if I was lost.

I met with 6 kinder through fourth grade teachers to discuss the various elements and educational practices implemented at Roosevelt School. Table 34 shows their years teaching at the school ranging from this being their first year to having taught at the school for ten years. I also met with five parents to obtain their perspective regarding the educational practices at the school. Their children were enrolled in grades kinder through sixth.

Roosevelt School is a kinder through sixth grade elementary school in a southern California school district, located 8 miles from the California-México international border. Table 35 shows that 626 students are enrolled with 80% Latinos, 50% English learners, and 65% socioeconomically disadvantaged (receiving free and reduced price lunch). The school employs 37 fully credentialed classroom teachers to teach in the Structured English Immersion, and Alternative Bilingual instructional programs. Roosevelt school had a 2009 API score of 805 and has met its 2008-2009 AYP goals. The school district has an API score of 830 (CDE, 2010).
Table 34

*Roosevelt School Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Years at school</th>
<th>Students grade level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 – 10</td>
<td>Kinder – 4\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>Kinder – 5\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35

*Roosevelt School Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>% EL</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>% Latino Students</th>
<th>API 2009</th>
<th>Met AYP</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>Instructional Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>SEI, ELD, AB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36

*Roosevelt Student Subgroups 2009 API Scores 2\textsuperscript{nd} - 6\textsuperscript{th} Grade*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student subgroups</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>API Scores</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roosevelt Subgroup</td>
<td>School District</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomically disadvantaged</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CDE, Data Quest, 2009-10 Accountability Progress Reporting
Of the 405 students that were included in the 2009 API, the Latino, socioeconomically disadvantaged, and English learner subgroups were numerically significant. Table 36 shows that the Latino, English learner, and socioeconomically disadvantaged subgroups met their 2009 API targets. The Latino subgroup included 331 students with an 803 API score. The school district’s 2009 API score for Latinos was 803 and for the state it was 736. The English learners subgroup included 210 students with a 797 API score. The school district’s 2009 API score for English learners was 774 and 726 for the state. The socioeconomically disadvantaged subgroup included 301 students with a 795 API score. The 2009 API score for socioeconomically disadvantaged students in the school district was 775 and 732 for the state. According to these API scores, the students at Roosevelt School are meeting the state academic performance goals compared to their subgroup counterparts in the district and state (CDE, 2010).

Three schools in the district had a 2009 API score comparable to Roosevelt School. Table 37 displays the demographic information for the three schools including Roosevelt School. The API score ranged from a high of 810 to a low of 805. Roosevelt School, School H, and School P had an API of 805. All the schools met their AYP goals. Each of the schools implemented SEI, ME, and AB programs, except for School H, which implemented an SEI, ME, and DL program. Roosevelt School had the most teachers with 35 followed by School H with 28 teachers. All five schools have more than 72% Latino student enrollment. School P and Roosevelt School had the highest percentage of EL enrollment with 57% and 50% respectfully and Roosevelt had 76% of students receiving free or reduced price lunch, the highest of the four schools. School N
Table 37

District Schools Demographics with Similar API 805

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>% EL</th>
<th>% Latino</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>2009 API</th>
<th>Met AYP</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>Instructional Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School N</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School H</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>SEI, ME, DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School P</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

had the lowest number of teachers with 20 and the highest API score with 810.

The achievement trends for Roosevelt School in table 38 have shown a growth in the percentage of students achieving proficient and advanced levels and a decrease in students scoring at far below basic from 2006 to 2009. The percentage of students scoring at far below basic decreased from 21% to 6% and the students scoring at advanced increased from 7% to 17%. In 2006, 59% of the students scored at basic, below basic, and far below basic levels and in 2009 50% students scored at basic, below basic, and far below basic levels. More students have shown improvement but half of the school is achieving at a basic level or below. Since 2006 the percentage of students scoring at proficient and advanced levels at Roosevelt school increased from 41% to 50% in 2009.
Table 38

Percent Roosevelt Students Scoring at CST LA Level 1 – 5, Years 2006-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far below basic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below basic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39

Percent Roosevelt ELs Scoring at CST LA Level 1 – 5, Years 2006-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far below basic</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below basic</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39 shows the achievement trends for English learner students at Roosevelt School on the CST from 2006 to 2009. In 2006 and 2007 no ELs scored at an advanced level. In 2008 1% of ELs scored at an advanced level and in 2009 7% scored at an advanced level. From 2006 to 2009 the percentage of ELs scoring at a proficient level increased from 6% to 26% and the percentage of ELs scoring at far below basic
decreased from 53% to 7%. The percentage of students scoring at a basic, below basic, and far below basic level was 94% in 2006, 95% in 2007, 78% in 2008, and 67% in 2009. The students have shown gains with more ELs scoring at a basic level (41%) in 2009 but that is still more than half of the English learner students scoring at or below the basic level, with 19% scoring at below basic and 7% scoring at the far below basic level.

Observing the instructional practices at Roosevelt School and talking to the principal, teachers, and parents allowed me to identify elements and themes regarding the instruction, curriculum, instructional program, and attitudes and beliefs toward student learners. Further insight into the school will be articulated in the following sections of this case study report.

_Roosevelt School Structure_

This is the principal’s second year at Roosevelt School. Along with the classroom teachers, the school also has an ELD coach and collaboration teachers. The ELD coach provides language instruction in the ELD lab classroom for newcomers and English learners. The collaboration teachers provide students with instructional support for teachers while they meet to collaborate with their grade level teams. Roosevelt School teachers provide instruction within two distinct instructional programs to meet the students’ language and learning needs. Teachers provide instruction in alternative bilingual classrooms and SEI classrooms. Students receive ELD in every classroom for 30 minutes daily. One AB classroom in kinder, first, and second grades provide instruction in Spanish all day except for the 30 minutes of ELD instruction (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010). Students in the second grade Alternative Bilingual
classroom receive mostly English instruction after the second half of the school year. From third to sixth grade all students receive instruction in English the full day. The SEI classrooms provide instruction in English to students identified as English learners. Students in the SEI classrooms may receive some Spanish support when needed. Third through sixth grade newcomers and students at the beginning and intermediate language levels receive instruction by the ELD coach in the ELD lab (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010; Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010). During my visits, the ELD coach was on leave and a long-term substitute teacher was taking over the class. At the time of my visits the ELD substitute teachers had been preparing and teaching the class for about 3 months.

*Roosevelt School Mission, Vision, and Values*

Roosevelt School strives to provide a safe and caring environment for students and parents to ensure that the school community master grade level skills. The principal, teachers and staff are committed to a comprehensive system of support to foster positive student growth in social and emotional behaviors and attitudes (Roosevelt School website, 2010).

*Roosevelt School Biliteracy Focus*

The goal for students at Roosevelt School is to reach English proficiency. Students’ primary language is valued and perceived as an asset but they are motivated to speak English as much as possible at school (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010). The purpose of the Alternative Bilingual classrooms is to provide native Spanish
speaking English learners with Spanish instruction to support their development in English.

Yo creo que la base que tenemos es excelente para ni mucho ni tan poquito; tres años que te ofrecemos. No son suficientes...no es la meta que seas lo más excelente en español. La meta es inglés y es la realidad. [I think that the foundation that we have of not that much and not that little is excellent; we offer three years. They are not sufficient...it is not the goal to be excellent in Spanish. The goal is English and that is the reality. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)]

In the second grade AB classroom the students receive more English instruction throughout the year but by the middle of the year the majority of the instruction, if not all, is in English. The teacher said that depending on the students she might still have to provide students with Spanish support. Second grade is the last grade where English learners can receive Spanish instruction because in third grade and beyond they will receive English only instruction.

I do a lot more English and maybe if they don’t understand so much, I have to because I have to get them ready for English only and I keep telling them that in third grade your teachers don’t speak Spanish, so I try to teach more English, and you can see that it’s a lot more English now, not because I want to but because I have to. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)

According to teachers, AB classrooms were offered up to third grade and fourth grade was the transition year until it was recently reduced to second grade (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010).

For placement of students in an SEI or AB classroom the principal and teachers look at the parent information and students language proficiency level and make a recommendation to parents for student placement.

Las maestras sugieren lo que piensan que sea mejor para el niño pero al final es la decisión del papá. [The teachers suggest what they think is best for the child...}
but at the end it’s the parent’s decision.] (Roosevelt School parent focus group, 2010)

Parents ultimately have the choice as to whether they want their child placed in an SEI or AB classroom. Some parents decided to place their children in an SEI classroom and some decided to place their children in an AB classroom. A parent stated that even though she was unaware that she had an option she’s happy with her decision (Roosevelt School parent focus group, 2010).

According to teachers the thought of having a DL program at the school was brought up by some parents but the principal and some teachers believe that dual language would not be successful at Roosevelt School because native English speakers in the community come to school with limited vocabulary skills in English (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010; Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010).

Parents in this community also want a Dual Immersion Bilingual program at this site but have been denied or told that test scores must increase first. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)

The school’s achievement level is a big reason that dual language is not a possibility in this community because students need to show proficiency on the CST before they can implement dual language instruction at Roosevelt School.

Roosevelt School Value for Learners

“We have high expectations for all students” exclaimed a teacher (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010). In the classrooms I observed teachers hold their students accountable for engaging during class. The students in the Alternative Bilingual kindergarten classroom were engaged in reading their bag of books for fluency in Spanish. They walked to their area with their books, set their timer and read for one
minute. They then marked their spot with blue tape and counted the number of words they read. When they finished reading one book they read another book. One of the students approached me and asked if he could read to me and he read well and was able to count all the words he read in one minute. I believe he read about 60 words (Roosevelt School Observation Anecdotal record, 2010). The teacher said that she considers her students and their parents in a sense part of a family.

Desde el momento que entras en ese lugar eres parte de la familia. [From the moment you enter this place you’re part of the family. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)]

Teachers provide students with positive reinforcement and set an environment where they can take risks for their learning. The second grade teacher spoke and taught the children in a respectful, gentle manner and the students responded well to the teacher (Roosevelt School Observation Anecdotal record, 2010).

Los maestros se enfocan en ayudar a los niños, a menos la maestra que tenemos en bilingüe, es muy buena maestra. [The teachers focus on helping the children especially the teacher we have in bilingual, she is a very good teacher.] (Roosevelt School parent focus group, 2010)

Parents said that they feel that there are good teachers in the classrooms and they believe that students can achieve.

I was observing the ELD lab when the ELD substitute teacher was assisting the students in preparing speeches that they were going to present in class (Roosevelt School observation anecdotal record, 2010). The ELD substitute teacher was excited for the students because she wanted them to participate in presenting a speech at some level since they would not be able to with the English proficient students (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010). The students presented and they also evaluated each other. At the end they received an award that the ELD substitute teacher had bought.
They all got up and did it, whether they wanted to or not, they went and did it. They each were a judge. They judged each other so they had to learn how to do that and then they all got their ribbons. And they were as proud as can be about themselves. I think their level of, I don’t know, pride rose through the roof. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)

The principal believes that it is the responsibility of everyone at the school to help students be successful and with no excuses and regardless of the educational or cultural background of the community. The principal stated that it was a greater responsibility for them to make sure that their children will have that high education and academic language (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010).

**Roosevelt School Curriculum**

The curriculum at Roosevelt is focused on teaching the California language arts and math standards. The teachers develop their lessons according to the standards they need to meet. The science standards are taught in the upper grades because the students are tested in science in fifth grade (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010). All teachers use the Houghton Mifflin adoption for language arts in both Spanish and English, McGraw-Hill math adoption, *Reflections* for social studies and *Into English* for ELD in kinder. The school also has the *English in a Flash, Imagine Learning*, and *Accelerated Reader* computer programs to assist students in developing their reading and language.

A major concern for teachers is that they only teach reading, writing, and math and with so many standards to cover do not have time to teach social studies and science. Other subjects like the art, music and physical education have been eliminated in the classroom due to the pressure of preparing students to meet the state test goals.
Some teachers have had to dramatically alter their instructional day, to eliminate the arts, social studies, and even science—until the emphasis returns for the 5th grade testing year. I attribute most of this to the context of our community being low-income, and non-native English speakers. In order to fulfill the minimum requirements of NCLB’s proficiency goals, a school like ours has a lot more ground to make up than a school with native speakers. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)

The principal acknowledges the teachers’ concerns and would like all teachers to include social studies and science along with their language arts lessons because it can help in meeting the language arts standards.

One of the things I see teachers dragging their feet on is that they see social studies and science as these extra things that we don’t have time for and that’s something that I need to work with them…but because we’re teaching literacy does not mean that we need to just teach fictional stories. We need to be teaching social studies and science in our classes where all our students are learning in all our classes. (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010)

She feels that she has not done enough to support teachers in accomplishing this aspect of their teaching. The second grade AB teacher was teaching her students the reading strategy of asking questions. She modeled different types of questions and the students practiced asking questions different types of questions. She then showed them pictures of ants to further generate more questions (Roosevelt School observation anecdotal record, 2010). A kinder teacher incorporated math and writing. The students had to write a “math story” using the manipulative and then they all presented their stories (Roosevelt School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

The focus for student learning is in reading, writing, and math. The teachers teach to the standards and are constantly reevaluating students to identify their academic needs and develop interventions. The teachers use the Houghton-Mifflin (HM) language arts adoption series for the language arts instruction even though it is are not aligned to the standard (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010). The teachers utilize the
Online Assessment Reporting System (OARS); to assist them in identify students’ literacy levels. They also utilize Inspire, a computer program that allows the teachers to input a standard and receive activities and assessment they can use in the classroom. The teachers like the OARS and the Inspire resources very much to compensate for the their language arts curriculum materials not being aligned to the standards (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010).

The school offers extended day for an hour after the school day ends. During extended day students receive more reading instruction and language development. To further prepare students for the CST the teachers use the CST release questions and practice finding the answer to the problem while modeling strategies for solving the problem (Roosevelt School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

Roosevelt School Instruction

The instruction in the classrooms is structured so that all students will understand and be engaged in the learning. The teacher modeling to students is a major component during the instruction. Teachers utilize visuals, charts, and sentence frames to engage students during the lesson. According to the principal, the classroom instruction should be able to provide students a way of accessing information and knowledge and the content that they’re being taught (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010). Teachers utilize visuals help students make connections with content and language.

The students can then access the information from the charts to support their learning. Sentence frames are used like prompts to help students know how to express their learning and be able to ask questions. (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010)
The visuals, charts, and other print in the classroom are there to provide a structure and to help students organize the information they are learning. Teachers also frontload vocabulary or pre-teach vocabulary from a story supports to support students’ ability to read the story and answer questions about the story. The students can then use the sentences frames to help them articulate their answer in class discussions or in collaborative group work (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010).

Differentiating the instructions allows students at varying levels of language and knowledge proficiency to access the informing at their level. Teachers differentiate the instruction as identified by the students’ needs and provided them with timely interventions (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010).

We provide interventions for students who may be struggling. These can be small groups, peer tutors, extra time with a support teacher. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)

The principal explained that during small group instruction students are able to collaborate with peers and have conversations using academic language about what they’re learning and what they want to learn (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010).

I also do lots of metacognitive development that enables them to understand different strategies that they can use in order to take charge of their own learning. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)

The teachers engage students of developing their metacognition by using thinking aloud as they modeled strategies for selecting the best multiple-choice answer to a question or word practice problem (Roosevelt School observation anecdotal record, 2010). A second grade teacher was guiding the students as they answered CST test release questions shown on the document camera. She was modeling how answer the following question:
Which sentence includes the most details? She solicited answers from the students and also was *thinking aloud* as they selected the best answer (Roosevelt School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

**Roosevelt School Accountability**

Roosevelt School teachers are accountable to the principal for teaching the required standards and conducting on-going assessment of their students. All teachers need to know where their students are making gains and where there are gaps.

She’s making us accountable that way that she knows the data that we have and she’s very knowledgeable so she knows where we need to work on it. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)

Teachers use a variety of methods to assess the students’ progress. They use teacher made test and quizzes, inventories, and anecdotal records to assess individual students or in groups. Teachers are also using *Inspect*.

We can go to *Inspect*, which is a computer program, and type in a standard and it give you activities for us to do with the kids. We love the program. We do this as a grade level and we print out a lot of assessments for them. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)

*Inspect* is a computer program that is aligned with the Houghton Mifflin language arts adoption and it is used as resource that provides teachers activities and assessment specific to the standards they are teaching. A teacher showed me some of the assessments that she retrieved from *Inspect* (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010). The school-wide assessment measures that they utilized include the *OARS*. The students take fluency, comprehension, spelling, vocabulary, and writing tests every six weeks. Through the *OARS* the teachers are able to identify the level for each student. The goal is to have everyone at the benchmark (proficient) or challenge (advanced) level.
They can then begin to pinpoint the needs of each student particularly those who scored at strategic (basic) and intensive (below basic) levels. They then set goals based on the data (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010). Other school-wide assessment measures are the math benchmark tests, and the *Local Measures*. *Local Measures* is the end of the year test developed by the school district for language arts and math. Students then take the CST at the end of the year. *Imagine Learning*, *Success Maker*, and *LAS Links* are assessments that are specifically for English learners (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010).

A concern for the principal is how well prepared her teaching staff is to provide effective ELD instruction. She stated that teaching ELD in the classroom needs to improve because some of the teachers seem to be lost.

I don’t think most teachers and, not just in this school, I think that many teachers don’t know what ELD is….They’ve gotten GLAD. They’ve gotten productive group work, frames. All those together help in an ELD lesson but it’s teaching just language that’s other than grammar work sheets. That’s the issue. (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010)

She feels that the knowledge base of the ELD coach has contributed to the success of English learners at Roosevelt school and not the practice of all teachers, but is interested in knowing how having a substitute teacher in the ELD lab affected student outcomes (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010).

**NCLB and Proposition 227 at Roosevelt School**

Teachers agree that NCLB has brought forth a strong focus for the achievement of English learners but it has also brought forth many concerns (Roosevelt School teacher
focus group, 2010). A benefit for all learners is that teachers are more accountable for student learning.

We have had to focus on an accountability piece for all learners. This made us take a closer look at our instructional efforts, and really reflect on improving them. As a result, there has been tremendous professional growth, as well as an improvement in the instructional efforts provided to English Learners. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)

NCLB has also made an impact on the instructional goals and accountability for school. Teachers say that it has put pressure on the principal and staff to cut back the bilingual program at Roosevelt School from fourth grade to second grade.

I attribute most of this to the context of our community being low-income, and non-native English speakers. In order to fulfill the minimum requirements of NCLB's proficiency goals, a school like ours has a lot more ground to make up than a school with native speakers. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)

As a result the school is transition more student from the AB classrooms into the SEI classrooms sooner than they have before so they can receive more English instruction by the time they begin taking the CST in second grade.

Teachers are also concerned about the overemphasis on teaching language arts and math. They feel that with the pressure to teach all the standards, they are limited in teaching other subjects.

Some teachers have had to dramatically alter their instructional day, to eliminate the arts, social studies, and even science--until the emphasis returns for the 5th grade testing year. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)

This means that teachers at Roosevelt School will not teach science if it is not tested. Science is emphasized in fifth grade because the students are tested in science on the CST. This concern is juxtaposed with their concern in the limited time they already have
to teach all the language arts and math standards. They feel that they cannot teach the
other content subjects anyways (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010).

The principal acknowledges the concern of over-testing for students. Students are
assessed all year and they are practically testing the whole month of May. Her concern is
that students get burned out and don’t do as well on the CST.

Is it really measuring their knowledge or their resilience for taking tests.
(Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010)

Not only are the students stressed out, the teachers are stressed out as well. Even though
all the teachers agree that the students are learning and achieving, they are concerned for
their overall success.

The kinder AB teacher explained that students are selected to enroll in the AB
classrooms based on the home language survey and use of Spanish in the home. The
Roosevelt School AB kindergarten teachers and the principal identify potential students
to place in the AB kind classroom by looking at the language survey. They check to see if
the family is requesting information to be sent home in Spanish and if the child had been
to preschool. Students that have a high understanding in Spanish are good candidates.
After further evaluation by the teachers and the principal, the parents are notified of
possible placement of their child in the AB classroom. Parents ultimately have the choice
as to whether they want their child place in an SEI or AB classroom (Roosevelt School
teacher focus group, 2010).

\textit{Roosevelt School Parent Involvement}

The parents from the focus group shared their experiences as a parent at
Roosevelt school. They said that the teachers, especially the primary grade teachers hold
them responsible for helping their children with their schoolwork. One mother said that she works with her kindergarten daughter on learning her alphabet to reinforce what she is learning in school (Roosevelt School parent focus group, 2010).

Where I do have an open door policy and I’ve told them that if they want to come in an volunteer, they are more than welcome. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)

A kinder teacher said she has an open door policy and parents are always in her classroom (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010).

The principal has been trying to get parents more involved, especially with attending the English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) meetings at school. The school is offering English classes to parents this year and she started having the ELAC meetings on the same day as the English classes.

That’s part of their English class that day and we try and hold the meeting in English so they can practice their language and at the same time we’re giving them information. So that group has worked really well where we can invite parents to be part of it. (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010)

The parents that attend the English classes really like the classes and want the school to continue them. Some of the parents said they attend the ELAC meeting and other meeting that the school invites them to, like the PTA meeting. The principal is encouraging parents to take on the leadership roles designed for parents, for example, the PTA.

This year our PTA president speaks only Spanish and that was one of her hesitations and how am I going to do it if I only speak Spanish, but she has done a tremendous job and we think that also demonstrates that language is not going to keep our kids from giving speeches. It’s not going to keep our parents from being in the leadership role. (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010)

Parents feel that they are well informed about the school. They school invites them to attend different meeting like Coffee with the Principal and they receive a
monthly newsletter with more information regarding the school. At the ELAC meetings the parents are informed about fiscals responsibility of the school and also personnel decisions made by the school. They are concerned with the budget cuts that may occur and how it will impact the school and their children. They also attend parent conferences and meet with teachers regularly. They are well informed about the academic progress of their children (Roosevelt School parent focus group, 2010).

Roosevelt School Summary

Roosevelt has shown some student gains on the CST but over 60% of English learners are scoring at a basic level or below and only 7% of English learners are scoring at an advanced level. The principal has been at the school for two years and this is her first experience as an administrator.

The language policy is directed toward preparing students to learn English. The role of the AB classrooms is to support Spanish speaking English learners to transition into an SEI classroom (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010). Alternative Bilingual classroom teachers feel that every year they are providing less instruction in Spanish. They acknowledge that they are teaching a transitional Spanish that supports students learning of English (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010). The principal made it clear that the students are being taught Spanish to learn English. Parents can decide to place their child in an AB classroom and at that point the waiver for an alternative program is explained to them (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010).

The curriculum is guided by the standards. Teachers stated that NCLB has caused Roosevelt School to focus the curriculum reading, writing, and math (Roosevelt School
According to the principal, language arts and math are the focus, but social studies and science needs to be incorporated with the language arts and math (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010). Teachers utilize the Houghton Mifflin language arts adoption as a main resource even though it is not aligned to the state standards. Other resources are available to teachers to support teacher in developing lesson and assessing students (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010).

The instruction at Roosevelt School is guided by the state standards. Teachers are responsible for knowing the academic level for each student and utilizing the appropriate strategies to make the learning accessible. The teacher modeling is a major component during the instruction (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010). The students are immersed in language and print from which the student can access from the walls and engage in with the teacher and other students (Roosevelt School observation anecdotal record, 2010). The sentence frames are a strategy that teachers utilize to support student engagement in groups and to build academic language. Teachers utilize visuals, charts, and sentence frames to engage students during the lesson and differentiate their learning by working with students individually or in small groups (Roosevelt School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

They majority of the teachers have been teaching at the school for many years and have experienced the transformation of the community from majority English speaking families to the majority Spanish speaking families. The principal has identified that the teaching staff, particularly the veteran teachers, need more professional development in implementing ELD in the classroom and that is a weak link in providing effective instruction to English learners (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010).
Case Study 4: Kennedy School

Those are the goals that we have for our kids that they can achieve on these assessment and through good instruction in the classroom, through good teaching, through good structured learning environments, where students understand what the expectation is of them, that they are there to learn, that they’re there to participate and be engaged and complete the work (Kennedy School Principal Interview, 2010)

Introduction

A California Distinguished Schools plaque was placed on the outside wall near the office door at Kennedy School. The office staff was friendly and greeted me with a smile every time I visited the school. While I waited to speak to the principal I observed that the office staff was attentive to parents and were able to communicate with them in English or Spanish. In the mornings it was common to see teachers in the office either speaking to the secretary, the principal or the attendance clerk. The Kennedy School building is unique in that the majority of the classrooms are inside the building and the auditorium is also part of the main building. From the office a hallway will lead you passed the nurse’s office and straight to the auditorium. Another hallway will lead you to the primary grade classrooms. The corners and turns of the hallway reminded me of a giant maze. Student work and student art was displayed on the walls along the hallway. Turning left at the intersection of the hallway led me to the kindergarten classroom. Turning right led me to the second grade classrooms. Walking straight led me outside to the playground area and the third through sixth grade classrooms. The classroom where the parent classes were held was located near the third grade classrooms.
I spent three weeks at Kennedy school observing the classroom instruction and meeting with the principal, teachers, and parents. As shown in Table 40, I met with 4 kinder through fifth grade teachers to discuss the various elements and educational practices implemented at Kennedy School. Their years teaching at the school ranged from this being their first year to having taught at the school for six years. I also met with five parents to obtain their perspective regarding the educational practices at the school. Their children were enrolled in grades kinder through sixth.

Kennedy school is a kinder through sixth grade elementary school in a southern California school district, located 5 miles from the California-México international border. Table 41 shows that 630 students are enrolled with 88% Latinos, 72% English learners, and 64% socioeconomically disadvantaged (receiving free and reduced price lunch). The school employs 30 fully credentialed classroom teachers to teach in the Structured English Immersion, Mainstream English, and Alternative Bilingual instructional programs. Kennedy school had a 2009 API score of 822 and has met its 2008-2009 AYP goals. The district has an API score of 830 (CDE, 2010).

Table 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kennedy School Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 41

*Kennedy School Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>% EL</th>
<th>% Free</th>
<th>% Latino</th>
<th>2009 API</th>
<th>Met AYP</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>Instructional Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>SEI, ME, ELD, AB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 430 students that were included in the 2009 API, the Latino, socioeconomically disadvantaged, and English learner subgroups were numerically significant. All three subgroups met their 2009 API targets. As illustrated in Table 42, the Latino subgroup included 385 students with an 824 API score. The school district’s 2009 API score for Latinos was 803 and for the state it was 736. The English learners subgroup included 302 students with an 813 API score. The school district’s 2009 API score for English learners was 774 and 726 for the state. The socioeconomically disadvantaged subgroup included 310 students with an 815 API score. The 2009 API score for socioeconomically disadvantaged students in the school district was 775 and 732 for the state. According to these API scores, the students at Kennedy school are meeting the state academic performance goals compared to their subgroup counterparts in the district and state in the state tests. (CDE, 2010)

Three schools in the district had a 2009 API score comparable to Kennedy School. Table 43 displays the demographic information for three schools including Kennedy School. The API score ranged from a high of 827 to a low of 821. Kennedy School, and School M had an API of 824. Three out of the four schools met their
Table 42

Kennedy Student Subgroups 2009 API Scores 2nd - 6th Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student subgroups</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>Kennedy Subgroup</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomically disadvantaged</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CDE, Data Quest, 2009-10 Accountability Progress Reporting

Table 43

District Schools Demographics with Similar API 824

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>% EL</th>
<th>% Latino</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>2009 API</th>
<th>Met AYP</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>Instructional Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School G</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>SEI, ME, DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>SEI, ME, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>SEI, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School L</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>SEI, ME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 AYP goals. Two schools implemented only SEI and ME programs, School G implements SEI, ME, and a DL program, and Kennedy School implemented SEI, ME, and an AB program. School M had the most teachers with 46 followed by Kennedy School with 35 teachers, School L with 32 teachers, and School G with 28 teachers.
Kennedy School had the highest percentage of Latino students, ELs, and students receiving free or reduced price lunch. Kennedy had an 88% Latino population, 72% EL population, and 64% of students receiving free or reduced price lunch. The next highest percentage of Latino students was School M with 67%. The next highest percentage of EL students was School G with 30%. And the next highest percentage of students receiving free or reduced price lunch was School M with 35%. The two schools that offered primary language instruction had the two highest 2009 API scores with 824 and 827. Kennedy School stood out from the four schools because it had a very high percentage of Latino students, ELs, and students receiving free or reduced price lunch, yet its API score was comparable.

