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ABSTRACT

Leadership Practice in Elementary School Dual Language Programs: A Collective Case Study

by

Joanie K. Monroy

Dr. James R. Crawford, Examination Committee Chair
Associate Professor of Educational Leadership
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Research in effective programming for English language learners has demonstrated the efficacy of dual language education as a model for closing persistent achievement gaps for this growing population of students. With goals of high academic achievement, linguistic proficiency in two languages, and cross-cultural proficiency, dual language education is an enrichment model of education that eschews the deficit thinking often associated with language-minority students. Based on the promise of enriched education for all participants, the number of dual language programs is increasing nationwide. As districts across the United States plan for the implementation of dual language programs, identifying effective leadership practices for sustaining these programs over time is critical to the strategic deployment of human and fiscal resources.

This collective case study examines best practices in dual language programs from a leadership perspective, with a focus on transformational and transformative leadership theories. District level policies and practices are discussed as they relate to the support of dual language programs over time.
School level leadership practices are examined in the context of best practices in
dual language education as they integrate with concepts of transformational and
transformative leadership paradigms.

Findings indicated that the actions of district leaders were crucial to the
sustained implementation of dual language programs, as they supported the
work of school leaders in five categories of leadership practice: vision, goals and
priorities, high performance expectations, allocation of resources, and
collaboration and shared decision making. Without the support of district
leadership in these areas, school leaders struggled to recruit and retain qualified
teachers, and minimum expectations for program design and implementation
were not fulfilled. Written policies were not followed, and consistent, on-going
professional development was not provided for dual language teachers or school
leaders. Because these essential components were missing, the promise dual
language programs hold for increasing student achievement could not be
realized.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation for my committee. Special thanks to Dr. James Crawford, my committee chair, for endless meetings and discussions. His way of seeing the world is like no other. Thanks to Dr. Teresa Jordan, who helped refine my thoughts and taught me to find absolutely everything in the library. Her love of language is inspirational. Thanks to Dr. Gene Hall, whose work on organizational change influences my daily decisions as an educational leader. There is a special place in my heart for Dr. Martha Young, who supervised my student teaching so many years ago and introduced me to the theories of language acquisition.

I would also like to thank the people who supported me, and without whose help I would not have been able to complete this work. To Dr. Leo Gómez, mentor and expert in dual language enrichment education, endless gratitude for treating me like a colleague. My appreciation and respect to Dr. Noni Mendoza-Reis, who challenged me to look in the mirror and question the assumptions of privilege. Thanks to Dr. Kelly Sturdy, who read my drafts, asked the hard questions, and kept reminding me to jump through the hoops. Thanks to Mr. Pat Skorkowsky, who sponsored my study and helped create time for me to work. Special thanks and appreciation to Dr. Marjorie Conner, who took my phone calls, read my work a thousand times, and would not let me quit until the end. You are more than a friend.

Finally, I would like to thank my family. My husband Adolfo has informed my understanding of language learning from the day I met him in a language school.
in Antigua, Guatemala. His view of politics and world issues keep me balanced, and his constant support keep me moving forward. My precious children, Pam, Derek, and Julissa, have supported me when it cost them much. My mother Eula Ray, who left too soon, is the voice in my head saying, “I always knew you could do it!” My father, John Ray, has loved me and believed in me every second of my life. Thank you, all of you. This work belongs to you.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ......................................................................................................................... iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ........................................................................................................ v

LIST OF TABLES .................................................................................................................. xii

LIST OF FIGURES ............................................................................................................... xiii

CHAPTER 1     INTRODUCTION .................................................................................. 1

  Problem Statement .......................................................................................................... 5

  Purpose of Study .............................................................................................................. 6

  Conceptual Framework .................................................................................................. 7

  Research Questions ....................................................................................................... 9

  Research Design ........................................................................................................... 9

  Definition of Terms ..................................................................................................... 10

  Assumptions .................................................................................................................. 12

  Limitations .................................................................................................................... 13

  Delimitations ................................................................................................................. 13

  Significance of the Study ........................................................................................... 14

CHAPTER 2     LITERATURE REVIEW ......................................................................... 15

  History of Bilingual Education .................................................................................... 15

  The Permissive Period ................................................................................................. 16

  The Restrictive Period ................................................................................................. 17

  The Opportunistic Period ............................................................................................ 18

  The Dismissive Period ................................................................................................. 20
Dual Language Education in the United States ........................................ 22
Transformational Leadership ................................................................. 23
Educational Contexts ............................................................................. 28
Transformational Leadership in Dual Language Programs ...................... 32
Varied Perspectives ................................................................................. 37
  Instructional Leadership ...................................................................... 38
  Ethical Leadership ............................................................................. 39
  Balanced Leadership ......................................................................... 43
Summary .................................................................................................. 47

CHAPTER 3     RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY ..................... 50
Introduction .............................................................................................. 50
Research Questions ................................................................................. 50
Selection of Subjects ................................................................................ 50
  Purposeful Sampling .......................................................................... 51
  Participants ......................................................................................... 53
Data Collection ......................................................................................... 54
  Interview Protocol ............................................................................ 54
  Field Observation Protocol ................................................................. 55
  Documents ........................................................................................ 56
Validity ...................................................................................................... 56
Reliability .................................................................................................. 57
Reflexivity ................................................................................................. 58
### Data Analysis

Summary

### CHAPTER 4 FINDINGS

Background Information of Participants

Dual Language Programs in the Study District

District Organization and Supervision

District Requirements for Dual Language Programs

Research Questions

Building Vision

  Program Structure

Goals and Priorities

  Assessment and Accountability

High Performance Expectations

  Cross-Cultural Competence

Resources

  Funding

  Staffing

  Professional Development

  Materials

Collaboration and Shared Decision Making

Family and Community

Summary
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1  School Data Profiles: Preliminary Analysis ........................................... 52
Table 2  School Data Profiles: Study Schools ..................................................... 53
Table 3  Participant Background Information: District Leaders ......................... 64
Table 4  Participant Background Information: Principals .................................. 66
Table 5  Participant Background Information: Assistant Principals ................... 67
Table 6  Supervisory Changes in Dual Language Schools: 2001-2012 ............... 77
Table 7  Dual Language Program Structure: Staffing ......................................... 90
Table 8  Dual Language Program Structure: Program Features ....................... 92
Table 9  Dual Language Elementary Schools: AYP Designations .................... 101
Table 10 Language Use in Dual Language Schools ........................................... 108
Table 11 Per-Pupil Spending in District and Schools: Five Year Comparison 113
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1      Dynamics among the Foundational Virtues ..................................... 42
Figure 2     Responsibilities Correlated with Second-Order Change ................... 44
Figure 3     Balanced Leadership Framework ..................................................... 46
Figure 4     Leadership Responsibilities by Category........................................ 47
Figure 5     Organizational Chart: 2001 – 2005.................................................... 71
Figure 6     Organizational Chart: 2006 – 2008.................................................... 72
Figure 7     Organizational Chart: 2009 – 2011.................................................... 74
Figure 8     Organizational Chart: 2011 – 2012.................................................... 75
Figure 9     Relationships between Transformational Leadership and the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education in the Theme Building Vision .......... 87
Figure 10   Relationships between Transformational Leadership, Dual Language Goals, and the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education in the Theme Goals and Priorities .................................................. 97
Figure 11   Relationships between Transformational Leadership, Dual Language Goals, and the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education in the Theme High Performance Expectations .................................................. 103
Figure 12  Relationships between Transformational Leadership, Dual Language Goals, and the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education in the Theme Resources .................................................. 110
Figure 13  District General Operating Budget: 20 Year History ....................... 112
Figure 14  Relationships between Transformational Leadership, Dual Language Goals, and the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education in the Theme *Collaboration and Shared Decision Making* ........................................ 122
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), the percentage of children in our schools who speak a language other than English is increasing rapidly. From 1979 to 2008, the numbers grew from 3.8 to 10.9 million nationwide. Of those 10.9 million K-12 students, 2.7 million were reported to speak English with difficulty. Among the children who spoke English with difficulty, approximately 75 percent spoke Spanish, followed by Asian/Pacific Islander languages at 12 percent. In spite of school reform efforts, results from the National Assessment for Educational Progress (NAEP) indicate there was no measurable reduction in the achievement gaps between White and Hispanic students from 1992 to 2008 (Aud et al., 2010).

Educational research regarding English language learners, along with a variety of studies comparing the efficacy of various instructional models for closing achievement gaps for this particular student population, indicates that dual language programs are an effective model for addressing those needs (Gómez, 2006; Howard, Sugarman & Christian, 2003; Thomas & Collier, 2002). With the goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, high academic performance, and cross-cultural competence, these programs hold great promise for increasing student achievement, not only for language minority students, but for native English speakers as well.

This promise of increased achievement has sparked unprecedented growth in the number of dual language programs currently being implemented across the
country. The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) maintains a Two-Way Immersion Directory to track bilingual immersion programs in the United States. In 1971, CAL reported only three existing immersion programs. By 1985, there were 49, and ten years later, in 1995, that number had risen to 195 (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2006). There are currently 384 such programs registered, with 358 of those programs identifying Spanish and English as the two languages of instruction (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2011).

While CAL lists only 58 schools with dual language programs in Texas, the Texas Two-Way Dual Language Education Consortium lists a total 324 registered programs in its state directory (Texas Two-Way Dual Language Education, 2011). In addition, Dallas Independent School District adopted one-way dual language education in the fall of 2006 as its only program for English language learners in Pre-K through first grade. One-way dual language models are composed of students with a common linguistic background who are not proficient in English. This decision alone increased the number of dual language programs in the state of Texas by 132 schools. Because reporting agencies depend on programs to self-register, it is impossible to accurately estimate the true number of dual language programs in schools across the United States.

Not only has dual language education been identified as an effective instructional model for raising student achievement and closing achievement gaps, but the components of an effective dual language program have been thoroughly explored and identified in the research. CAL has produced a document titled *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* (Howard,
Sugarman, Christian, Lindholm-Leary & Rogers, 2007), supported by an extensive review of the literature in the field of bilingual education, research-based teaching practices, and general school reform. The document, a rubric-style guide for program planning and implementation, is divided into the following seven strands: 1) assessment and accountability; 2) curriculum; 3) instruction; 4) staff quality and professional development; 5) program structure; 6) family and community, and 7) support and resources. While some references to administrative functions exist in the rubric, no direct discussion of the specific leadership practices that support the ongoing implementation of effective dual language programs are included.

Research in the field of dual language education makes reference to the role of administrators in the successful implementation of dual language programs, but remarks are general and often anecdotal in nature. Montegue (1997) commented, “As the head of the school, the administrator serves as a model for children, teachers, and parents preparing to engage in the new forum of language learning offered in dual language programs” (p. 340). Lindholm-Leary (2001) defined the role of the principal separately from the role of an instructional leader who provides expertise in program design, implementation and training, as well as promoting the program in the community. The principal, according to Lindholm-Leary, is responsible for allocating resources, supporting teachers, and understanding the program “well enough to explain it to others” (p. 60).

The literature recognizes unique challenges presented by dual language programs, particularly two-way models that include both native-English and
native-Spanish speaking populations. Freeman, Freeman and Mercuri (2005) cautioned that even where programs are designed to ameliorate academic, linguistic, and social inequities, true equity is difficult to achieve. Because of deeply ingrained social structures and values, native English speaking students may receive preferential treatment in instruction, allocation of resources, and in other, more subtle expressions of academic expectation. These issues of entitlement and social justice, along with the political nuances of any educational program that proposes to provide instruction in students’ native language are raised throughout the literature, but the leadership aspects of these issues are seldom addressed.

Problem Statement

With increased attention to research-based programs used to foster achievement for language minority students, dual language programs are growing in popularity and increasing in number across the country (Fortune & Tedick, 2008). As new programs are established, clear guidelines are present in the literature for planning and implementing such programs; however, there is little mention in the literature of the leadership practices that support effective implementation.

Lindholm-Leary (2005) identified three tasks required of leaders in dual language programs: “program advocate and liaison; supervisor of model development, planning and coordination; and facilitator of staff cohesion, collegiality, and development” (p.29). Alanis and Rodriguez (2008) identified
three similar leadership characteristics that contributed to a sustainable program: student advocacy, curricular expertise, and shared decision making. However, as Lindholm-Leary (2005) observed, even a very successful program may collapse if it relies on a single person for leadership.

Program guides, including the *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Programs* (Howard et al., 2007), present curriculum and instruction components for implementing dual language programs, assessment considerations, and criteria for community and family relations. All of these components depend on strong leadership for effective execution; yet, there are few references to specific leadership behaviors or practices that contribute to effective implementation. The paucity of specific direction for leaders presents an opportunity for further exploration of leadership practices that support existing program guidelines.

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study was to identify specific leadership practices of site administrators in established elementary school dual language programs that impact the dual language program, and to investigate leadership activities of district leaders that support the sustainable implementation of those programs. Site administrators specifically included principals, assistant principals, and a program coordinator in their roles as leaders of dual language programs in elementary schools. District leaders included a district superintendent, direct supervisors of schools, and leaders in the district’s English Language Learner Program with oversight responsibilities for the district’s dual language programs.
These leaders included the English Language Learner Program Director, and the English Language Learner Program Coordinator assigned to dual language schools.

Leadership practices in use at the sample district’s five identified dual language elementary schools were compared to transformational leadership practices identified by Leithwood and Jantzi (2006), along with components identified in the literature related to implementation of effective dual language programs. Specifically, the seven strands and 30 principles outlined in the *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Programs* (Howard et al. 2007), combined with Leithwood & Jantzi’s framework, guided the analysis of leadership support for program implementation.

Conceptual Framework

In order to examine leadership practices in established dual language programs, this study was grounded in the theories of transformational leadership as posited by Burns (1978). Leadership is expressed along a continuum from transactional to transformational, with transformational leadership described as that which unites leader and followers, “in pursuit of ‘higher’ goals, the realization of which is tested by the achievement of significant change that represents the collective or pooled interests of leaders and followers” (p. 425-426). Burns compared leaders and followers to teachers and students on a quest for “truth and mutual actualization” (p. 449). This theory of leadership is a construct that is applicable in a wide variety of contexts, but certainly appropriate for approaching
issues of school improvement and reform. In a review of transformational educational leadership research, Leithwood (2005) noted that there is significant evidence to support the positive effects of transformational leadership practices on student achievement outcomes, students’ engagement in school, and overall organizational effectiveness.