The CST achievement trends for Kennedy School depicted in table 44 have shown some growth in the percentage of students achieving proficient and advanced levels and a decrease in students scoring at far below basic from 2006 to 2009. The percentage students scoring at far below basic decreased from 20% to 5% and the students scoring at advance increased from 7% to 17%. In 2006, 59% of the students scored at basic, below basic, and far below basic levels and in 2009, 50% of students scored at basic, below basic, and far below basic levels. A slight improvement was seen but half of the school is achieving at a basic level or below. Since 2006 the percentage of students scoring at proficient and advanced levels at Kennedy School increased from 41% to 50% in 2009.
Table 44

*Percent Kennedy Students Scoring at CST LA Level 1 – 5, Years 2006-2009*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far below basic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below basic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45

*Percent Kennedy ELs Scoring at CST LA level 1 – 5, Years 2006-2009*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far below basic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below basic</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CST achievement trends for English learners at Kennedy School in table 45 have shown some growth in the percentage of students achieving proficient and advanced levels and a decrease in students scoring at far below basic from 2006 to 2009. The percentage of students scoring at far below basic decreased from 13% to 9% and the students scoring at an advance level increased from 5% to 15%. The greatest growth was seen in the percentage of students scoring at below basic with a decrease from 34% to
10% from 2006 to 2009. In 2006, 77% of the students scored at basic, below basic, and far below basic levels and in 2009 67% students scored at basic, below basic, and far below basic levels. More students have shown improvement but more than 60% of the English learners are achieving at a basic level or below. Since 2006 the percentage of students scoring at proficient and advanced levels at Kennedy School increased from 23% to 43% in 2009.

Observing the instructional practices at Kennedy school and talking to the principal, teachers, and parents allowed me to identify elements and themes regarding the instruction, curriculum, instructional program, and attitudes and beliefs toward student learners. Further insight into the school will be articulated in the following sections of this case study report.

**Kennedy School Structure**

Kennedy School has one principal, one project coordinator, one reading coach and one math coach to support teachers. This was the principal’s first year at the school. The project coordinator assists the principal in coordinating the various instructional and school programs implemented at the school. The reading coach and the math coaches support teachers in preparing units and lessons, analyzing data, and providing professional development (Kennedy School Principal Interview, 2010). Kennedy School uses site-based-decision-making to guide decisions affecting student achievement, which include an Instruction Leadership Team (ILT) made up of one teacher from each grade level.
Thirty classroom teachers provide instruction within four distinct instructional programs to meet the students’ language and learning needs. Kennedy School provides students instruction in alternative bilingual classrooms, SEI classrooms, and Mainstream English classrooms. Students receive English Language Development (ELD) in every classroom for 30 -45 minutes daily. Four Alternative Bilingual (AB) classrooms in kinder and first grades provide instruction in Spanish all day except for the 30 minutes of ELD instruction (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010). From second to sixth grade all students receive instruction in English the full day. The SEI classrooms provide instruction in English to students identified as English learners. Students in the SEI classrooms may receive some Spanish support when needed. Native English speaking students and students identified as Initial Fluent English Proficient (I-FEP), when first enrolled in the school, are placed in Mainstream English classrooms (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010).

**Kennedy School Mission, Vision, and Values**

The Kennedy school mission, vision, and values are displayed on the school’s website. It states that Kennedy school is devoted to the success of all its students and their families. The school is committed to providing students with a safe and nurturing environment, strives to create high achieving, innovated thinkers, and challenges students to become self-confident, life-long learners. Kennedy School community provides opportunities for all students and their families to take responsibility for learning and an active role in education. (Kennedy school website, 2010).
Kennedy School Biliteracy Focus

The voices heard throughout Kennedy School merged into a combination of English and Spanish. Students were playing on the blacktop and some of them were communicating in English and others in Spanish. In the office some parents were communicating with the office staff or with each other in Spanish and others in English. The voices represented throughout the school community illustrated the school’s makeup, the makeup of the community, and the school’s language policy.

The AB kindergarten classroom was rich in print with Spanish language and content materials. The teacher and the students were reviewing the characteristics of narrative text. The teacher taught the literature lessons to her students using the chart on the wall and utilizing academic language and rich content vocabulary. Deeper into the day the teacher used a song and signals to review the letters and sounds in Spanish (Observation Anecdotal Record, March 17, 2010). The fifth grade classroom also was rich in print in English. The students engaged in reading a story in groups and discussing the story. The teacher set high expectations for students to utilize academic language as they read and discussed the story Pioneer Girl (Observation Anecdotal Record, March 17, 2010).

The language policy at Kennedy School is to provide English instruction to all students in every grade with the option of Spanish instruction in kinder and first grade. Spanish speaking English learners are offered instruction in Spanish in kinder and first grade. Beginning in second grade they receive instruction in English up to sixth grade. Once English learner students enter second grade they are placed in an SEI classroom. English learners may also be placed in an SEI classroom starting at kinder up to sixth
grade. The instruction in an SEI classroom is in English but in some cases English
learners may receive some support in Spanish. According to a Kennedy School teacher,
the AB program was offered from kinder to second grade a few years ago but was then
changed to provide English instruction beginning in second grade. The change was made
to assist students in transitioning to an English instruction classroom in third grade.

Entonces al Sr. Garcia (principal) en aquel tiempo se le ocurrió, era que
comencemos el transición en segundo para que el niño no se le hiciera tan
difícil en ese cambio....el brinco que hacen de segundo a tercero es grande.
[Then at that time it occurred to Mr. Garcia (principal) that we begin the transition
in second grade so that the change would not be so difficult for the child….the
jump that they make from second to third is big.] (Kennedy School teacher focus
group, 2010)

According to one teacher who taught second grade at the time, she felt that the change
was good for students because the jump from third to fourth grade was difficult for
students and having more English instruction supported students (Kennedy School focus
group, 2010). She also said that many parents supported it because the teachers were
bilingual and would continue providing their children support

Parents and teachers believe that it is important for native Spanish speaking
students to have a strong foundation in their home language in Spanish and be bilingual.
Teachers in the focus group believe that it is important because parents can better support
their children in Spanish but once they enter an all English classroom it will be more
difficult for parents (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010). Parents want their
children to be bilingual and learn Spanish and English well and they feel that their
children are doing well in the English classes (Kennedy School parent focus group,
2010). The parents in the focus group said that they want their children to maintain their
heritage and their home language that is why they have their children read and write in Spanish at home and let the school teach them English.

_Yo de hecho en casa los pongo a que lean en español y les dicto en español pero eso nomás en casa._ [I actually have them read in Spanish and I teach them in Spanish, but that’s all at home. (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010)]

Another parent shared that she helps her child maintain Spanish while she learns English at school because she wants her child to know both languages:

_No, yo en lo personal quiero que sepan los dos idiomas y entonces yo sé bien mi español y yo les ayudo con el español y que aprendan bien aquí el inglés igual. Que tengan los dos idiomas._ [No, personally, I want them to know both languages and so then I know Spanish well and I help them with the Spanish and they can learn English well here equally. They can have two languages.](Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010)

One parent said that she would continue speaking to her child in Spanish at home and let the school teach them English.

_Kinder and first grade parents have a choice as to whether they want to put their children in an AB classroom or in an SEI classroom. The principal explained that the language survey done by the parents determines if the child can qualify to be placed in an alternative bilingual classroom then the parents are notified._

_So at that point we do ask and then it’s the parent’s choice. So it’s not something that we throw them in blindly. We do ask them. We do get their permission before we even do the assessment, the LAS, and then see how they are going to qualify or not for a bilingual program or if we are just going to recommend them for the English only program._ (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010)

At that point the Limited English Proficient (LEP) aide explains the waiver process. The principal explained that at that point the parents decide on whether they want their child to receive English only instruction or receive instruction in Spanish.

_We do have the waivers that we provide, obviously, for the alternative program that we have, which is the early exit bilingual program._
parents either decide if they’re wanting their kids to just be immersed in English and not even deal with having their kids learn any Spanish or we have the parents that are concerned over the fact that their kids are going to struggle and they’re not going to be as successful unless they get support in their native language so it’s a toss up, 50/50. (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010)

Teachers from the focus group feel that some parents choose to put their children in an AB classroom because they want them to have a strong foundation in Spanish. Other parents choose to have them in an English only classroom because they believe that they will learn English better.

O también la cosa es que, si es a veces falta de información o a veces que los papas aprenden de chiquitos inglés y no les quieren meter en bilingüe. Pero hay otras ocasiones que a mí me ha tocado que hay papás que se han dado cuenta que los primeros hijos ya pasaron por un programa bilingüe en otra escuela o en esa escuela y entonces no les fue muy bien. [Or the thing is this, sometimes it is lack of information or sometimes that parents learn English at a young age and they don’t want to put them in bilingual. But in other occasions I’ve seen parents who have realized that their first children have been through a bilingual program in another school or in this school and then did not fare well for them.] (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

They said that a reason for that may be that the parents themselves were in a bilingual program or had other children in a bilingual program that failed them and because of that have decided to put their child in English only. The principal noted that kinder has four classrooms and they are only able to fill two Alternative Bilingual classrooms and the other two classrooms are the SEI classrooms (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010).

**Kennedy School Value for Learners**

The teachers have high expectations for students to learn and they expect them to achieve (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010). The teachers are passionate about teaching and their students' learning.
Kennedy es un lugar en donde nos interesamos por los niños, por la capacidad de cada uno de ellos y damos el máximo de que están en nuestras manos para que ese alumno no solamente venga a estudiar si no que encuentre un lugar donde divertirse, donde ser él, donde ser capaz de poder tomar un reto y llevarlo acabo. [Kennedy is a place where we are interested in the students, for their learning and we give our all so that that student not only come to learn but to also find place where he can have fun, where he can be himself, where he can be challenged and carry it out.] (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

The parents stated that the teachers are very dedicated to teaching and assuring that students are learning and achieving.

Los maestros se preocupan mucho por que los niños aprendan….Los maestros dedican mucho tiempo. De hecho hasta en la tarde y en la noche todavía a veces están apoyando con los trabajos. [The teachers are very concerned that the children learn. The teachers dedicate much time. In fact they are still supporting the work in the afternoon and at night.] (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010)

Teachers are dedicated and positive with students. During the classroom observations I saw teachers provide students with positive reinforcement and expected them to be focused and on-task. In an AB kindergarten classroom the teacher was challenging students to write multiple sentences. The classroom environment in the kindergarten classroom was fun and encouraging for students. The teacher encouraged students to give their input in describing the beginning, middle, and end of a story (Kennedy School observation anecdotal record, 2010). Teachers feel that Kennedy school is a good place for students because the entire teaching staff is well prepared and committed to the students.

Creo que son responsables, de lo que yo he mirado y siento que se interesan por los estudiantes entonces creo que sienten el compromiso de enseñar. [I think that they are responsible, from what I’ve seen and I feel that they are interested in the students so I think that they feel a commitment to teach. (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)
The parents said that one of things they like about Kennedy School is that they feel that their children are in a safe school environment. The adults and school staff constantly remind students of the academic and behavior expectations. The principal stated that they work hard at the school to provide students with a safe environment (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010). Another important aspect of providing a safe environment at school is how teachers motivate students to work hard and be focused on learning. One teacher explained how teachers motivate students.

And more than positive thinking and passion, parents like that the teachers motivate students with rewards and acknowledgements for meeting behavior and achievement expectations and attending school (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010).

Another form of motivation that was prevalent in the school was that of the need to do well on the CST. An observation noted during my visits to Kennedy School classrooms was that teachers emphasized to students the expectations to complete work or focus on the classroom instruction to prepare for the test. In a third grade classroom during Universal Access time the teacher was modeling and reviewing how to analyze text in a reading passage to select the correct multiple-choice answer. The teacher reminded students during the exercise about the process and strategies for selecting the correct answer.
It takes a little longer but we need to get ready for the test. (Kennedy School observation anecdotal record, 2010)

Students who score at proficient and advanced on the state test are recognized by the school and receive a medal. The principal explained that the school provides students with medals for achievement.

One of the ways that we celebrate our students being successful is through an achievement festival where students who are proficient or advanced receive a medal in front of the community. They’re celebrated and parents look forward to that. (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010)

Parents like that the school makes the effort to acknowledge the students’ academic accomplishments because it motivates students (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010). Teachers would like to see the school recognized more students for their effort and for showing academic growth because only students who do well on the CST are recognized (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010).

**Kennedy School Curriculum**

The instructional focus for the entire school is based on the state language arts and math standards and social studies and science are integrated into the lessons. A scope and sequence is created for the entire year emphasizing the key standards that will be taught. The key standards that are tested on the CST are the focus for instruction.

Our instructional program is based around standards. Regardless of what instructional methods we use, we heavily focus on the standards. (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010)

The teachers create a scope and sequence from the beginning of the year, identifying what are the key standards that are necessary for students to reach proficient and advanced levels on the CST and identifying the material that will be necessary (Kennedy
School principal interview, 2010). One teacher explained that most teachers do backwards planning for developing unit plans and lessons centered around the California standards (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010). The principal stated that science and social studies is integrated with the emphasis being on language arts and math.

We heavily focus on language arts and math but we do integrate the social studies and science curriculum into the language arts but we do bring in the science curriculum as well into the language arts just because it is rich in academic language. (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010)

The standards and objectives were clearly shown on the white boards or on the walls around in the classroom I visited. The fifth graders were focused on drawing inferences with evidence from a story, *Pioneer Girl*, from the Houghton Mifflin (HM) reading anthology book. The walls also showed that they were learning about perimeter of a polygon in math and electricity and matter in science. Many of the charts on the wall were teacher generated, including GLAD charts, with some student generated work (Kennedy School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

The third grade classrooms were focused on evaluating a story and developing vocabulary. The students were reading the story, *Pepita Speaks Twice*, from the HM reading anthology book. The walls revealed that the focus for grammar was adjectives, articles, and predicates, the writing process, and GLAD charts. Much of the print in the classroom was teacher generated with some students work (Kennedy School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

The AB kindergarten classrooms focused on identifying letters name and sound, providing examples of narrative text, describing the story sequence, and counting to 30. The walls displayed some student work showing national and state symbols, like the statue of liberty, the golden bear and the bald eagle. The learning objective to identify
United States and California symbols was also displayed on the wall. The classroom was covered in teacher-generated charts, student writing, the monthly calendar, and many GLAD charts (Kennedy School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

A teacher described the process for planning lessons and integrating content into the language arts and math standards in the kindergarten classroom.

>Pues estamos hablando de animales, entonces trato de que la historia que leamos en lectura sea de animales. En donde ELD sean las partes de los animales. En matemáticas contemos, restemos con animales, En que todo tenga que ver con animales para que ellos vean con una mezcla con estudio sociales la de animales o de ciencia naturales. [Since we are talking about animals, then I try to make the story that we’re reading be about animals. In ELD make it about the parts of the animal. In math we count, subtract with animals, in that everything has to do with animals so that they see with a mixture of social studies with the animals or life science.] (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

The teachers expressed that they are expected to teach the standards but there are so many. At times they feel overwhelmed because they feel like they don’t have enough time to teach the required lessons.

>Que cuando ya llegas a ese final es como que no, sea, a lo mejor quisiera ya tomar eso 45 minutos y cambiarlos por más lectura y escritura porque no te alcanza el tiempo en la mañana. [That when you get to that time it’s like no, I mean, I would like take those 45 minutes and change them for more reading and writing because there is not enough time in the morning.] (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

Although they know how important the ELD time is for students, teachers sometimes wish they could utilized those 30 or 45 minutes to complete their language arts lessons. The fifth grade teachers commented that it is difficult to teach social studies because science integrated with ELD is taught from the beginning of the year until the middle of the school year. By the time they begin to get into teaching social studies it is time for CST testing (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010).
En quinto el ELD nomás lo incorporamos en ciencia, los últimos 45 minutos ciencia y ELD pero es ‘embedded’, allí está todo. Entonces es más la materia. Ciencia, lo que estás, es tu enfoque, que realmente es ELD donde pueda. [In fifth grade ELD is incorporated in science, the last 45 minutes science and ELD but is embedded, and that is all. So it is more the content. Science, what is there, is in reality you fit ELD where you can.] (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

The ELD instruction is integrated within a science theme during the daily 30 to 45 minute time. Teaching social studies is not a mayor focus because it is not tested on the CST (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010).

Kennedy School utilizes various materials to develop and implement in the classroom. They have the Houghton Mifflin instructional materials for reading and writing, the Scott Foresman instructional materials for social studies, and McGraw-Hill for math and science. These materials are available but the teachers have the option of using other materials just as well, particularly because some of the materials lack the content or rigor desired (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010). The teachers in each grade level need to agree on which materials to use, but the first option is to use the materials at hand.

Si la norma no la puedes enseñar con ninguno de los programas que ya tienes o que viene muy pobre o que no puedes sacar mucho jugo de ese programa entonces sí tienes que, con tu compañeros de tu grado, tienes que llegar a un acuerdo y vamos a utilizar esto para cubrir a esta norma. [If you cannot teach the standard with any of the programs that you have or it is very poor or you can’t get much juice from that program then you have to, with your grade level partners, you have to come to an agreement and utilize this to meet the standard.] (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

The teachers agreed that the curricular materials that they currently have are not aligned to the state standards, particularly with the Houghton Mifflin language arts series. They feel that it presents lessons that are below the minimum expectations of the standards (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010).
Kennedy School has a morning program, extended day, and offers students a Saturday class. According to parents, the school offers a morning program where students have a reading time and computer time (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010). The computer lab is open where students can work on language arts and math programs, as well as English language development programs. They also offer a math class in the morning (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010).

Y el programa de después de la escuela que también es para los que les falta más en inglés. Trabajan especialmente con esos niños que les falta más inglés. [And the after-school program that that is also for students who need more English. They work especially with those children who need more English.] (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010)

Kennedy School has extended day an hour after students are released from school. Extended day is focused on meeting students’ needs by providing them with language arts and math enrichment opportunities. Club 350, a Saturday class, is also offered twelve Saturdays of the year for two and a half hours to provide enrichment opportunities around language arts and math (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010). They focus on teaching problem-solution strategies. According to the parents, the Saturday class is for especially for the more advanced students that need some a bit more support to get to the next level (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010).

**Kennedy School Instruction**

Kennedy School teachers implement the Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR) framework as the process of instruction for language arts, math and ELD in Spanish and English. According to the principal, the GRR framework has provided a
structure to support teachers in developing lessons that meet the learning needs of students.

We use the Gradual Release of Responsibility framework and that allows us to really examine the content standards, to examine the language that is necessary for students to be successful on those standards, as well as understanding what is it that students need. (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010)

Stating the language and content objectives is an essential component in the instructional process that was consistently observed in each classroom I visited. They were visible on the walls or on the whiteboard and the teachers also stated the objective to students (Kennedy School observation anecdotal record, 2010). The teachers noted that their students are very familiar with the standards, content objectives, and language objectives (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010).

The parents are very impressed with the type of attention the teachers give to instructing students in the classroom.

Les dan diferentes formas de explicación para que ellos puedan entender lo que les están enseñando. [They give them different was of explaining so they can understand what they are teaching.] (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010)

Within the GRR structure the teacher utilizes differentiation techniques to make the learning accessible for all students. One of the differentiation techniques includes utilizing the language frames to help engage students in the classroom and support their language development (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010). A clear example of differentiating with the language frames was seen in the fifth grade classroom. In pairs, students were to finish reading Pioneer Girl and make inferences about the story and with textual evidence. After modeling, the teacher set the expectation for students to make an inference and discuss it using academic language. The teacher provided the students with
language frames to help them engage in this activity. The language frames give the students a structure for, in this case, inferring about the story and they insert the meaning or explanation. This was an example:

The fact that__________, and since I know that ____________, this shows that ___________ (Kennedy School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

Some students find it easy to share and participate and other students find it more difficult to formulate their ideas and don’t want to say something wrong.

*Ya si tienes un language frame lo mira y ya nomás tiene que completar el área que está en blanco y ya le da un poquito más de confianza de decir sabes que, lo voy a leer y ya nomás ocupo un propio idea y ya no esta tan dificil.* [If you have a language frame you see it and you only have to complete the blank area and it gives you a little bit more confidence of saying you know what, I’m going to read and I only need an idea and then it’s not so difficult.] (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

The use of language frames gives students an avenue to be successful but at the same time holds the student accountable to the content being taught (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010). Another teacher said that she utilizes the language frame in writing as part of the students’ journals.

Teachers have Universal Access time to specifically work with students in small groups focused on their areas of weakness in math, reading, and writing.

*Es un grupo pequeno que reunes y según son sus necesidades académicas, le ayudas, le puedes volver a dar la lección de otra manera, le puedes dar ejemplos, puedes trabajar con el más para que entienda mejor la lección en tanto la mañana para lectura e escritura, como matemáticas.* [It’s when you meet with a small with academic needs, you help them, you can give the lesson again in a different way, you can provide examples, you can work with him more so that he understands the in the morning in reading, writing and math.] (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

According to the principal, teachers group students by ability level at that point, according to the standard, and meet with them at least twice, three times, maybe five
times a week, depending on the need of the students (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010).

The push-in support for students provides time for another teacher to come into the classroom and give small group instruction or even one-on-one for grade levels and classes whose students show greater need, and the teachers do small group with targeted students as well (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010). Students also work collaboratively in groups, as part of the GRR framework. The teachers in third grade implement expert groups with students that are more advanced. They work independently and help each other. In fifth grade the students engage in productive group work where they use reciprocal teaching and learn from one another (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010). The students use the language frames, engage in dialogue, think about how they learn and get feedback from the teacher. The teacher then calls the students to the front of the class and they share their work with everyone. The teacher then gives them more feedback and positive reinforcement (Kennedy School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

In grades second through sixth part of their instructional day involves a time for building academic language. The principal explained that the teachers do a lot of metacognition with the students, where they model how to solve problems.

It goes back to, we could say they are simple but sometimes students don’t know, reading the entire passage, reading the question, reading the instructions. Making sure that they understand the particular academic vocabulary within the question. (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010)

A teacher shared that the school has done this for several years and it had shown to be effective in helping all students know the language of CST testing (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010).
As part of the lessons, the teachers implement a variety of strategies to provide access for students of varying language and achievement levels. Parents like the various strategies that teacher implement in the classroom with students.

*Usan mucho a las estrategias. No nomas están leyendo, sino usan estrategias cómo figuras, paisajes, juegos. Todo lo hacen con estrategias para que ellos aprendan visual y por su oido y eso a mi me gusta mucho de está escuela.* [They use many strategies. They are not just reading, but they use strategies like figures, field trips, games. They do everything with strategies so that the can learn by seeing and by listening and I like that very much about this school.] (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010)

A parent noted that she has seen how well her child’s teacher explains to the students and has a lot of patience (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010). The teachers said that they use SDAIE strategies, think-pair-share, visuals, graphs, charts, songs and chants to engage and support students (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010). They also said that utilize small groups to engage and support students and frontloading of vocabulary of knowledge and content (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010). And they hold high expectation for students to learn and for them to make the learning accessible for all students.

*Kennedy School Accountability*

Kennedy school is held accountable by how well the students score on the CST. The principal holds the teachers accountable to make the learning accessible for all students and prepare them to do well on the CST. The students are held accountable by the teacher to meet the benchmark goals and score well on the CST. Ultimately the student achievement is measured by how they score on the CST.

The way the school is measured as being successful is through the CST’s and the state API and the federal AYP. The goal is that the students are going to be
proficient or advanced on those CSTs. (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010)

Teachers know that their focus from second through sixth grade is to prepare students to do well on the CST.

Comienza desde segundo hasta arriba. Sí en tercero yo puedo concordar con ella porque tercero es igual. Tercero tiene que estar enfocado en los CSTs. [It begins from second and up. Yes in third I concur with her because it is the same. Third [grade] has to be focused on the CSTs.] (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

The emphasis of instruction is to teach the language arts and math standards. Students are then continuously assessed. The parents are well aware of the push to do well on the CST and they support the school in any way they can.

Y ya desde ahorita les ponen en los pasillos que le ponen motivaciones para este gran examen. No, nomas viera está escuela, que barbaro, o sea, para arriba. [And already they put motivational messages in the hallway for this big test. You should see this school, unbelievable, I mean, moving up.] (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010)

The parents are proud of Kennedy School and want their children to do well at school (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010).

Aside from the CST, students are assessed by formal and informal measures by the teacher, the school, and the school district. The teachers evaluate students using observations, informal tests, mini-quizzes, teacher created tests, and student work (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010). The school evaluates students by giving six thematic assessments throughout the year. Students are also evaluated for language proficiency in Spanish and English using the Language Assessment in Spanish (LAS) and the CELDT (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010).

The students are taught the California state content standards and are evaluated by the CST. To meet the requirements for the state accountability the students must do well
on the CST. According to the AYP and API the school is meeting the achievement needs of almost half of its English learners. Teachers analyze student data for reading, writing, fluency, and comprehension then design lessons to meet the needs of the students. The ILT and reading and math coaches support teachers and provide professional development focused on the school needs. Teachers use student data to identify the student’s needs and plan the appropriate instruction.

**NCLB and Proposition 227 at Kennedy School**

The principal and teachers attribute the instructional focus on English learners achievement the last few year to NCLB. The Kennedy School principal acknowledges that the changes due to NCLB have affected teachers.

At first it created an environment where there was animosity from teachers over why we can’t be free to teach, but at the same time, at that time, there was no structure and people were doing something completely different even though they were in the same grade level…there was no focus. (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010)

The principal was very honest and cognizant of how NCLB has placed many limitations as to how teachers can teach the way they have to teach at Kennedy School and he explained that the school’s focus is on the standards because the standards are the indicators for success on the CST and they must be accountable for the standards. The standards for which they are evaluated are language arts, math, science, and writing on certain years and that is their focus (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010).

The teachers acknowledge that the instruction process is more focused and all teachers are being held accountable for implementing the best practices for English learners. It has caused more continuity from grade to grade. I also think it has caused us to look at data more intensely, causing more targeted instruction, and making sure our ELs get more focused teaching in all standards by teaching
them not just functional language, but academic language. (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

One teacher said that teachers had to employ a no excuses type of attitude for student learning (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010). While the teachers know this and have to accept it as their reality, they have their concerns for the achievement of their students.

Teachers feel that they are teaching too many standards in a limited amount of time and are unable to focus on the developmental areas that they feel are beneficial for students.

We’re so much student test, test, test, test, that we don’t give the kids a chance to do hands-on, to play games, to do other stuff that we used to do that we don’t have that much time to do right now, but they could actually practice the skills, not only to take a test but to make it their own; to own it and be able to explain to their partner, to be able to use it in the real world. (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

The teachers feel that they are teaching students to be good test takers instead of teaching them to be critical thinkers. Students try hard every year and when some of them are not recognized they lose motivation. In the end the teachers feel that the students try hard to meet the need for the teacher and the school instead of valuing learning for themselves.

It’s really sad to see in the classroom when you ask the kids, Why is it important that you need to do this and then automatically, I’ve been getting a lot from my kids, because of the test, because I need to do good on the CST….They’re just doing it for the test. They are not internalizing it. (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

Teachers feel that it is too much testing for students. They get tested six times a year and focus on building the academic language that will be seen on the test. They feel that kids are tired and question how much of their learning can they actually put into practice in their real life.
When they’re done with the test, you have to see those kids. Every year you see the same thing. They’re done with the test and it’s like [sigh of relief]. I want to just forget everything because I’m done with the test [teacher]. Here, this is what you wanted. (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

The push to do well on the CST, meet AYP, and reach API goals has created a competition between teachers to see who has high student scores (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010). Teachers believe that schools in the school district are competing against one another to see who gets the highest student scores. They question the competition versus accountability and see that it is unfair for teachers because the teachers are being pushed to prepare students to meet their achievement goals and they are the ones who ultimately are held accountable (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010).

There are teachers who are passionate and you’re here to do this and this and do all different strategies to help your kids, but I also believe that there are teachers who don’t do that. They need somehow to be accountable….Maybe NCLB should focus on the teachers. Come and observe the ones that are not and train the ones that are not doing the job. (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

NCLB has also narrowed the curriculum at Kennedy School to reading, writing, and math, and science in the upper grades, as the main subjects taught because those are the standards that are assessed on the CST. Kennedy Schools is intentionally teaching the standards that are being taught to meet the API and AYP goals to avoid sanctions and public display (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010).

Parents that have their children enrolled in the AB classrooms are informed about the waiver. The principal stated that parents are not ignorant one way or another about the parent request waiver for an alternative program, as detailed in proposition 227. New parents that have not had children in schools will probably not know about it until they actually request to have their child enrolled. Parents that have had children in schools
may or may not know about the waiver as well. Once parents decide whether they want to place their children in an AB classroom the information is presented to them (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010).

**Kennedy School Parent Involvement**

The parents I visited with are well involved with the school and they said that the principal and the teachers have an open-door policy for parents. Since day one the Kennedy School principal worked to get more parents to be involved in their children’s education at school.

*Nos dice que nosotros siempre vamos a ser bien recibidos en el salón de clases en la hora que uno quiera entrar y ver que es lo que los maestros están haciendo o si uno quiere ser voluntario en la escuela...dan mucho oportunidad para que uno pueda venir.* [He tells us that we will always be welcomed in the classrooms at whatever time we want to enter and see what the teachers are doing or if one wants to volunteer in the school…there are many opportunities so one can come.] (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010)

Parents said that they have helped the teachers in the classroom to check student work and volunteer to help in the parent volunteer room where they make books, make copies, cut, draw, paint, and laminate (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010). Teachers feel that it is important to have more parents involved at the school because it makes an impression on students when they see that their parents are part of the school and it also creates a sense of accountability for open communication between the teacher, parent, and student (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010). The principal believes that in order for the school to be successful the parents need to be a part of the school (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010). As part of the school community, a community program is available for parents who are in need of assistance or support
One way that some of the parents are involved is by attending the English Learner Advisory Committee ELAC at school and the school district board meetings (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010). The school began offering classes for parents at the school. Parents have had the opportunity to attend English classes, parenting classes, and more. According to the parents the school has also offered them classes about the women, nutrition, and cancer (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010).

The parents feel that they are well informed, although the teachers feel that parents are not well informed regarding their rights to choose an AB classroom for their children (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010). The parents said that they receive a lot of information from the school on a regular bases. Parents are informed through a newsletter, flyers, and teacher notes. Announcements are set on the marquee in front of the school and sometimes parents are notified by a telephone call from the school. Parents are encouraged to attend all the school meetings for parents where the school presents information regarding the school’s finances, programs, and accountability report. Parents are also expected to attend their child’s parent conference. Certain parents have also been selected to inform the rest of the parents in the school of school news and information (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010).

I asked parents what changes or improvements would they like to see at the school and they all agreed that they would like to have a physical education teacher at school, more attentive noon duty supervisors, and more personnel in the front of the school in the mornings and afternoon. Their concern was student safety.

The parents like the new principal because they said that he has been very open and has been interested in having parents become more involved at school and at home.
with their children. The parents are happy with the effort the school has put forth to inform parents about the school. Having a phone tree where a select group of parents contact other parents to provide them with information about the school is a great way to involve parents and inform parents.

**Kennedy School Summary**

Kennedy has shown some student gains on the CST but over 50% of English learners are scoring at a basic level or below and 15% of English learners are scoring at an advanced level. The principal has been at the school for one year and have 6 years experience as an administrator.

Kennedy reduced the AB classrooms from second grade to first grade and offers English instruction for all students and Spanish instruction for English learners in kinder and first grades. Kennedy School parents that have their children enrolled in the AB classrooms are informed about the waiver when place their children in an AB classroom, as required by Proposition 227. Once Kennedy School parents decide whether they want to place their children in an AB classroom the information is presented to them (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010).

The school is a safe environment for students and students are expected to demonstrate good behavior at school (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010). Teachers encourage students to actively participate in class and positively reinforce their behavior and engagement (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010). The school acknowledges students’ academic achievements on the CST with awards and recognitions. Parents like that the school recognizes students because they feel that it
motivates them (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010). Teachers would like to see more students be acknowledged for their efforts aside from achieving on the CST (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010).

The instructional focus is based on the state language arts and math standards with social studies and science integrated into the lessons. A scope and sequence is created for the entire year emphasizing the key standards that will be taught (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010). Many of the charts on the wall are teacher generated and the instruction includes grammar, spelling, the writing process, and GLAD strategies (Kennedy School observation anecdotal record, 2010). The ELD instruction is integrated within a science theme during the daily 30 to 45 minute time.

Kennedy School utilizes the Houghton Mifflin instructional materials for reading and writing, the Scott Foresman instructional materials for social studies, and McGraw-Hill for math and science. The teachers have the option of using other materials because the Houghton Mifflin language arts adoption is not aligned to the state standards and some of the materials lack the content or rigor desired (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010). Kennedy School also provides before and after-school programs and access to computer programs to assist the students’ language development. Morning programs, extended day, and Saturday classes provide students with extra instruction and support in language and content (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010).

Kennedy school is held accountable by how well the students score on the CST. The principal holds the teachers accountable to make the learning accessible for all students and students are held accountable to meet the benchmark goals and achieve on the CST (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010). The teachers expressed that at
times they feel overwhelmed because they feel like they don’t have enough time to teach
the required lessons (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010).

Kennedy School is meeting its AYP and API goals and almost half of its English
learners are meeting the achievement goals. Kennedy School evaluates student
achievement by the CST, formal and informal measures like observations, informal tests,
mini-quizzes, teacher created tests, and student work (Kennedy School teacher focus
group, 2010). Students are also evaluated for language proficiency in Spanish and
English (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010).

The principal and teachers attribute the instructional focus on English learners
achievement the last few year to NCLB. The Kennedy School principal acknowledges
that NCLB has caused tension with teachers. The school’s focus is on the standards
because the standards are the indicators for success on the CST and they must be
accountable for the standards, targeting language arts, math, and science (Kennedy
School principal interview, 2010). Teachers feel that they are teaching too many
standards in a limited amount of time and are unable to focus on the developmental areas
that they feel are beneficial for students. They feel that they are teaching students to be
good test takers instead of teaching them to be critical thinkers and that students are being
tested too much (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010).

Teachers also believe that the pressure to achieve is causing schools and teachers
in the school district to compete against one another to see who gets the highest student
scores. They question the competition versus accountability and see that it is unfair for
teachers because the teachers are the ones who ultimately are held accountable (Kennedy
School teacher focus group, 2010).
The principal believes that in order for the school to be successful the parents need to be a part of the school. The parents said that the principal and the teachers have an open-door policy for parents. They like that the principal has worked to get more parents to be involved at school. Parents volunteer to help teachers in the classroom and do other tasks like making copies and preparing materials (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010). Teachers want more parents to be involved at school (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010). The school supports the school community by offering a variety of community programs and assistance (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010). The parents feel that they are well informed, although the teachers feel that parents are not well informed regarding their rights to choose an AB classroom for their children.
Case Study 5: Lincoln School

I think that in a nutshell, if you say how do you describe the school, I think it’s the whole word is engagement. That everybody has the ability and the opportunity to engage and give their opinion and now that it will be received (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010)

Introduction

The words “Believe, Achieve, Succeed” are displayed on the office wall. The school’s core values are also stenciled on the wall in different world languages: caring, responsibility, respect, cooperation, honesty, perseverance, and citizenship. Besides the warm, friendly greeting by the office staff, this is what catches your eye when you enter Lincoln school. The office is spacious and you will almost always see teachers, staff, students and parents there during different times of the day since the teacher’s lounge, the nurse’s office, and the parent workroom are only separated by three doorways. To reach the classrooms you need to walk through the parent workroom and by the computer lab and library.

The parent workroom has a staff member that prepares materials for teachers they may include making copies, putting together booklets, laminating, cutting, gluing, stapling, hole punching, among other things. Every time I visited the school I always saw at least one parent working in the parent room. Walking past the library you can’t help to notice the very colorfully decorated mural type decoration on the back wall and some student work displayed in the walkway. At the end of the walkway is the door that takes you outside to where the classrooms are located.
Getting to Know Lincoln School

I spent four weeks at Lincoln school observing the classroom instruction and meeting with the principal, teachers, and parents. I observed the classrooms of all the teachers who participated in focus except for one. As presented in Table 46, seven 3rd-5th grade teachers met with me to discuss the various elements and educational practices implemented at Lincoln School. Their years at the school varied from two years to twelve years. I also met with five parents to obtain their perspective regarding the educational practices at the school. Their children were enrolled in grades third through sixth.

Lincoln school is a kinder through seventh grade charter school in a southern California school district, located 9 miles from the California-México international border. Table 47 shows that 592 students are enrolled with 95% Latinos, 57% English learners, and 46% socioeconomically disadvantaged (receiving free and reduced price lunch). The school employs 32 fully credentialed teachers to teach in the school-wide dual language instructional program. Lincoln school had a 2009 API score of 876 and met its 2009 AYP goals. It is one of the ten highest achieving schools in this school district where the highest API score is 889 and the lowest is 754. The district has an API score of 830 (CDE, 2010).
Table 46

*Lincoln School Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Years at school</th>
<th>Students grade level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 – 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 – 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 47

*Lincoln School Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>% EL</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>% Latino Students</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>Instructional programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-7</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 48

*Lincoln Student Subgroups 2009 API Scores 2nd - 6th Grade*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student subgroups</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>Lincoln Subgroup</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CDE, Data Quest, 2009-10 Accountability Progress Reporting
Of the 418 students that were included in the 2009 API, the Latino, socioeconomically disadvantaged, and English learner subgroups were numerically significant. All three subgroups met their 2009 API targets (see Table 48). The Latino subgroup included 406 students with an 869 API score. The school district’s 2009 API score for Latinos was 803 and for the state it was 736. The English learners subgroup included 256 students with an 835 API score. The school district’s 2009 API score for English learners was 774 and 726 for the state. The socioeconomically disadvantaged subgroup included 218 students with an 834 API score. The school district’s 2009 API score for socioeconomically disadvantaged students was 775 and for the state it was 732. According to these API scores, the students at Lincoln school are meeting the state academic performance goals compared to their subgroup counterparts in the district and state in the state tests (CDE, 2010).

Five schools in the district had a 2009 API score comparable to Lincoln School. Table 49 displays the demographic information for the five schools including Lincoln School. The API score ranged from a high of 880 to a low of 870. Lincoln School, School C, and School D had an API of 876. School C is also a charter school. All six schools met their 2009 AYP goals. School C, School D, and School K offered SEI, ME, and DL programs. School J and School I offered on SEI and ME programs and Lincoln School was the only school to offer only a DL program. School D had the most teachers with 46 followed by School K with 44 teachers. Lincoln School had 32 teachers. Lincoln School had the highest percentage of Latino student enrollment, EL enrollment, and students receiving free or reduced price lunch out of the six schools. Lincoln School had a 95% Latino population, 57% EL population,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>% EL</th>
<th>% Latino</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>2009 API</th>
<th>Met AYP</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>Instructional Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School J</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>SEI, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln*</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>SEI, ME, DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>SEI, ME, DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School I</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>SEI, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School K</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>SEI, ME, DL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Charter school

and 46% of students receiving free or reduced price lunch. The next highest percentage of Latino student enrollment was at School J with 64%. The next highest percentage of EL students was School I and School K with 25%. And the next highest percentage of students receiving free or reduced price lunch was School J with 36%. School J had the highest API with 880 and offered SEI and ME programs. Lincoln School, School C, and School D had the next highest API with 876 and the three schools implemented a type of DL program. Lincoln School stood out from the five school because it had a very high percentage of Latino students, the highest percentage of EL enrollment, and the highest percentage of students receiving free or reduced price lunch and it had a comparable API score with 876 and it was the only school in the district to implement a DL program in the entire school.
Table 50

*Percent Lincoln Students Scoring at CST LA Level 1 – 5, Years 2005-2009*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far below basic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below basic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 51

*Percent Lincoln ELs Scoring at CST LA level 1 – 5, Years 2006-2009*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far below basic</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below basic</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CST achievement trends for Lincoln School in table 50 have shown growth in the percentage of students achieving proficient and advanced levels and a low percentage of students scoring at far below basic from 2006 to 2009. The percentage of students scoring at far below basic decreased from 7% to 4% and the students scoring at advance increased from 24% to 30%. In 2006, 52% of the students scored at basic, below basic, and far below basic levels and in 2009, 33% of students scored at basic, below basic, and far below basic levels. This is a decrease from a little more than half of the students to about one third of the students. The most noticeable trend at Lincoln School is the decrease of students scoring at a basic level and the increase of the students scoring at proficient and advance from 2006 to 2009. Almost half (48%) of the students in 2006 and 67% in 2009 scored at proficient and advanced levels. Since 2006, the percentage of students scoring at a basic level decreased from 37% to 22% in 2009. Since 2006 the percentage of students scoring at proficient levels increased from 24% to 37% in 2009. Since 2006 the percentage of students scoring at advanced levels increased from 24% to 30% in 2009.

The CST achievement trends for English learners at Lincoln School in table 51 have shown growth in the percentage of students achieving proficient and advanced levels and a decrease in students scoring at far below basic from 2006 to 2009. The percentage of Lincoln School EL students scoring at far below basic decreased from 34% to 7% and the EL students scoring at advance increased from not having any in 2006 to 17% in 2009. In 2006, 82% of EL students scored at basic, below basic, and far below basic levels and 51% of EL students scored at basic, below basic, and far below basic levels in 2009. Since 2006 the percentage of students scoring at proficient and advanced
levels at Kennedy School increased from 18% in 2006 to 49% in 2009, but just over half of them are still achieving at a basic level or below.

Observing the instructional practices at Lincoln school and talking to the principal, teachers, and parents allowed me to identify elements and themes regarding the instruction, curriculum, instructional program, and attitudes and beliefs toward student learners. Further insight into the school will be articulated in the following sections of this case study report.

Lincoln School Structure

Lincoln has one principal and two Instructional Focus Specialists (IFS). The school principal, along with other teachers, established the school in 1998 and has been the principal since the beginning. The two IFS are responsible for supporting teachers and supporting the implementation of the different programs at the school.

The instructional program at the school is a 50/50 Dual Language model where for half of the instructional time the students are in the Spanish component classroom receiving instruction in Spanish and the other half of the time they are in the English component classroom receiving English instruction. There are four classrooms in each grade level from grades kinder through third. Two of the teachers share two groups of students where one teacher teaches the Spanish component and the other teaches the English component. There are three classrooms in each grade from grades fourth to sixth. One classroom teacher provides the Spanish instruction, one provides the English language arts instruction, and one provides the math instruction in English. The students rotate through the three classes everyday.
Once a week every grade level meets for about two and a half hours during the school day to plan with grade level teachers, analyze student data, prepare lessons, etc. and to ask for support and receive feedback from the principal and IFS. During this time the students receive science instruction, computer/technology instruction, physical education, and go to the library.

The school also implements Microsociety the last 45 minutes of the day and has an Intergenerational Program.

The school utilizes the United Nations model to create a microcosm of the real world inside the school where students collaborate with parents, business volunteers, and teachers to create functioning small communities. (Lincoln School website, 2010)

The Microsociety program is a research-based education program that transforms classrooms by providing a real world context for academic learning (Microsociety, 2010).

The intergenerational program is designed to foster intergenerational, school-based experiences that promote growth and understanding between children and older adults. According to the school website, the school utilizes the United Nations model to create a microcosm of the real work inside the school where students collaborate with parents, business volunteers, and teachers to create a functioning small community (Lincoln School website, 2010).

Lincoln School Core Beliefs, Mission, Vision

The core beliefs at Lincoln school include a commitment to students’ academic, social, civic, and character development by:

- integration of world class curriculum standards with the highest achievement goals;
- celebrating diversity and challenge opportunities utilizing critical thinking for all students;
- establishing a learning community where learners needs are met, resources are provided, questions are answered and every learner’s potential are unlocked;
- valuing the acquisition of other languages to be competitive in world markets;
- children demonstrating confidence, empowerment, self-discipline, ethical responsibility, and resiliency by committing to academic excellence; and
- children involve themselves in the community and establish awareness of global perspective

The school’s mission states that they will support the core beliefs through the development of standards based curriculum, dual language acquisition, connections to real life experiences, and strong parent/community participation. Their vision is to use the philosophy of critical pedagogy and international perspective to implement a Dual Immersion program that fosters student accountability, language learning, and critical self-reflection to prepare students for the future (Lincoln School website, 2010).

**Lincoln School Biliteracy Focus**

To reach the classrooms at Lincoln School you must walk through the office, through the parent workroom, and past the library. The use of Spanish and English is profoundly present in the school. The front office staff is bilingual. They communicated with parents in Spanish and English and the same with teachers and the administrator. I communicated with them in both Spanish and English during my visits. In the parent workrooms the parents were speaking Spanish and in the library I heard students
speaking in Spanish and English. I asked the principal about the school’s language policy and he said that the goal is to teach students in two languages.

The language policy at our school is that every child at our school will be bilingual, biliterate or multilingual and the policy is that all students, regardless of ethnicity, regardless of cultural backgrounds, regardless of that, will leave this school speaking two languages, reading, writing and oral. (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010)

The DL program is designed to meet Lincoln School’s meet goal of educating biliterate and bilingual students.

In a DL classroom the teacher models the designated language and does not speak the other language during instruction. During my observations, the third grade Spanish teachers delivered the classroom instruction in Spanish. Both third grade Spanish teachers were consistently encouraging the students to speak in Spanish when discussing or working with each other students (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

The English teachers delivered their instruction in English. One teacher explained the language focus for students.

Here we want you to be proficient in two languages. We talk about how it will benefit them socially and economically. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

The teachers are cognizant of the potential benefits of being bilingual and biliterate. In the fourth and fifth grade Spanish classrooms the students were encouraged to share, discuss, and articulate in Spanish and the teacher was consistent with the instruction in the target language. The same held true in the English classrooms (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010). The teachers modeled the content and academic vocabulary during the delivery of the lessons and the students were held to high expectations to utilize the vocabulary during their group work and discussions with other
students in both languages (Lincoln School teacher focus groups, 2010). At designated times in the morning I observed students finish with one class and go to their next class while a new group of students entered the classroom. During my observations of the fourth grade Spanish class, the students shuffled out and went either to the English language arts class or the math class and a new group of students shuffled in to the Spanish language arts/social studies class, where “they learn about language all day” (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). One teacher said that learning content in two languages is a big piece of their daily learning. The principal noted that being bilingual and biliterate gives students power and the ability to participate in a global society. A parent stated a similar sentiment about the importance of being bilingual.

Ser bilingüe es tener dos posibilidades, dos maneras de pensar, dos maneras de vivir, dos maneras de comer. Tienes como dos caminos iguales seguros en la vida. [Being bilingual is having two possibilities, two ways of thinking, two ways of living, two ways of eating. You have, like, two paths in life and both are equally secure.] (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010)

The parents like the DL program at Lincoln School because the English instruction is not translated into Spanish for the students and vice versa. The principal and teachers stated that they hold high expectations for students to become bilingual.

Obviously something is working and I think in that way our school does stay true to its mission and what it set out to do, create bilingual students. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

According to the Lincoln School principal, the reason the school is able to maintain a DL program is because of the charter but also because the school community believes in it and supports it (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010).
Lincoln School Value for Learners

The principal and teachers consider themselves, along with the students and parents, a community of learners.

Our teachers don’t say those kids. They are all our kids. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

The students at Lincoln School are held to high academic expectations and the teachers, principal, staff, and parents have created a supportive environment where students can take risks in learning (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). The school and teachers value the cultural diversity of the school community. This school obviously embraces the inclusion of multiple languages as the everyday instruction practice. The open-door policy provides a space for parents to be involved in the school (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). I observed a parent in the classroom assisting the teacher organize and file student work. During every school visit I observed parents working in the parent workroom (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

Teachers provide students with the opportunities to achieve and be successful by challenging students to be critical thinkers (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). In different classrooms that I observed students were questioning, categorizing, comparing, and forming opinions. Fourth grade students were self-assessing their group work. In fourth grade math, the teacher asked the students to think when in the real world would you need to use perimeter? Third grade students read articles in independent groups and each student had a role within the group (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010). Teachers posed questions to challenge students to think about their learning. The teachers and the principal call it metacognition (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010).
Teachers value students’ voice as part of the instructional program and maintain a rigor to the students’ learning by challenging the students beyond the minimum standards (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). The third grade teachers were reinforcing the school’s core values (caring, responsibility, respect, cooperation, honesty, perseverance, citizenship) with students and allowing students to select students that they felt were demonstrating the core value. The teacher recognized the students by giving them a certificate. One week they focused on respect and another week they focused on honesty, and another week they focused on caring (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010). One parent shared that the teachers at Lincoln School are really good teachers.

A parent finds that the teachers have always been innovative in their teaching and motivating towards students. Other parents feel that the teachers at Lincoln School work hard at being prepared to teach their children well.

Teachers hold students to high expectations and expect all of them to be engaged and participate. Teachers also feel that they provide a safe classroom environment for
students by praising and encouraging students (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). The principal feels that the school and teachers have corazón [heart].

The heart of the school is focused on the humanness of how we humans interact with each other and how we can make a difference in the lives of kids. (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010)

The positive relationships developed between teachers, students, and parents helps promote the best environment for learning and a sense of belonging (Lincoln, School teacher focus group, 2010).

I asked the teachers to tell me the one thing that works well at Lincoln School and their response was the teachers’ mindset and relationships. One teacher shared that she didn’t really care about the student [CST] results.

I knew they were important and but I always just did my best and the students were just super prepared because of other teachers. I think it’s the mindset that everybody goes over the top and we’re willing to do whatever we have to do so students can learn in both languages. But I think it is mindset. Everyone has a goal in mind and that is for all students to succeed. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

Lincoln School teachers contribute their mindset attitude to the professional development they received from a consultant, Mutu, who stressed thinking in small steps and believing that the students could learn and achieve (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010).

That was the main thing and not blaming the kids and parents and all the things that you can’t control. What are you doing to make them succeed? Try to get students from one level to another with little steps and he showed us how it was going to be reflected on our API and I think that was what started us on the road. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

The teachers feel that the way they approached teaching changed by being reflective in how they educated students and knowing what they could control. This has helped teachers not get so frustrated and overwhelmed (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010).
According to the teachers the other thing that worked was the relationships that they developed with students and teachers. Forming and maintaining positive relationships with teachers and students was really important (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). One teacher said that teachers work as partners and push each other to provide a rigor. Another teacher explained the benefits of forming strong relationships with students.

The kids set the goals and you set the goals with them but if you don’t have a positive relationship with that student they are not going to want to improve and they won’t care. They will be apathetic and not be invested in school and they won’t go up because they choose not to. No matter how many strategies you use, if they don’t want to they’re not going to go up. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

Teachers said that it was easy for them to get focused on the task, the planning, and the implementation of lessons and strategies by a certain time but without the relationship gaps would begin to form and a connection with students and fellow teachers would be lost.

In the classrooms the positive relationship was evident with teachers and the students. Students responded well to the instruction and classroom expectations. For the most part I observed students engaged and on-task during whole class instruction and in small group work. Students were smiling and seemed happy to be in the classroom. The teachers were attentive to the students and provided clear instruction and expectations (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

Parents feel that they can approach teachers at any time for any questions or concerns they may have. The teachers stated that the school has an open door policy and their classrooms are always open to parents, at any time. Knowing that, parents trust teachers, even if parents have had issues with teachers (Lincoln School parent focus
One parent gave an example of an instance when the teachers went out of their way to support her daughter when she was struggling with her reading.

*Pues gracias a Dios, las maestras trabajaron muy bien con mi hija. La estimularon mucho y mi hija subió increíble. La maestra Smith se quedaba después de escuela para trabajar con ella. La maestra Jones le daba trabajo extra o yo le ponía trabajo extra….Y las maestras estuvieron apoyándome y apoyándome.* [Well, thank God, the teachers worked very well with my daughter. They stimulated my daughter a lot and my daughter improved incredibly. The teacher [Smith] would stay after school to work with her. The teacher [Jones] gave her extra work or I would give her extra work….And the teachers were supporting me and supporting me.] (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010)

I asked the principal what had been some of the major improvements or changes that has allowed the school to reach the level of achievement that your students are reaching now and he said it was the belief and mindset that all the students will learn and that the teachers need to provide the opportunities for the students to be successful.

Establishing a belief system that all kids can learn. And if you don’t believe kids can learn we need to provide the resources to help you to change your mindset… You need to work with these kids. You are responsible for them. You are accountable for them and you will make them successful because if they are not it is a reflection of you and what you have done. And it is not done in a negative way it is just done in a more of accountability aspect. (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010)

One teacher said that she would work with students after school or on Saturdays and try different strategies if she saw that what she was doing in class was not working for them. The teachers seem dedicated to the students.

And I think the teachers, we think that deep inside, as corny as it sounds, we really want our kids to learn. We care about them. We put our body and soul into their learning. We care about them and we want them to succeed and achieve. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

The teachers at Lincoln School are passionate towards their students and genuinely want them to succeed (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010).
Lincoln School Curriculum

The first thing I found out during my first visit is that every classroom is designated as a country and a city within that country. I soon learned the name and country of the classrooms that I observed. Every classroom I visited had a similar visual scheme regarding the information presented on the walls. Each classroom had a wall or part of a wall that showed the information and a visual representation of the city and country it represented. In every classroom the content and language standards and objectives were written on the whiteboard or placed on one of the walls (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010). In the third, fourth and fifth grade classrooms teacher generated work (input charts, process charts, vocabulary, visuals), student generated work, and teacher-student generated work for each of the content areas covered were displayed in that classroom. The fourth grade Spanish class, provided a good example of student generated work with timelines that students created of the explorers and indigenous groups in California for social studies. An example of teacher-student generated work was a process grid presenting the Miwok cultural information and a paragraph of the Chumash indigenous group (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010). During one of my classroom visits I also observed students do oral presentations on the California missions they researched. The students’ miniature representation of their California mission was also on display in the classroom. All of this was in Spanish. The fourth grade English classroom was similar in that the language arts standards and objectives were visible and different walls were concentrated with charts, information, and vocabulary from the different concepts being taught. The Farmer in the Dell chart, persuasive writing T-chart, signal words, and a narrative pictorial chart were
some of the charts and work that were featured on the walls (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

The third and fifth grade classrooms were similar. The Spanish classrooms showed social studies and language arts content and concepts, along with science content and concepts in third grade (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010). The English classrooms walls displayed language arts concepts but integrated with social studies content. The fifth graders focused on persuasive writing. In Spanish they wrote a persuasive letter to colonists persuading them to colonize or not colonize in Jamestown.