For the purposes of this study, transformational leadership was examined using the Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) framework, which identified nine dimensions of leadership practice:

1. Setting Directions
   1.1. building school vision
   1.2. developing specific goals and priorities
   1.3. holding high performance expectations

2. Developing People
   2.1. providing intellectual stimulation
   2.2. offering individualized support
   2.3. modeling desirable professional practices and values

3. Redesigning the Organization
   3.1. developing a collaborative school culture
   3.2. creating structures to foster participation in school decisions
   3.3. creating productive community relationships (p. 205).

In addition to its efficacy as a leadership model for school improvement, Shields (2004) suggested that, “transformative leadership, based on dialogue and strong relationships, can provide opportunities for all children to learn in
school communities that are socially just and deeply democratic” (p. 110).
Because of the nature of dual language programs and the diverse student populations who participate in those programs, issues of equity form part of the theoretical framework for analyzing leadership practices. In their discussion of essential components for dual language programs, Freeman et al. (2005) insisted that, “All school personnel must be dedicated to academic and social equity and the promotion of equal status for both languages” (p. 69).

Paolo Freire (1970) advocated for a form of education that liberates through dialogue, proposing that education at its best becomes “the practice of freedom” (p.62). Because schools are embedded in the larger communities they serve, the dialogue is expanded beyond the walls of the school and into the larger social context. According to Freire (1998), “the school…cannot abstract itself from the socio-cultural and economic conditions of its students, their families, and their communities” (p. 62). Respect for the language, identities, knowledge, and experiences of students and their families are central to the practice of dual language administrators. The ongoing dialogue extends to teachers and staff, as well as individuals and institutions outside the school, in order to serve the needs of diverse student populations (Riehl, 2000).

Research Questions

1. What are the leadership practices that contribute to the implementation of dual language programs?
2. Which, if any, of the nine dimensions of transformational leadership, as defined by Leithwood and Jantzi (2006), are evident in the observed leadership practices of dual language administrators?

Research Design

This qualitative study employed an instrumental, collective case study design to collect and analyze data related to the leadership practices of school administrators in five established elementary school dual language programs and the district leaders that oversee these programs. Creswell (2005) defined the instrumental case study as a form of qualitative study where the focus is a specific issue, with a case or cases used to illuminate the issue. The study is defined as a collective case study because it includes the study district and five dual language elementary schools, which taken together, provide insight into the issue of leadership practices in dual language programs. Yin (2009) described this design as an embedded case study, or a single case that gives attention to sub-units within the same organization.

Data were collected in a holistic manner from district personnel and schools, then analyzed using an integrated approach in order to provide a more “insightful analysis” of both individual and organizational phenomenon that contributed to the “situation under investigation” (Moran-Ellis, Alexander, Cronin, Dickinson, Fielding, Slaney, & Thomas, 2006, pp. 52-53). The five schools were selected using a homogeneous sampling strategy, wherein, “the researcher purposefully samples individuals or sites based on membership in a subgroup that has
defining characteristics” (Creswell, 2005, p. 206). Specifically, there are seven elementary schools currently implementing dual language programs in the study district. From those seven schools, five schools with similar demographic characteristics were selected for inclusion in the study in order to describe this particular “subgroup in depth” (Glesne, 2006, p. 35).

First, interview protocols were developed for use with district personnel and site administrators based on the nine domains of Leithwood and Jantzi’s (2006) transformational leadership framework, along with additional items based on best practices in dual language education. Protocols were field tested with a team of site administrators working in dual language programs and refined based on their feedback. Interviews were audio taped, and transcripts were produced for synthesis and analysis in relation to the extant literature in the fields of dual language education, transformational leadership, and transformative leadership for social justice. Observations relevant to the dual language context and observed leadership behaviors were conducted at study sites and field notes collected using a site observation field guide. Interviews and observations were conducted over the course of a contiguous 12 week period during the regular school year. Documents collected and analyzed include, but were not limited to, district manuals related to the education of English language learners and the implementation of dual language programs, school handbooks, school improvement plans, literature provided to school communities related to dual language programs, and training materials for administrators and staff.
Definition of Terms

**Dual language education**: an additive form of bilingual education that consistently uses two languages for instruction. Goals of dual language education programs include proficiency in two languages, high levels of academic achievement in both languages, and cross-cultural competence (Soltero, 2004).

**Immersion**: A program that uses the target language to teach curricular content in a structured manner. Instruction includes assistance and support to maximize comprehension for students as they learn the new language (Lessow-Hurley, 2005).

**One-way dual language education**: a dual language program where all or most of the students participating are from one language group. One-way dual language programs include heritage language programs designed to maintain the language and culture of minority students, and foreign language immersion or international schools, where majority language students gain proficiency in another language (Soltero, 2004; Freeman et al., 2005).

**Transformational Leadership**: Leadership that is characterized by empowering followers, responding to their needs, providing intellectual stimulation, and aligning the goals and vision of the leader, follower, and the organization. The expected outcome is an organization that exceeds expectations and creates high levels of commitment and satisfaction for its members (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005).
Transformative Leadership: A theory of educational leadership that is distinguished from transformational leadership by its focus on issues of social justice, power, and equity in organizations (Shields, 2010).

Two-way dual language education: a dual language program where students include native English speakers and native speakers of another language, instruction is provided in two languages, and students are integrated for most content area instruction. Also known as two-way immersion, two-way bilingual education, dual immersion (Freeman, 2004).

Assumptions

It is assumed that the participants will respond to interview questions honestly. Further, it is assumed that the interview protocol has been prepared accurately based on Leithwood and Jantzi’s (2006) model.

Limitations

The results of this study are limited to the contexts in which the study was conducted and may not be easily generalized to other contexts. Since all of the schools selected are elementary schools, the sampling procedure may decrease the generalizability of findings to middle or high school sites. In addition, leadership support in a large, urban school district may not be generalizable to other district configurations such as small, rural school districts with fewer specialists assigned to provide program support or to assist teachers in meeting the needs of language learners in schools.
Delimitations

The study was limited to five elementary schools in a large urban school district in a southwestern state. The sample of participants was limited to district and site administrators who work in the five study schools, and interview data were limited to self-reported information from those participants.

Significance of the Study

While there is abundant literature in the field of bilingual education in general, and much has been written about dual language programs specifically, few connections have been made to leadership theory and practice. Research has centered on the efficacy of instructional models for improving student achievement and identifying key components of effective programs. Because dual language programs serve minority and immigrant students, there are concomitant social and political issues that are raised in the literature; however, these issues are not approached from a leadership perspective.

This study is significant because it sought to identify transformational leadership practices in dual language programs in order to inform the practice of school administrators and others who lead such programs. Collier and Thomas (2009) emphasized the transformational nature of leadership required to meet the educational challenges posed by growing numbers of English language learners in United States schools, and noted, “As we face our continuously transforming world, we can develop visions of our future schools – visions which may become reality in a relatively short time, because everything is accelerated
these days” (p. 1). Transformational leaders begin their work with the building of a shared vision, and go on to develop a community dedicated to intellectual growth, collaboration, and positive relationships (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006).

Further, this study explored the role of district leaders in the implementation of dual language initiatives and how their work supported site administrators in their ongoing efforts to lead successful instructional programs. This information could prove useful to districts in the planning and structuring of programs, as well as in the selection and training of school administrators for dual language programs. It may further prove useful to district leaders who support dual language programs as they supervise site-based leaders, review and refine curriculum, provide professional development, and allocate resources to improve program implementation. It may also be of use to university leadership preparation programs and departments of curriculum and instruction as the popularity of dual language programs increases across the country.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Research specifically examining the issues surrounding leadership in the context of dual language programs is scarce; however, the United States boasts a rich and well-documented history of bilingual education. The literature reveals an ample research base for transformational leadership in political, military, and business environments, and more recently, in the context of school improvement. This review of the literature brings together those strands, first by examining the history of bilingual education in general, then the historical development of dual language programs in particular. The historical overview is followed by a review of the literature related to transformational leadership, from its foundations to its current applications in the educational context. Finally, the two bodies of literature come together in a review of the limited literature that, directly or indirectly, explores transformational leadership in dual language programs.

History of Bilingual Education

The history of bilingual education in the United States is inextricably linked to the history and patterns of immigration. From the time the first English colonists came to settle in the new world, questions of education and language policy began to weave themselves into the story of the new republic. For the purposes of analysis, Ovando (2003) identified four distinct periods in the history of bilingual education:

1. The Permissive Period – 1700s-1880s
2. The Restrictive Period – 1880s-1960s
3. The Opportunist Period – 1960s-1980s
4. The Dismissive Period – 1980s-Present

The Permissive Period

According to Spring (2004), “English colonists brought their feelings of racial and cultural superiority about their Protestant beliefs and English culture to North America in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries” (p. 5). In spite of the ideals of democracy that Americans hold dear, the requirements for citizenship have always been somewhat limiting. In fact, the founding fathers only provided freedom and equality – the rights of citizenship – for white, Protestant men. Nevertheless, they recognized the power of education and language policy to “civilize” the people they referred to as “domestic foreigners” (Spring, 2004).

While Thomas Jefferson was establishing schools to teach Native Americans to speak English, children in the colonies were learning in a variety of European languages. In spite of Noah Webster’s efforts to unite the country around a uniquely American form of English, there were many German bilingual schools and language differences were not considered a threat to the “Americanization” of immigrant groups. However, many of the German schools were Catholic parochial schools, and these schools came under attack in the 1880s as a result of anti-Catholic sentiment. In 1889, Wisconsin and Illinois passed laws requiring English-only instruction in schools, inadvertently affecting German Protestant schools along with Catholic schools (Crawford, 1999). In this case, as in many others to follow, language policy was used to mask a different political purpose.
In spite of the attacks on German Catholic schools in Wisconsin and Illinois, Kloss (1998) pointed out that:

Surveys conducted in 1900 reported that 600,000 children in U.S. elementary schools, public and parochial, were receiving part or all of their instruction in the German language. This represented about 4 percent of the nation's elementary school enrollment – larger than the proportion of students (from all language groups) in bilingual classrooms today (p. 4).

Though it might be convenient to point to this period in U.S. history as a period when bilingual education flourished, Ovando (2003) cautioned, “The 18th and 19th centuries can be more accurately characterized as inconsistent and contradictory regarding the ideology, policies, and politics of language diversity” (p. 3).

The Restrictive Period

Around the end of the 19th century, a new wave of immigrants created a deeply negative sentiment among the established population. The new immigrants were not from northern Europe. They were Italian, Greek, Jewish, and Slavic, and they came in large numbers. The multiplicity of languages that was comfortable among the existing northern European population became an issue as the population became more and more diverse. As a result of public outcry, Congress passed a law adding English proficiency as a requirement for naturalization. Speaking English became synonymous with being an American, and the idea of assimilation became the order of the day.
During this period in the American Southwest, “Americanization” came to mean educational programs “designed to strip away Mexican values and culture and replace the use of Spanish with English (Spring, 2004, p.86). In Puerto Rico, it meant that, “…teachers were instructed to have students give speeches, recitations, and patriotic readings and to sing patriotic songs and march to band music” (p. 92). These activities, expressions of American nationalism, were to be conducted only in English. Although the Puerto Rican teaching force was mostly Spanish speaking, the commissioner of education mandated that, after first grade, all instruction would be delivered in English. By the mid-1900s, there were very few bilingual schools of any kind left in the United States, and American society had become overwhelmingly monolingual (Crawford, 1999).

Across the United States, students of color attended schools that were separate from schools for white students. Native American, Asian, and Latino students, along with African American students, were excluded from all white schools based on their ethnicity and the color of their skin. In 1954, in *Brown v. Board of Education*, the Supreme Court ruled that, “In the field of public education the doctrine of ‘separate but equal’ has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.” Despite the Supreme Court ruling, it would take many years of struggle before public schools in the United States would begin earnest efforts to desegregate (Spring, 2004).

**The Opportunist Period**

In 1968, Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Title VII of ESEA, known as the Bilingual Education Act, provided
funding for bilingual programs, designating monies for teacher training, instructional materials, and parental involvement. This legislation was primarily the result of political pressure brought to bear by Mexican American groups. Although the law did not specifically mandate native language instruction and its focus was remedial in nature, it provided the impetus for a resurgence of bilingual education in the United States. In 1971, Massachusetts mandated bilingual education in districts with sufficient populations of English language learners, and many other states passed legislation allowing native language instruction (Crawford, 1999).

In 1974, the Supreme Court ruled for the first time on a case involving language policy in education. In *Lau v. Nichols*, the court ruled that students who were not proficient in English were entitled to special assistance in order to provide them with equal access to the curriculum. The court did not require the schools to provide bilingual education; however, the San Francisco school district signed a consent decree, agreeing to provide bilingual education for students represented in the case (Hakuta, 2006). Shortly after the ruling, the Office of Civil Rights conducted investigations and provided guidelines to school districts, known as the Lau remedies. These guidelines were more specific, included specific instructional strategies, and required bilingual education programs at the elementary level where districts had 20 or more students with the same native language (Ovando, 2003).
The Dismissive Period

Bilingual education programs enjoyed strong support from Native American and Latino communities, who were anxious for children to maintain their native languages, along with their cultural heritage. This goal, however, was never shared by the nation at large. In fact, there was never an agreement regarding the goal of bilingual education reached by congress, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), or the educators charged with implementing bilingual programs across the country. Because of this perspective, bilingual programs were mostly transitional in nature, with the focus and primary goal of moving students into English as quickly and efficiently as possible.

This was especially true after 1980, when the Fairfax County, Virginia, school district was allowed to use English-only methods to teach English language learners. Under Ronald Reagan, the federal guidelines shifted away from requiring bilingual instruction, favoring English as a Second Language (ESL) methodologies and allowing districts to choose their own programs. With this new flexibility, many districts abandoned bilingual programs, embracing the Reagan administration’s preference for English-only instruction. The Office of Civil Rights backed away from stringent enforcement of mandates related to specific programs for English language learners as well (Crawford, 1995).

In 1981, in *Castañeda v. Pickard*, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in favor of Mexican American students in Texas who claimed their school district was treating them unfairly based on their ethnicity. Although they were provided with a bilingual program, the court found that the program was not adequate and
established the following criteria for determining program effectiveness in meeting the needs of English language learners: a) it must be based on “a sound educational theory”, b) it must be “implemented effectively,” with adequate resources and personnel, and c) after a trial period, it must be evaluated as effective in overcoming language handicaps (Hakuta, 2006). These standards were adopted by the Office of Civil Rights in 1991, and remain in effect to date (Crawford, 1995).