In the English classroom they wrote persuasive essays on recycling. One of the walls had a teacher-generated model that explained the steps for writing a four paragraph persuasive paragraph. On the wall beside it were examples of capitalization and punctuation of cities and states for grammar. One of the fifth grade social studies standard entails knowing the states and capitals. This is one example of how the teacher integrated language arts with the content to meet the standards for both (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

A similar approach was seen in the third grade classrooms. They were focused on teaching expository text and in Spanish they taught the concept of main idea with details while teaching the science standards for the Sun, Moon, and Earth, and in English they taught it through a bug theme, meeting the third grade science standards. Examples of poetry writing and songs were displayed on the walls (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010). The day I observed the third grade English classroom the teacher was modeling on the document camera how to complete the vocabulary page in their bug book. The word she was modeling was entomologist and she was questioning
students and soliciting student input in providing the information to complete the page.

As they were engaged in the discussion she was writing the responses on the page shown on the document camera (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

According to the principal interview and teachers and parents focus groups, the curriculum at Lincoln schools exposes children to a multicultural perspective and provides the opportunity for students to learn about the world and their surroundings.

The parents who have children in fourth grade commented that during the earthquake crisis in Haiti, the students had an opportunity to learn about Haiti, but learn more than just that there was an earthquake.

La maestra de cuarto les está poniendo muchos artículos pero del internet. Entonces los está haciendo lo que están los niños oyendo alrededor, como ahorita lo de Haití, ella los hizo investigar del internet qué es Haití, cuál es su religión, qué es su juego favorito. ¿Es el soccer? Entonces, no nomás conocen de Haití de que tembló, si no ¿dónde está ubicado y qué es su cultura? ¿Qué es Haití? [The fourth grade teacher is giving them many articles but from the internet. So then she is having them do what the children are hearing about, like right now about Haiti, she had them research on the internet what is Haiti, what is their religion, what is their favorite game. Is it soccer? So they just don’t know about the earthquake in Haiti, but instead, where is it located and what is their culture. What is Haiti?] (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010)

Beyond learning about the original United States thirteen colonies, fifth graders composed paragraphs on global warming and recycling. In fourth grade students read articles that dealt with more contemporary issues like the rainforest, the banning of the pledge of allegiance, gym class everyday, and gun control. On the day I was observing, the students were given the opportunity to choose the article they were most passionate about and work in pairs or groups of three. The task was to read the article they chose, discuss the pros and cons of the topic it in their group and complete the t-chart (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010).
The instruction at Lincoln School is guided by the state content and language arts standards. Teachers at Lincoln School utilize the Houghton Mifflin math adoption, the Scott Foresman social studies materials, the *Bien Dicho* grammar materials, and the *Making Meaning* language arts materials. The publisher curriculums and materials are used as resources to support teaching the standards rather than guiding the curriculum. The standards guide the instruction and teachers create their own units using the standards (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). The teachers said that they teach beyond the minimum standards, work as partners and push each other to provide a rigor.

Rigor from a teacher point of view, if you are being challenged then you feel rigor; thinking above the superficial level. It is the rigor of their ability, where they are at that time, pushing them to the next step up. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

The teachers went on to explain that rigor is meeting the students’ needs by pushing them beyond their comfort zone, pushing them beyond their developmental level, and thinking beyond what they experience in the classroom and their school community.

It is pushing the child beyond their comfort zone, beyond their zone of proximal development. Not just pushing them with the questioning but trying to put it in a real-world example, applicable in the real world. Pushing them academically and socially, students think about what they can do to change the world, how do they matter. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

The teachers push students to think about their learning. The principal and the teachers called it metacognition. The students have to be able to understand and explain the objectives and the purpose of their learning because they become aware of their learning when they are able to explain what they know. That’s the metacognition (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). Parents feel that their children are learning more than expected. One parent said that she noticed how her child’s language is much more
advanced and is learning high-level concepts, like persuasive writing (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010).

The teachers in each grade level organize the implementation of the curriculum by dividing the year into units of study, integrating the standards for those units, and creating effective teaching strategies that go along with that unit. They then incorporate language frames, GLAD strategies, grammar, etc, and the same thing for math. In math they include concept development and algebraic thinking (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). The standards guide the development of the units of study and teachers use a variety of resources to develop the lessons. Instead of using basal books, teachers use authentic literature in developing their lessons for the units of study that best meets goals for the standards. Basal books are not used because the principal believes that teachers have been institutionalized to a systematic educational process for teaching and learning that oppresses students where the teacher uses the basal, gives the assignment, teaches the assignment, and either the kids get it or they don’t get (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010). Teachers at Lincoln School use authentic literature instead of the Houghton Mifflin language arts adoption and they select the literature that best meet the grade level standards that will be covered. They create their own units of study, using the Houghton Mifflin language arts adoption as a resource, rather than the end all.

So in changing that way of thinking, it’s given the teachers the opportunity to think before they actually teach and one of the unique things about this school is that we got rid of the basals. We got rid of those programs that can label kids. We got rid of those systems that easily put kids into categories and we looked at instruction for all, but at the same time, instruction that takes into account all of those little entities, and take it from there. (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010)
One parent commented that she likes it when the teachers have the students read a book for class and complete different assignments, like a summary. She feels that that promotes learning and enjoyment of reading for students. She would like to see more of that type of assignments (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010).

When asked what research supports the program implementation at Lincoln School, the principal named different educational researchers like Robert Marzano, Fontis and Pinnel, Doug Fischer, Nancy Frey, Paulo Freire, Antonia Darder, Karen Cadiero-Kaplan, and Alberto Ochoa, but mostly the work from Paulo Freire.

I think that the thought of looking at education and seeing it from a different lens and seeing it from the grassroots rather than from the top down. There lies the tension in that in order for everyone to become totally engaged and involved it needs to make sense to the community and it needs to make sense to the people you’re working with and not everyone is there yet. (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010)

He believes that this approach to education promotes engagement for everyone in the school community and allows for everyone to be involved.

The academic subjects and content are taught and the instruction is guided by the California state standards. English language arts and math are taught in English in all grades. Spanish language arts, social studies, and science are taught in Spanish in kindergarten through third grade. Spanish language arts and social studies are taught in Spanish in fourth through sixth grade and science is taught in English.

We take the standards. We go beyond the standards. We use all these strategies to help them learn what they need to learn. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

The teachers teach beyond the minimum standards and implement various instructional strategies to engage all students regardless of their achievement level or language proficiency level (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010).
**Lincoln School Instruction**

I asked the principal to give an example of how the teachers promote learning and a sense of belonging for students looks like in a normal classroom at Lincoln School.

In a normal classroom it would be where the teacher presents the lesson and then poses questions for students, students work collaboratively to try to engage and find the solution of or work with the skill that has been taught, and then they get guided to teach others or even learn from themselves and they have to do it independently and apply it to their own thinking. (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010)

Instruction begins at 8:00 in the morning and ends at 3:00 in the afternoon at Lincoln School. The Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR) framework guides the instructional approach for every lesson. First, the teacher models the concept to be learned. Second, the teacher sets a purpose. Third the teacher gives students a guide to what they’re doing and why they’re doing it, allowing the teacher an opportunity to give feedback into the activity. Fourth, the teacher has the students work collaboratively. Finally, the teacher shows that independent piece, focused only on that standard.

The elements of the instruction that the teachers, principal, and parents at Lincoln School mentioned consisted of modeling, accessing prior knowledge, differentiation, transferability, and engaging students.

The true instructional program is looking at the standards and figuring out how to teach it using the Gradual Release and GLAD. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

The teachers begin by modeling the concepts that the students will be learning. In fifth grade I observed the teacher model how to write a persuasive letter by writing a letter to the local congressperson about taking firearms off the streets. She shared it with the students and identified the characteristics of a persuasive letter by highlighting them. Each student had a copy of the letter and they were identifying the characteristics along
with the teacher and highlighting the characteristics on their copy (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010). In another classroom I observed the teacher model to students how to complete the antonym, synonym, and homograph activity in their journal. The fourth grade teacher used the think-aloud strategy as she used emphasis of her voice to model commands and exclamations during the grammar lesson and in math the teacher modeled how to use the graph paper to draw the rectangles for perimeter. In third grade the teacher modeled to students how to identify the main idea in a text and how to use the sentence frame to articulate the response. In a reading group, another third grade teacher described what is a summary and modeled how to be a summarizer by finding the important points in the text (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010). Modeling to students and accessing their prior knowledge helps the teachers teach to the strengths of the students and adjust to their teaching to meet the specific needs of the students.

It’s helped us in actually seeing their previous knowledge and to see who knows it, who kind of knows it, and who needs the most help so we know how to differentiate instruction when we teach. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

After introducing the lesson and modeling for students, the teacher and the students work on it together. This time provides the students with the opportunity to dialogue, pose questions, and problem solve.

The teacher presents the lesson and then poses questions for students, students work collaboratively to try to engage and find the solution of or work with the skill that has been taught, and then they get guided to teach others or even learn from themselves and they have to do it independently and apply it to their own thinking. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

It also allows for teacher-student collaborations to develop paragraphs, discuss articles, engage in conversations, sing songs and chants, collaboratively develop students’
academic language and vocabulary, and support students in thinking about their thinking (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

Lincoln School teachers differentiate the learning by incorporating many visuals, sentence frames, and input and process charts into the lessons from which students can access as learning tools from the walls or the board throughout the day (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010). The teachers said that the GRR model provides a consistent structure for instruction where the teachers model to the students, students collaborate with the teacher, students collaborate among themselves, and the goal is for students to practice the activity in various ways to finally be able to do it independently and be successful (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). This challenges teachers to be creative with the delivery of the instruction and provide students with different opportunities to learn and understand. For example, instead of a utilizing a traditional read-aloud technique a fifth grade teacher used different style of delivering a text by incorporating voices for the different characters (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010). The third grade teacher used a narrative input chart with the plot of the story in which students can interact. Beyond small group instruction, some of the differentiating strategies that teachers implement during their instruction provide utilizing the sentence frames to support the various language levels of the students and stress analysis and synthesis level thinking (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010). Teachers introduce and practice vocabulary by handing out vocabulary cards to students to place on a chart when rereading text. Teachers implement processes that students can utilize to reinforce their learning. For example, the fifth grade classroom has an entire wall with the process and characteristics of a persuasive essay. One of the GLAD strategies that
the third grade teachers utilize is the cognitive content dictionary, which is a process that students use for content, concepts or vocabulary development. For this process the teacher introduces the work or concept. The teacher then asks which of the students have heard of the word or not heard of it. Then they identify if the word is a noun, verb, prefix, suffix, etc., come up with a definition, draw a visual, and give an example (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

As a school all grades implement a practice of transferability of skills. Teachers feel that one of the reasons for the success in achievement for students is because of the transferability of skills.

It’s the transferability that our reading and writing transfers over so students have two teachers teaching them the same standard in different languages, working together, in different ways, different teaching, but it’s the same standard and so they are being reinforced. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

The Spanish and English teachers collaborate and decide on specific methods of instruction that they will implement during the lessons in both classrooms. One example of this collaboration for transferability is when the Spanish teacher frontloads a lot of the conventions and grammar that students will learn in both Spanish and eventually in English. Another facet of this collaboration is when the English teachers make connections with cognates. The transferability is designed to support the language development for their native Spanish speakers learning English and for their native English speakers learning Spanish (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). When I visited the English and Spanish classrooms I saw the teachers utilizing the same graphic organizers or charts, but not necessarily the same content (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record).
At the beginning of this case study report the principal was quoted stating that engagement is key to the school and that everybody has the ability and the opportunity to engage. Student engagement is a key to the instruction at Lincoln School (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010). According to the teachers and the principal, you’ll see teacher engagement, student-to-student engagement, and you’ll also see student independent work. Teachers engage students by providing a clear objective and clear purpose for learning. Teachers engage students by questioning and using the think-pair-share strategy to allowing all students to be involved in the learning (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). Students and teachers work together to create paragraphs or complete graphic organizers or input charts. Teachers utilize student journals to engage students in writing, vocabulary development, and reflections. Teachers create opportunities for students to complete activities or assignments with an authentic purpose (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). In fourth grade the students do oral mission presentations and create student generated state books. In third grade the students write letters for Peace One Day and create their Bug Book. Teachers also engage students by singing songs and chants, like the Area and Perimeter Song and the Angle song (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010). Grouping students also engages students. Students are grouped so they work in pairs, groups of three, or sometimes groups of five or six students, typically for literature circles and reading groups.

Another big piece to the instruction is the Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD). According to the teachers they implement many of the GLAD strategies (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). The input chart, inquiry chart, narrative input chart, cognitive content dictionary, teacher-student constructed paragraphs, songs
and chants tied to the content and concepts, and the Farmer in the Dell are some of the GLAD strategies that I observed on the classroom walls or the teachers utilizing during the lesson with students (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

**Lincoln School Accountability**

The teachers teach a unit of study every eight weeks. The teachers are held accountable to turn in lesson plans to the principal and IFS every week. The students are evaluated at the end of each unit of study with a unit benchmark test that assesses the standards covered in the unit. The unit benchmark test is created by the IFS and is based on the standards that were included in the unit plan and the teacher lessons plans. Teachers look at the end of the benchmark test to look at individual student and group progress. The new unit of study is designed using the benchmark test data. Teachers are held accountable to the principal and IFS for the students’ diagnostic reading scores. Teachers also assess students with quizzes, tests, assignments, rubrics for projects and oral presentations, portfolios, reading and writing inventories, and writing prompts. At the end of the year the school administers the state CST and STS test to grades second through seventh and the *Local Measures* to grades kinder through seventh.

The principal, IFS, and teachers do classroom walkthroughs. Teachers are held accountable and are provided feedback regarding the classroom environment, instruction, and student engagement (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010). Teachers receive direct feedback and they are expected to reflect on the feedback given and improve their instruction. The teachers said they want to receive feedback because it is important that they know how they are doing in the classroom with their students. The principal stated
that he holds everyone accountable to making sure that the expectations set for teachers, students, and parents are met.

You made a commitment to be here, you know your expectation….It’s your choice….If teachers aren’t cutting it, they’re gone. I have to make the decision based on kids. (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010)

Teachers are held to high expectations by the principal for attaining successful student outcomes. Teachers’ jobs are potentially on the line if they fail to adhere to the vision and goals of the Lincoln School (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010).

The principal and teachers mentioned the tensions they face associated with the state testing and student achievement. The principal had some concerns regarding the academic goals for students at Lincoln School. He would like to utilize more performance-based assessment where the students are given the problem and have to find the solution and he would like students’ to be able to take their learning and successes and be able to apply it to something else. The students have proved that they are achieving on the state tests but he wants students to take their learning to the next step and focus on the application of students’ learning to other entities because he doesn’t see the application of what they are learning (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010).

The teachers made recommendations that focused on the support for teachers’ preparation and instruction at Lincoln School. The teachers said that they are fully supported by the IFS and the principal but would like to be observed more and receive more consistent feedback regarding their classroom instruction, lesson implementation, and lesson plans. They expressed that they find it beneficial when they receive specific feedback on their instruction, classroom environment, and student engagement because it helps them prepare effective lessons (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010).
Teachers are required to turn in lesson plans every week. They are held accountable for having a good instructional plan for students. They know the importance of having prepared lesson plans every week and find that it is beneficial to their teaching and instruction but at the same time they feel that having to turn it in every week and being asked by the office staff to turn it every week is “detrimental to the profession” because they feel that they are not being trusted to provide a strong instructional plan for students. Preparing lesson plans has also impacted the focus of the planning time from prepping lessons and discussing student progress to finishing lesson plans (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010).

The instruction at Lincoln School involves providing a structured process for lesson implementation, setting clear objective for students, and implementing effective strategies to engage students regardless of their academic level. Teachers are held accountable for student achievement and all the students at Lincoln School have met the state achievement goals. Lincoln School is accountable to the state to meeting the API and AYP goals. All the students, including the English learners have met the achievement goals on the CST. English learners also take the STS to determine their achievement in Spanish language arts and math. The standards drive the instruction and the student achievement data informs teachers of how to differentiate the instruction to better meet students’ academic and language needs.

We take the standards. We go beyond the standards. We use all these strategies to help them learn what they need to learn (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

Meeting the standards is the minimum. Going beyond the standard challenges students to excel and reach their achievement goals.
Every eight weeks an end-of-the-unit benchmark test provides consistent student achievement data that the teachers use to help develop the next unit of study and to identify the instructional strategies that will be most effective to support student learning.

Teachers look at the test results in detail and figure out the best way to teach it to students, to give them the support, to cover that standard so that they will do well on it (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010).

The principal, IFS, and at times teachers, do walkthroughs of classrooms and provide teachers and grade levels feedback on their instructional focus, implementation of the lessons, classroom environment, and the level of student engagement. Teachers that lack commitment, passion, and accountability to the student learning are not asked to return the following school year.

It’s about, you made a commitment to be here, you know your expectation, your expectations that everyday you need to be here. It’s your choice. You don’t have to be here either. And it’s like, we’re going to hold you to those expectations. I think that’s what’s made this school. (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010)

Ultimately, the teachers are held accountable for the academic achievement of students. The school district holds the principal accountable to raise and maintain the academic achievement of students as measured by the API and AYP scores. The Lincoln School teachers and parents hold the principal accountable by maintaining an honest and open door of communication (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010).

**NCLB and Proposition 227 at Lincoln School**

According to the teachers, NCLB has forced teachers to break down the standards and really understand what they need to teach and how they need to teach it. NCLB has forced educators and school districts to stop ignoring English learners and begin to address their needs where, before, English Learners were blamed for the low, test scores
(Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). Beyond the CST, the benchmark tests provide a good and continuous measurement of the students’ academic achievement. The principal believes that assessment is necessary to show that the students are learning.

The teachers expressed their concerns and tensions regarding NCLB and the state testing. Schools and teachers are ranked according to the students’ test scores and that puts pressure on teachers for their students to score well on the test. The teachers are concerned that it has made everybody very competitive and has focused the attention of the instruction to reading, writing, grammar, and math because that is the focus of the CST (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). They agreed that the school has done well in preparing students with the skills to do well on the state test, but that is not their only priority.

It is a mixed bag, we’re supporting children in becoming successful but at the same time we’re supporting them in being good test takers. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

Teachers are unsure if they teach to the test or even how that may look but they know that NCLB has made an impact in every school.

Even though it [the test] is important and it does impact the way kids are taught, it is different from other schools where the goal is to teach to the test; skills based activities, drilling, and practicing how to take tests. We don’t do that. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

They debated in the focus group whether they teach to the test in regards to only focusing on what is going to be tested on the CST instead of focusing on the holistic curriculum, but they all agreed that their emphasis is on the standards and to teach beyond the standards to meet their students’ academic and language needs (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010).
Proposition 227 has not affected the goals of this school in any way partly because the school is charter and because the school community supports dual language and the vision and mission of the school (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010). All parents at Lincoln School sign the proposition 227 parent waiver option for alternative programs and because it is a charter school, the school can choose to have a dual language program for the whole school (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010).

**Lincoln School Parent Involvement**

Lincoln School embraces parents and makes it mandatory that parents volunteer 30 hours every year. Parents are encouraged to help at school, support teachers, attend school meeting, parent conferences, curriculum nights, help with directing traffic, and volunteer to go on fieldtrips, among other things. The school has an open door policy for parents and parents feel that teachers are accessible (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). Although the principal is supportive of all parents, they would like the principal to be more accessible to meet with them on an individual bases when requested (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010). Parents trust teachers and feel comfortable helping in the workroom making copies and preparing materials for teachers, and also in the classrooms filing papers, organizing students’ work in their portfolio, but they also feel that helping teachers in the classroom is more important. Upper grade parents want to support their children’s classrooms but feel that the fifth and sixth grade teachers don’t allow them to help in the classrooms as much as in the primary grade classrooms (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010).
Teachers feel that the home-school connection is valued and that there is collaboration amongst parents and teachers. This is evident when teachers have the curriculum nights (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). At the curriculum nights the teachers teach the parents strategies that they can use at home with their children because they are expected to support their children at home with homework, health, and maintaining the school expectation. Parents want to know what their child is learning in the classroom and how they are being taught (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010).

Teachers feel that parents hold them accountable to a certain point because they expect the school to provide their children with a certain rigor (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). They expect their children to learn achieve, become better at math, become better readers, speak English better and become true bilinguals and when they see that their child is not learning they let the teachers and the principal know (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010).

The parents are part of the United Nations of Parents. Some parents are Parent Ambassadors and take a leadership responsibility to support the school and other parents (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). Parents feel like Lincoln School is their school and want to do what they can to support it so their children can continue to provide their children with the best education. They like that the school is offer parents English and parenting classes and would like the school to keep providing more classes (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010).

Parents get informed about the school in a few different ways. Teachers send home flyers and notes that are specific to their child’s classroom or grade. Parents received the Paw Prints monthly newsletter that includes the monthly calendar of events.
with important dates, announcement, and general school information. Most of the information is given at the different meetings that they are invited to attend. They have an opportunity to meet with the principal at the *Coffee with the Principal* meetings and the grade level curriculum nights. At the curriculum nights the parents receive information regarding the standards and expectations for their children. The teachers present strategies that parents can use to help their children at home. At the Lincoln School charter board meetings the parents are informed about the school budget and expenditures, decisions made, faculty presentations, and other school information (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010). One recommendation that the parents made was to have the school information at the board meetings presented in a more comprehensible manner, with language that all parents will be able to better understand.

Parents are informed of the school’s academic progress and are invited to the charter board monthly meetings. The school sends home a monthly newsletter with school information, news, and calendar of events and meetings. Flyers and notes are also sent home with students. Parents are required to attend parent conferences and to volunteer 30 hours of service every year (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010). The school has an open door policy for parents and parents are encouraged to engage with teachers and their children by attending grade level curriculum nights to support their children academically at home. At the same time, parents hold their children to high expectations to learn and hold the school to high expectations for educating their children and meeting the school goals.

I think parents expect for their children to learn and to see them achieve and to see growth. It seems parents get excited when their children are speaking better English or becoming better mathematicians and becoming true bilinguals and I
think that they expect that and when they see that their child is not progressing, they do let the school know. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

The parents recognized that the principal and the teachers have done a lot to provide their children with the best education and maintain a successful school and that the principal has fought to defend the school against those who doubted the success of the school.

Entonces, pienso que la escuela es muy buena y que el director a luchado mucho por mantener la escuela. Contra viento y marea. Contra todos los prejuicios que tenían y todos los contros que tenía con el distrito, el estado, y la nación, ha hecho mucho por defender a la escuela. [So I think the school is very good and that the principal has fought hard to maintain the school. Against all odds. Against all biases and the challenges he had with the district, the state, and the nation, he has done much to defend the school.] (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010)

One of the parents describe the relationship between the parents and the school that of a big family. Sometimes parent may not get along with the teachers and the principal but everyone is supportive of each other regardless (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010).

Pienso que es como un reloj. Que somos los papás y la escuela, los maestros, el director y tenemos que engranar todos y trabajar para que este reloj funcione y el punto es que trabajemos los papás, los niños, los maestros y la dirección al mismo nivel, al mismo sistema. [I think it is like a clock. We are the parents, the school, the teachers, the principal and we must engage everyone and work to make this clock work and the point is for the parents, the children, the teachers and the administration to work at the same level, in the same system.] (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010)

The Lincoln School parents will be the first to approach the principal to express what they think is wrong and what they feel would make the school better but they will work collaboratively to support the school.
Lincoln School Summary

The language policy at Lincoln School promotes the implementation of a school-wide dual language instruction a goal of biliteracy for students. The expectation for students is to acquire proficiency in Spanish and English. Parents like the dual language and that it is preparing their children to be bilingual biliterate, and bicultural (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010). According to the Lincoln School principal, the reason the school is able to maintain a DL program is because of the charter but also because the school community believes in it and supports it.

Students are held to high expectations within a safe and welcoming school environment. Teachers provide students with the opportunities to achieve and be successful by challenging students to be critical thinkers (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). In different classrooms that I observed students were questioning, categorizing, comparing, and forming opinions. Teachers posed questions to challenge students to think about their learning. Teachers hold students to high expectations and expect all of them to be engaged and participate. Teachers also feel that they provide a safe classroom environment for students by praising and encouraging students (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010).

The principal feels that the school and teachers have corazón [heart]. Forming and maintaining positive relationships with teachers and students is important for teachers (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). The teachers at Lincoln School are passionate towards their students and genuinely want them to succeed (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010).
The teachers differentiate the instruction so that all students will have access to the learning and be able to engage. They utilize visuals, graphic organizers, charts, grouping strategies, and process oriented activities during their instruction to make the instruction accessible to their learning. The English and Spanish teachers collaborate to provide structures that promote the transference of skills from one language to another.

The students are evaluated at the end of each unit of study with a unit benchmark test that assesses the standards covered in the unit. Teachers assess students with quizzes, tests, assignments, rubrics for projects and oral presentations, portfolios, reading and writing inventories, and writing prompts. At the end of the year the school administers the state CST and STS and the district *Local Measures* assessment. The principal, IFS, and teachers do classroom walkthroughs. Teachers are held accountable and are provided feedback regarding the classroom environment, instruction, and student engagement (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010). The teachers said they want to receive more feedback because it is important that they know how they are doing in the classroom with their students. Teachers are held to high expectations by the principal for attaining successful student outcomes and their jobs are potentially on the line if they fail to adhere to the vision and goals of the Lincoln School (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010).

The principal would like to utilize more performance-based assessment and see students be able to take their learning and successes and be able to apply it to something else. The student achievement data informs teachers of how to differentiate the instruction to better meet students’ academic and language needs. Teachers are required to turn in lesson plans every week. They know the importance of preparing appropriate
lessons but they also feel that they are not being trusted to provide a strong instructional plan for students.

The teachers expressed their concerns and tensions regarding NCLB and the state testing. Kennedy teachers teach social studies and science as a focus of the Spanish curriculum and integrate it into the English curriculum but the students don’t have fine arts anymore and time for physical education has also been reduced because of the accountability. Schools and teachers are ranked according to the students’ test scores and that puts pressure on teachers for their students to score well on the test. The teachers are concerned that it has made everybody very competitive and has focused the attention of the instruction to reading, writing, grammar, and math because that is the focus of the CST (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010).

Lincoln School embraces parents and makes it mandatory that each parent does 30 volunteer hours yearly. Parents are encouraged to help at school, support teachers, attend school meeting. Although the principal is supportive of all parents, they would like the principal to be more accessible to meet with them on an individual bases when requested (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010). Parents trust teachers and feel comfortable helping in the workroom making copies and preparing materials for teachers. Teachers feel that parents hold them accountable to a certain point because they expect the school to provide their children with a certain rigor (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). They expect their children to learn achieve, become better at math, become better readers, speak English better and become true bilinguals and when they see that their child is not learning they let the teachers and the principal know (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010). Parents also like that the school offers parents English and
parenting classes and would like the school to keep providing more classes (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010).

Teachers send home flyers and notes that are specific to their child’s classroom or grade. Parents received the Paw Prints monthly newsletter that includes the monthly calendar of events with important dates, announcement, and general school information. Most of the information is given at the different meetings that they are invited to attend. Parents are informed of the school’s academic progress and are invited to the charter board monthly meetings. The school sends home a monthly newsletter with school information, news, and calendar of events and meetings.

**Chapter Summary**

The results from the five case studies were reported in this chapter. Each case study report provided a detailed description of the school’s language policy, pedagogical practices, student achievement outcomes, and accountability. Chapter six will present a comparative analysis of the five case studies and identify the key findings and emerging themes.
This study examined how the language policy in four California public schools addressed the spirit of state and federal mandates while providing educational access to English learners. The language policy influenced by Proposition 227, 1974 Lau decision, Castaneda v. Pickard (1981), and NCLB have influenced the language policy and the manner is which schools educate English learners. A comparative analysis of the five case studies examined each school’s language policy, pedagogical practices, student outcomes, and accountability for student success. The English Learner Educational Access Continuum, in Figure 8, defined the effectiveness of the each school for English learners. The four pedagogical elements in the education of English learners included: (1) language policy, (2) value for learners, (3) curriculum, and (4) instruction.

This chapter will present an analysis of the results from the five case studies presented in two sections. The first section of the chapter will present the themes that emerged from the five case studies as they relate to providing educational access for English learners. The second section of the chapter will provide the analysis of the effectiveness of each school as defined by the English Learner Educational Access Continuum (Figure 8).
Emerging Themes

The results from the case studies revealed how the schools provided educational access for English learners. The case study results were synthesized and key themes emerged as a result of the pedagogical practices for English learners.

The case studies results showed that all the school implemented consistent instructional approaches and expectations imposed upon by the school district. Each school was mandated to implement the following instructional and curriculum elements into their daily instructional programs:

• utilize the California state standards to guide the instruction;
• implement the Gradual Release of Responsibility framework in each lesson;
• assess students every six to eight weeks; and
• utilize assessment data to identify students’ academic needs

These were common instructional practices encountered in the five schools. The analysis of the schools revealed the effectiveness of each school in implementing these instructional practices and other aspects that provided or denied educational access to English learners.

Language Policy

The five schools’ language policy held specific English language proficiency outcomes for students. The instructional language program at each school was designed to meet specific language outcomes based on policy. Kennedy, Roosevelt, Jackson, and Washington Schools offered students an early-exit transitional type of AB program to
provide support in their primary language instruction while they transition to English by third grade or before. An early-exit transitional model is a type of subtractive biliteracy approach (Lambert, 1987). Subtractive bilingualism is “the philosophy behind structured immersion in the United States” (Crawford, 1995, p. 143). Kennedy School and Jackson School both offered primary language instruction from kinder to first grade. Roosevelt offered primary language instruction up to first grade with the transition in second grade and Washington School offered it up to second grade with the transition in third grade. The Spanish instruction that the students receive at these schools is not to develop Spanish proficiency. Thus, the policies at these schools were to transition students to English and these schools reflected the subtractive biliteracy approach.

Conversely, the language policy at Lincoln School held Spanish and English proficiency outcomes for students.

The language policy at our school is that every child at our school will be bilingual, biliterate or multilingual and the policy is that all students, regardless of ethnicity, regardless of cultural backgrounds, regardless of that will leave this school speaking two language, reading, writing and oral. (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010)

Lincoln’s language policy held students to bilingual/biliteracy outcomes by offering a 50/50 Dual Language (DL) program to build proficiency in the students’ primary language while they become proficient in English. A DL model is a type of additive biliteracy approach (Lambert, 1987). Figure 12 illustrates the type of instructional language program that each school implemented in the different grades. This chart clearly illustrates the goals of English acquisition present at all schools with Lincoln being the exception by having program policy and goals towards both Spanish and English proficiency.
Table 52 shows that Kennedy School had 43% EL students scoring at proficient and advanced levels in 2009 while Jackson School had 29%. They both had similar instructional language programs but there was a disparity in the achievement outcomes. Roosevelt and Washington offered more primary language instruction up to second and third grade, respectfully. Roosevelt had 33% EL students scoring at proficient and advanced levels and Washington School had 27%. Roosevelt School and Washington School offered more primary language instruction and had comparable EL student achievement as Jackson School. Kennedy School had the highest percentage of EL students scoring at proficient and advanced levels on the CST from the four schools that had AB classrooms.

Figure 12. Primary Language Instructional Programs
Table 52

Language Policy and EL Students Scoring Proficient and Advanced 2009 CST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Language Outcomes</th>
<th>Instructional Programs</th>
<th>Proficient/Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>English proficiency</td>
<td>AB K-1, SEI, ME</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>English proficiency</td>
<td>AB K-1, SEI</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>English proficiency</td>
<td>AB K-2, SEI</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>English proficiency</td>
<td>AB K-3, SEI, ME</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln*</td>
<td>Biliteracy</td>
<td>DL K-7</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Charter school

Figure 13. Percentage ELs at CST Proficient and Advanced Levels
Lincoln School was the only charter school in the study and the only school that offered a DL instructional program. The uniqueness of this school was that the Dual Language instruction was offered in all grades. Lincoln School had 49% EL students scoring at advanced and proficient levels. That was a slightly higher percentage than Kennedy School. Almost half of the EL students at Kennedy School and Lincoln School were achieving proficient and advanced levels on the CST. English learners were achieving on the CST at Kennedy School with more English instruction but the English learners at Lincoln School were also achieving on the CST with daily English and Spanish instruction. Providing more primary language instruction did not prevent Lincoln EL students’ the opportunity to acquire English proficiency. On the contrary, they met or exceeded the English proficiency goals as compared to other schools that more English instruction. Thomas and Collier (2001) found that 90-10 and 50-50 Dual Language programs were the only programs that provided native Spanish speaking students the opportunity to reach proficiency in English and Spanish in all subjects and excel beyond the grade level expectation. In comparing different Dual Language programs across the United States, Donna Christian (1996) found that native Spanish speakers scored at or above grade level in English and Spanish reading and math.

The argument could be made that Lincoln School had higher EL achievement on the CST because it had a lower percentage of students receiving free or reduced price lunch compared to the other four schools, and it was a charter school, which gave it more academic freedom and fiscal flexibility. However, when Lincoln School was compared to other schools in the school district with DL programs (see Table 22), it is notable that Lincoln School had a considerably higher percentage of students receiving free or
reduced price lunch while at the same time demonstrating high or at least equal student achievement. For example, Lincoln School and School C had the same 2009 API score, both met their AYP goal, both were charter school and both implemented a Dual Language program. The major difference between then was that Lincoln had a higher percentage of EL enrollment, Latino enrollment, and students receiving free and reduced price lunch enrollment with 57% EL enrollment, 95% Latino enrollment, and 46% students receiving free and reduced price lunch. School C had 24% EL enrollment, 43% Latino enrollment, and 12% students receiving free and reduced price lunch. This demographic data showed a huge disparity between socioeconomic statuses of the school communities yet with equal achievement scores.

In comparison to Kennedy School, Lincoln had 46% EL students that receive free or reduced price lunch and Kennedy had the next lowest with 64%. There was a 20% difference between both schools but, within the context of the school district, Lincoln School had the highest percentage of students that receive free and reduced price lunch and the EL students were showing achievement gains.

Every principal stated that they valued the students’ home language yet three out of the five schools reduced the their AB programs to offer more English instruction

Students’ Spanish language is valued and respected, but for most students school is the only opportunity to speak and practice their English…too few opportunities in the community and home for most students to speak and practice English. (Jackson School principal interview, 2010)

According to the Jackson School principal, the students’ opportunity to practice English is limited in their community; therefore the school needs to provide those opportunities.

Proposition 227 requires schools to instruct students in Structured English Immersion classrooms where the instruction is mainly English with some instructional
support for non-English proficient students (Proposition 227, Initiative statute, article II, section 305, 1997). A subtractive biliteracy model is detrimental to EL students because it minimizes the students’ primary language use in school and promotes monolingual proficiency (Baker, 1996). English proficiency is valued and lacking English proficiency is perceived as a deficit for learning (Baker, 1996; Baker & Jones, 1997; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). Subtractive language methods deny English learners the opportunity to reach biliteracy goals. Students negotiate between the school culture and their home culture and the more they learn English the less they use Spanish, and that causes them to see less of a need to maintain their Spanish language (Darder, 1991). Parents at Jackson School, Roosevelt School, and Kennedy School were all concerned with wanting their children to be bilingual and bicultural.

*Yo de hecho en casa los pongo a que lean en español y les dicto en español pero eso nomás en casa.* [I actually have them read in Spanish and I teach them in Spanish, but that’s all at home. (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010)]

They all supported their school’s subtractive biliteracy policy and felt their school was doing well in teaching their children English, but they were struggling at home to maintain their children’s cultural identity and language.

*No le gusta el oir el español. Prefiere el inglés pero como nosotros somos Mexicanos, ahorita le estoy diciendo que escuche el español y si tiene una duda que pregunte. Eso es la manera en que yo trabajo pero estás hablando que la tarea es en ingles, las explicaciones son en inglés, las clases son en inglés, todo es en inglés entonces cada vez es menos español que pueden recibir de nosotros.* [He doesn’t like to hear Spanish. He prefers English but since we’re Mexican, now I’m telling him to listen to Spanish and if he is not sure to ask. That is the way I work it but you’re talking about the homework is in English, the explanations are in English, the classes are in English, everything is in English so every time it is less Spanish that they can get from us. (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010)]
In particularly, fifth and sixth grade parents told stories of their children not wanting to speak Spanish at home, even though they, the parents, don’t really speak English. The connection between parents and their children is being lost.

An additive biliteracy model benefits EL students because it provides them with support to gain academic knowledge while they learn English (Baker & Jones, 1997).

Here we want you to be proficient in two languages. We talk about how it will benefit them socially and economically. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

The ideals of bilingual education encompass primary language development, English development, the social and cultural integration into mainstream society, and a secure ethnic identity (Crawford, 1995; Darder, 1991; Nieto, 2001). Lincoln School clearly reflects these sentiments. Spanish and English are both valued and perceived as important.

Ser bilingüe es tener dos posibilidades, dos maneras de pensar, dos maneras de vivir, dos maneras de comer. Tienes como dos caminos iguales seguros en la vida. [Being bilingual is having two possibilities, two ways of thinking, two ways of living, two ways of eating. You have, like, two paths in life and both are equally secure.] (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010)

The advantage of being biliterate allows students to value and maintain a positive cultural identity at home and at school. Overall, Lincoln School stood out as an example of how both academic achievement and the cultural language is not only valued but utilized as an important component of the students’ cognitive, language, and social development.
Learning and Achievement Expectations

Students are more successful in school when teachers believe that they can learn, hold high expectations for them, and genuinely care about them (Ladson-Billings, 1994). The teachers and principals at the five schools expressed that they held students to high expectations for students to achieve academically.

We have high expectations for all students. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)

One Roosevelt School teacher held the students in her classroom accountable for their learning and considered her students and their parents in a sense a part of the family (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010). A teacher from Washington School expressed that she wants students to think about their learning and articulate their ideas.

I hold them to high expectations. I don’t even care if they give me the right answer, really, what I care about is the reasoning behind it and that they are discussing it. If they got the answer wrong I’m fine with it as long as there is good logic behind it. I don’t care if the answer is wrong. If they are engaged and really trying to reason and dialogue, I’m huge on that. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

She values that students be engaged in articulating their ideas, regardless if they are correct or incorrect. The teachers at Kennedy School want students to experience a challenging and fun educational experience.

Kennedy es un lugar en donde nos interesamos por los niños, por la capacidad de cada uno de ellos y damos el máximo de que están en nuestras manos para que ese alumno no solamente venga a estudiar si no que encuentre un lugar donde divertirse, donde ser él, donde ser capaz de poder tomar un reto y llevarlo acabo. [Kennedy is a place where we are interested in the students, for their learning and we give our all so that that student not only come to learn but to also find place where he can have fun, where he can be himself, where he can be challenged and carry it out.] (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

The self-fulfilling prophecy set by the school for students is to learn English and the students are performing to the expectation (Merton, 1968). Generally, the teachers had
positive attitudes about teaching English learners and genuinely cared about their academic success. The Indicators for Effective Conditions for Learning framework (Gonzalez, 2010), in Figure 4, outlines the expectations for learning with (a) high expectations, (b) safe climate to take risks, (c) inclusive of all levels and abilities, and (d) value community social and cultural capital. Lincoln, Kennedy, and Roosevelt Schools stood out in the study because they placed an important emphasis on building a collaborative learning community as a key to their students’ academic success.

Nos dice que nosotros siempre vamos a ser bien recibidos en el salón de clases en la hora que uno quiera entrar y ver que es lo que los maestros están haciendo o si uno quiere ser voluntario en la escuela...dan mucho oportunidad para que uno pueda venir. [He tells us that we will always be welcomed in the classrooms at whatever time we want to enter and see what the teachers are doing or if one wants to volunteer in the school...there are many opportunities so one can come.] (Kennedy School parent focus group, 2010)

Parents were valued and were expected to be involved with the school and their children’s learning. An example was shown at Roosevelt School where there was a goal for integrating parents as active participants in the school.

This year our PTA president speaks only Spanish and that was one of her hesitations and how am I going to do it if I only speak Spanish, but she has done a tremendous job and we think that also demonstrates that language is not going to keep our kids from giving speeches. It’s not going to keep our parents from being in the leadership role. (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010)

The principals made an effort to invite parents to be involved at all the schools. The teachers also acknowledged that many parents were involved in their children’s education.

I think parents expect for their children to learn and to see them achieve and to see growth. It seems parents get excited when their children are speaking better English or becoming better mathematicians and becoming true bilinguals and I think that they expect that and when they see that their child is not progressing, they do let the school know. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)
Lincoln and Kennedy School parents had opportunities to be critical and have an avenue to express their concerns to the school leadership. Parents knew they had a place in their school and responded positively to the invitation to be engaged. In contrast, Washington School and Jackson School have limited parent involvement at their schools. The Washington School principal stated that the parents have not connected with her because she has not been as engaged with parents as was the previous principal.

The former principal, he really embraced the parents and he did a lot of parent education classes. He was working on his dissertation. I’m not doing that so they’re a little iffy still. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

She added that it has been a struggle to get the PTA started once again and at the time of this interview she only had one parent on the PTA board. Jackson School parents would like the principal to be more inviting towards parents.

Uno como papá se siente uno como sin confianza porque si quieres tu hablar con la directora primero tienes que hacer una cita porque cualquier problema que tengas y haber cuando te va a dar la cita para atenderte y te sientes así cómo rostrado pues, o sea, sin confianza. Eso es lo que también los papás los tiene así como no tienen confianza, no se acercan. [As a parent you feel like without trust because if you want to speak with the principal you first need to for whatever problem you have and who knows when you will get the appointment to meet with her and you feel like bothered, or without trust. And parents feel the same way, and because they don’t feel that trust, they don’t go to the school. (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010)

The parents don’t feel confident about going to the school because they lack trust in the principal.

The teachers in this study shared their aspirations for their students to be challenged beyond meeting the state standards and preparing for the CST.

We’re so much student test, test, test, test, that we don’t give the kids a chance to do hands-on, to play games, to do other stuff that we used to do that we don’t have that much time to do right now, but they could actually practice the skills, not only to take a test but to make it their own; to own it and be able to explain to
their partner, to be able to use it in the real world. (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

The Kennedy teachers felt that the pressure of meeting the CST goals put limitations on teaching students to be critical thinkers and being able to connect their learning to opportunities in their community and beyond. The importance of standardized test scores and schools attaining a high Annual Performance Index (API) score have targeted English learners, immigrants, and ethnically diverse students as a weak link in the chain (Sleeter, 2005). The teachers in the five schools expressed their opinion toward the priority for being accountable on the state test and how it impacts what students are taught.

There is a tremendous amount of emphasis placed on testing. A tremendous amount of emphasis placed on the ability to respond to multiple-choice questions, and in that regard, I think that this particular site really conditions the students to be successful in that avenue. (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010)

The Jackson School teachers felt that their students are instructed to become good test takers and be able to find the best multiple-choice answer. The teachers at Washington felt that they should be teaching more content area subjects than just language arts and math.

But as far the school, I think there needs to be a better balance among all the standards not just language arts and math standards, but also the science, music, and arts standards. So as far as a well-rounded school, this is not the place. But as far as teaching to the standards, Oh yes! They are learning the standards for sure. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

They would like to see students receive science instruction, music, and art as well. Kennedy School teachers feel that the test is becoming the focal point of student’s reason for learning.

It’s really sad to see in the classroom when you ask the kids, Why is it important that you need to do this and then automatically, I’ve been getting a lot from my
kids, because of the test, because I need to do good on the CST….They’re just doing it for the test. They are not internalizing it. (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

They said they feel that the students are not internalizing their learning and it makes them sad to see that. Overall at Washington, Jackson, Roosevelt, and Kennedy Schools, the sentiment was that the expectations was solely proficiency in English to meet the school district and state levels of achievement as based on the CST.

It was clear that the teachers’ passion for teaching and their students’ success came out for all schools but it was most evident at Lincoln School.

*Me gusta mucho el trabajo de los maestros. Yo agradezco mucho porque sé que se esfuerzan de más. Yo veo un esfuerzo superior al que cualquier persona o maestra haría por tu hijo.* [I really like the work of the teachers. I am grateful because I know that they strive for more. I see a greater effort in that anyone or any teacher would do for your child.] (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010)

Lincoln School teachers and principal showed evidence of making personal connections with students to create knowledge that stretched beyond the classroom walls. As Shor states, participation by students involves providing active experiences in class, to develop knowledge, reflective understanding, encourage their aspirations and achievements, and treated as responsible, caring human beings (Shor, 1992).

It is pushing the child beyond their comfort zone, beyond their zone of proximal development. Not just pushing them with the questioning but trying to put it in a real-world example, applicable in the real world. Pushing them academically and socially, students think about what they can do to change the world, how do they matter. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

The teachers at Lincoln School acknowledged the limitation and barriers in education but they are taking steps to impact their students’ learning by challenging students to learn beyond the standards, developing language across the curriculum, and connecting the students’ learning to their lives and to the world. They also do this with clear leadership
ad support from their principal. This is a key factor towards student access in learning and achievement.

Teaching to the Standards

The five schools in the study acknowledged that the California state standards guide the implementation of the curriculum and daily instruction. The data revealed that the majority of the schools narrowed or restricted the curriculum to mainly focus on teaching the language arts and math standards. This practice is consistent with research that states that since NCLB only measures language arts and math achievement many schools have narrowed their curriculum and instruction to consist of reading, writing, and math (Abernathy, 2007; Linn, 2008). Teachers are more likely to spend less time teaching untested topics (Tracey, 2005), more so, when school administrators further reinforce the practices. This pedagogical practice emerged as a tension with teachers and parents.

But as far the school, I think there needs to be a better balance among all the standards not just language arts and math standards, but also the science, music, and arts standards. So as far as a well-rounded school, this is not the place. But as far as teaching to the standards, oh yes! They are learning the standards for sure. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

No Child Left Behind has pressured the schools to focus on teaching the reading, writing and math standards to prepare students for the CST (Abernathy, 2007; Linn, 2008; Tracey, 2005). This action was most prevalent at Washington, Jackson, and Roosevelt School. These actions caused teachers to critically reflect on their schools’ curriculum focus and minimizing and/or eliminating the social studies, science, art, music, and PE instruction. Kennedy and Lincoln School taught or integrated more social
studies and science into the curriculum design than the other schools. The Kennedy School principal explained that the teachers at their schools integrate social studies and science into the language arts and math instruction.

We heavily focus on language arts and math but we do integrate the social studies and science curriculum into the language arts but we do bring in the science curriculum as well into the language arts just because it is rich in academic language. (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010)

The rich academic language from the social studies and science curricula add to the students’ language development. The teachers concurred with the principal, but added that they feel overwhelmed because they have many language arts standards to teach. Lincoln School teachers acknowledged that they teach beyond the minimum standards to provide rigor for students.

Rigor from a teacher point of view, if you are being challenged then you feel rigor; thinking above the superficial level. It is the rigor of their ability, where they are at that time, pushing them to the next step up. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

For example at Lincoln, the third grade teachers taught the concept of main idea with details along with the science standards for the Sun, Moon, and Earth in Spanish and taught it through a bug theme in English. They reinforced the students’ learning by including poetry writing and songs (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

The misalignment of the Houghton Mifflin language arts adoption with the California state standards was a point of tension with teachers across four schools. The state adopted materials used in schools are not aligned to the California state standards (Tracey, 2005). The Washington School and the Roosevelt School teacher use other resources that help compensate for the lack of connection the language arts adoption has with the standards. The Washington School teachers explained that they have to spend
more time and effort planning and developing lessons. The Kennedy teachers said that they have the option of using other materials just as well, particularly because some of their existing materials lack the desired content or rigor (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010). The curriculum at Lincoln school exposes children to a multicultural perspective and provides the opportunity for students to learn about the world and their surroundings (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010). Further, the school recognizes that there is a misalignment in the curriculum and supports teachers in developing a standard based language arts curriculum using multiple resources and grade-level collaboration.

La maestra de cuarto les está poniendo muchos artículos pero del internet. Entonces los está haciendo lo que están los niños oyendo alrededor, como ahorita lo de Haití, ella los hizo investigar del internet qué es Haití, cuál es su religión, qué es su juego favorito. ¿Es el soccer? Entonces, no nomás conocen de Haití de que tembló, si no ¿dónde está ubicado y qué es su cultura? ¿Qué es Haití? [The fourth grade teacher is giving them many articles but from the internet. So then she is having them do what the children are hearing about, like right now about Haiti, she had them research on the internet what is Haiti, what is their religion, what is their favorite game. Is it soccer? So they just don’t know about the earthquake in Haiti, but instead, where is it located and what is their culture. What is Haiti?] (Lincoln School parent focus group, 2010)

Lincoln School parents recognized how teachers create opportunities for students to learn about the Haitian culture as a lesson of the earthquake that rocked Haiti.

The state content standards are pivotal to developing the instructional focus at each grade level in each school. Almost all the schools in the study focus the majority of their instructional day to teach the language arts and math standards. The concern for teachers is that students will internalize the testing aspect of school and not internalize the actual learning that needs to be taking place. Another concern from teachers is that there
are many standards to teach before the testing window and other content will deter from meeting the needs.

**Engagement is the Key to Instruction**

The Indicators for Effective Conditions for Learning framework (Gonzalez, 2010), in Figure 4, outlines the indicators for effective learning conditions for English learners with (a) cultural awareness and diversity, (b) authentic learning, (c) collaborative learning, and (d) expectations for learning. Some of the indicators for student engagement include *student choice, active participation, peer modeling and collaboration*, and *teacher-student collaboration*. The key to effective student engagement are the implementation of (a) GLAD, (b) differentiating instruction, and (c) the transference of skills as part of the classroom instruction.

The students were engaged in all the classrooms that I observed but their level of engagement varied in each classroom. The GRR framework was the model of instruction that teachers followed because it assured that teachers were engaging students in working with the teacher and in collaborative groups. The elements of instruction that the teachers, principal, and parents at Lincoln School mentioned consisted of modeling, accessing prior knowledge, differentiation, transferability, and engaging students.

The true instructional program is looking at the standards and figuring out how to teach it using the Gradual Release and GLAD. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

All teachers across schools had a print rich environment but the Lincoln School classrooms were richer than in other schools, particularly in showing evidence of student generated work (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010). For example, the fourth grade classrooms I observed displayed student-generated charts explaining the
cultural traits of a California indigenous group, student journals, and student writing. The fifth grade classrooms displayed teacher-student generated charts modeling how to write a persuasive essay (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010). The kinder classrooms at Kennedy School displayed some student work in the form of teacher-student generated charts focused on identifying the characteristics of a story and student writing, but the majority was teacher-generated print. The third and fifth grade classrooms displayed some student writing, but the majority of the work displayed on the walls was teacher-generated charts for math concepts, vocabulary, and grammar (Kennedy School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

Learning Environment

The Lincoln principal expected the teachers at his school to engage students in a variety of ways everyday. Forming a learning community creates contexts where teachers gather as much information as possible about their students and their home communities and make a commitment to work together (Ruiz et al, 1996).

We provide an environment that allows kids to take risks even if they are uncomfortable with the language because of all the support, visuals, language frames, prompts…(Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

The learning environment established by Lincoln teachers supported student learning beyond their comfort zone. A point of concern at Washington School was reducing the teacher talk time in the classroom and increasing the student talk time.

But the big piece, for example, for instructional tools, is just getting the children to articulate what they are doing with a partner and the need for the language development, which is what I found upon my arrival, that it was teacher directed--85% teacher talk, 15% auditory, the child just had to be still. So that was the mode of instruction. We’re honestly, in some cases we might be doing some group work, but I’m happy with just pairs. If we can do pairs we’re doing a good
job because we cut down the ratio already, from teacher talk to students having that interaction. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

While the principal has a goal for collaborative learning by engaging students in collaborative groups and having active participation, she recognizes that such collaboration is not occurring in all classrooms but is satisfied with students working in pairs. Conversely, the teachers at Roosevelt School utilized collaborative grouping to provide students more direct instructional support.

We provide interventions for students who may be struggling. These can be small groups, peer tutors, extra time with a support teacher. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)

The principal explained that during small group instruction students are able to collaborate with peers and have conversations using academic language about what they’re learning and what they want to learn (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010). Kennedy teachers utilize Universal Access time to specifically work with students in small groups focused on their areas of weakness in math, reading, and writing.

It’s when you meet with a small group with academic needs, you help them, you can give the lesson again in a different way, you can provide examples, you can work with him more so that he understands the in the morning in reading, writing and math. (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

According to the principal, teachers group students by ability level at that point, according to the standard, and meet with them at lease twice, three times, maybe five times a week, depending on the need of the students. Kennedy School utilizes push-in support for students. Push-in support is the opposite of a pull-out approach, where instead of sending students with another teacher outside of their regular classroom, the teacher come to the classroom and works with students in small group or on an individual bases (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010). At Lincoln School, after the teacher
introduces and models the lesson for students, the teacher and the students work on it together. This strategy provides the students with the opportunity to dialogue, pose questions, and problem solve.

The teacher presents the lesson and then poses questions for students, students work collaboratively to try to engage and find the solution of or work with the skill that has been taught, and then they get guided to teach others or even learn from themselves and they have to do it independently and apply it to their own thinking. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

Further, this instructional approach also allows for teacher-student collaborations to develop paragraphs, discuss articles, engage in conversations, sing songs and chants, collaboratively develop students’ academic language and vocabulary, and support students in thinking about their thinking (Lincoln School observation anecdotal record, 2010).

**GLAD Strategies**

All the teachers across the five schools were trained to implement GLAD strategies but Jackson School teachers explained that they could not utilize them because they didn’t have time to do it effectively.

We don’t do very many GLAD strategies anymore simply because we don’t have time and you can’t test on it. Only if we could figure out a way to make GLAD multiple-choice. (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010)

The Jackson School teachers suggested that they put more emphasis on strategies to prepare students for the state tests. Roosevelt and Washington Schools showed evidence of some GLAD strategies being implemented but minimal compared to Kennedy and Lincoln School (Roosevelt and Washington observation anecdotal record, 2010).
For example, the Kennedy and Lincoln classrooms exhibited more evidence of the implementation of GLAD strategies visible than the classrooms in the other schools (Kennedy & Lincoln Observation Anecdotal Record, 2010). Some of the outcomes of the GLAD strategies I observed on the classroom walls included input charts, inquiry charts, narrative input charts, teacher-student collaborative paragraphs, songs and chants tied to the content and concepts, and Farmer in the Dell (Lincoln & Kennedy School observation anecdotal record, 2010). The teachers utilized these strategies during their classroom instruction. Overall the learning environment of these schools promotes student engagement and collaboration. At some of the schools the teachers are trained to implement the GLAD strategies but feel that they don’t have time to utilize the strategies in the classroom, while at other schools the models are strong and consistent with the GLAD process and goals.