During the years from the 1980s through the present, English-only ideologies have steadily gained strength as the numbers of English language learners have multiplied in classrooms across the country. In 1970, children of immigrants comprised six percent of the total U.S. population of school-age children; by 2000 that number had risen to 19 percent, almost one of every five students. The growth in the population of English language learners at the national level from 1990 to 2000 was 46 percent, with a growth rates between 101 and 354 percent in 13 states (Capps, Fix, Murray, Ost, Passel & Herwantoro, 2005). This rapid growth sparked the same type of public concern engendered by the immigration patterns of the late 19th century.

Throughout this same time period, research has steadily accumulated to prove the efficacy of bilingual education; however, the issues have changed little from the time when Congress passed the first English proficiency requirement for citizenship. Language policy in the United States has always been closely tied to deeply held beliefs about what it means to be American and the “uneasy balance between unum and pluribus” (Ovando, 2003, p.18). When the No Child Left
Behind Act was signed into law in 2001, the federal Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs (OBEMLA) became the Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA), and the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII) became the English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III). This change in federal nomenclature brought to an end, “…a period in American history when the term bilingual education was codified in U.S. law and the institution of government” (Bikle, Billings & Hakuta, 2003, p. 589).

Dual Language Education in the United States

The first dual language program in the United States was established in 1963 at the Coral Way Elementary School in Dade County, Florida. This program was established to serve the children of Cuban immigrants, but was open to both Spanish and English speakers and provided instruction in the two languages to both groups. Students were separated by their native language group for most of the day, and only mixed heterogeneously for art, music, and non-instructional activities. In spite of limited interaction, both groups demonstrated above-average achievement, with the only exception being the native English-speaking students’ level of achievement in Spanish reading. This program was exceptional, not only for its novelty, but because it shifted the focus of bilingual programming from remedial to enrichment (Crawford, 1995; Bikle et al., 2003; Freeman, et al., 2005).
According to Lindholm-Leary (2001), three dual language programs soon followed the program at Coral Way. During the 1970s, school districts in Chicago and Washington D.C. started 50:50 models similar to the program at Coral Way, while San Diego City Schools began a 90:10 program. The Washington D.C. program, established at Oyster Elementary School in 1971, served an approximately equal balance of English dominant and Spanish dominant students, with instruction provided equally in both languages (Crawford, 1995). While it also served a mixed population of students, the San Diego program provided instruction to all students primarily in Spanish during the early grades (90:10), gradually increasing the ratio of English instruction to 50:50 in the intermediate grades. Although the results from these programs were positive, there was little research published to document their success (Lindholm-Leary, 2001), and the growth of dual language programs in the United States was slow throughout the 1970s and 1980s.

Transformational Leadership

The theory of transformational leadership has its roots in the work of James M. Burns and his 1978 analysis of the ways political leaders interact with followers in the process of changing or transforming organizations (Chance & Chance, 2002). In his seminal work, titled simply Leadership, Burns identified a continuum of leadership behaviors that moved from contingent reinforcement, which he labeled transactional leadership, to the ultimate transformational leadership. According to Bass (1995), at the far end of Burns’ transformational
continuum, “transforming leaders convert followers to disciples…They elevate the concerns of followers on Maslow’s (1954) hierarchy from needs for safety and security to needs for achievement and self-actualization, increase their awareness and consciousness of what is really important, and move them to go beyond their own self-interests for the good of the larger entities to which they belong” (p. 467).

The concept of human need and the fulfillment of those needs are central to Burns’ theory of leadership. In a transactional mode, leaders trade on followers’ needs in order to obtain compliance. Whether rewards are concrete or intangible, transactional leadership relies on an external locus of control to move the organization and its members toward established goals. Burns (1978) equated this type of leadership with manipulation and “pandering” (p. 458). At the other end of the continuum, the transformational leader was compared to a teacher, and “Teachers – in whatever guise – treat students neither coercively nor instrumentally but as joint seekers of truth and of moral actualization…They seek to help students rise to higher levels of moral reasoning and hence to higher levels of principled judgment” (p. 449).

Research and development of transformational leadership theory was taken up with fervor by Bernard Bass, who expanded the applications of Burns’ original design into industry, business, military, and eventually educational organizations. In order to measure leader behaviors, Bass developed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), which includes idealized influence (also called charisma), inspirational influence, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation
on the transformational side, and identifies laissez-faire, management by exception, and contingent reward as behavioral dimensions on the transactional side (Bass, 1995). This survey instrument has been used in a variety of published and unpublished versions, and has been translated into at least ten different languages (Bass, 1995; 1997; 1998; Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Based on numerous studies using the MLQ, along with field observations and interviews, Bass developed the Full Range of Leadership model, presenting an optimal leader profile founded on the concept that, “every leader displays each style to some extent” (Bass, 1998, p. 7). In Bass’ optimal leadership model, the ideal leader demonstrates laissez-faire leadership behaviors infrequently, with the other transactional leadership behaviors occurring with increasing frequency in the following order: management-by-exception (passive), management-by-exception (active), and contingent reward. Finally, the ideal leader demonstrates the four dimensions of transformational leadership with most frequency (Bass, 2006, p. 10).

Although Bass (1998) did not place transformational leadership behaviors in any particular order within his Full Range of Leadership model, he did provide a hierarchy of effectiveness in public and private organizations. In this analysis, he combined idealized and inspirational influence under the category of charisma, with a correlation coefficient of .74 in the public sector and .69 in the private sector. Intellectual stimulation demonstrated a correlation coefficient of .65 in the public sector and .56 in the private sector, while individual consideration yielded
a correlation coefficient of .63 in the public sector and .62 in the private sector (p. 9).

Bass did not discount transactional leadership as a critical component of effective leadership; rather, he placed it in a subordinate role and argued that, “Transactional leadership, particularly contingent reward, provides a broad basis for effective leadership, but a great amount of effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction is possible from transactional leadership if augmented by transformational leadership” (Bass, 1998, p.10). Although some cultural and organizational differences exist, Bass claimed this axiom holds true across a variety of public and private organizations, in different countries and cultures, and regardless of language or religion (Bass, 1997).

Throughout the 1980’s, a new perspective on leadership continued to flourish. As Bass (1997) noted, these “New Leadership” theories are required for a time when “knowledge work” dominates, calling for, “envisioning, enabling, and empowering leadership” (p. 131). Among the enduring transformational models developed during that decade was The Leadership Challenge, based in the research of Kouzes and Posner, and originally published in 1987. According to the authors, The Leadership Challenge is about how leaders mobilize others to want to get extraordinary things done in organizations. It's about the practices leaders use to transform values into actions, visions into realities, obstacles into innovations, separateness into solidarity, and risks into rewards” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. xvii).
Developed primarily in business and industrial contexts, *The Leadership Challenge* framework includes five dimensions of leader behaviors:

1. Model the way
2. Inspire a shared vision
3. Challenge the process
4. Enable others to act

In addition to the five dimensions of exemplary leadership, the framework includes ten commitments of exemplary leadership that further define the five dimensions:

1. Find your voice by clarifying your personal values
2. Set the example by aligning actions with shared values
3. Envision the future by imagining exciting and ennobling possibilities
4. Enlist others in a common vision by appealing to shared aspirations
5. Search for opportunities by seeking innovative ways to change, grow, and improve
6. Experiment and take risks by constantly generating small wins and learning from mistakes
7. Foster collaboration by promoting cooperative goals and building trust
8. Strengthen others by sharing power and discretion
9. Recognize contributions by showing appreciation for individual excellence
10. Celebrate the values and victories by creating a spirit of community

Kouzes and Posner’s framework focused solely on the transformational end of Burns’ transactional-transformational continuum, and on transformational leadership behaviors. Nadler and Tushman (1990) identified three dimensions of transformational leadership as critical to success in organizations: (a) envisioning; (b) energizing; and (c) enabling. In their model, envisioning included elements of modeling and inspiring shared vision, energizing included components of personal competence, confidence, and courage. Finally, enabling reflected the same focus on shared leadership and encouragement that is found in Kouzes and Posner’s model. In Transforming Leadership, Burns (2003) pointed to Nadler and Tushman’s three dimensions of transformational leadership and remarked, “These are even more the functions of transforming leadership, which it achieves not by enslaving followers, but by liberating and empowering them” (p. 27).

Educational Contexts

According to Leithwood, Jantzi and Steinbach (1999), leadership theories are, “developed in a context of organizational and broader social goals, needs, norms, and expectations” (p. 22). It becomes critical to this study, therefore, to examine transformational leadership theory in educational contexts; more specifically, in the context of schools and school reform efforts. This examination is strengthened by considering the dimensions of transformational leadership in the light of the unique functions of schools and the expected outcomes of school reform. As Barnett, McCormick and Connors (2001) commented, “One would like to assume that at some basic level they believe that restructuring schools will
make them more effective, will cause teachers to teach differently and therefore, this will make a difference to the learning and motivation of students” (p. 24).

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of transformational leadership in schools, researchers have employed a variety of constructs. In a meta-analysis of transformational research in schools, Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) set out to answer the following five questions:

1. What is meant by “transformational” leadership in school contexts?
2. What gives rise to this form of leadership?
3. What circumstances either foster or hinder the impact of transformational leadership?
4. How do transformational leadership practices exercise their impact?
5. Do the actual outcomes of transformational leadership in schools warrant the attention it currently enjoys? (p. 178)

The researchers selected 32 studies to include in the meta-analysis, seven of which used Bass’ model and some version of the MLQ to conduct their research. Eighteen of the studies employed Leithwood and Jantzi’s model, which was designed to extend Bass’ model for use in school contexts, and the balance of the studies used some other model.

From the 32 studies included in the meta-analysis, Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) identified three broad categories of transformational leadership behaviors (TBLs) and another category to include transactional/managerial behaviors. Beyond analysis of leader behaviors, this meta-analysis included accumulated data related to five antecedents to transformational leadership behaviors, i.e.,
school reform initiatives (3 studies), leaders’ proactivity (1 study), and formal leadership training experiences (2 studies). Overall, there was little evidence found as to the effect size of any of these antecedents, which led Leithwood and Jantzi to comment, “More evidence about an expanded array of theoretically defensible antecedents ought to be a significant item on the agenda for future transformational leadership research” (p.185).

While Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) found mixed results in direct measures of student achievement, an analysis of the ways transformational leaders exercise their impact yielded 41 “intervening variables” that were organized into the following four categories: (a) characteristics of leaders’ colleagues; (b) characteristics of students; (c) organizational structures; and (d) organizational processes or conditions. These school conditions, which are presumed to have a positive correlation to student achievement, include school culture and climate, changed teacher practices, pedagogical or instructional quality, organizational learning, and collective teacher efficacy. The authors found that, “Transformational school leadership had uniformly positive effects on all of these mediators” (p.188).

In a 2006 study, Leithwood and Jantzi conducted a focused study to test their transformational leadership model, developed specifically for school contexts. The model is organized in three categories of leadership practice, with nine specific dimensions added as follows:

1. Setting Directions
   1.1 building school vision
1.2 developing specific goals and priorities
1.3 holding high performance expectations

2. Developing People
   2.1 providing intellectual stimulation
   2.2 offering individualized support
   2.3 modeling desirable professional practices and values

3. Redesigning the Organization
   3.1 developing a collaborative school culture
   3.2 creating structures to foster participation in school decisions
   3.3 creating productive community relationships  (p. 205)

In this study, Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) employed path analytic techniques in an attempt to determine the effects of transformational leadership behaviors on student achievement, as well as teachers’ motivation, capacity, work setting, and classroom practices in large-scale school reform efforts based on data from a four-year evaluation of England’s national Literacy and Numeracy Strategies reform initiative. The statistical model employed, path analysis, “is an extension of the regression model, used to test the fit of the correlation matrix against two or more causal models which are being compared by the researcher” (Garson, 2006, p. 1). The samples included data from 500 randomly selected schools for the literacy sample and 500 randomly selected schools for the numeracy sample. Data included surveys collected from teachers and student achievement data from the selected schools.
The findings of this study indicated that transformational leadership behaviors have a positive effect on teacher motivation and capacity. They also impact the way teachers view their work setting and significantly impact changing classroom practice; however, there was no significant effect noted on student achievement. This led Leithwood and Jantzi to question the policies that local school leaders are required to implement and remark, “There is a significant gulf between classroom practices that are ‘changed’ and practices that actually lead to greater pupil learning; the potency of leadership for increasing student learning hinges on the specific classroom practices which leaders stimulate, encourage, and promote” (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006, p. 223).

It is to this climate of school reform that the discussion of transformational leadership must eventually return, for the policy decisions that impact the work of school leadership determine substantially what the outcomes will be. “When governments prescribe preferred local action in some detail…and provide serious incentives and sanctions for compliance, the responsibility and accountability for student achievement ought to look very different than is typically the case” (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006, p. 224). In fact, Hallinger (2003) claimed that the very acceptance of transformational leadership theory in the educational setting occurred as a reaction against the top-down policies of the 1980s and “the directive imagery encompassed in the instructional model derived from the effective schools research” (p. 335).
Transformational Leadership in Dual Language Programs

The discussion of leadership and school reform typically centers on the topics raised by Hallinger (2003), who identified instructional leadership issues related to first-order changes such as, alignment of academic standards, time allocations, and curriculum with the school mission, as well as supervision and evaluation of teaching and learning, professional development, and incentives for teachers and students. Second-order changes identified by Hallinger are the domain of transformational leaders – those changes that require deeper levels of commitment and collaboration, a shared vision and sense of purpose from all members of the organization. “Leadership must be conceptualized as a mutual influence process, rather than as a one-way process in which leaders influence others. Effective leaders respond to the changing needs of their context” (p. 346).

For school leaders to effectively address improvement efforts, they must come to terms with the needs of English language learners. The 2000 census indicated that one of every five school age children is the child of an immigrant. Ten percent of kindergarten children, 7% of elementary school students, and 5% of secondary school students were classified limited English proficient; however, well over half of the limited English proficient students in secondary schools were born and raised in the United States (Capps et al., 2005). This seems to indicate that our school reform efforts are failing to reach the most rapidly increasing sector of our school-age population, allowing the achievement gap to widen in spite of policy holding schools accountable for their performance.
In a 15 year longitudinal study that included both qualitative and quantitative data for over 2 million students in districts across the United States, Collier and Thomas (2004) stated without equivocation, “Enrichment dual language schooling closes the academic achievement gap in L2 and in first language (L1) students initially below grade level, and for all categories of students participating in this program. This is the only program for English learners that fully closes the gap; in contrast, remedial models only partially close the gap” (p. 1). Their findings are supported by extensive research in the field of effective programs for language minority students (Gómez, 2006; Howard et al., 2003; Thomas & Collier, 2002).

Because these programs hold such promise for closing achievement gaps for language learners, they are increasing in number at an unprecedented rate. Gómez (2006) reported a growth of 2000% in dual language programs in the past decade across the state of Texas. The Center for Applied Linguistics currently reports 330 two-way dual immersions programs across the U.S., and Texas Two-Way Dual Language Education reports 255 programs in Texas alone. While the literature holds promise for student outcomes, little attention is paid to the leadership aspects of program implementation specific to dual language contexts.

Feinberg (1999) presented anecdotal evidence that the administration of dual language programs requires special skill sets that may not be required in other types of school settings. Based on a study conducted in Miami-Dade schools, where the dual language program with the most longevity in the United States is
located, Feinberg identified various skills critical to the successful implementation of dual language programs, which included: articulating and gaining commitment from all stakeholders to a common vision appropriate to the mission of the school; coping with resistance to that mission; enhancing the school's image; working with the media to communicate school success; and using the political process to support school budget needs and program related policy development. While some of these activities may be common to the administration of any school, Feinberg (1999) emphasized the difference when leading a program with the social and political implications inherent in dual language contexts.

School leaders highlighted in Feinberg's (1999) report developed strategies to ensure the survival of their programs over time, in spite of adverse political climates. They actively sought out positive publicity and developed strong relationships within the organization and the community, building networks to support the academic, social, and political mission of their schools. The participants in this study acted on their tacit understanding that legal, political, and economic forces make things happen in our society. Educators who harness the energy of these forces, point to support from parent groups and academe, and use the media to magnify the strength of their communications to school stakeholders and community opinion molders are better able to affect the course of events that have an impact on their students and programs (p. 64). Finally, Feinberg pointed to the Miami-Dade school leaders as examples of activists in
the cause of social justice, defending the best of public education for minority
students, while holding their teachers up as the key to program success.

Riehl (2000) further examined the role of school leaders working with diverse
student populations, and expressed concern that, “Like teachers, they not only
experience, but reproduce, sometimes unwittingly, conditions of hierarchy and
oppression, in particular by fostering compliant thinking instead of critical
reflection” (p.58-59). It is the way administrators respond to the following tasks
that determine whether or not their work will be truly inclusive and transformative
in nature: fostering new meanings about diversity, promoting inclusive practices
within schools, promoting inclusive teaching and learning, molding inclusive
school cultures, and building connections between schools and communities.
This assumes a personal sense of agency that moves beyond the typical
administrative role, building alliances with the community that are mutually
respectful and beneficial for children.

This perspective of transformative leadership in school contexts that serve
minority students was supported by Shields (2004), who proposed that,
“Transformative leadership, based on dialogue and strong relationships, can
provide opportunities for all children to learn in school communities that are
socially just and deeply democratic” (p. 110). Shields choose to focus on an
element of transformational leadership first elucidated by Burns (1978), “The
most powerful influences consist of deeply human relationships in which two or
more persons engage with one another” (p. 11) and choose to use the term
transformative rather than transformational to indicate the depth of personal
commitment involved those interactions. In addition to dialogue around the issues of race, ethnicity, class, and language differences, Shields argued that transformative school leaders recognize deficit thinking and become advocates for minority students by beginning, “to act agentically, to lead deliberately, to facilitate transformative dialogue, and to achieve socially just learning environments for all children” (p. 127).

It is exactly this shift from deficit thinking, from a remedial mindset to an enrichment focus, which is the promise dual language programs hold for closing achievement gaps for English language learners. As Collier and Thomas (2004) pointed out, “In contrast to remedial programs that offer ‘watered down’ instruction in a ‘special’ curriculum focused on one small step at a time, dual language enrichment models are the curricular mainstream taught through two languages” (p. 2). Crucial to the successful implementation of these programs, Collier and Thomas’ research revealed, is a school leader who is committed to the vision, who carefully oversees the quality and fidelity of implementation, and who fosters positive relationships among staff and community. In the context of dual language programs, this transformational leader will, “seek to create a context in which organizational members are motivated by what they consider to be a moral imperative. This imperative is to collaborate with their colleagues and other stakeholders in providing students with the best educational experiences of which they are capable” (Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach, 1999, p.96).
Varied Perspectives

“Every theory of leadership serves as a lens that puts certain behaviors or traits into sharp focus and sees others only fuzzily, if at all” (Lashway, 2006, p. 39). If this is true, then no one theory of leadership can serve all purposes or fit all contexts. Fidler (1997) suggested, “no one theory nor (sic) any one approach can subsume the complexities of leadership and, indeed, that a search for such an all-encompassing theory may be illusory” (p. 27).

Instructional Leadership

In the context of school leadership, the concept of instructional leadership has received extensive attention since the 1980’s. Hallinger (2005) defined instructional leadership within three dimensions: defining the school’s mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school learning climate. Within those three dimensions, ten instructional leadership functions are imbedded. Defining the school’s mission includes the functions of framing clear goals and communicating clear goals. Managing the instructional program includes supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating curriculum, and monitoring student progress. Promoting a positive school learning climate includes protecting instructional time, promoting professional development, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, and providing incentives for learning. Over the twenty-five year period from 1983 to 2005, this model was the subject of 110 research studies in a variety of countries across continents (Hallinger, 2005).
The extensive study of instructional leadership as a means for improving student outcomes yielded a picture of the principal’s role in effective schooling. The largest effect was evidenced in the first dimension, related to framing and communicating the school’s goals and mission, while the least impact was evident in the second dimension, managing the instructional program. These results lead Hallinger (2003) to point to a future where transformational leadership is a more appropriate lens for examining school leadership, given its focus on developing an organization’s capacity to grow and change. “Rather than focusing specifically on direct coordination, control, and supervision of curriculum and instruction, transformational leadership seeks to build the organization’s capacity to select its purposes and to support the development of changes to practices of teaching and learning” (p. 330).

**Ethical Leadership**

Fullan (2003) claimed that the quality of life in a democratic society depends on a strong system of public education, and insisted that, “schools must serve all children, not simply those with the loudest or most powerful advocates” (p. 3). This moral imperative is addressed by school leaders who build relational trust and create a culture where doing the right thing is built into the culture of the organization. Starratt (2004) echoed Fullan’s call for moral leadership in schools as the responsibility of citizens in a democratic society. “The work of educational leadership should be work that is simultaneously intellectual and moral; an activity characterized by a blend of human, professional, and civic concerns; a work that is humanly fulfilling and socially responsible” (p. 3). The ethical
leadership framework is built on three-dimensional “map of the ethical terrain” (p. 6) to guide the choices, decisions and actions of educational leaders. Those three virtues are: (a) responsibility, (b) authenticity, and (c) presence.

The role of school leader is approached in Starratt’s work (2004) as that of “citizen-administrator” (p. 26). As an administrator and a citizen, the school leader has a responsibility to individual students and their families, to the communities they serve, and to society as a whole. This includes “pursuing the human, educational, and civic good of the students and teachers while responding to specific interpersonal, institutional, and political situations in order to prevent harm to students and teachers (p. 45). The demands of this perspective are exceptional, as the virtue of responsibility calls administrators to be fully human in their roles as school leaders, sharing in the human condition as it impacts all members of the school community. This stance requires empathy, generosity, and a heart open to learning about the lives and experiences of others.

The second virtue in Starratt’s (2004) framework is authenticity. The first challenge of authenticity is to know oneself, to be true to one’s own values and beliefs. Second, “the logic of the virtue of authenticity is that it obliges us to be true to ourselves and to our relationships at the same time that it obliges us to honor and preserve the rights of others to be true to themselves and their relationships” (p. 80). These responsibilities are both personal and social. For the educational leader, authenticity also means remembering that the most important work of the school happens in the classroom. “The leader, then, must
truly partner with the teachers continually to explore with them ways to raise the quality of learning for all children” (p. 79-80).

The third virtue of Starratt’s (2004) framework connects responsibility and authenticity. It is the virtue of presence. “Being fully present means being wide awake to what’s in front of you” (p. 86). It is engagement, dialogue, and recognition. This level of communication includes both the spoken word and nonverbal communication, and at its most basic, may be positive or negative. The model further identifies three types of presence: affirming, critical, and enabling. At its best, the leader’s presence empowers, communicating the message, “It’s good to be who you are; let your work express who you are and who you are becoming” (p. 103). The dynamics among the three foundational virtues of educational leadership are expressed visually in Figure 1.

As a theoretical lens for examining leadership, ethical leadership is certainly related, if not antecedent, to transformational leadership. In his seminal work on transformational leadership, Burns (1978) proclaimed, “The premise of this leadership is that, whatever the separate interests persons might hold, they are presently or potentially united in pursuit of ‘higher’ goals, the realization of which is tested by the achievement of significant change…” (p. 425-426). Bass (1998) emphasized the importance of mature moral development for effective transformational leadership, and distinguishes the true transformational leader from the pseudotransformational leader. In his study, true transformational leaders used inspirational or charismatic actions to move followers toward shared
benefits. Pseudotransformational leaders exhibit the same behaviors with self-serving intentions.

Figure 1
Dynamics among the Foundational Virtues

(Starratt, 2004, p. 110)

Conversely, Starratt (2004) repeatedly referred to ethical leadership as transformational in nature. He referred to the critical presence of the ethical leader as a presence that is based on, “compassion and hope for the human condition,” as well as “resilience that transforms oppressive situations into opportunities for heroic and courageous transcendence of the human spirit” (p. 98). Fullan (2003) also defined the moral imperative as transformational, and
calls for principals to lead in their schools, districts, and society. Heifitz & Linsky (2002) referred to this leadership perspective as “sacred heart” and described the qualities of innocence, curiosity, and compassion as the tools of the leader who would "mobilize others…to face challenges that demand courage, and to endure the pains of change without running away" (p. 230).

**Balanced Leadership**

Based on a meta-analysis of more than 30 years of research on the effects of leadership on student achievement, the researchers at Mid-continental Research in Education and Learning (McREL) identified 21 leadership responsibilities and 66 practices that have a significant impact on student achievement. The meta-analysis began with an examination of more than 5000 studies, including doctoral dissertations, completed during the 30 years from the early 1970’s. From those leadership studies, there were 69 that met the criteria for inclusion in the meta-analysis. These criteria included: 1) quantitative student data; 2) student achievement based on norm-referenced tests, or some other objective measure of achievement; 3) student achievement as the dependent variable; and 4) teacher perceptions of leadership as the independent variable (Waters et al., 2003; Waters & Cameron, 2007).

After the 21 responsibilities were identified, a factor analysis was conducted to determine if any of the 21 responsibilities could be reduced or combined. This was accomplished by surveying 700 principals with 92 items related to: 1) the inter-correlation between the 21 leadership responsibilities; and 2) principals’ understanding of change initiatives as first-order or second-order
change. First-order change is defined as change that is perceived as, “1) an extension of the past; 2) within existing paradigms; 3) consistent with prevailing values and norms; and, 4) implemented with existing knowledge and skills.” Second-order change is defined as change that is perceived as, “1) a break with the past; 2) outside of existing paradigms; 3) conflicted with prevailing values and norms; and, 4) requiring new knowledge and skills to implement” (Waters & Cameron, 2007, p. 28). The survey results did not show sufficient correlation between any of the 21 responsibilities to justify eliminating or combining any of them (Figure 2).

Figure 2
Responsibilities Correlated with Second-Order Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positively Correlated</th>
<th>Negatively correlated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment</td>
<td>• Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexibility</td>
<td>• Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change Agent</td>
<td>• Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ideals and Beliefs</td>
<td>• Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitor and Evaluate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Optimize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Waters & Cameron, 2007, p. 12)
The survey did indicate a strong correlation between the 21 responsibilities and change. All 21 responsibilities were positively correlated with first-order change; however, when principals responded to second-order change, the results were different. “Eleven of the leadership responsibilities correlated at a level of statistical significance with second-order change…seven were positively correlated, and four were negatively correlated with second-order change” (Waters & Cameron, 2007, p. 12).

The authors suggested these findings were an indication of the “implementation dip” that typically accompanies the implementation of second-order change initiatives. It suggests that when schools undertake an initiative with second-order implications for most stakeholders, teachers may feel there is less cohesion and more fragmentation in the school and less clarity about the school’s vision (culture). They may also feel the principal is less accessible and willing to listen to their concerns (communication). Furthermore, they may feel like they have less influence on the day-to-day functions and directions of the school (input). Finally, they may feel like patterns of behavior, communications, and decision making are no longer predictable (order). (Waters & Cameron, 2007, p. 13)

The authors emphasized that these are not indicators that principals are not fulfilling the four responsibilities that are negatively correlated with second-order change; rather, that second-order change creates unintended negative consequences, affecting teachers’ perceptions of the principal’s performance. They encourage principals to share these four leadership responsibilities with
members of their leadership team through times of second-order change (Waters & Cameron, 2007). In order to make the 21 responsibilities and 66 practices more readily accessible for school leaders, and connect them to current research in systems theory and school improvement, they were organized into the Balanced Leadership Framework. The four components are configured as shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3
Balanced Leadership Framework

(Waters & Cameron, 2007, p. 15)
This framework arranges the responsibilities and practices in a user-friendly structure, which includes the following four components: 1) Leadership; 2) Focus; 3) Magnitude of Change; and 4) Purposeful Community (Waters & Cameron, 2007). According to the authors, Leadership is the foundation of the framework, and serves as an “interface among Focus, Magnitude, and Purposeful Community” (p. 16). The 21 responsibilities fall under the components as displayed in Figure 4.

Figure 4
Leadership Responsibilities by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposeful Community</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Affirmation</td>
<td>• Focus</td>
<td>• Change agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication</td>
<td>• Contingent rewards</td>
<td>• Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Culture</td>
<td>• Discipline</td>
<td>• Ideals/beliefs*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ideals/beliefs</td>
<td>• Involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment</td>
<td>• Intellectual stimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Input</td>
<td>• Focus</td>
<td>• Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relationships</td>
<td>• Order</td>
<td>• Monitor/evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Situational awareness</td>
<td>• Outreach</td>
<td>• Optimize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visibility</td>
<td>• Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Waters & Cameron, 2007, p. 16)

Ideals and beliefs are included in two categories because the factor analysis identified this responsibility as one positively correlated with second-order
change; however, “it is also included in Purposeful Community due to its importance in building collective efficacy” (p. 17).

The Balanced Leadership Framework includes a four-phase process for leading first-order change and second-order change, as well as a four-fold definition of Purposeful Community. There is a high level of detail for each of the 21 responsibilities and 66 practices, designed to, “help leaders connect vision (i.e., knowing what to do and why to do it) with action (i.e., knowing how to do it) in their schools” (p. 1).