_Differentiating Instruction_

Differentiating instruction was another instructional practice that was implemented in all the schools but at different levels of implementation. The most mentioned differentiation strategy was the use of language frames. The language frames were used to differentiate student oral language development and promote collaborative classroom engagement. An example of differentiating with the language frames was seen in a Kennedy fifth grade classroom. Students made inferences with textual evidence about a story they read in class. After modeling, the teacher set the expectation for students to make an inference and discuss it using academic language. The teacher provided the students with language frames to help them engage in this activity (Kennedy
School observation anecdotal record, 2101). At Washington School a sixth grade teacher explained that she utilized the sentence frames to support her students during collaborative group work.

I have all my kids all organized per very specific reasons. Their groups are multi-leveled for when I’m doing whole group so they can help each other. I’m really, really detailed in how I do that…I’ve got high, medium, and low in all the tables so it’s evened out as much as possible. I teach kids how to be leaders and at the same time how to get help from other students. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

Her students also have responsibilities during group work and she tries to engage with her student during whole group instruction by modeling and guiding their learning because it gives the students a sense of belonging in the classroom (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010).

The teachers at Roosevelt, Kennedy, and Lincoln Schools further implemented this strategy. Here teachers stressed metacognition engaging students’ in learning, a process clearly encouraged by the school leadership. The teachers push students to think about their learning. The students have to be able to understand and explain the objectives and the purpose of their learning because they become aware of their learning when they are able to explain what they know. That’s the metacognition (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010).

I also do lots of metacognitive development that enables them to understand different strategies that they can use in order to take charge of their own learning. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)

The teachers engage students in developing their metacognition by using thinking aloud as they modeled strategies for selecting the best multiple-choice answer to a question or word practice problem (Roosevelt School observation anecdotal record, 2010). In grades second through sixth part of their instructional day involves a time for
building academic language. Kennedy teachers do a lot of metacognition with the
students, where they model how to solve problems.

It goes back to, we could say they are simple but sometimes students don’t know,
reading the entire passage, reading the question, reading the instructions. Making
sure that they understand the particular academic vocabulary within the question.
(Kennedy School principal interview, 2010)

A teacher shared that the school has done this for several years and it had shown to be
effective in helping all students know the language of CST testing (Kennedy School
teacher focus group, 2010).

Transferability of Skills

The teachers and principal at Lincoln School explained that they utilized
strategies for the transferability of skills from one language to the other. The concept of
transferring knowledge and skills from one language to another is grounded from the
Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis (Cummins, 2000). This hypothesis is based on the
interdependence of concepts, skills, and linguistic knowledge integrated between the first
and second language. The transferability of skills is designed to support the content and
language development for the native Spanish speakers learning English and for the native
English speakers learning Spanish (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010). The
Dual Language model at Lincoln School allows teachers to model language and content
use in two languages in a very specific manner to support students’ transferability.

It’s the transferability that our reading and writing transfers over so students have
two teachers teaching them the same standard in different languages, working
together, in different ways, different teaching, but it’s the same standard and so
they are being reinforced. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)
The Spanish and English teachers collaborate and decide on specific methods of instruction that they will implement during the lessons in both classrooms. One example of transferability is when the Spanish teacher frontloads conventions and grammar that students will learn in both Spanish and eventually in English. English teachers make connections with cognates. This is significant because in a DL model the students can make connections with language by accessing their prior knowledge in their primary language and making the transference to English. The advantage of utilizing two languages is that it may facilitate in lowering their affective filter in the classroom and help make their learning comprehensible (Krashen, 1992). Students in a transitional bilingual model are at a disadvantage because the opportunity to make the transfer of skills from one language to the other is limited due to the amount of time dedicated to specific English instruction they receive daily.

**English Language Development**

The ELD program was also a source of tension for Washington and Roosevelt Schools. Washington School was going through a reconstruction of its ELD program and Roosevelt School was continuing to build teachers’ capacity toward effective implementation of ELD in the classrooms. The Washington School principal explained that she was trying to put in place structures that would facilitate utilizing all the instructional time.

So then what I did, I had to take from fourth to sixth grade and I separated them. So they had different children so they were forced. They didn’t like it. They fought it, they fought it, they fought it. The teachers now seem to like that grouping so now we’re in to the second year. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)
The principal mentioned that the ELD program was in disarray and her goal this year was to restructure it to make it more effective for English learners despite the teachers’ resistance. The ELD program should be the most effective part of the instructional day at Washington School, particularly, because more than half of student population is English learners and the majority of the instruction in English (Washington School principal interview, 2010). The Roosevelt School principal explained that many of the veteran classroom teachers were unprepared to instruct ELD in their classrooms.

I don’t think most teachers and, not just in this school, I think that many teachers don’t know what ELD is….They’ve gotten GLAD. They’ve gotten productive group work, frames. All those together help in an ELD lesson but it’s teaching just language that’s other than grammar work sheets. That’s the issue. (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010)

She stated that teaching ELD in the classroom needed to improve because some of the teachers seemed to be lost. The tension expressed by the principals regarding the implementation of ELD instruction questions the effectiveness of the implementation and whether the school is showing signs of improving the instruction for English learners. The Castañeda v. Pickard ruling required school districts to (1) provide students with programs based on sound educational theory, (2) implement programs effectively and with adequate resources, and (3) determine whether school districts maintain the same educational approach when evident that it is failing (648 F.2d 989, 5th Circuit, 1981).

Every school except Lincoln School had a designated time for ELD. Classroom teachers taught ELD at Kennedy, Roosevelt, Jackson, and Washington Schools. Roosevelt School included a pullout ELD program for English learners taught by the ELD coach.

I don’t think most teachers and, not just in this school, I think that many teachers don’t know what ELD is….They’ve gotten GLAD. They’ve gotten productive
group work, frames. All those together help in an ELD lesson but it’s teaching just language that’s other than grammar work sheets. That’s the issue. (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010)

The Roosevelt principal stated that many of the veteran teachers at her school were ineffective at teaching ELD. She attributed the academic success of their English learners to the instruction provided by the ELD coach. According to the Washington School principal, the ELD program at her school was in bad shape when she arrived. Teachers decided when they taught ELD and the principal saw that they were not utilizing the instructional time effectively.

I put ELD with the transition, so I did it right on line up time. So the kids finished recess they lined up for ELD class. The teachers didn’t like it. They hated it. (Washington School principal interview, 2010)

She spent her first year establishing a structure for implementation, which included having teachers pick up their students on time from recess.

Neither the principal nor the teachers at Lincoln School mentioned that they had an ELD time. I asked the Lincoln School teachers how they provided appropriate educational access to learning and they explained that the students learn about language all day in two languages.

Two languages intertwine and work together and support each other so that the child learns both languages and becomes a biliterate-bilingual student. In traditional bilingual program the EL students were segregated academically and socially. Here there is an interdependency that is created. The English speakers are dependent on the Spanish speakers to help them in the Spanish class and vice versa. They help each other. It is more collaborative. They are all learners, a community of learners, and everyone depends on each other. (Lincoln School teacher focus group, 2010)

The expectation is that the students work collaborative to support each other in developing two languages. The expectation for teachers is that they work directly with the students with the most need.
It is interesting because we have created also a system that teachers work with them and they are responsible for working with students who are not at grade level expectations. We do bring in support but we bring in support to support the students that are on average, that are at the cusp. But the teacher needs to work with the students that need more instructional support. (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010)

The teachers are held accountable by the principal to meet the instructional needs of every student. According to August and Hakuta (1997), in addition to primary language instruction, important schooling factors for effective instruction for English learners include:

1. supportive school-wide environment leadership that is sensitive to EL students’ needs;
2. “customized” learning environment that meets the particular EL students’ needs;
3. curriculum that incorporates basic and higher order thinking, and explicit skill instruction;
4. opportunities for student-centered learning;
5. systematic student assessment;
6. staff development that includes attention to EL students’ needs; and
7. parent involvement in students’ education

An effective ELD program with properly prepared teachers is an important aspect of a school’s instructional program, particularly in schools with a high percentage of English learners.
No School Left Unaccountable

The study results reinforced the issues and tensions found in the research literature regarding principals and teachers and the mandates set forth through NCLB.

First, teachers and principals recognized that identifying the academic needs of English learners and implementing appropriate instructional practices has been a good thing.

In my opinion, the No Child Left Behind law, even though it has many flaws, has changed the way some teachers view and treat our diverse students. (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010)

Teachers need to know who are the students, what are their literacy and language needs, and develop the appropriate instruction to help them reach their goals. NCLB has set high accountability requirements for school to meet on a yearly basis.

One tension that principals and teachers identified was the sense of urgency for students to show academic achievement at their school (Abernathy, 2007).

The way the school is measured as being successful is through the CST’s and the state API and the federal AYP. The goal is that the students are going to be proficient or advanced on those CSTs. (Kennedy School principal interview, 2010)

Schools need to show that they are meeting the academic needs of all their students, which include the student subgroups. NCLB imposes sanctions and makes the schools’ academic achievement scores public record. The sense of urgency to achieve has pushed schools to practically abandon primary language instruction. This was seen in the reduction of Alternative Bilingual education programs in schools.

NCLB has led to the near destruction of bilingual education at [Jackson]. Since test scores are a driving force behind NCLB, bilingual education classrooms only exist in kinder and first, both of which are not testing grades. (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010)
The teachers at Jackson School believe that the need to improve state tests scores has led Jackson School to offer less primary language instruction up to first grade, thus offering more English instruction. The push for English learners to acquire English proficiency as fast as possible may create *sink or swim* conditions that can lead a substantial number of students to be excluded from the core curriculum (Espinosa & Ochoa, 1992; Nieto, 1992).

A second tension was that NCLB mandates that all students be tested in language arts and math in English (U. S. Department of Education, 2001).

Some teachers have had to dramatically alter their instructional day, to eliminate the arts, social studies, and even science--until the emphasis returns for the 5th grade testing year. I attribute most of this to the context of our community being low-income, and non-native English speakers. In order to fulfill the minimum requirements of NCLB’s proficiency goals, a school like ours has a lot more ground to make up than a school with native speakers. (Roosevelt School teacher focus group, 2010)

The teachers expressed their concern about limiting the students’ instructional opportunities to receive instruction in other content subjects besides language arts and math (Abernathy, 2007; Linn, 2008; Tracey, 2005).

We’re so much student test, test, test, test, that we don’t give the kids a chance to do hands-on, to play games, to do other stuff that we used to do that we don’t have that much time to do right now, but they could actually practice the skills, not only to take a test but to make it their own; to own it and be able to explain to their partner, to be able to use it in the real world. (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)

Teachers feel that they are teaching too many standards in a limited amount of time and are unable to focus on the developmental areas that they feel are beneficial for students. They believe that they are teaching students to be good test takers instead of teaching them to be critical thinkers (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010). Parents from
each school wanted to see their school offer other types of classes and activities for their children.

A third tension was utilizing core curriculum materials that were not aligned to the state standards (Tracey, 2005). As seen at four of the five schools in this study, the Houghton Mifflin language arts adoption teacher’s edition is not aligned to the California state standards and teachers cannot use it to help them develop their lessons. Roosevelt School and Washington School utilize a web-based resource to provide the teachers support in knowing the standards to help them develop lessons.

I can’t use any of the lessons inside for me to do. I got to create my own. The only way I can create my own or have been able to create my own this year is because of Inspect…. But I’m working 10-15 hours every day (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)

This teacher acknowledged that being able to develop her own lessons using a variety of materials allows her to prepare lessons geared towards the needs of her students but that she works a lot of hours to achieve this.

And a final tension involves the pressure imposed on teachers to prepare their students to do well on the state test.

No Child Left Behind uses only punishment or the threat of punishment to change the behaviors of teachers and administers. (Abernathy, 2007, p. 37)

Teacher are uncertain and stressed out because they are accountable for test scores and this makes teachers less willing to be creative and take risks in their classrooms (Abernathy, 2007; Brint & Teele, 2008).

There is a tremendous amount of emphasis placed on testing. A tremendous amount of emphasis placed on the ability to respond to multiple-choice questions, and in that regard, I think that this particular site really conditions the students to be successful in that avenue. (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010)
Jackson School parents can tell that the students and the teachers are pressured (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010).

*Hay puros pretest y los niños ya traen una presión y las maestras traen una presión.* [There are pure pretests and the children feel the pressure and the teachers feel the pressure. (Jackson School parent focus group, 2010)]

Both teacher and parents at Jackson School are particularly concerned about the amount of time students spend testing, practicing, and preparing before and after school.

**Conclusion**

No Child Left Behind has greatly impacted how the five schools in this study establish their language policy, design the curriculum, implement the instruction, and hold themselves accountable. The pressure to meet the API and AYP was expressed by the principals, teachers, and parents, particularly when the students’ academic achievement level is determined by their performance on the CST. The push for students to test well on the CST has led Washington, Jackson, Roosevelt, and Kennedy Schools to reduce the AB program offering less primary language instruction compared to previous years. The pressure of NCLB has also led Washington, Jackson, and Roosevelt Schools to narrow the curriculum to mostly teach the reading, writing, and math standards, thus excluding social studies and science, except in the grades where science is tested. These schools have large English learner populations and it is critical that teachers be prepared to effectively teach English learners in developing a second language. The principals, along with teachers, are responsibility for identifying the teachers’ needs and provide appropriate and meaningful professional development that will enhance their instructional practice and reinforce their attitudes and beliefs towards teaching culturally
and linguistically diverse students. These are some of the tensions that the teachers and principals in these five schools are struggling to negotiate as they continue to meet their academic goals.

Figure 14 illustrates a summary of the Indicators of Effective Conditions for Learning implemented by each of the five schools in this study. The summary chart shows the 18 indicators, identified in Figure 6, and the five schools in which they were being implemented. Lincoln School showed that they implemented all 18 indicators. Kennedy School implemented 13 out of 18 indicators and Roosevelt implemented 10 out of 18 indicators. Lincoln, Kennedy, and Roosevelt emphasized the expectations for student learning. Jackson School implemented 8 out of 18 indicators and did not emphasize any indicators for cultural awareness and diversity. Washington School implemented 8 out of 18 indicators and did not emphasize any indicators for the expectation for student learning. The summary chart shows illustrates in which areas the schools are impacting students and where they need to focus their attention.

The most noticeable trend is the lack of implementation of the indicator for an authentic purpose for learning and student choice. An authentic purpose for learning is focused on outcomes that have a real-life function that often extends beyond the classroom, which may include real audiences and have real purposes (Ruiz et al., 1996). I only observed this practice at Lincoln school where students created projects that they presented to their classmates and parents and the learning was focused on social and global issues dealing with Peace One Day, the earthquake in Haiti, and a green planet.
The teachers at Kennedy, Roosevelt, Jackson and Washington Schools expressed that the pressure to meet achievement goals focused more attention on developing strategies to take the CST and teaching the standards, thus limiting their creativity. Student choice is when students can exercise choice in their learning by choosing writing topics, books, research projects, and thematic cycles (Ruiz et al., 1996). The standards already dictate what teachers are going to teach students and I observed little opportunity for students to do research projects and give input on what they would like to learn. A sixth grade teacher at Jackson School expressed that the students can’t do the ancient civilization...
projects like in previous years. A Washington School teacher stated that her students don’t dictate what she needs to teach, the standards do.

Identifying and defining the instructional practices in schools with the Indicators of Effective Conditions for Learning is one way to determine a school’s effectiveness. The chart in Figure 13 provided a snapshot of the implementation of the indicators for each school as a measure of their effectiveness. The following section will provide a comprehensive comparison of five schools and their effectiveness.

**Comparative Analysis**

The schools were then positioned on the English Learner Educational Access Continuum for each construct in the English Learner Pedagogy and Outcomes Framework in Figure 15. Each school was coded with a specific color and number and is represented on the continuum according to its color and number. Lincoln School is represented on the continuum by the color burgundy (1), Kennedy School is blue (2), Roosevelt School is green (3), Jackson School is orange (4), and Washington is tan (5). The following section will describe the analysis and define each school and how it is represented on the continuum.

**Biliteracy Focus**

The biliteracy focus continuum showed the biggest discrepancy between Lincoln and the other schools. Kennedy, Roosevelt, Jackson, and Washington Schools were to the far left of the continuum showing evidence of a subtractive biliteracy language policy and implementing more English instruction for English learners in the form of SEI and
Mainstream English classrooms. The SEI classroom is structured to teach content by means of English instruction and sheltering techniques to make the instruction understandable (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005). The strategies and techniques that are implemented in the SEI classroom in these schools feature sound instructional strategies for English learners but the nature of all English instruction discourages students from utilizing their native language. The research literature on second language acquisition emphasizes building the students’ primary language to support learning a second language (August & Hakuta, 1997). Hornberger (1991) provides a typology defining the transitional, maintenance and enrichment model of bilingual education. The transitional bilingual model encompasses the characteristics of a language shift from the primary language to the second language, cultural assimilation to the dominant cultural and social incorporation in the larger community (Hornberger, 1991). The early transitional AB classrooms implemented at Kennedy, Jackson, and Roosevelt Schools fall into the transitional bilingual model typology. While they do receive excellent Spanish instruction it is only for a short time and the goal is to support them while they learn English. The AB classrooms are geared for students to gain proficiency in English as soon as possible. Even though Roosevelt and Washington Schools offers more Spanish instruction they maintain a subtractive biliteracy model.

Lincoln School is set most close to the additive biliteracy focus continuum because it provides English and Spanish instruction for its students everyday from kinder through sixth grade. It does not set completely on the dual language side of the continuum because even the Spanish instruction in minimized in the upper grades to give way to more English instruction for English language arts and math.
Figure 15. English Learner Educational Access Continuum
The pressures of NCLB have every school altering their bilingual programs, including Lincoln School. The Dual Language model provides students with a rich primary language experience in Spanish and English, yet this modification to the Dual Language model raises the question—does it then continue being an enrichment model for language development or a maintenance model for maintaining the primary language while learning English? Developing both languages continuously assists English learners to nurture their biculturalism and personal independence (Hornberger, 1991; Darder, 1991). Regardless, the model that is being implemented at Lincoln School is working to provide academic access to English learners as illustrated by demonstrating cultural awareness and diversity, developing biliteracy across the curriculum, using the students’ home language for developing English, and engaging students with challenging lessons (Gonzalez, 2010).

**Value for Learners**

Washington, Jackson, Roosevelt, and Kennedy Schools were identified on the Values for Learners continuum, in Figure 10, the values of meritocracy. The teachers and principals have the best intentions for students and truly want them to be successful, but the educational approach to teaching the students was reflective of a deficit-based perception of the students’ cultural and linguistic background. This means that the school believes that the students could be successful if they become proficient in English and are only taught the standards that they would be tested on the CST. The CST only tests math and language arts, and science in fifth grade.
Educators whom maintain a meritocratic ideology may fall for the myth that non-English speakers and non-white ethnic students are intellectually deficient and will probably not reach the expected achievement goals and expectations (Bartolomé, 2003). Teachers and administrators will say that they look beyond race and ethnicity and teach all students the same. While this may seem like a noble and ethical practice, it may be a dangerous practice that perpetuates a status quo educational practice that maintains culturally and linguistically diverse students to low expectations, limiting their access into the mainstream culture, and denying them the opportunity to develop a sociocultural identity (Darder, 1991; McLaren, 1989). The expectations for student learning manifested with utilizing strategies to answer the correct multiple-choice answer, English proficiency, and high students achievement on the CST. A multicultural education approach toward meeting the educational, sociocultural, and language needs of ethnically diverse students begins with viewing the students’ differences as a positive attribute rather than a limitation (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billing, 1994; Nieto, 2001).

Teachers who are culturally responsive to the needs of their students recognize the differences among their students to appropriately meet their needs (Banks, 2006; Gay, 2000; Sleeter, 2005). Pearl (1990) proposes that knowledge, the guarantee of particular rights, the opportunity to participate with equal power, and equal encouragement are four requirements of democratic education that are needed to combat deficit thinking. It is important for teachers to enact values of equal encouragement toward ethnically and linguistically diverse students and encourage them to take risks, make mistakes, and learn from them. Students who achieve more often than not are more willing to take risks and students who had never taken risks can develop into more secure individuals (Pearl,
Lincoln School has created a school environment where students are held to high expectations and students can take risks in their learning by making the learning accessible and relevant, and challenging students to learn beyond the standards. Teachers who internalize a value of empowerment for their students believe that their students can succeed and be empowered individuals. They are committed to seeing that their students succeed and they take risks to create a positive teacher-student relationship (Gay, 2000). Student participation involves providing active experiences in class, to develop knowledge, reflective understanding, encourage their aspirations and achievements, and be treated as responsible, caring human beings (Shor, 1992). Valuing students’ diversity, cultural pluralism, and multilingualism as a strength is an important aspect in an empowerment approach in education (Banks, 1999; Nieto, 2001). These critical practices and beliefs extend toward an empowering pedagogy that value empowered students.

Lincoln School models most specifically these concepts where they challenge the status quo inequities that culturally and linguistically diverse students face on a daily basis in schools. Lincoln illustrates this by promoting an international perspective in the curriculum, teaching beyond the standards, and valuing students language and culture by preparing all students to be biliterate individuals.

If I was a student I think it would be a great place. Not only am I being challenged academically, I’m also given the opportunity to become biliterate, I’m also given the opportunity to learn about the world and my surroundings, and as a student the impact I can make into the community. (Lincoln School principal interview, 2010)
Standards and Curriculum

Washington, Jackson, and Roosevelt Schools were identified on the Curriculum continuum, in Figure 10, as utilizing a compensatory curriculum approach. Kennedy was identified on the curriculum continuum as utilizing an ethnocentric curriculum approach and Lincoln was identified as utilizing a multicultural curriculum approach.

A compensatory education approach acknowledges a deficit perspective toward students that allegedly are in need of intellectual stimulation that can be repaired through focused school interventions (Pearl, 1997). A compensatory curriculum encompasses a basic-skills curriculum where students are exposed to “instruction on rote, skill-drill exercises which typically emphasize (d) cognitive skills of recognition and recall” with workbooks and worksheets (Anyon, 1997, p. 136). Not only does a compensatory curriculum limit students to a basic type of education, it limits teachers to a basic type of instructional practice that can be referred to as a “teacher-proofed” curriculum. A compensatory approach to curriculum development provides all students with limited access to diversity education where differences are tolerated but not necessarily accepted (Nieto, 1998).

The high-stakes accountability emphasis with NCLB has influenced the five schools in the study to change the instruction focus to meet the state standards and be successful on the CST. Washington, Jackson, and Roosevelt implemented an instructional practice with a narrowed curriculum of math and language arts. The Houghton Mifflin language arts materials were almost unusable and teachers resorted to developing their own lessons, which requires more time, energy, and the capacity to do it effectively. The five schools in this study taught critical thinking strategies that
emphasized finding the correct multiple-choice answer and teachers had to utilize the Gradual Release of Responsibility framework to ensure that they were teaching effectively. The use of worksheets and workbooks were prevalent thus lacking a sense of authentic purpose to learning other than finding the correct answer. The purpose was geared for students to achieve on the CST.

Kennedy School showed evidence of the same curricular approach exhibited by Washington, Jackson, and Roosevelt Schools but the Kennedy School teachers taught an expanded curriculum that integrated social studies and science with the language arts and math. An ethnocentric curriculum dismisses legitimate issue of culture, language, and gender discrimination and fails to include more information regarding the different ethnic groups in the nation. Limiting students to different and various perspectives detracts them from being exposed a wide range of information, thus preventing them to build critical thinking and analysis skills, and reach their own conclusions (Diaz, 2001). The students at Kennedy School were exposed to more of a process to learning, but at a minimal level. The Kennedy School principal explained that the school’s success was evident on how well they students did on the CST. The Kennedy School teachers were frustrated because they felt that the purpose for learning was directly related to the students’ CST achievement and they didn’t think that the students were provided with opportunities to integrate their personal perspectives and experiences into their learning, thus preventing students from developing into critical thinkers and life-long learners

Lincoln showed a multicultural curriculum approach. Lincoln teachers taught beyond the standard and differentiated the instruction to make is accessible to all students. A multicultural curriculum concentrates on incorporating diverse cultural
perspectives, rejecting racism and various forms of discrimination and oppression, and affirming values of cultural pluralism (Gay, 1995; Nieto, 1992). The curriculum included math, language arts, social studies, and science and the curricular themes emphasized topics and issues that impacted the students at school, in their community, and in the world. A multicultural approach to curriculum design incorporated the cultures of diverse learners into the social and academic context of schooling that lead to supporting and promoting the students’ sociocultural identity, language development, learning outcomes, and their personal development (Hollins & Spencer, 1990). Lincoln School demonstrates cultural awareness and diversity of the school community and outside the school community through an authentic purpose for learning, active student participation, and student critical thinking (Gonzalez, 2010).

**Instruction**

Three schools were identified as utilizing a skill-based approach on the instruction continuum in Figure 14. A skills-based approach to instruction instills the same principles of the banking method in that the approach to teaching is based on what the school and teacher deems as necessary for the student because they lack the appropriate cultural capital to be successful in school. The teachers at Washington, Jackson, and Roosevelt Schools stated that they are focused on teaching the students to meet the standards and do well on the CST. One Washington School teacher described the teaching emphasis at her school.

I would say it’s definitely a good place as far as being taught the standards because that’s what we’re completely focused on. So, a great place if you want to be exposed to California state standards because that is our focus. (Washington School teacher focus group, 2010)
Teaching to the standards brings on specific limitation in regards to what teachers need to teach and what students should learn. This brings up the issue is how to teach the students. A banking method instruction entails a teacher driven instructional practice where the students merely learn remedial skills of rote memorization of facts and decoding without paying attention to meaning (Freire, 2001). The goal is to produce a product that shows mastery in a skill without focusing on the process of learning. The Jackson School teachers feel that they are preparing students to take multiple-choice tests.

A tremendous amount of emphasis is placed on the ability to respond to multiple-choice questions, and in that regard, I think that this particular site really conditions the students to be successful in that avenue. (Jackson School teacher focus group, 2010)

The consequences for this intended outcome is relegating students to do more worksheet type of work, thus limiting students to opportunities for an authentic purpose for learning. The teacher may be culturally aware and sensitive to the diverse needs of the students, yet strict curriculum pacing, and clear expectations for high achievement on the standardized tests may hinder their expectations to different the instruction, promote cooperative learning opportunities, and expose students to social issue that may directly and indirectly affect them.

And here we go back to the loss of a culture. Where do you learn from your culture—you get culture? From social studies. We don’t have it. Where do we come back to become a good scientist—to inspire that into the kids, to promote that into the kids, to become a good scientist? We don’t have science. We don’t get to do full science experiments. We don’t get to do until they are in 5th grade because they have to pass the test in 5th grade. But why wait until 5th grade to give all the load to the fifth grade teacher because they have to do good in the test? So that’s, how much is enough? When will NCLB understand that we’re leaving a generation of kids with lack of information, lack of science, lack of social studies, lack of social skills. Social skills! (Kennedy School teacher focus group, 2010)
A student-centered instruction utilizes the students’ cultural capital to develop appropriate lessons and identify students’ strengths to incorporate in the daily instruction. The focus for student learning is on process rather than product. When students can reflect on the process of engagement in their learning they can create and recreate knowledge. In reading, the teacher focuses on meaning first by engaging students on thinking about a story that was read aloud or in small groups. Sleeter and Grant (1988) proposed a few instructional principles that multicultural education experts promote for schools: (1) to view students as motivated learners, capable of learning and understanding at a high academic level, (2) teachers should use the students’ unique learning style and methods to build onto their learning, (3) teachers value the skills, knowledge, and experiences that students bring to school and use it to add on more knowledge, (4) teachers have high and realistic expectations for all students, (5) teachers utilize cooperative learning approaches and structures in the classroom, and (6) teachers assist students in developing and cultivating a positive self-concept for success in school. This approach reinforces the instructional approach implemented at Kennedy and Lincoln Schools. As seen in Figure 13, Kennedy and Lincoln school were identified as implementing the majority if not all of the Indicators of Effective Condition for Learning, including having high expectations for student learning, valuing the student’ social and cultural capital, and providing a safe climate for students to take risks in their learning (Gonzalez, 2010).
Student Outcomes

English learner language and achievement outcomes were examined in the study. The analysis of the student outcomes involved the case study results and the research literature. The student outcomes were reflected in the state’s 2009 CST achievement outcomes for English learners at each school. The percentage of English learners scoring at basic and lower levels determined the placement of each school on the EL achievement continuum. The language outcome levels were originally based on the state English proficiency levels as measured by the CELDT test, but the study did not utilize the CELDT data to measure language outcomes. Instead, the language outcomes reflected the conceptual sociocultural outcomes for language as defined by the schools’ language policy.