Summary

While there are many lenses through which to view leadership, Wilmore & Thomas (2001) proclaimed, “Without transformational leadership, the school is a ship without a sail, a journey without a map, a compass without a pointer” (p. 117). In 1990, one in 20 students in the public schools in grades K-12 was an English language learner. Today, that number has grown to one in nine, and by 2030, demographers estimate it may reach one in four (Goldenberg, 2008). As a group, English language learners are performing far below their English-speaking peers. On the 2005 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), fourth grade English learners scored approximately three and one-half grade levels below their English-speaking peers in reading, and results were only slightly higher in math and science. Two years later, in 2007, results had not changed (Goldenberg, in press 2010).

Discussing the persistent achievement gap between English language learners and their native English-speaking peers, Collier and Thomas (2009)
observed, “As a nation, we cannot afford continuation of current educational practices that have created this large gap, at the risk of under-preparing a large segment of our citizenry for the 21st century” (p. 4). While there are many lenses through which to view leadership, varied perspectives converge in the precepts of transformational leadership. As Wilmore and Thomas (2001) declared, nothing less will suffice for students.

We cannot keep managing schools as if they were independent entities unconnected to the community as a whole. To produce the results necessary, a transformational leader is required to march students and teachers, academically and personally, into the new century with a love and desire for future learning. Anything less we cannot afford. A transformational leader seeks to change schools as we have known them into caring, responsible, knowledge rich, competent, change-oriented centers of the community. These schools are places where all students truly can and will learn. (Wilmore & Thomas, 2001, p.123).
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to identify leadership practices that support the implementation of dual language initiatives; specifically, practices of district leaders and site administrators that may impact dual language programs, or contribute to the effectiveness and sustainable implementation of those programs. This qualitative study employed an instrumental, collective case study design to collect and analyze data related to the leadership practices of school administrators in seven dual language elementary schools and the district leaders that oversee those programs.

Research Questions

1. What are the leadership practices that contribute to the implementation of established dual language programs?

2. Which, if any, of the nine dimensions of transformational leadership, as defined by Leithwood & Jantzi (2006), are evident in the observed leadership practices of dual language administrators?

Selection of Subjects

The five elementary schools included in this study were located in a large, urban district in a western state. During the 2009 – 2010 school year, the district reported a student population of 309,332 students. Of those students, 41.2% were Hispanic, 18.2% were English language learners, and 43.7% qualified for
free or reduced lunch, a common indicator of economic disadvantage (School Improvement and AMAO Plan, 2010). The district identified these five elementary schools as dual language schools in its *English Language Learner Program for Student Success Procedures Reference Manual* (2010). They represent several geographical regions of the district, with slight variations in demographic profiles.

**Purposeful Sampling**

The five schools were selected for inclusion in the study using homogeneous purposeful sampling methodology, based on the characteristics the sites possess (Creswell, 2005). First, seven elementary schools were identified using the district list of elementary dual language schools published in the district's *English Language Learner Program for Student Success Procedures Reference Manual* (2010) and *Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide* (2010). There was one dual language middle school listed in both program manuals, which was not considered. Demographic characteristics of the seven existing dual language schools were compared, and two schools were eliminated due to the small number of English language learners served by their programs, and their classification as one-way foreign language programs in the district's *Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide* (2010) program roster. Demographic and general achievement characteristics of all district dual language elementary schools are displayed in Table 1.
Based on a comparison of the characteristics of the seven dual language elementary schools in the study district, five schools with similar demographic profiles were chosen for the study. Common characteristics considered by the researcher were higher percentages of students designated Hispanic and limited English proficient (LEP) at the five schools, as well as higher percentages of students who qualified for free or reduced lunch. After the five study schools were identified, alphabetic identifiers were adjusted to match the reduced number of study schools. Characteristics of the five dual language elementary schools selected for the study are displayed in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
<th>School D</th>
<th>School E</th>
<th>School F</th>
<th>School G</th>
<th>School H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRL</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transiency</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient Math</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient Reading</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient Writing</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. FRL = Free or Reduced Lunch; LEP = Limited English Proficient; IEP = Individualized Education Plan.
The two schools not included in this study were schools F and G.
Four of the five elementary schools are listed in the district’s *Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide* (2010) program roster as two-way immersion programs, and one (school C) is listed as a one-way developmental program. Because of its similar demographic profile, and the high percentage of English language learners present in the school population, this school was included the study group.

**Participants**

From the sample population, individual participants in this study included district leaders with oversight responsibilities for dual language initiatives,
including the Deputy Superintendent of Instruction, the Director of English Language Learner Programs, the district’s Dual Language Program Coordinator, and Academic Managers responsible for direct supervision of dual language program schools. At the site level, participants included five building principals and four assistant principals, and one program coordinator at the study schools.

Data Collection

Data collected included semi-structured interviews with district leaders and site administrators working in the dual language programs at the study schools. In addition, observations were conducted at each site using an observation protocol developed by the researcher and in accordance with established district observation procedures. Field notes were recorded describing salient components of the schools’ dual language programs, the school setting, and observed leadership behaviors (Glesne, 2006). Documents produced at the district and site levels were also collected for analysis. Collected data were then analyzed in an integrated manner to provide more “insightful analysis” of both individual and organizational phenomenon that contributed to the “situation under investigation” (Moran-Ellis et al., 2006, pp. 52-53).

Interview Protocols

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with district personnel and school site administrators from the study schools. Interview protocols were developed for use with participants based on the nine domains of Leithwood and Jantzi’s (2006) transformational leadership model, with additional items to explore school-
community partnerships and other organizational structures that support the implementation of dual language programs in study schools (Appendix 2). Protocols were field tested with site administrators working in dual language programs and refined based on their feedback (Glesne, 2006).

District leaders were interviewed at their work sites at times selected by the participants. Interviews were scheduled for 60 minutes, and ranged from approximately 20 minutes to well over an hour. Principals and assistant principals were interviewed at their work site at a time designated by the participant. Each interview was scheduled for 90 minutes and ranged in duration from just under 30 minutes to approximately 60 minutes. In the course of interviewing participants, opportunities became available to explore topics in depth and extend the interview beyond the research protocol (Cresswell, 2005; Glesne, 2006; Yin, 2009). Along with field notes and researcher’s notes taken during interviews, all interviews were audio recorded and transcribed for analysis. Printed transcriptions were first reviewed for accuracy by the researcher, then returned to participants for member checking before they were analyzed. Corrections were made to interview transcriptions based on the responses of participants (Creswell, 2005; Glesne, 2006).

**Field Observation Protocol**

The field observation guide developed for this study included components of the *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* (Howard et al., 2007), as well as elements from Leithwood and Jantzi’s (2006) nine dimensions of transformational leadership (Appendix 3). In addition, there was space for
researcher notes, descriptions, drawings, and personal insights (Creswell, 2005). These descriptive and analytical observations extended the structured components of the observation guide. Glesne (2006) further recommended making autobiographical notations, which situate the researcher within the research context. These notes provided opportunity for reflection and material for reflexivity; specifically, “inquiry into and discussions of decisions affecting the research process” (p. 125).

Documents

Documents collected in the course of this study included district and school site documents related to the education of English language learners and the implementation of dual language programs. Communication in print, email, or on websites, and other public documents provided insight into the research context (Creswell, 2005). Documents were both current and archival in nature, and in some cases extended beyond print or electronic media, including photographs, diagrams, maps, charts, newspaper articles and editorial content. Useful for verifying facts prior to interviews and observations, as well as checking details afterward, documents were most valuable for supplementing and substantiating other sources of information (Yin, 2009).

Validity

According to Yin (2009) construct validity in case study research is established by three processes: using multiple sources of evidence, establishing a chain of evidence, and allowing participants to review and comment on a draft
of the study before it is finalized. The first requirement is satisfied by the collection of interview audio files and transcripts from multiple participants, field notes from researcher observations at study school sites, and the collection and analysis of relevant documents from both the district and school site levels. Yin (2009) further recommended maintaining all collected data in electronic form, including raw audio files from interviews, portable document files, and electronic versions of field notes. This practice would allow other researchers to access data easily should the need arise.

Furthermore, validity is enhanced in case study research by returning a draft copy to participants for review. This member check allows participants to provide feedback and comment on both the preliminary report and interpretation, which may provide additional information to enhance the research findings. Glesne (2006) echoed recommendations to employ multiple sources of data, employ member checking as described by Yin (2009), and added peer review and debriefing to the process. This “external reflection and input” (p. 37) provides perspective, helps to control for researcher bias, and lends credibility to the case study design.

Reliability

Reliability in case study research can be defined as consistency within and across cases in the handling of procedures, processes and analysis of data (Creswell, 2009). In order to ensure reliability in a multi-case study, procedures must be consistently implemented from one site to another; therefore, interview...
protocols were developed in advance and used consistently in all semi-structured interviews. Probes for additional information occurring spontaneously in the course of interviews were documented and applied as appropriate to subsequent interviews, particularly when they yielded pertinent data or uncovered unexpected findings requiring further investigation. When appropriate, the researcher contacted participants directly with follow-up questions to ensure consistency of findings from one site to another.

Observations and field notes were collected at all five dual language sites based on a structured observation field guide to ensure consistency of data collection processes across sites. The guide included components from the *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* (Howard et al., 2007), Leithwood and Jantzi’s (2006) School Leadership and Management Survey, and space for drawings, diagrams, descriptions, and notes related to the school setting and observed behaviors (Glesne, 2005). Site visits included common areas and randomly selected classrooms, and represented a combined total of approximately 120 to 180 minutes at each school site. Site visits were completed over the course of one trimester, or twelve week, period.

**Reflexivity**

Glesne (2006) defined reflexivity as, “critical reflection on how researcher, research participants, setting, and phenomenon of interest interact, and influence each other (p. 6). According to Gilgun (2010), researchers are reflexive when they are aware of the impact they have on the research process in three major
areas: 1) the topics they choose to investigate; 2) the perspectives and experiences of the study participants; and, 3) the audience for whom the presentation of research findings is intended. Glesne (2006) described the reflexive process as “conducting two research projects at the same time: one into your topic, and the other into your ‘self’” (p. 126).

Reflexivity is a process that must be accounted for throughout the research process, from design through implementation, while conducting data analysis, during the process of writing and sharing findings and recommendations, and in applying findings to practice (Gilgun, 2010). According to Watt (2007), “researchers first of all need to be aware of their personal reasons for carrying out a study -- their subjective motives -- for these will have important consequences for the trustworthiness of a project” (p. 85). To facilitate reflexive thought, Glesne (2006) recommended asking oneself questions throughout the research process and recording reflections in a field log. Those questions are classified in three categories: inquirer; participants, and audience. Possible questions are listed in Appendix 4.

Data Analysis

Interview transcripts, observation field notes, and analysis of district and school level documents related to dual language programs were visually scanned and highlighted by the researcher and analyzed for common themes. The nine domains of Leithwood and Jantzi’s (2006) transformational leadership model, along with the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (Howard et al.,
Ryan & Bernard (2003), identified four tasks involved in the analysis of qualitative data: “1) discovering themes and subthemes, 2) winnowing themes to a manageable few (i.e., deciding which themes are important in any project), 3) building hierarchies of themes or code books, and 4) linking themes into theoretical models” (p. 85).

Themes and subthemes were discovered using a method described by Ryan & Bernard (2003) as “pawing through texts and marking them up with different colored pens” (p. 88). Interview transcripts and field notes were read repeatedly and marked with colored highlighters for repetitions in the data, or ideas that occurred frequently across all or most texts analyzed. As those repetitive themes were identified, notes were made in the margins as to possible sub-themes, or categories within the themes, that could be explored by a more in-depth analysis of the text. Interview transcripts were then entered into the Atlas.ti qualitative data analysis software and detailed coding was added using the application’s coding feature. Atlas.ti is a Windows based application which allows the researcher to “organize text, graphic, audio, and visual data files, along you’re your coding, memos, and findings into a project” (Creswell, 2005, p. 235). Codes were categorized and titled based on the seven strands and 30 principles found in the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (Howard et al., 2007). Themes that occurred repetitively in the data were also coded by the researcher (Ryan & Bernard, 2003).
Ryan & Bernard (2003) further recommended the technique of searching for missing data as a form of identifying themes in collected data. "Researchers have long recognized that much can be learned from qualitative data by what is not mentioned" (p.92). Caution must be exercised when employing this method of data analysis, as “Distinguishing between when informants are unwilling to discuss a topic and when they assume the investigator already knows about the topic requires a lot of familiarity with the subject matter” (p.93). Missing data were noted by lack of coded text in a particular strand or principle, then cross-checked with site observations and all district and site level documents available to the researcher.

On the topic of data analysis and interpretation, Glesne (2006) asked the question, “How can you know your interpretation is the right one?” (p.167). The researcher will approach the analysis of collected data from a constructivist-interpretive paradigm, which posits that reality is constructed in the mind of the participant; therefore, there is no single, right way to interpret collected data. According to Ponterotto (2004), the constructivist paradigm depends on dialogic interaction between researcher and participant to shape reality, which is also colored by the context, and life experiences of both the researcher and the participant. While it is imperative that, “the researcher should acknowledge, describe, and "bracket" his or her values,” it is understood that they will never be completely eliminated (p.131).

For the purposes of this study, data collected was organized and synthesized to transform it from its raw form to narrative that was interpreted in broad themes.
as they emerged. Glesne (2006) compared these narratives to the lens of a camera, “selecting and portraying details that resonate with the study’s purposes” (p. 164). As the details of interviews, field notes, and documents came together to tell a story, patterns and trends emerged in response to the research questions. It was in this process that data were transformed into findings.

Summary

The design of this study was to begin with semi-structured interviews with district leaders and site administrators. Interview data were supplemented by observations, field notes, and document analysis. Finally, data were synthesized and displayed in comparison to the nine domains of Leithwood and Jantzi’s (2006) transformational leadership model, along with the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (Howard et al., 2007), in order to create a comprehensive, multi-dimensional view of the dual language context and the leadership factors that influence the implementation of these programs.
This chapter presents the results and findings of this instrumental collective case study, which focused on leadership practices in dual language programs. The chapter is presented using a descriptive approach to provide background information about study participants, historical information about dual language programs in the study district, and to address themes that emerged from the study. The study was guided by two primary research questions:

1. What are the leadership practices that contribute to the implementation of established dual language programs?

2. Which, if any, of the nine dimensions of transformational leadership, as defined by Leithwood & Jantzi (2006), are evident in the observed leadership practices of dual language administrators?

Background Information of Participants

Participants interviewed in this study included five district leaders with oversight responsibilities for dual language programs, the five principals, four assistant principals, and one program coordinator at the dual language elementary study schools. Interviews ranged in length from 20 minutes to approximately an hour and a half. Background information was collected from interview transcripts, as well as site and district level documents available to the researcher. Pseudonyms were assigned to the schools and district level
participants. School pseudonyms were then arranged in alphabetical order for consistency of presentation.

District leaders interviewed in the course of the study included the district’s Deputy Superintendent of Instruction, the English Language Learner Program Director, the English Language Learner Program Dual Language Coordinator, and two Academic Managers with direct supervisory responsibility for dual language elementary schools. Data are presented in Table 3 to establish the roles, gender, ethnicity, length of time in current position, and educational background for each of these participants.

Table 3
Participant Background Information: District Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Time in Current Position</th>
<th>Experience in Dual Language Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Rojas</td>
<td>Deputy Superintendent of Instruction</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>Previous experience in another state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Sanders</td>
<td>English Language Learner Program Director</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Previous experience in another state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dora Ramirez</td>
<td>English Language Learner Program, Dual Language Coordinator</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Bilingual teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Morris</td>
<td>Academic Manager</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>&gt;10 years</td>
<td>Supervision of dual language schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Lindsey</td>
<td>Academic Manager</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>&gt;10 years</td>
<td>Supervision of dual language schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings demonstrated that all five district leaders had some leadership experience in dual language programs. Three were native Spanish speakers, and another spoke Spanish as a second language. All but the Deputy Superintendent of Instruction, David Rojas, were female, and had been in their current positions for five years or more. Elizabeth Morris, Academic Manager, spoke at length about her experience as a dual language parent, and how that experience informed her commitment to dual language programs. For Laura Sanders, English Language Learner Program Director, the interest in dual language programs began when she was a bilingual teacher who identified personally with her English language learner students. All five district leaders stated that they were supportive of dual language programs and believed in the potential for increasing achievement for English language learners.

Background information was also collected for each of the site leaders participating in the study. Data displayed in Table 4 include the site principals’ gender, ethnicity, length of time in current position, previous experience in dual language programs, and whether or not the participant was fluent in the program language, which in this case was Spanish. Pseudonyms were not assigned to site leaders; rather, they were identified by their role at each school. Findings indicated that only two of the principals at the five dual language elementary schools spoke the program language fluently. While principals had some previous experience in dual language programs, most of that experience was teaching experience rather than leadership experience. Only one principal
had leadership experience in a dual language program prior to her current assignment in a dual language school.

### Table 4

**Participant Background Information: Principals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Time in Current Position</th>
<th>Experience in Dual Language Programs</th>
<th>Fluent in Program Language (Spanish)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspen Principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Bilingual teacher</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Bilingual teacher</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress Principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>Previous experience in another state</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian of Middle Eastern descent</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>Teaches university level teacher certification classes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background information was collected for the assistant principals at each site. At the time of the study, there was no assistant principal assigned to Evergreen Elementary School; however, there was a program coordinator who served as instructional leader for the dual language program. The program coordinator was included in the study as the site leader for the dual language program in place of
an assistant principal. Data displayed in Table 4.3 include the site principals’
gender, ethnicity, length of time in current position, previous experience in dual
language programs, and whether or not the participant was fluent in the program
language.

Table 5
Participant Background Information: Assistant Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Time in Current Position</th>
<th>Experience in Dual Language Programs</th>
<th>Fluent in Program Language (Spanish)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspen</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>&gt; 6 months</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian – member of ethnic minority by virtue of religious heritage</td>
<td>&gt; 6 months</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Dual language program program teacher</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the assistant principals had experience in a dual language program
prior to their current assignment at a dual language school, but the program
coordinator had taught in the dual language program at Evergreen Elementary and served as an English Language Learner Specialist prior to assuming her role as an instructional leader for the program. None of these leaders spoke the program language fluently, and two had been in their positions for less than six months at the time of the study. All four assistant principals reported both instructional and leadership experience in schools with diverse student populations prior to assuming their positions at dual language schools.

Dual Language Programs in the Study District

The study district recognized seven schools as dual language elementary schools. Of those seven schools, two were more accurately described as “international schools” with less than 3% English language learners in one school and less than 20% English language learners in the second. Four of the remaining five elementary schools were listed in the district’s Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide (2010) program roster as two-way immersion programs, and one school, with 82.1% English language learners, was listed as a one-way developmental program. For purposes of the study, and to maintain the anonymity of participants, schools were assigned pseudonyms. Pseudonyms were then arranged in alphabetical order for consistency of presentation. The five dual language elementary schools included in this study are: Aspen Elementary School, Bristol Elementary School, Cypress Elementary School, Douglas Elementary School, and Evergreen Elementary School.
The first dual language program in the study district was founded in 2001 at Evergreen Elementary School. The program was started in kindergarten and first grade with 14 students participating at the kindergarten level, and 16 students participating at the first grade level. The program was described as a two-way immersion model, with 50% of students' instructional time provided in English, and 50% in Spanish. Care was also taken to ensure a balance of native English speakers with native Spanish speakers in the program. A program coordinator and additional teaching units, along with Spanish language materials, were provided through a federal grant in the amount of $425,000.00, which supported the program over the course of two years. In the second year, the program was expanded to second grade (Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide, 2010; Grant Performance Report, 2003).

As part of the initial implementation of the district’s dual language initiative, a new program was established at a second elementary school in 2002. This was a one-way foreign language immersion program, overseen by the grant-funded program coordinator. Additional teaching units were funded through the grant, and extensive professional development was provided to program teachers at both schools. Regularly scheduled meetings were held with parents of students participating in the program, which addressed various aspects of the program, concepts related to language acquisition, and strategies for assisting students in the home. The program coordinator provided advocacy, professional development, resource acquisition, student assessment, and program evaluation support throughout the term of the grant. When the grant expired in 2003, the
program coordinator retired, and the district chose not to fund the position. However, the grant’s goal of expanding dual language programs in the study district was realized, with two additional programs added in 2004, one more in 2005, and another two in the fall of 2006.

District Organization and Supervision

The study district covered an area of almost 8,000 square miles. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the population served by the district was 1,375,765 in 2000, and had grown to 1,951,269 at the time of the 2010 census. The district reported a total enrollment of 231,125 students in the 2000 – 2001 school year, and a total enrollment of 309,480 in the 2011 – 2012 school year. During the ten year period from 1999 to 2009, the district enrollment grew by 65,000 students (Budget and Statistical Report, 2012). From 2000 to the time of this study, the district was under the direction of three different superintendents.

In 2000, the district was organized into five geographical regions, with a Region Superintendent assigned to each region and an Assistant Superintendent assigned to direct supervision of school principals, as displayed on the simplified organizational chart in Figure 5 (Budget and Statistical Report, 2005). Supervision of the dual language programs typically fell to the direct line supervisor, who changed over the years with three major reorganizations in the study district.
In 2006, an additional region, designated Superintendent’s Schools Division, was added, to serve 32 specialty schools that fell into four designated categories: (a) Empowerment Schools; (b) Select Schools; (c) Professional Practice Schools; and (d) Language Acquisition Models. Four dual language schools were moved into that line of supervision under the heading Language Acquisition Models with the expressed purpose of addressing the needs of English language learners, as displayed in Figure 6 (Budget & Statistical Report, 2007). The fifth study school, Evergreen Elementary, remained under the supervision of the East Region, supervised by the Assistant Superintendent. This seemed to have been an inadvertent omission of the school from the list of dual language schools moved to the Superintendent’s Schools line of supervision.
In January of 2006, the English Language Learner Program Department hired a full time Dual Language Program Coordinator to support the development and implementation of dual language programs. An Assistant Superintendent was assigned to the supervision of the four dual language schools in the Superintendent’s Schools Division. Collaborative meetings and professional development opportunities were organized for dual language site leaders. During the 2007-2008 school year, planning began for a dual language middle school, designated as a magnet school to serve students district-wide. The middle school began implementation of its dual language magnet program in the fall of 2008. Throughout this phase of growth, three of the district’s seven dual language schools remained under the supervision of their respective regions,
with direct supervision provided by the Assistant Superintendent assigned by the Region Superintendent to the school.

Effective July, 2009, the district was again reorganized, consolidating the six existing regions into four service areas. The Region Superintendents’ title was changed to Area Superintendent, and the Assistant Superintendents responsible for the direct supervision of schools were assigned to new positions titled *Academic Managers*. The Superintendent’s Schools Division was consolidated into the Instruction Unit, reporting directly to the Deputy Superintendent of Instruction. The Associate Superintendent of the Superintendent’s Schools Division retained responsibility for schools designated Empowerment Schools and Magnet and Career and Technical Academies, formerly designated Select Schools. As displayed on Figure 7, dual language elementary schools were returned to their respective areas, reporting directly to the Academic Manager assigned by the Area Superintendent (Budget & Statistical Report, 2010a).

Each designated Area Superintendent was responsible for developing area-wide initiatives, which were communicated with school administrators at monthly principal’s meetings. Initiatives focused on literacy, mathematics, interventions, and classroom walk-through models for improving instruction. These initiatives varied from one area to the next, as did expectations for implementation of district-wide initiatives related to parent communication and grading.
In August of 2011, under the direction of a new Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent of Instruction, the district was reorganized into three Area Service Centers. Each Area Service Center was divided into Performance Zones, generally organized around school feeder alignment patterns. Each of the 13 Performance Zones was assigned to a separate Academic Manager, who reported directly to the Deputy Superintendent of Instruction. Dual language schools were included in their respective Performance Zones according to their high school feeder alignments, and reported to their corresponding Academic Managers (Figure 8).
Included in the 2011 reorganization of the study district was a change in the organizational mapping of the English Language Learner Program Department. Historically, the program was located in the Student Support Services line of supervision, which included other federally funded programs such as Title I services, the Office of Compliance and Monitoring, the Gifted and Talented Education program, the Grants Development Department, and all special education services. Under the new organizational structure, the English Language Learner Program Department was moved directly under the supervision of the Deputy Superintendent of Instruction. The Dual Language Program Coordinator was assigned to provide services to specific Performance Zones and support to dual language schools as needed.
Findings indicated that dual language schools were consistently placed in the district organizational line of supervision based on geographic location, rather than common program designation. During the two academic years when the dual language schools were assigned to the Superintendents’ Schools Division, they were recognized as Language Acquisition Model schools, and additional attention was devoted to program development. However, the principal at Evergreen Elementary School reported that the school was excluded from the list of dual language schools moved to the Superintendent’s Schools Division, and for the first half of the 2006-2007 school year, that particular school was without designated supervision. This seemed to be an inadvertent omission on the part of the district.

Findings also indicated that the district reorganization process resulted in numerous supervisory changes at the schools. By the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year, dual language elementary schools had experienced two to five different direct supervisors over the life of the dual language program. Supervisory changes were compounded by changes in site principals over the years, as there had been at least two different principals assigned to each of the schools during the years the schools had been implementing dual language programs (Table 6).

Dual language principals reported that there had been a minimum of three assistant principals assigned to each of the dual language schools as well. There was no evidence that specific criteria had been established for the selection of
either district supervisors or site administrators responsible for the oversight of dual language programs.

Table 6

Supervisory Changes in Dual Language Schools: 2001-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor 1</td>
<td>Supervisor 2</td>
<td>Supervisor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal 1</td>
<td>Principal 2</td>
<td>Principal 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor 1</td>
<td>Supervisor 2</td>
<td>Supervisor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal 1</td>
<td>Principal 2</td>
<td>Principal 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress</td>
<td>Supervisor 1</td>
<td>Supervisor 2</td>
<td>Supervisor 3</td>
<td>Supervisor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Principal 1</td>
<td>Principal 2</td>
<td>Supervisor 1</td>
<td>Supervisor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen</td>
<td>Supervisor 1</td>
<td>Supervisor 2</td>
<td>Supervisor 3</td>
<td>Supervisor 4</td>
<td>Supervisor 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal 1</td>
<td>Principal 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District Requirements for Dual Language Programs

During the 2009-2010 school year, under the supervision of the Superintendent’s Schools Division, the district developed a Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide. The guide was developed by the English Language Learner Program Department, and was co-edited by the Executive Director of Dual Language of New Mexico, who was also one of the co-authors of the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (Howard et al., 2007), a nationally recognized guide for the planning, implementation, and evaluation of dual language programs.
The program guide described a stringent ten-step process for any school to be certified as a dual language school, which included requesting an application from the English Language Learner Program Department and submitting the application to the school’s direct supervisor for preliminary approval. In addition to supervisory approval, the application was to be approved by the English Language Learner Program Department. Combined with the approval process, the school was required to address the following questions, listed on a separate commitment form:

- How does the school’s student population support the implementation of a Dual Language Enrichment Program?
- How will you structure the school day to ensure a commitment of time for additional content and language development in both languages of instruction?
- How will you ensure teachers are provided with common planning time required for the full implementation of the Dual Language program?
- What steps will the school take to ensure qualified bilingual and/or TESL endorsed teachers are hired to implement the program?
- How will you fund supplementary materials required to provide appropriate grade-level instruction in both languages?
- How will you fund professional development of Dual Language program components for all staff?
- How will you fund at least one additional teacher to coordinate program implementation and student progress monitoring in the target language?


Along with the commitment form, schools were required to submit a record of meeting dates documenting meetings with various stakeholder groups, dates the meetings were held, names of committee members, and dates of compliance.
with various staff notification requirements. The stakeholder record must indicate that at least 75% of the staff and community were in agreement with plans to implement a dual language program at the school (p.16). Once all forms were completed and approvals obtained from the supervisor and English Language Learner Program Department, the school was given permission to begin planning for program implementation. Implementation of the dual language program begins in the early childhood or kindergarten program, and is articulated up one grade level each year. Recommendations were included for attrition as the program moved up, and how to place students who entered the school after first grade.

The district's *Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide* (2010) further outlined three minimum requirements, labeled in the guide as “non-negotiables” that must be followed by all dual language schools:

1. Instruction in both Spanish and English, with a minimum of 50 percent of instruction in Spanish for all students;
2. Strict separation of languages for instruction; and
3. A minimum commitment of K-5 for elementary schools implementing the program.

The guide stated that only schools following these three non-negotiable requirements were authorized to implement a dual language program. The district, in the same section, made the commitment,“to promising the development of a K-12 Dual Language Enrichment Program as the need and interest of students and families grow” (p. 7).
The district guide also outlined four goals of dual language programs in the district. These were:

1. Students will develop high levels of proficiency in their first language.

2. All students will develop high levels of proficiency in a second language.

3. Academic performance for both groups of students will be at or above grade level.

4. All students will demonstrate positive cross-cultural attitudes and behaviors. *(Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide, 2010, p. 7).*

Research was cited emphasizing the continued dominance of the majority language (English) in dual language programs, and the district articulated its commitment “to being intentional in the development, delivery, and assessment/monitoring of cross-cultural competency curriculum” (p.8).