The language outcomes for Jackson School and Kennedy School English learners are found at the far left subtractive bilingualism. Conceptually, the students receive a subtractive bilingualism model of language instruction where they develop their English proficiency but will cease to develop their primary language, at school. Roosevelt and Washington School provide at least one year more of primary language instruction for English learners but continue to maintain an early-exit transitional bilingual model. They promote subtractive bilingualism for students. Lincoln promotes bilingualism and biliteracy. Conceptually the students will develop English proficiency and be proficient in Spanish.

Each school’s 2009 CST scores determined the measure of academic achievement for English learners on the continuum. Washington School had 73% of English learners scoring at basic, below basic, and far below basic. Jackson School had 73% of English
learners scoring at basic, below basic, and far below basic and Roosevelt School had 67%. Kennedy School had 57% of English learners scoring at basic, below basic, and far below basic and Lincoln School had 51% of English learners scoring at basic, below basic, and far below basic.

Challenging the current status quo, monolingual accountability system, the measure of success for English learners is lacking an important dimension for true accountability and learning. The CST is a one-dimensional measure of student success and fails to acknowledge student learning in their primary language. Students are assessed in Spanish via the Standards Test in Spanish (STS), and in previous years with the APRENDÁ and SABÉ tests, but it is not clear how these tests are utilized in regards to holding schools accountable to student learning and student success. Schools should be recognized for not only supporting students in reaching English proficiency but for developing students’ cognitive abilities in their primary language.

**Comparative School Effectiveness Report Card**

The Comparative School Effectiveness Summary Report Card in Figure 17 outlines the effectiveness of each school in providing educational access as defined in this study by the Indicators of Effective Conditions for Learning and the English Learner Educational Access Continuum (Gonzalez, 2010). To provide a context of effectiveness, the language policy, language outcomes, and EL achievement outcome constructs were quantified in order to score each school according to the English Learner Educational Access Continuum in Figure 15. As seen in Figure 16, the language policy construct includes five elements on the continuum beginning with mainstream English (1), SEI (2),
early-exit transitional (3), late-exit transitional (4), and dual language (5). The language policy outcomes construct includes four elements on the continuum beginning with monolingualism (1), subtractive bilingualism (2), maintenance bilingualism (3), and biliteracy (4). And the EL achievement outcomes construct includes five elements on the continuum beginning with far below basic (1), below basic, (2), basic (3), proficient (4), and advanced (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Policy</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream English</td>
<td>SEI</td>
<td>Early-exit transitional</td>
<td>Late-exit transitional</td>
<td>Dual language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Outcomes</th>
<th>Monolingualism</th>
<th>Subtractive bilingualism</th>
<th>Maintenance bilingualism</th>
<th>Biliteracy</th>
<th>--</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL Achievement Outcomes</td>
<td>Far below basic</td>
<td>Below basic</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 16. Quantified Continuum Construct Elements*

A cumulative score for each score combines the points for the language policy construct, language outcomes construct, EL achievement outcomes construct, and each indicator implemented in the school. Each indicator is worth one point. The total points combine to 32 points. The Comparative School Effectiveness Report Card in Figure 17 provides a summary of each school and a total score out of a possible 32 points. Washington School was identified with an SEI language policy, subtractive bilingualism language outcomes, basic EL achievement outcomes, and 8 indicators for a total score of 15 points out of 32 total points. Jackson School was identified with an SEI language policy, subtractive bilingualism language outcomes, basic EL achievement outcomes, and 8 indicators implemented for a total score of 15 points out of 32 total points. Roosevelt School was
identified with an SEI language policy, subtractive bilingualism language outcomes, basic EL achievement outcomes, and 10 indicators implemented for a total score of 17 points out of 32 total points. Kennedy School was identified with an SEI language policy, subtractive bilingualism language outcomes, basic EL achievement outcomes, and 13 indicators implemented for a total score of 20 points out of 32 total points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Policy</th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Jackson</th>
<th>Roosevelt</th>
<th>Kennedy</th>
<th>Lincoln</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Outcomes</td>
<td>SEI</td>
<td>SEI</td>
<td>SEI</td>
<td>SEI</td>
<td>DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtract Bilingual</td>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>Biliteracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL Achievement Outcomes</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Awareness and Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates cultural awareness/diversity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop language/biliteracy in curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use home language for developing English</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage students with challenging lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect lessons to students’ lives</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole texts explicit teach skills/strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding learning of content and skills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic purpose for learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning first, followed by form</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-centered</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active participation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students serve as models for peers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and students working together</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations for Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High expectations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe climate to take risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive of all levels and abilities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value community social &amp; cultural capital</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Card:</td>
<td>Total points = 32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17. Comparative School Summary Report Card
Lincoln School was identified with a Dual Language policy, biliteracy language outcomes, proficient EL achievement outcomes, and 18 indicators implemented for a total score of 31 points out of 32 total points. According to the Comparative School Summary Report Card, Lincoln School clearly shows that it is providing educational access for English learners and reaching positive language and achievement goals. Kennedy School implemented more indicators than Roosevelt, Jackson, and Washington but its language policy is a promoting subtractive bilingualism for its large population of Latino English learners. Roosevelt, Jackson and Washington implemented fewer indicators and are implementing subtractive bilingual practices with their language policy.

Summary

This chapter described the comparative analysis of the five schools as defined on the English Learner Educational Access Continuum framework. It also presented the emerging themes that resulted from the analysis. The following chapter will continue with a discussion on the case studies, the findings the resulted from the analysis, and the emerging themes and provide a reexamination of the English Learner Educational Access Continuum framework. The discussion will present the implication for creating policy, designing curriculum and instruction, and measuring student outcomes for English learners as it relates to providing educational access.
 CHAPTER SEVEN

DISCUSSION & IMPLICATIONS

The schools in the study have the immense task of providing educational access for English learners. The teacher and principals truly want the students to learn and achieve and they believe that the students can reach the academic goals and be successful. The tension lies in determining what it means to learn and achieve. The California state standards define what the students need to learn and the CST determines at what level they are achieving. While the CST does provide schools with a gauge of students’ progress of meeting the state standards, it has many limitations in determining whether students are receiving a meaningful educational experience. Schools are held accountable for their students’ achievement solely based on the CST outcomes. No Child Left Behind has proven to be a gift in educating English learners but it has also proven to be a curse. Teachers and principals in the study agreed that the instructional focus on the needs of English learner students is due to NCLB, but NCLB has also impacted the instructional practices at the school that may prove to hinder English learners’ opportunity towards a meaningful education, for example, students valuing their identity, language, and culture. These sociocultural outcomes are aspects that a majority of culturally and linguistically diverse students’ negotiate as part of their educational experience (Darder, 1991)
Conclusions

The schools in the study were highly influenced by the pressure to meet their AYP, particularly since all the schools had high population of English learner and students receiving free and reduced price lunch. According to the research literature, schools with these demographic characteristics typically fail to meet the adequate academic goals for students (Baltodano, 2005; Crawford, 1995; Darling-Hammond, 2004; Gándara & Rumberger, 2007; Gándara et al, 2003; Gándara et al, 2008; Gold, 2006; Guzmán-Johannessen, 2008; Lachat, 1999; Ochoa & Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004). The English Learner Educational Access Continuum (Figure 14) defined the educational access for English learners in the study (Gonzalez, 2010). The schools were placed on the continuum for each construct as a measure of the effectiveness for English learners. Washington, Jackson, Roosevelt, and Kennedy Schools placed language and curriculum limitations on English learners as part of the schools’ goal to have students reach English proficiency and achieve on the CST. Although some of the schools are fairing well, as measured by their API and AYP, they are only measuring the students’ achievement in reading, writing, math, and English proficiency. NCLB and the expectations to meet AYP have influenced Washington, Jackson, Roosevelt, and Kennedy Schools to define academic success as a status quo, monolingual construct, thus ignoring the development of the students’ primary language and the opportunity to be challenged by a rigorous curriculum that allows students to think and question beyond the minimum standard expectations. Lincoln School provided evidence of challenging the status quo, monolingual approach toward educating English learners by challenging students to
develop two languages and providing educational opportunities where students can learn beyond the minimum standard.

**Student Outcomes**

The student outcomes that measure student achievement are relegated to language proficiency on the CELDT and achievement on the CELDT. These outcomes maintain the status quo, monolingual practices in schools. Culturally and linguistically diverse students undergo a more complex educational experience as they negotiate two cultural contexts of home and school and two languages. These are two aspects of the child’s development that are not acknowledged as part of achievement and learning. This continuation of this research needs to extend to encompass more schools and more school districts and include the students’ perspective and voice. Including the students will allow this study to include students’ bicultural outcomes. Examining the sociocultural aspect of teaching and learning along with biliteracy challenge the notion of defining learning outcomes from a monolingual, status quo perspective. That falls along the same lines of challenging the notion of learning outcomes versus achievement outcomes. As of now, the achievement outcomes that measure schools’ accountability is only limited to the CST, which informs the API and AYP. I would argue that achieving on the CST has its merit and is important for students but does not constitute learning.

The English Learner Educational Access Continuum (Figure 14) was utilized in the study as a tool to identify and define the language policy, pedagogical approach, and the student outcomes that schools implement (Gonzalez, 2010). This is an important concept particularly when examining the rigor and intended outcomes for English
learners. This framework is dynamic in the constructs and the defining elements of each construct is subject to change or be modified as the issues of policy, pedagogy, and accountability for English learners continue to be examined and analyzed in providing educational access.

Limitations

The limitations in this study are specific to the methodological approach in examining the data collected at the schools. The first limitation is the relatively short time involved in conducting the interview, focus groups, and observing classrooms. This limited the time spent observing classrooms and the instructional practices to a maximum of three visits of one to three hours in length. I averaged at least one hour in each classroom and visited each classroom two to three times. Spending more time in the classroom and having more visits could have provided a more comprehensive examination of the instructional practices in school with English learners. The limited time spent may affect how the findings in the study are generalized.

The second limitation is specific to my role as a researcher and the professional relationship I had with schools and the participants in this study. I was more familiar with the educational practices at Lincoln due to my previous professional affiliation as a teacher for six years at Lincoln. The tension of objectivity was prevalent during the examination of Lincoln compared to the other school, from which I was less familiar. The challenge was staying true to the methodological approach of the study and examining each school with the purpose set by the frameworks developed and through research literature.
James Banks (1998) discussed the role of the insider-outsider researcher, a concept introduced by Merton (1972), and the quest for authentic voice. Merton (1972) stated that the insider and the outsider are both needed to find seek the truth. Banks (1998) introduced the role of the indigenous-insider as one of four types of cross-cultural researchers.

This individual endorses the unique values, perspectives, behaviors, beliefs, and knowledge of his or her indigenous community and culture and is perceived by people within the community as a legitimate community member who can speak with authority about it. (Banks, 1998, p. 8)

I feel that my role as the researcher in this study resembles the description of an indigenous-insider. This proved to be both a positive and a challenge in conducting this research. The advantage of being an insider was that I had already developed a level of trust with the participants prior to the study and this allowed me complete access to classrooms, student data, and open input on the part of the participants. I felt the schools in the study accepted me as a researcher and allowed me to examine their schools because of my many years of experience as an educator, in general, and my years as educator in the school district. The disadvantage of being an insider, particularly at Lincoln, was being familiar with the school’s educational practices and negotiating which information was based on the data and what was based on my previous knowledge and experiences at the school. The advantage of being an outsider in the schools in this study was that the examination of each school was based on the data collected in the schools. The disadvantage was that at specific schools it was more difficult to gain access to classrooms, teacher participants, parent participants, and sometimes the principal because I feel there was a level of mistrust and skepticism as to why I wanted to examine their school. I believe that the nature of the study helped in legitimizing my purpose in
examining their school and for the most part the school helped in gaining access to the schools.

Another limitation was the omission of the students’ voices. The student perspective would have provided a more comprehensive examination of the schools and how they provide English learners with educational access.

**Recommendations**

The examination of the schools revealed some findings that have been identified in the research literature concerning the education of English learners. This study attempted to not only name and identify the pedagogical practices the provide access for English learners, but also tried to identify how language policy impacts the design and implementation of the pedagogy. These following recommendations are based on the findings from the five schools in the study and will be specific to the stakeholders that can influence and do influence the educational approach implemented in school for English learners.

**Teachers**

Teachers need to always believe in their students’ abilities to learn and be an advocate for their students in the schools. The teachers I met were passionate about teaching and identified the unfair practices that they were engaged in implementing at the schools. The teachers were tense, tired, and at times frustrated about the condition in education, but their heart was still in teaching.
One recommendation is for teachers to be creative within the parameters of teaching to meet the standards and integrate more opportunities to think beyond the standard, make connections to the students lives beyond the classroom, and create authentic purposes for learning that do not directly relate to the CST. That may mean to utilize a variety of curricular materials that extend to more than just the Houghton Mifflin language arts adoptions, especially since it is not aligned to the standards.

My second recommendation is for teachers to be reflective practitioners and take the time to critically reflect on their practice that includes the instruction, the needs of their students, and their attitudes and beliefs about how to best impact their students’ learning. The data from this study revealed that teachers make an impact with students by engaging them in learning. The teachers’ attitudes and instructional practice varied in all each classroom and it depends on the teacher how they deliver and what type of support they provide students before, during, and after the lesson, everyday. The teachers and principals of the schools that were showing higher levels of achievement for English learners spoke more about the importance of differentiating the instruction in their classrooms, implementing strategies to facilitate the students’ transference of skills, and holding themselves accountable for meeting the needs of all students.

My third recommendation is for teachers to maintain a great interest in their students’ academic, language, and cultural development and create the appropriate conditions in the classroom that will benefit their culturally and linguistically diverse students.

These recommendations for teachers are grounded in the research literature for effective pedagogical practices for English learners. While these are important
educational practices that will make a difference for students, teachers need to be supported by their school administrators in terms of professional development, opportunities for teacher collaboration, and encouragement to take risks in the best interest of kids.

**Principals**

The pressure for principals to show achievement at their school is great. That pressure is placed on teachers to prepare students to perform on the CST. In most of the schools I saw the contradictions experienced by the principals in regards to the best way to educate students, how they were educating students, and how they supported the instructional practice in the classrooms. They spoke of valuing the cultural capital of the community, yet some schools limited the opportunity for students to utilize their home language as a tool to help them learn English. They spoke of challenging all their students, including English learners, yet most of the schools were teaching a narrowed curriculum, limited to reading, writing, and math, for the most part. The sense of urgency they faced was in negotiating the instructional practice to meet the goals for the CST.

My first recommendation is to place more trust in teachers and develop a respectful collaboration to meet the expected academic goals. The many teachers are passionate and dedicated to meeting the needs of students and will follow the school’s mission and vision set by the principal. Treating the teachers as professionals and with respect will facilitate creating an environment of accountability and respectful professional collaboration.
My second recommendation is for principals to provide students a full curricular spectrum that includes social studies and science as the daily instruction. This can facilitate the practice of meeting the language arts standards with the content standards, giving English learners access to the content while they develop their language proficiency, and not limiting it to just 30 to 45 minutes of ELD. This would require teachers to be trained to integrate content standards with language arts standards without utilizing more instructional time.

My third recommendation would be to give teachers more autonomy in utilizing materials to complement the school adopted materials and/or compensate for the gaps that exist in the school adopted materials.

My fourth recommendation is to provided teachers with professional development to be able to meet these curricular and instructional goals, particularly in establishing conditions in the classroom where the students have an opportunity to be engaged in their learning.

My fifth recommendation is to provide professional development on cultural and language and culturally relevant pedagogy to better understand their students and to better meet their needs.

My sixth recommendation is to provide Latino English learners with more focused and rigorous primary language instruction for a more extended time to allow students to not only develop English but to maintain their home language and cultural identity.
School District

The school district has a responsibility to support schools, principals, and teachers to provide the most meaningful and nurturing educational experience for English learners. The school district promotes multiliteracy but the language proficiency and curricula design in these schools seems to contradict the district's mission. Almost all the principals in this study felt a sense of urgency to show academic growth in their school and meet AYP goals and that pressure has been placed on the school district. The Jackson principal stated that principals are held accountable for meeting their school’s achievement goals and if they don’t they are replaced (Jackson School principal interview, 2010).

My first recommendation is to provide further professional development to principals and teachers to further develop techniques and strategies to engage students in authentic and challenging learning that will help them develop language proficiency and cognitive abilities.

My second recommendation is for the school district to support the principal in creating a positive and collaborative school community involving parents, for the purpose of knowing the needs of the students and parents.

My third recommendation is for the school district to promote more additive biliteracy models in school communities with high Latino populations. The school district promotes multiliteracy but the majority of the additive biliteracy models are implemented in school with small a smaller percentage of Latino English learner students.
My fourth recommendation is to support schools by adopting materials that are aligned to the state standards and support schools that are utilizing other materials, beyond the state adoption curriculum materials, to develop their units and lessons of study.

State

The state holds schools accountable for meeting the state standards on the CST. As of now the CST in English is the key evaluation measure even though English learners are tested in Spanish with the STS. The majority of the schools in this study were utilizing the Houghton Mifflin language arts adoption but the adoption was more limiting than helpful because it was not aligned to the standards.

My first recommendation is to promote the adoption of language arts materials that are aligned to the state standards.

My second recommendation is to begin measuring English learners Spanish proficiency and holding Dual Language schools in the state accountable for developing biliterate students.

My third recommendation is to support school districts in promoting Dual Language schools in communities with a high percentage of English learners and students receiving free or reduced price lunch.
Implications for Future Research

The results and findings from the study revealed important themes and indicators of schools’ effectiveness for providing access to English learners. The following discussion points are focused on the implication of the themes for policy, accountability, and teacher preparation in teaching English learners.

**Indicators of Effective Conditions for Learning**

This study revealed that schools that maintained a strong emphasis for student engagement in the classroom demonstrated higher English learner achievement gains. The instructional practice that benefits English learners in these schools promoted differentiation, the transference of skills, GLAD Strategies, and collaborative engagement of students. The Indicators of Effective Conditions for Learning framework in Figure 18 outlines the instructional strategies and approaches that benefit English learner achievement and learning (Gonzalez, 2010).

The Indicators of Effective Conditions for Learning framework promotes instructional practices that emphasize (a) cultural awareness and diversity, (b) authentic learning, (c) collaborative learning, and (d) expectations for learning (Gonzalez, 2010). This framework incorporates many pedagogical aspects of teaching and learning that benefit culturally and linguistically diverse students (Banks, et al., 2007; Ruiz, et al., 1996; Tharp, et al., 2000). The examination of the schools revealed that these indicators are being implemented in schools at varying levels of implementation and consistency.
The implications of being able to define the effectiveness of the instructional program in schools with large English learner populations are immensely important from an evaluation aspect. The Comparative School Summary Report Card in Figure 20 provided a clearly insight into how to measure the effectiveness of each school as defined by the Indicators of Effective Conditions for Learning framework and the English Learning Educational Access Continuum (Figure 19).
Figure 19. English Learner Educational Access Continuum
Both of these frameworks can also be utilized as a professional development framework focused on meeting the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students. These school effectiveness frameworks are dynamic and further development of these tools will be required to better inform educators, parents, and policy decision makers. And further examination of the instructional practices presented in this study is needed in schools.
with large and small English learner population, particularly focusing on the collaborative engagement for developing language and cognitive abilities.

**Primary Language Instruction Does Not Impede English Proficiency**

A finding in this study is that extended and rigorous primary language development does not impede students’ English development and achievement levels, as demonstrated by Lincoln School. The argument could be made that Lincoln had a lower percentage of students receiving free or reduced price lunch compared to the other schools at 46%, but that is a considerable percentage, as compared to the other schools in the district with the same API level. The Roosevelt principal and teachers stated that a Dual Language program would not work in their community because the English language levels of the students are too low, but parents have requested such a program (Roosevelt School principal interview, 2010). The school district should be supporting the parents instead of denying them their right to choose.

I argue that providing students the opportunity to learn in two languages is rigorous and challenging in itself. The ideological perspective of administrators, teachers, and parents in Dual Language schools lends itself to promote innovative educational programs and enriching curriculum and instruction for students. Lincoln was a charter school and typically has more fiscal and pedagogical liberties than the other four schools but the teachers at Lincoln that I observed were utilizing many of the strategies and approaches identified in the English Learner Educational Access Continuum in Figure 14. For example, the teachers were developing language and biliteracy across the curriculum in two languages and in social studies and science. The teachers were
engaging students to be active participants by incorporating songs and chants, working in collaborative groups, doing projects, making presentations, and incorporating authentic literature. The teachers were also connecting the lessons to the students’ lives by having students think, discuss, and write about real world issues that concerned peace, gun control, and a green planet. Further research is needed in the area of dual language schools, additive biliteracy, and effective instructional practices for English learners.

Reflection

My work will continue to challenge the inequities in education and further examine the conditions that impact culturally and linguistically diverse students and their families. Many teachers are in the careers because they believe in kids but there is still much work to be done in preparing teachers and providing appropriate opportunities to reflect and grow as an educator. Many of the challenges are found in critically examining the current educational policies and negotiating the tensions to create conditions in schools that provide students with a meaningful education.

This study was important to me on a personal and professional level. Personally, as a biliterate and bicultural Latino man, I have experienced the tensions of adjusting to a White monolingual world while staying true to my Mexican family upbringing that involves language, culture, heritage, and personal history. Every day I am constantly negotiating these tensions in which I interweave between two cultural contexts. Professionally, I believe that the principles of biliteracy and biculturalism in an educational context are key in providing educational access to culturally and linguistically diverse students.
I hope that this study was also important to the participants. I felt that the participants involved in this study were real and relentless in expressing what they felt and do in their classrooms and in their school. The teachers are the ones who make that personal connection with students. The teachers are the ones that make a lasting imprint on students that for many students, stays with them forever. I hope that their participation provided them an opportunity to self-reflect and learn more about their students, their school, and most importantly, themselves. I learned so much about myself as a researcher particularly that I enjoy being in schools and talking with educators and parents about the passion that we all share, which is educating kids.
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APPENDIX A

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Principal/Administrator Interview Questions

1. Is this a good place to be a student? Why? What makes it so?

2. What can I expect to see at your school that promotes learning for English learners?

3. How does the school establish an environment that promotes learning and a sense of belonging for students, parents, and school staff?

4. What are the expectations you set for yourself, teachers, parents and students?

5. What are the teacher expectations for English learners in this school?

6. What are the parent expectations for their children in this school? What are the parent expectations for teachers and administrators?

7. What is the language policy in your school?

8. Regarding proposition 227, what types of alternative programs are offered at this school?

9. Describe the instructional programs that are implemented at this school. How are they effectively implemented to meet the needs of English learners’ literacy/biliteracy development, instructional goals, value for learners, and academic achievement?

10. What was the rationale for selecting this program(s)? What research supports the program implementation?

11. What are the educational and/or instructional goals for English learners at this school?

12. Describe how the school provides appropriate educational access to learning (content, development of language(s), materials, resources—staffing, allocation of funds, etc.) that meets the needs of its diverse student population.

13. Describe how NCLB impact the way this school educates students, and more specifically, English learners?

14. What student outcomes are used to measure English learners’ academic and language (English and/or Spanish) achievement in this school? What other methods or criteria are used to measure student achievement?

15. What indicators guide your process for school accountability?

16. Describe the approach for holding this school (administrator, teachers, students, school staff, parents) accountable for learning?
APPENDIX B

TEACHER FOCUS GROUP PROMPTS
Teacher Focus Group Prompts

1. Is this a good place to be a student? Why? What makes it so?

2. How do you offer the best environment that promotes learning and a sense of belonging for students and parents?

3. What can I expect to see in your classroom/program that promotes learning for English learners and your diverse student population? Access to learning:
   --Academic language (*listening, speaking, reading, writing*)
   --Content (*math, history, science*)
   --Instructional program (*L2 development, L1 development*)
   --Materials (*books*)
   --Resources (*staffing, technology, library*)

4. Describe how NCLB impact the way this school educates students, and more specifically, English learners? How are students’ academic achievement measured at this school?

5. How do parents become involved at this school?
   a. How does this school inform parents?
   b. What information has been shared to parents concerning the education of their children?
   c. What other information should be shared?

6. What indicators guide your process for school accountability?
   a. What has this school done to improve the education of students and the involvement of parents?
   b. What else would you like to see the school do that would improve the education of all students, the quality of the teachers, and the involvement of parents?
APPENDIX C

PARENT FOCUS GROUP PROMPTS
Parent Focus Group Prompts

7. Is this a good place to be a student? Why? What makes it so?

8. What do teachers at this school do to create an environment that promotes a sense of belonging for students and parents?

9. What do teachers at this school do to promote learning for students who are learning English as a second language?
   • Academic language (listening, speaking, reading, writing)
   • Content (math, history, science, etc.)
   • Instructional programs (English development, L1 development)
   • Materials (books, etc.)
   • Resources (staffing, technology, library, facilities, etc.)

10. How are students’ academic achievement measured at this school?

11. Describe how this school provides information to parents.
    a. What information has been shared to parents concerning the education of your children?
    b. What other information should be shared?

12. How do parents become involved at this school?

13. What has this school done to improve the education of students and the involvement of parents?
    a. What else would you like to see this school do that would improve the education of all students, the quality of the teachers, and the involvement of parents?
Grupos de Discusión con Padres de Familia Cuestionario

1. ¿Es este un buen lugar para ser un estudiante? ¿Por qué? ¿Por qué es así?

2. ¿Qué hacen los maestros en esta escuela para crear un ambiente que promueve un sentido de pertenencia para los estudiantes y los padres de familia?

3. ¿Qué hacen los maestros en esta escuela para promover el aprendizaje de los estudiantes que están aprendiendo inglés como segundo idioma?
   - Lenguaje académico (escuchar, hablar, leer, escribir)
   - Contenido (matemáticas, historia, ciencia, etc.)
   - Programas de instrucción académico (desarrollo de inglés, desarrollo de idioma natal)
   - Materials (libros, etc.)
   - Recursos (personal, tecnología, biblioteca, instalaciones, etc.)

4. ¿Cómo se mide el logro académico de los estudiantes en esta escuela?

5. Describa cómo esta escuela proporciona información a los padres de familia.
   a. ¿Qué información ha sido compartido a los padres de familia sobre la educación de sus hijos?
   b. ¿Qué otra información debe ser compartida?

6. ¿Cómo se involucran los padres de familia en esta escuela?

7. ¿Qué ha hecho esta escuela para mejorar la educación de los estudiantes y la participación de los padres de familia?
   a. ¿Qué más le gustaría ver en esta escuela para mejorar la educación de todos los estudiantes, la calidad de los maestros y la participación de los padres de familia.
APPENDIX D

OBSERVATION ANECDOTAL RECORD
Observation Anecdotal Record

Date: _____________  School:_____________________________________  # Students_____
Grade level: ____________  Length of observation: Start:___________  Finish:____________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Observation Notes</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Observations: standards, objectives, goal, schedule, content, material, etc

Gonzalez (2010), Language Policy and Access for English Learners: Pedagogy, Outcomes, and Accountability
APPENDIX E

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION CONTINUUM
Classroom Observation Continuum

Date: __________________  School:_____________________
Grade level: ____________  Length of observation: Start:___________ Finish:___________

**Biliteracy Focus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtractive</th>
<th>Additive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( ) English-only</td>
<td>( ) SEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Early-exit transitional</td>
<td>( ) Late-exit transitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Dual language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) English goal</td>
<td>( ) L1 for English goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) L1 &amp; English goal</td>
<td>( ) Biliteracy goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) L2 instruction</td>
<td>( ) L2 instruct/L1 support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) L1/L2 instruct.</td>
<td>( ) L1 &amp; L2 instruct emphasis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value for Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deficit-based</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( ) Set low expectations</td>
<td>( ) Set high expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) No students will learn</td>
<td>( ) Some will learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Most will learn</td>
<td>( ) All students will learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Disengage students</td>
<td>( ) Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Inclusive of preferred levels and abilities</td>
<td>( ) Inclusive of all levels and abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Stressful classroom climate</td>
<td>( ) Safe classroom climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Exclusive of students’ language/cultural background</td>
<td>( ) Inclusive of students lang/cult. backgr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking method</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( ) Teacher producing together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Deny students’ ideas/experience</td>
<td>( ) Acknowledge ideas/experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Teacher explanation modeling</td>
<td>( ) Teacher Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Individual student work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) One-size-fits all approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Focus on skills before meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Emphasis on activity process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Pre-generated lessons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Connect learning to test/quiz/assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Lecture conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Curriculum

( ) Knowledge ( ) Comprehension/Application ( ) Analysis/Synthesis ( ) Evaluation

( ) Worksheets/skills-based ( ) Pre-packaged program ( ) Authentic multicultural content/materials

( ) Subject focused content ( ) Literacy developed across content ( ) Biliteracy developed across content

( ) Meets teacher’s needs ( ) Meets school’s needs ( ) Meets students’ needs

( ) Teach to status quo ( ) Teach to teacher’s strengths ( ) Teach to students’ strengths

Notes:

Gonzalez, 2010, Language Policy and Access for English Learners: Pedagogy, Outcomes and Accountability, adapted from Ruben W. Espinoza (2003), Teaching and Learning Form
APPENDIX F

TEACHER AND PARENT COVER LETTERS
Dear Teachers,

My name is Gustavo Gonzalez, a doctoral student at San Diego State University and Claremont Graduate University. I am conducting research for my dissertation, titled: *Language Policy and Access for English Learners: Pedagogy, Outcomes, and Accountability*. I am interested in conducting part of my research at your school and I ask for your support and invite you to participate in a focus group.

My research will examine how schools have used language policy to inform the implementation of school programs and instruction and how schools provide educational access to English learners. The language of instruction, the expectations for students, and instructional methods for English learners are key elements that should be considered for educating English learners.

Many of the students in our schools speak a language other than English at home and the majority of them are Spanish speakers. Although English learners have been showing improvement in achievement over the past few years, considerable gains are still needed in closing the achievement gap. Schools that have been successful in demonstrating academic and language growth for English learners have provided a variety of effective instructional programs, high teacher quality, and responsible accountability for student achievement.

Understanding how language policy informs the selection and implementation of programs for English learners can lead to more effective methods for instructional implementation and school accountability. Identifying effective teaching elements that positively impact English learner outcomes can lead to developing effective professional development opportunities for teachers, administrators, and school staff. Identifying schools’ characteristics that are beneficial or detrimental to English learner outcomes can assist administrators in creating language policies that promote access and achievement for all students.

This research involves interviewing the principal, conducting focus groups with teachers and parents, and observing the school and selected classrooms. I invite you to volunteer to participate in a focus group with other teachers at your school. If you are interested in participating in the focus group please call me or send me an email message. Thank you for your attention and support.

Best regards,

Gustavo Gonzalez  
Doctoral Student  
San Diego State University/  
Claremont Graduate University  
(858) 361-4455  
gonzaleg07@yahoo.com
Dear Parent,

My name is Gustavo Gonzalez, a doctoral student at San Diego State University and Claremont Graduate University. I am conducting a research study for my dissertation, titled: Language Policy and Access for English Learners: Pedagogy, Outcomes, and Accountability. I am interested in conducting part of my research study at your school. I ask for your support and invite you to participate in a discussion group.

My research study will look at how schools have selected their school programs, how they teach students, and how they have provided students that are learning English with access to the main academic subjects. Knowing the teaching methods that positively affect the results for students that are learning English help in preparing teachers, principals and school staff. Knowing schools’ characteristics that have positive or negative student results can help principals in selecting better school programs that promote access and achievement for all students.

This research study will include the participation of parents. I invite you to volunteer to participate in a group discussion with other parents. In the group discussion you will talk about what your child’s school does to provide students with a good education. This is not a Chula Vista Elementary School District Activity.

Thank you for your attention and support.

Best regards,

Gustavo Gonzalez
Doctoral Student
San Diego State University/
Claremont Graduate University
(858) 361-4455
gonzaleg07@yahoo.com

If you are interested in participating in the group discussion please call me or send me an email message or return this bottom portion in the attached envelope to your child’s teachers. Please include (1) your name, (2) name of the school, (3) your telephone number, (4) your email address, and (5) the days and times that you are able to meet for the discussion group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mondays</th>
<th>Tuesdays</th>
<th>Wednesdays</th>
<th>Thursdays</th>
<th>Fridays</th>
<th>Saturdays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 12:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 pm – 3:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 pm – 6:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 pm – 9:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Name: ___________________________  2. School: ___________________________
3. Telephone number: ___________________________  4. Email address: ___________________________
Estimado padre de familia:

Mi nombre es Gustavo Gonzalez, un estudiante de doctorado en la Universidad Estatal de San Diego y la Universidad Graduado de Claremont. Estoy realizando un estudio de investigación para mi tesis, titulado: \textit{Poliza lingüística y el acceso para los estudiantes aprendiendo inglés: Pedagogía, resultados y rendición de cuentas}. Estoy interesado en la realización de parte de mi estudio de investigación en su escuela y les pido su apoyo y los invito a participar en un grupo de discusión.

Mi estudio de investigación analizará cómo las escuelas han seleccionado a los programas escolares, cómo enseñan a los estudiantes y cómo se han proveído el acceso a las materias académicas principales a los estudiantes que están aprendiendo inglés. Conocer los métodos de enseñanza que influyan positivamente en los resultados para los estudiantes que están aprendiendo inglés ayuda en la preparación de maestros, directores y personal de la escuela. Conocer las características de las escuelas que tienen resultados positivos o negativos puede ayudar a los directores en la selección de mejores programas escolares que promuevan el acceso y el logro de los estudiantes.

Este estudio de investigación incluye la participación de padres de familia. Los invito a participar voluntariamente en una discusión de grupo con otros padres de familia. En la discusión del grupo hablarán sobre lo que la escuela de su hijo/a hace para proveerle a los estudiantes una buena educación. Esto no es una actividad del Distrito Escolar de Chula Vista.

Gracias por su atención y apoyo.

Saludos cordiales,

Gustavo Gonzalez
Estudiante Doctoral
Universidad Estatal de San Diego/
Universidad Graduado de Claremont
(858) 361-4455
gonzaleg07@yahoo.com

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Si usted está interesado en participar en la discusión de grupo por favor llámeme o envíe un mensaje de correo electrónico o entregue esta parte de abajo con sus datos en el sobre adjunto al maestro/a de su hijo/a. Por favor incluye (1) su nombre, (2) nombre de la escuelas, (3) su número de teléfono, (4) su correo electrónico y (5) los días de la semana y el horario que es capaz de asistir la discusión de grupo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Los lunes</th>
<th>Los martes</th>
<th>Los miércoles</th>
<th>Los jueves</th>
<th>Los viernes</th>
<th>Los sábados</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 12:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 pm – 3:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 pm – 6:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 pm – 9:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Nombre: 2. Escuela: 
3. Número telefónico: 4. Correo electrónico:
APPENDIX G

CONSENT FORMS
San Diego State University
Consent to Act as a Research Subject
Language Policy and Access for English Learners: Pedagogy, Outcomes, and Accountability

Principal Investigator
Gustavo Gonzalez
San Diego State University/Claremont Graduate University

Faculty Advisor
Dr. Karen Cadiero-Kaplan, PhD
Chair, Department of Policy Studies in Language and Cross-cultural Education
San Diego State University

Research Purpose
You are invited to participate in a student initiated dissertation research study. This research study will examine the language policy and pedagogy in schools for educating English learners and how it impacts their language and achievement outcomes. The following pedagogical elements will be examined: (1) teacher’s value for students, (2) curriculum, and (3) instruction. The findings will be used to help districts, schools, and teachers create policies and professional development that support teachers in effectively meeting the needs of all students. The goal is to identify the instructional elements that contribute to effectively or ineffectively educating English learners in reaching their language and academic achievement goals.

Description of the Research
This study is comprised of a series of school-site visits. During the first visit, the principal will be asked to participate in a one-hour audio recorded interview regarding the school academic programs, teacher instructional practices, and policies in place for the students they serve. Teachers (4–8) will be asked to participate in a one-hour audio recorded focus group regarding the school academic programs, their classroom practices, and policies in place for their students. Parents (4–8) will be asked to participate in a one-hour audio taped recorded group regarding the school academic programs, classroom practices, and policies in place for their children at the school. Site visits will also include classroom observations during which time data will be collected regarding instruction, student engagement, and the classroom environment. Observation data will be gathered through the use of field notes. Schools will be asked to provide CST language arts scores and APREnda, SABE, and/or STS language arts test scores.

Principal/Administrator Participation
Upon consent, you will be interviewed and asked a series of questions regarding your school’s academic programs, teacher instructional practices, and policies for the students you serve. The interview will last about 60 minutes an no more than 90 minutes. You will also be asked to provide a map of the school or to orient the researcher with the school site. A follow-up meeting will be requested to answer any questions the researcher may
have and/or to provide any clarification concerning the interview and school observations. This meeting will not exceed 60 minutes.

**Risks or Discomforts**
While the nature of the interview questions you will be asked is not inherently personal, only share what you feel comfortable sharing and if any time you begin to feel uncomfortable about responding to a question you may discontinue participation, either temporarily or permanently.
You should be aware that the information you provide may be made public and may be published.

**Benefits**
By participating in this study, you may be contributing to the improvement of schools that service English learners. There is no direct benefit to you for participating in this study.

**Confidentiality/Privacy**
Confidentiality will be maintained to the extent of the law. Your identity will not be revealed to anyone without your written consent and pseudonyms will be used to further protect your identity. The audio recording, notes, records of this study will be kept private. Research records, notes, and audio recordings will be kept in a locked file; only the principal investigator and faculty advisor will have access to the original records. The interview will be audio recorded and the audio recordings will be used for the sole purpose of gathering accurate information for this research study. You will be able to review and edit the audio recordings prior to any publication. No copies of audio recordings will be made public without your written permission, and they would only be available for educational or research purposes.

**Incentives to Participate**
You will not be paid to participate and there are no costs to participate in this research study.

**Voluntary Nature of Participation**
Participation in this research study is voluntary. Your choice of whether or not to participate will not influence your future relations with the Chula Vista Elementary School District or with this researcher. Your choice of whether or not to participate will not influence your future relations with San Diego State University. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to stop your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are allowed.

**Questions about the Study**
If you have any questions about the research now, please ask. If you have questions later about the research you may contact Gustavo Gonzalez, at (858) 361-4455 or email: gonzaleg07@yahoo.com. You can also contact my faculty advisor, Karen Cadiero-Kaplan at (619) 594-4994 or email: kcadiero@mail.sdsu.edu.
If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact the Division of Research Affairs San Diego State University (619) 594-6622 or email: irb@mail.sdsu.edu.

Consent to Participate
The San Diego State University Institutional Review Board has approved this consent form, as signified by the Board’s stamp. The Consent form must be reviewed annually and expires on the date indicated on the stamp.

Your signature below indicates that you have read the information in this document and have had a chance to ask any questions you have about the research study. Your signature also indicates that you agreed to participate in this study and have been told that you can change your mind and withdraw your consent to participate at any time. You have been given a copy of this consent form. You have been told that by signing this consent form you are not giving up any of your legal rights.

____________________________________
Name of Participant (please print)

____________________________________
Signature of Participant

__________________________
Date

____________________________________
Signature of Investigator

__________________________
Date
Research Purpose
You are invited to participate in a student initiated dissertation research study. This research study will examine the language policy and pedagogy in schools for educating English learners and how it impacts their language and achievement outcomes. The following pedagogical elements will be examined: (1) teacher’s value for students, (2) curriculum, and (3) instruction. The findings will be used to help districts, schools, and teachers create policies and professional development that support teachers in effectively meeting the needs of all students. The goal is to identify the instructional elements that contribute to effectively or ineffectively educating English learners in reaching their language and academic achievement goals.

Description of the Research
This study is comprised of a series of school-site visits. During the first visit, the principal will be asked to participate in a one-hour audio recorded interview regarding the school academic programs, teacher instructional practices, and policies in place for the students they serve. Teachers (4–8) will be asked to participate in a one-hour audio recorded focus group regarding the school academic programs, their classroom practices, and policies in place for their students. Parents (4–8) will be asked to participate in a one-hour audio taped recorded group regarding the school academic programs, classroom practices, and policies in place for their children at the school. Site visits will also include classroom observations during which time data will be collected regarding instruction, student engagement, and the classroom environment. Observation data will be gathered through the use of field notes. Schools will be asked to provide CST language arts scores and APRENDA, SABE, and/or STS language arts test scores.

Teacher Participation
Upon consent, you will participate in a focus group and given prompts to discuss regarding your school’s academic programs, your classroom practices, and policies in place for your students. The focus will consist of 4 to 8 third through sixth grade teachers that have provide instruction to English learners. The focus group will last no more than 60 minutes. You will be asked to give your consent to observe your classroom during
your instructional time. The researcher will be specifically observing the classroom environment (clean, comfortable, safe, evidence of student work), value for students (inclusive of levels/abilities, care for students, expectations of students), instruction (language, strategies, approaches), curriculum (challenging, culturally appropriate, authentic, grade level appropriate) and evaluation (observation, anecdotal, student work, reading inventory, portfolios). The observations will last from one hour to three hours per visit. More than one visit may be required. The researcher may ask to have a follow up meeting with you following the observation lasting 30 minutes and no more than 60 minutes.

**Risks or Discomforts**
While the nature of the focus group prompts you will be asked is not inherently personal, only disclose information and opinions that you feel comfortable with others knowing and if any time you begin to feel uncomfortable about responding to a question you may discontinue participation, either temporarily or permanently. You should be aware that the information you provide may be made public and may be published.

**Benefits**
By participating in this study, you may be contributing to the improvement of schools that service English learners. There is no direct benefit to you for participating in this study.

**Confidentiality/Privacy**
Confidentiality will be maintained to the extent of the law. Your identity will not be revealed to anyone without your written consent and pseudonyms will be used to further protect your identity. The audio recording, notes, records of this study will be kept private. Research records, notes, and audio recordings will be kept in a locked file; only the principal investigator and faculty advisor will have access to the original records. The focus group will be audio recorded and the audio recordings will be used for the sole purpose of gathering accurate information for this research study. You will be able to review and edit the audio recordings prior to any publication. No copies of audio recordings will be made public without your written permission, and they would only be available for educational or research purposes.

**Incentives to Participate**
You will not be paid to participate and there are no costs to participate in this research study.

**Voluntary Nature of Participation**
Participation in this research study is voluntary. Your choice of whether or not to participate will not influence your future relations with the Chula Vista Elementary School District or with this researcher. Your choice of whether or not to participate will not influence your future relations with San Diego State University. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to stop your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are allowed.
Questions about the Study
If you have any questions about the research now, please ask. If you have questions later about the research you may contact Gustavo Gonzalez, at (858) 361-4455 or email: gonzaleg07@yahoo.com. You can also contact my faculty advisor, Karen Cadiero-Kaplan at (619) 594-4994 or email: kcadiero@mail.sdsu.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact the Division of Research Affairs San Diego State University (619) 594-6622 or email: irb@mail.sdsu.edu.

Consent to Participate
The San Diego State University Institutional Review Board has approved this consent form, as signified by the Board’s stamp. The Consent form must be reviewed annually and expires on the date indicated on the stamp.

Your signature below indicates that you have read the information in this document and have had a chance to ask any questions you have about the research study. Your signature also indicates that you agreed to participate in this study and have been told that you can change your mind and withdraw your consent to participate at any time. You have been given a copy of this consent form. You have been told that by signing this consent form you are not giving up any of your legal rights.

___________________________________________________________________________
Name of Participant (please print)

__________________________  ______________________
Signature of Participant        Date

__________________________  ______________________
Signature of Investigator        Date
San Diego State University
Consent to Act as a Research Subject
Language Policy and Access for English Learners: Pedagogy, Outcomes, and Accountability

Principal Investigator
Gustavo Gonzalez
San Diego State University/Claremont Graduate University

Faculty Advisor
Dr. Karen Cadiero-Kaplan, PhD
Chair, Department of Policy Studies in Language and Cross-cultural Education
San Diego State University

Research Purpose
You are invited to participate in a student initiated dissertation research study. This research study will examine the language policy and pedagogy in schools for educating English learners and how it impacts their language and achievement outcomes. The following pedagogical elements will be examined: (1) teacher’s value for students, (2) curriculum, and (3) instruction. The findings will be used to help districts, schools, and teachers create policies and professional development that support teachers in effectively meeting the needs of all students. The goal is to identify the instructional elements that contribute to effectively or ineffectively educating English learners in reaching their language and academic achievement goals.

Description of the Research
This study is comprised of a series of school-site visits. During the first visit, the principal will be asked to participate in a one-hour audio recorded interview regarding the school academic programs, teacher instructional practices, and policies in place for the students they serve. Teachers (4–8) will be asked to participate in a one-hour audio recorded focus group regarding the school academic programs, their classroom practices, and policies in place for their students. Parents (4–8) will be asked to participate in a one-hour audio taped recorded group regarding the school academic programs, classroom practices, and policies in place for their children at the school. Site visits will also include classroom observations during which time data will be collected regarding instruction, student engagement, and the classroom environment. Observation data will be gathered through the use of field notes. Schools will be asked to provide CST language arts scores and APRENDA, SABE, and/or STS language arts test scores.

Parent Participation
With your permission, you will participate in a group discussion and be given topics to discuss about the programs the school offers, how the teachers teach students, and what the school teaches students. The group discussion will have a group of 4 to 8 parents. The group discussion will last no more than one hour.
Risks or Discomforts
While the nature of the focus group prompts you will be asked is not inherently personal, only share what you feel comfortable sharing and if any time you begin to feel uncomfortable about responding to a question you may discontinue participation, either temporarily or permanently. You should be aware that the information you provide may be made public and may be published.

Benefits
By participating in this study, you may be contributing to the improvement of schools that service English learners. There is no direct benefit to you for participating in this study.

Confidentiality/Privacy
Confidentiality will be maintained to the extent of the law. Your identity will not be revealed to anyone without your written consent and pseudonyms will be used to further protect your identity. The audio recording, notes, records of this study will be kept private. Research records, notes, and audio recordings will be kept in a locked file; only the principal investigator and faculty advisor will have access to the original records. The group discussion will be audio recorded and the audio recordings will be used for the sole purpose of gathering accurate information for this research study. You will be able to review and edit the audio recordings prior to any publication. No copies of audio recordings will be made public without your written permission, and they would only be available for educational or research purposes.

Incentives to Participate
You will not be paid to participate and there are no costs to participate in this research study.

Voluntary Nature of Participation
Participation in this research study is voluntary. Your choice of whether or not to participate will not influence your future relations with the Chula Vista Elementary School District or with this researcher. Your choice of whether or not to participate will not influence your future relations with San Diego State University. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to stop your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are allowed.

Questions about the Study
If you have any questions about the research now, please ask. If you have questions later about the research you may contact Gustavo Gonzalez at (858) 361-4455 or email: gonzaleg07@yahoo.com. You can also contact my faculty advisor, Karen Cadiero-Kaplan at (619) 594-4994 or email: kcadiero@mail.sdsu.edu.
If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact the Division of Research Affairs San Diego State University (619) 594-6622 or email: irb@mail.sdsu.edu.

**Consent to Participate**
The San Diego State University Institutional Review Board has approved this consent form, as signified by the Board’s stamp. The Consent form must be reviewed annually and expires on the date indicated on the stamp.

Your signature below indicates that you have read the information in this document and have had a chance to ask any questions you have about the research study. Your signature also indicates that you agreed to participate in this study and have been told that you can change your mind and withdraw your consent to participate at any time. You have been given a copy of this consent form. You have been told that by signing this consent form you are not giving up any of your legal rights.

____________________________________
Name of Participant (please print)

____________________________________  ______
Signature of Participant                      Date

____________________________________
Signature of Investigator                      Date
Universidad Estatal de San Diego
Consentimiento a Actuar Cómo Tema de la Investigación
Póliza de Idioma y Acceso para Estudiantes Aprendiendo Inglés como Segunda Idioma: Pedagogía, Resultados y Responsabilidad

Investigador Principal
Gustavo Gonzalez
Universidad Estatal de San Diego/ University Graduado de Claremont

Consejera de la Facultad
Dr. Karen Cadiero-Kaplan, PhD
Departamento de Estudio de Póliza en Lenguaje y Educación Intercultural
Universidad Estatal de San Diego

Propósito de la Investigación
Usted está invitado/a a participar en un estudiante iniciado estudio de investigación de tesis. Este estudio de investigación examinará cómo deciden las escuelas a enseñarles a los estudiantes que están aprendiendo inglés y cómo afecta a la forma en que los alumnos aprenden inglés (y/o otros idiomas), la lectura, la escritura y otras materias escolares. Este estudio de investigación examinará (1) cómo los maestros valoran a los estudiantes, (2) qué les enseñan los maestros a los estudiantes y (3) cómo los maestros les enseñan a los estudiantes. Los resultados de este estudio de investigación se usarán para ayudar distritos escolares, escuelas y maestros encontrar maneras para mejorar enseñar todos los estudiantes y y encontrar maneras para mejorar preparar maestros a enseñar más eficazmente. El objetivo es identificar las mejores o menos favorables formas para enseñar a los estudiantes que están aprendiendo inglés y están tratando de llegar a su idioma y los objetivos de rendimiento académico.

Descripción del Estudio de Investigación
Su escuela será visitada durante este estudio de investigación. Durante la primera visita, se le pedirá al director/a que participe una entrevista de una hora de duración que será audio grabada. El director/a se le preguntará sobre los programas que la escuela ofrece a los estudiantes, cómo los maestros les enseñan a los estudiantes, y lo que la escuela enseña a los estudiantes. Los maestros serán invitados a participar en una discusión de grupo de una hora de duración que será audio grabado para hablar sobre los programas que la escuela ofrece a los estudiantes, cómo los maestros les enseñan a los estudiantes, y lo que los maestros enseñan a sus estudiantes. Los padres de familia serán invitados a participar en una discusión de grupos de una hora de duración que será audio grabado para hablar sobre los programas que la escuela ofrece a los estudiantes, cómo los maestros les enseñan a los estudiantes y lo que la escuela enseña a sus hijos. También durante las visitas a la escuela se llamará a cabo observaciones en las aulas y se apuntará datos importantes que muestra cómo los maestros enseñan, que enseñan y que aprenden los estudiantes. Se le pedirá a la escuela los resultados estudiantil en lecto-escritura de los exámenes estatales (California Standards Test-CST) en inglés y en español.
Participación de Padres de Familia
Con su permiso, usted participará en una discusión de grupo y se le dará temas para discutir sobre los programas que la escuela ofrece a los estudiantes, cómo los maestros enseñan a los estudiantes y lo que la escuela enseña a los estudiantes. La discusión de grupo tendrá un grupo de 4 a 8 padres de familia. La discusión de grupo tendrá una duración de no más de una hora.

Riesgos o Molestias
Aunque el tipo de temas que se le pedirá a discutir en la discusión de grupo no es necesariamente personal, sólo discute y comparte la información y opiniones que usted se siente a gusto compartir con otras personas en el grupo y si en cualquier momento que empieza a sentirse incómoda sobre cómo responder a una pregunta usted puede interrumpir su participación, ya sea temporal o permanentemente. Usted debe saber que la información que usted proporcione puede ser compartida con el público y puede ser publicada en un artículo o libro.

Beneficios
Al participar en este estudio de investigación, puede ayudar en la mejora de las escuelas que enseñan a los estudiantes que están aprendiendo inglés. No hay ningún beneficio directo para usted en participar en este estudio de investigación.

Confidencialidad/Privacidad
Su privacidad se mantendrá en la medida de la ley. Su nombre y cualquier descripción de su ser no se hará público sin su permiso por escrito y un nombre falso será utilizado para proteger aún más su identidad. Las grabaciones de audio, notas y registros de este estudio de investigación se mantendrá en privado. Registros de la investigación, las notas y grabaciones de audio se guardarán en un archivo bloqueado; solo el investigador principal y la consejera de la facultad tendrán acceso a los documentos originales. Se audio grabará las discusión de grupo y las grabaciones de audio se usaran con el único propósito de conseguir información precisa para este estudio de investigación. Usted podrá revisar y editar las grabaciones de audio antes de cualquier publicación. Ninguna copia de las grabaciones de audio se hará público sin su permiso por escrito, y que sólo estaría disponible para fines educativos o de investigación.

Incentivos para la Participación
Usted no tendrá que pagar para participar y no hay costos para participar en este estudio de investigación.

Participación Voluntaria
La participación en la discusión de grupo es voluntario. Su elección de si desea o no participar no influirá en sus relaciones futuras con el distrito escolar de Chula Vista o con este investigador. Su elección de si desea o no participar no influirá en sus relaciones futuras con la Universidad Estatal de San Diego. Si usted decide participar en este estudio de investigación, usted es libre de retirar su consentimiento y suspender su participación en cualquier momento sin consecuencia or pérdida de beneficios a los que se permite usted.
**Preguntas sobre el Estudio de Investigación**
Si usted tiene alguna pregunta sobre esta investigación, por favor pregunte. Si después tiene alguna pregunta sobre esta investigación, puede comunicarse Gustavo Gonzalez a (858) 361-4455 o por correo electrónico: gonzaleg07@yahoo.com. También puede comunicarse con mi consejera de facultad, Karen Cadiero-Kaplan, a (619) 594-4994 o por correo electrónico: kcadiero@mail.sdsu.edu.

Si tiene alguna pregunta sobre sus derechos como participante en este estudio, puede comunicarse con Division of Research Affairs San Diego State University (619) 594-6622 o correo electrónico: irb@mail.sdsu.edu.

**Consentimiento para Participar**
El San Diego University Institutional Review Board ha aprobado este formulario de consentimiento, como indica el sello de la Junta. El formulario de consentimiento debe ser revisada cada año y expira en la fecha indicada en el sello.

Su firma indica que usted ha leído la información en este documento y han tenido la oportunidad de hacer cualquier pregunta que tenga sobre el estudio de investigación. Su firma también indica que está de acuerdo en participar en este estudio de investigación y le han dicho que usted puede cambiar de opinión y retirar su permiso para participar en cualquier momento. Usted ha recibido una copia de este formulario de consentimiento. Usted ha dicho que al firmar este formulario de consentimiento que no renunciamos a ninguno de sus derechos legales.

________________________________________________________________________
Nombre de Participante (en letra de molde)

________________________________________________________________________
Firma de Participante  Fecha

________________________________________________________________________
Firma de Investigador  Fecha