Schools were given the option of selecting the dual language model appropriate for their school community, as long as the model conformed to one of the district’s three standard models. The first model sanctioned by the district was a 50:50 Two-Way Immersion program. This model is described as 50:50 because half of the instructional time is allocated to the majority language (English), while the other half is allocated to the minority language (in this case, Spanish). Two-way refers to the student population, ideally comprised of half students who are proficient in the majority language and half who are proficient in the minority language. Where the school population does not permit the school to meet this requirement, the guide stated, “In order for this model to maximize its effectiveness, at least one third of its students need to be proficient in each of the
program languages” (p. 9). Under the two-way program immersion description, the guide presented options for literacy development. These included initial literacy presented in both program languages to both groups (simultaneous literacy development), or the separation of students by native language for initial literacy instruction (native initial literacy) in kindergarten and first grade.

The second program model offered as an option for schools was 50:50 Developmental One-Way Immersion. This option was presented for schools “in which all or most students are English Learners” and was described as one-way because “the primary/only direction of language learning is the addition of English to the EL Student’s native language (usually Spanish)” (p. 10). The third option presented for schools was a 50:50 Foreign Language One Way Immersion program, which serves native English speaking students in schools that do not have the requisite one-third native Spanish speakers to develop a two-way immersion program. Included in all program descriptions were requirements for schools to implement the chosen model with a high level of fidelity, defining criteria for fidelity, and rationale for fidelity of implementation.

To guide Spanish language instruction, the Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide (2010) provided Spanish Language Arts Standards adapted from the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Spanish Language Arts Standards. Standards were provided for primary elementary, intermediate elementary, middle and high school, and the expressed expectation was that teachers in the district’s dual language program were to use these standards when providing instruction in Spanish (p. 21).
Research Questions

Two research questions guided the inquiry in this study. The questions are:

1. What are the leadership practices that contribute to the implementation of established dual language programs?
2. Which, if any, of the nine dimensions of transformational leadership, as defined by Leithwood and Jantzi (2006), are evident in the observed leadership practices of dual language administrators?

First, collected data, including interview transcripts, site observation notes, and a variety of documents were read repeatedly, and highlighted by the researcher to identify salient themes, concepts, and repeated ideas in texts. Notes were made in the margins as the researcher reviewed, sorted and highlighted text. After several reviews of the data, the researcher entered the collected data into Atlas.ti qualitative analysis software, in order to more readily manage the large quantities of data and the number of related codes that emerged from the text.

Collected data were reviewed by the researcher using the Atlas.ti qualitative data analysis software and detailed coding was added using the application’s coding feature. The first set of codes was developed in conjunction with Research Question One: What are the leadership practices that contribute to the implementation of established dual language programs? The conceptual framework for developing the first set of codes was the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (Howard et al., 2007). A second, parallel set of codes was developed within the same hermeneutical unit based on Research Question
2: Which, if any, of the nine dimensions of transformational leadership, as defined by Leithwood and Jantzi (2006), are evident in the observed leadership practices of dual language administrators? The conceptual framework for the second set of codes was the nine dimensions of transformational leadership, as posited by Leithwood & Jantzi (2006). Themes that occurred repetitively in the data were also coded by the researcher (Ryan & Bernard, 2003).

Themes and categories for Research Question Two were coded within the Atlas.ti qualitative data analysis software program within the same hermeneutical unit, alongside themes and categories for Research Question One. Then the researcher reviewed the collected data again for correlations and connections between the two questions. Using the Atlas.ti network function, categories from Research Question One were combined with Research Question Two to create thematic networks between the two questions.

In this section, findings were organized based on those thematic networks as they emerged under the three categories and nine dimensions of transformational leadership as conceptualized by Leithwood and Janzti (2006). Where appropriate, the researcher combined dimensions within the same category to accommodate discussion of the findings. Findings from Research Question One, which are specifically related to leadership practice in dual language programs, were subsumed in the transformational leadership framework in order to examine them from that conceptual perspective. As recommended by Ryan & Bernard (2003), the researcher also reviewed the data
for missing information to identify themes, cross-checking interviews with
collected documents and field observations.

The researcher identified five salient themes, aligned with the Leithwood &
Jantzi (2006) transformational leadership framework, which included the seven
strands and all 30 guiding principles for dual language education identified by
Howard et al. (2007):

1. Building Vision
2. Setting Goals and Priorities
3. Holding High Performance Expectations
4. Resources
5. Collaboration and Shared Decision Making

Building Vision

Leithwood, et al. (1999), define the process of building vision well beyond the
school level, and list the following vision-building behaviors of district
superintendents:

- Developing a district mission statement and constantly using it with
  staff in communication and decision making;
- Creating a shared vision for the district in which most district members
  believe;
- Using research in decision making and planning;
- Being sensitive to the views of the community, parents, board, and
  staff about directions for the district;
• Being willing to take risks in order to bring about change;
• Incorporating considerations for the district’s past and present in developing plans for the future (p. 58-59).

Findings indicated that the study district had a mission statement, or slogan, that was used consistently in all district communication, “Ready by Exit.” In a State of the District message in early 2012, the district superintendent reiterated his reform agenda, with mention of a blue-ribbon task force to examine the possibility of expanding innovative programs. Specifically mentioned were empowerment schools, magnet programs, and options for blended learning using online technologies. A new performance framework that ranked schools based on various factors, including growth on state tests and achievement gap closure for identified subgroups, was mentioned for the first time to the public.

In remarks addressing area needing improvement, the superintendent called for a “consistent district-wide plan to help students with English language acquisition.” He qualified this statement by including all students, including those who may not have been read to at home, not just those acquiring English as another language. There was no mention of dual language programs, or of any specific options for improving services to English language learners.

When interviewed for this study, David Rojas, Deputy Superintendent of Instruction, articulated a long range vision for expanding dual language programs, which included adding dual language elementary schools and expanding programs to middle and high school. However, that vision was not communicated to dual language site leaders or their direct supervisors.
Elizabeth Morris, Academic Manager and dual language parent, reflected on the district’s vision for dual language programs,

As far as what I think the vision is for the English language learners – it’s to get them to be proficient. It’s to get them to be able to read, speak, write, and listen to English. As far as dual language, I’m not so sure I think that the district advocates for bi-literacy, and I feel like we’re really missing out by not promoting that more.

Dual language principals were even more concerned about the district’s vision for their programs. The principal at Aspen was very direct in her expressing her doubt about the district’s vision, “Sometimes I question if they’re going to let us continue doing this. I don’t know. That’s a big question that I have, and I hope they will, because our kids need it.” The principal at Douglas was also unsure of the district’s support for dual language,

I know that it’s effective. I think that if I could run it school-wide it would help us give every child the opportunity to be bilingual and bi-literate by the end of fifth grade. I think that would be great. I don’t know if the district can support it once they leave elementary school.

The effects of the district’s lack of vision for dual language programs had influence beyond leaders’ uncertainty about the future. Because there was no central vision for dual language programs, there was no board policy or regulation that required schools’ to comply with the district’s *Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide* (2010), or with best practices in dual language education. The English Language Learner Program staff had no authority to
direct principals or their supervisors, nor were they allowed to remove resources when programs were poorly implemented. For these reasons, program structures in the study schools were not in alignment with the district’s standards for dual language programs. Figure 9 demonstrates the relationship of the building vision dimension of Leithwood and Jantzi’s (2006) framework with Strand Five of the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (Howard et al., 2007).

Figure 9

Relationships between Transformational Leadership (Leitwood & Jantzi, 2006) and Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (Howard et al., 2007) in the theme Building Vision

Leithwood et al. (1999) described eight characteristics of a transformational principal specific to building vision as providing an overall sense of purpose, developing a shared vision, communicating the vision of the school to
stakeholders, and creating excitement around the common vision of the school. Findings indicated the three of the five principals in the five dual language study schools were passionate about the dual language program at their school and shared that passion with their staff and community. The principal at Evergreen Elementary described her vision for the dual language and her dream for her students to continue learning language,

My inspiration is to continue with the dual language and hopefully students do not quit after fifth grade because how wonderful it is to have another language! It’s a unique experience to have the students learn a second language in kindergarten. By third grade they’re proficient and it’s a treat to go visit and sit with the kids and see how they’re learning in the classroom. I hope they continue to do so.

The principal at Aspen expressed her excitement about the program, and the possibilities it offered her students,

There are lots of stories. It's not just a program for my little Hispanic kids. It's for everyone. It's for my African American kids and my white kids. Anybody can be bilingual, trilingual, quadra-lingual, you know, and that's the hope – that we can do that. It gives them a different perspective. It immerses them in culture, too, because we do things with Social Studies, so they get to see and feel other things that they might not have thought of before.

However, the principal at Cypress Elementary expressed doubt about the program, “I'm still not convinced this is the route to go for this school. It may be, it
may not be. I’ll be very anxious to see, to take a look at our data at the end of the year.” Because of the loss of bilingual staff and the minimal implementation at Douglass Elementary, the principal expressed frustration,

I know this is going to sound bad but it’s pathetic. And it’s embarrassing that this is the way that I run it here. And it hurts because I know what it takes to run a great empowered, successful program and I’m not doing it.

Program Structure

The five dual language elementary schools included in this study had been implementing their dual language programs for five years or more. Site leaders were asked to describe their dual language programs, site documents were analyzed, and program descriptions were returned to participants for verification. Findings revealed a variety of implementation configurations in the five district dual language programs. Programs were placed on a matrix by grade level describing dual language staffing distributions at each grade level, as demonstrated in Table 7.

For purposes of reporting, the total number of dual language program classes at each grade level is displayed first in the table, followed by the total number of teachers allocated to the grade level. After the colon, each cell displays the number of teachers providing instruction in English and Spanish at each grade level. In cases where a dual language program teacher provided instruction in both English and Spanish in the same classroom, that class was labeled Self-Contained DL English & Spanish.
Dual language programs are typically implemented in kindergarten or in kindergarten and first grade during the first year of implementation, with a grade level added each year as students move through the program (Freeman, et al. 2005; Soltero, 2004). With the study district’s average rate of transience at 32.5%, and all five study dual language schools reporting transiency rates at or above the district average, some attrition would be expected in the programs. Four of the five study schools reported placing incoming Spanish-speaking students who were new to the country into their dual language programs in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual Language Program Structure: Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aspen ES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Teachers: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, 4 Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bristol ES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 teachers: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, 3 Spanish, 1 self-contained DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cypress ES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Teachers: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, 2 Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Douglas ES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Teachers: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, 2 Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evergreen ES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 teachers: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, 2 Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


upper grades. Even with all these factors considered, the researcher did not find all five dual language programs to be fully staffed and articulated from kindergarten through fifth grade.

Aspen Elementary did not provide dual language programming for kindergarten students, whose instruction was all in English. The principal stated “Because our population is so low literacy-wise, and due to staffing as well, I decided to just have kindergarten be all English for right now.” Douglas Elementary offered no dual language instruction in first grade, and only one class in second and third grades. Although, after five years of implementation, the program should have been fully articulated through fourth grade, there were no dual language program classes in fourth and fifth grade. The principal cited staffing as the primary reason for the lack of consistent dual language programming at the school.

Table 8 displays program features at the five dual language elementary study schools by grade level. These features include percentage of instructional time allocated to each program language, whether language was divided by content or time, and if language was divided by content area, the table indicates which content areas were taught in Spanish and which were taught in English. Where the schools met the district requirement of 50% of instructional time allocated to each program language, the table indicates the program at that grade level was 50:50.
While the district expressly required all elementary dual language programs to implement a 50:50 model from kindergarten through fifth grade (*Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide*, 2010), findings indicated that schools were meeting that requirement in approximately 60% of dual language classrooms in the study schools. At Douglas Elementary, the dual language program was only being implemented at the kindergarten level. Because the teachers at second and third grade were delivering instruction primarily in English, with native language support in Spanish, the classrooms at second and third grade were not meeting
the district requirements for any of the dual language models described in the *Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide* (2010). Furthermore, those classrooms did not fit the working definition of dual language classrooms present in the literature describing best practice in dual language education (Freeman et al., 2005; Lessow-Hurley, 2005; Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

Cypress Elementary also demonstrated program structures that were inconsistent with district requirements and best practices in dual language education. While the program in kindergarten and first grade conformed to acceptable models, with students separated for initial literacy instruction in their native language, literacy instruction was all English in second through fifth grade. Math instruction was also in English, leaving only Science and Social Studies instruction in Spanish. Both site leaders cited concern for standardized tests in English and poor performance on English reading assessments as the reason for this program decision. The assistant principal also worried that some of the Spanish dual language program teachers were not adequate language models for the students in English, although they were originally hired to teach in Spanish.

District leaders interviewed in this study recognized the inconsistencies in program implementation, but did not act to correct them. Both Cypress and Douglas Elementary were assigned different Academic Managers at the start of the study. These two supervisors were new to their positions and had no experience with dual language programs. When the principal at Douglas Elementary went to her immediate supervisor with staffing concerns, seeking
advice as to how to continue the dual language program at the school with reduced staffing, her supervisor’s reply was, “Do what you have to do.” The principal chose to reduce the dual language program to two kindergarten classrooms, and in spite of parent concerns, the supervisor supported this decision.

The English Language Learner Program Director stated that she had no authority over principals, and was only able to make recommendations for program improvement. She referred to the Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide (2010) as a “cookbook” for dual language programs rather than a document with regulatory authority over programs, although it was endorsed by the school board and developed by her department. The Deputy Superintendent of Instruction also recognized that dual language programs were being implemented with varying degrees of fidelity, and articulated the need for the district to make a firm decision about its investment in dual language programs. He discussed fidelity of implementation as a component of strong dual language programs and stated that he was working directly with the English Language Learner Program Director to make improvements.

The researcher found no official school board policy in the study district regulating dual language programs, nor was there any reference to bilingual programs in general or dual language programs specifically noted in the district’s official regulations. The state law required the district to provide students with, “a bilingual program of instruction or a program of instruction that teaches English as a second language” (NAC 388.640). However, there was no specific
legislation requiring the district to provide students with instruction in their native language, and no mention of dual language programs in the state’s administrative code governing educational programs of study.

Although eight out of ten school leaders expressed a vision for the future of the dual language programs at their schools, findings indicated the absence of a unifying vision for dual language programs from the district level. This created uncertainty and frustration for school leaders, along with inconsistent implementation of programs within and among schools. Although the district published a Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide (2010) outlining requirements for program planning and implementation, there were no supervisory requirements for schools to follow the expectations set out in the guide, nor were there sanctions for schools that failed to meet the “non-negotiable” expectations set out by the district.

Goals and Priorities

The dimension of developing specific goals and priorities includes ten transformational leadership practices, outlined by Leithwood et al. (1999). These practices include developing clear goals that are aligned with the school’s vision, providing staff with a process to review progress toward goals, express their views about common goals, and align school goals with individual professional goals. Transformational leaders also work “towards the development of consensus about school and group goals and the priority to be awarded such goals” (p. 65).
One of the systems schools use for setting goals and priorities is the school improvement planning process. When asked about the school improvement plan in place at each of the dual language study schools, principals reported that the dual language program was not mentioned in the plan for their schools. The focus at each of these schools was on standardized assessments used to determine the schools’ AYP status, which were all administered in English; therefore, site leaders did not see the value in including the dual language program in their school improvement plans. Because there was no formal accountability process for dual language program evaluation, nor did the district place value on student progress in Spanish, schools did not view the program as a priority.

The principal at Bristol Elementary mentioned that the school was accountable for English testing, but did not get credit for the work they did in dual language, “I've seen at a dual language school we do certain things in dual language but we don’t get – we're not accountable AYP wise for the Spanish portion of it because you don't test in Spanish, so that makes it a little difficult.” Figure 10 demonstrates the relationship transformational leadership dimension Goals and Priorities to Strand One of the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (Howard et al., 2007), Assessment and Accountability, as well as the first two goals of all dual language programs:

1. academic proficiency in two languages; and
2. linguistic proficiency in two languages.
The English Language Learner Program Director reported that the district had plans to conduct a program evaluation at the dual language schools, but funding had not permitted the hiring of out-of-district consultants to perform the program evaluation. She stated that the program evaluation would be based on the district’s *Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide* (2010), and that she wanted to give schools time to conform to the requirements set out in the guide. “So now after three years we’ve given them enough time. On the fourth year will be the evaluative piece. We’re looking at getting dual language directors from other districts to come in and do the outside evaluation.” None of the site leaders had
been advised that an evaluation of their dual language program was being considered.

**Assessment and Accountability**

The district, in accordance with state and federal regulations, required both initial and annual language proficiency assessment of all students who qualified for English language learner services, with additional requirements for students enrolled in dual language programs. According to the *ELLP Procedures Reference Manual* (2010), the district was required by state law to administer initial assessments dual language students in their primary language except in the following circumstances: 1) the student is in kindergarten or first grade; or 2) the student’s first language is not commonly written. The procedures reference manual stated that the responsibility for administering Spanish language assessments to dual language students belonged to the schools.

Results of annual English language proficiency assessments were reported at the school and district levels in compliance with federal regulations in a report of Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). These objectives established three criteria for student advancement in English by language acquisition level and academic achievement. Two goals were related to language proficiency as measured by the annual English language proficiency assessment, and one was based on results from the state’s criterion referenced assessment (CRT) as established by Title I goals for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). These goals were established by the state’s Department of Education,
and did not include progress in Spanish language acquisition for students in dual language programs (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives, 2012).

All five schools reported administering some type of reading assessment in English and Spanish to as formative measures to evaluate the progress of their dual language students. These assessments included the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), the Aimsweb Reading Curriculum-Based Measurement (R-CBM). One school also reported using the Qualitative Spelling Inventory (QSI) in English and Spanish. The English Language Learner Program for Student Success Procedures Reference Manual (2010) did not state that schools must administer an annual assessment in Spanish; however, it had been the practice of the district to do so. Students enrolled in dual language programs were tested annually using the Spanish version of the language proficiency assessment administered to all language learners in the district. Results were compiled in the English Language Learner Program’s database and made available to site leaders via the program’s website in a password protected area. Data were archived and Spanish scores were readily available online for dual language program students from the past five years of language proficiency assessments. When asked about measures used to evaluate program effectiveness, only three site leaders mentioned the use of language proficiency scores, Spanish or English, to evaluate the efficacy of their dual language programs.

The English Language Learner Program Director stated that the district had adopted the WIDA standards for Spanish Language Arts Standards, and those
standards were included in the *Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide* (2010) with the requirement that dual language program teachers use them in the design and delivery of instruction in Spanish. However, none of the site leaders interviewed was aware of the district’s adoption of the WIDA standards or their presence in the program guide. They reported searching for Spanish language arts standards online, and using standards found online from other states. Furthermore, the researcher found no direct alignment between the district’s Spanish language assessment and the WIDA standards.

Without exception, school leaders cited the state’s Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) in reading and mathematics as the standard measure for evaluating the effectiveness of their dual language program. This assessment was administered to all district elementary students in third through fifth grades in the spring of each year, and was only given in English. Students were also tested in writing in fifth grade. Writing scores were combined with fifth grade reading scores to calculate students’ English Language Arts proficiency score. Results from these assessments were the standard by which all schools were classified by the state as making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) or not under the 2001 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), or No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (Proficiency Examination Program, 2010). None of the five study schools made AYP targets for the 2010-2011 school year (see school AYP designations in Table 9), increasing the sense of urgency and pressure felt by site leaders.
### Table 9

Dual Language Elementary Schools: AYP Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>10-11 Classification</th>
<th>10-11 Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspen ES</td>
<td>Did not make AYP</td>
<td>N4 – Needs Improvement, Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol ES</td>
<td>Did not make AYP</td>
<td>N1 – Needs Improvement, Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress ES</td>
<td>Did not make AYP</td>
<td>N8 – Needs Improvement, Year 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas ES</td>
<td>Did not make AYP</td>
<td>N6 – Needs Improvement, Year 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen ES</td>
<td>Did not make AYP</td>
<td>W – Watch List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appeals and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Final Designations (2011)*

The study district pointed out clearly in its program guide that, “The research indicates that on average both NES and ELL students participating in Dual Language Enrichment Education do as well or better on standardized English achievement tests as their monolingual speaking peers …” (p. 3). Nevertheless, findings indicate that site leaders tended to add English-only instruction because of their concern over student achievement on English standardized tests. One principal said, “Since we only do testing CRT’s in English, it’s just hard to say how much we can focus on Spanish when we need to focus on English for some of these students. We have to pass the CRT’s, so all the focus has to be on the CRT’s. The CRT’s are in English.” An assistant principal explained, “Being where we are, we need to teach them literacy in English. When you take the
high school proficiency, it’s in English. The writing exam is going to be in English, so we have to get them there.”

High Performance Expectations

The third dimension of the category Setting Directions in Leithwood and Jantzi’s (2006) Transformational Leadership framework is Holding High Performance Expectations. Leithwood et al. (1999) defined the characteristics of a transformational leader in this dimension as:

- Expecting staff to be innovative, hardworking and professional; these qualities are included among the criteria for hiring staff;
- Demonstrating an unflagging commitment to the welfare of students;
- Often espousing norms of excellence and quality of service;
- Not accepting second rate performance from anyone;
- Establishing flexible boundaries for what people do, thus permitting freedom of judgment within the context of overall school goals and plans;
- Being clear about one’s own views of what is right and good” (p. 69).

Another characteristic of the transformational leader defined in this dimension, which Leithwood et al. (1999) assigned to district level leaders, is “openly valuing justice, community, democracy, excellence, and equality” (p. 69). This characteristic directly correlates the third goal of all dual language programs, which is developing cross-cultural competence. From the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (Howard et al., 2007), the researcher grouped Strand 2: Curriculum, and Strand 3: Instruction, in this dimension (Figure 11).
While classroom instruction was not the focus of this study, in the course of data collection, site leaders discussed instructional practices. Principals and assistant principals discussed the foundational practices of dual language instruction, such as the separation of languages for instruction, heterogeneous cooperative grouping, and the availability of materials in both languages for instruction (Freeman et al., 2005; Gómez, Freeman & Freeman, 2005; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Soltero, 2004). They were highly attuned to the district’s implementation of the Common Core State Standards, and without exception,
stated that the program was aligned to state and district standards. While all site leaders expressed a desire for students to gain bilingual competencies, the pressure to meet state and district AYP targets shifted their primary focus to academic achievement in English.

**Cross-Cultural Competence**

Christian (2000) articulated the three goals of dual language programs as 1) high levels of proficiency in two languages; 2) academic achievement in two languages; and 3) cross cultural competence. The importance of the third goal, and its impact on the linguistic and academic achievement of language minority students, are documented in the literature in the field of dual language education (Collier & Thomas, 2009; Freeman et al., 2005; Howard, et. al., 2007; Lessow-Hurley, 2005; Lindholm-Leary, 2001). The study district’s *Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide* (2010) stated that the district, “is committed to being intentional in the development, delivery, and assessment/monitoring of cross-cultural competency curriculum” (p. 8).

The researcher found minimal reference to the third goal in all collected data, both from district and site level leaders. The English Language Program Director stated that the program had collaborated with the district’s Equity and Diversity Department to provide training in cultural diversity for schools; however, these professional development opportunities were not mentioned by the dual language elementary schools included in the study. Veronica Lindsey, one of the two Academic Managers included in the study, discussed her understanding of “hidden rules” and a background in working with students from “impoverished
circumstances.” When discussing the district’s vision for English language learners, district leaders consistently focused on academic proficiency in English as the district’s goal for language minority students.

While site leaders were able to articulate goals related to academic and linguistic proficiency, they were not as likely to mention cultural competence as a program goal. The program coordinator at Evergreen Elementary stated that students learned about cultures in Spanish-speaking countries through their social studies text, and the principal at Aspen made a similar reference to cultural activities within the social studies curriculum. When asked specifically about cross-cultural competence, the assistant principal at Bristol Elementary explained that students developed cross cultural understanding by working side-by side in two languages and establishing friendships with students from other ethnic groups. She also emphasized the advantages of having a diverse staff, where bilingual staff members were able to assist their English-speaking colleagues with making community connections. The assistant principal at Cypress Elementary mentioned the cultural context of the school community; however, his comments indicated difficulty in communicating school priorities with parents and community. He defined one of his challenges as,

Parents understanding what we do in the school. A lot of times we do things in school, and they don’t understand why. So how do we communicate that effectively without really being rude, or not being able to relate to the culture, and being anti-Spanish?
Amrein & Peña (2000) discussed asymmetry in dual language programs, and asserted, "Without a systematic review of their practices, dual language programs may be subjecting students to inequality, to fewer educational opportunities, and to policies and practices that separate students according to race, ethnicity, and language orientation" (p. 9). One recommended measure of equity was an analysis of program languages, including print materials and decorations posted on the walls in dual language schools. During site observations, the researcher made notes regarding the use of language in common areas, as well as student work displayed in English and Spanish.

At all five dual language schools, office staff were available to assist parents in Spanish; however, there were no signs or announcements at the entrance to the schools or in any front office that would indicate to the public that the school was a dual language school. All five schools reported sending school communication home in both English and Spanish and providing translators for parent meetings, but this was standard practice at all Title I schools in the study district. Daily announcements for students and staff were typically conducted in English with the exception of Aspen Elementary, where the principal reported conducting announcements in both English and Spanish. Aspen was also in the process of adding the Pledge of Allegiance in Spanish to the school's daily routines. At Evergreen Elementary, student work was displayed in English and Spanish throughout the school, with all grade levels represented. At Bristol, school-wide Spanish vocabulary was displayed in the hall, along with student work in Spanish and English at the primary grades. Work by students in the
intermediate grades was displayed in English. There was one Spanish bulletin board outside the Spanish dual language kindergarten classroom at Douglas Elementary, with no other Spanish text displayed in the common areas of the building.

Aspen Elementary and Cypress Elementary were “outdoor” schools, where it was more difficult to display student work outside the classroom. Each classroom opened to an outdoor breezeway, and there were no indoor hallways. At Aspen, Spanish was included in student-friendly tracking of the school’s independent reading program in the cafeteria. Cypress had recently added pictures of students to the front office and cafeteria. Murals and positive words were painted in bright colors by a community partner on the outdoor hallways. The pictures were actual photographs of Cypress Elementary students, but all the brightly colored text was in English. The library was recently remodeled by a community business partner, with quotes about the importance of reading in both English and Spanish added to the walls. Approximately one-third of the quotes were in Spanish, while two-thirds were in English.

All five schools reported availability of core curriculum materials in both program languages. At Aspen, Cypress, and Evergreen, specific efforts had been made to increase the ratio of Spanish to English text in the schools’ literacy library; however, there was no more than 30% to 40% Spanish leveled text available at any of the schools. In the school libraries, texts available for students to check out were much more likely to be available in English than in Spanish (Table 10). Only one site leader, the assistant principal at Aspen
Elementary, mentioned the importance of having authentic Spanish texts available for students to read.

Table 10

Language Use in Dual Language Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aspen ES</th>
<th>Bristol ES</th>
<th>Cypress ES</th>
<th>Douglas ES</th>
<th>Evergreen ES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core curriculum materials</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>available in Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library books in Spanish</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both languages (print) used</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistently in common areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student work posted in both</td>
<td>Classrooms only</td>
<td>Primary grades only</td>
<td>Classrooms only</td>
<td>Kindergarten only</td>
<td>All grade levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>languages (hallways)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both languages used for</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>announcements and student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When outlining essentials for dual language programs, Freeman et al. (2005) stated that, “All school personnel must be committed to academic and social equity and the promotion of equal status for both languages” (p.69). The study district, in its *Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide* (2010), made a commitment to cross-cultural competence for the adults and children participating in dual language programs. According to Pucci (1994), a commitment “must
evidence itself in terms of tangible resources, as well as thoughtful policies” (p. 78).

Resources

The category described by Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) as *Developing People* includes three dimensions, which are: 1) providing individualized support; 2) creating intellectual stimulation; and 3) modeling important values and practices. As the researcher analyzed and coded the collected data, including interviews, site observations, and a variety of documents from the site and district levels, this category was amplified to include *Strand 4: Staff Quality and Professional Development* and three components of *Strand 7: Support and Resources* from the *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* (Howard et al. 2007). The overall theme was then titled *Resources*, as it included the concept of adequate and equitable funding for dual language programs (Figure 12). These concepts are interrelated because the recruiting, retaining, and professional development of dual language teachers was tied to the adequate and equitable distribution of resources within and among schools in the study district. The consistent, on-going professional development of dual language site leaders and teachers was also related to the district’s allocation of resources to the program, as well as policies, procedures, and organizational structures that support the transformational leadership practices identified by Leithwood & Jantzi as individualized support, intellectual stimulation, and modeling important values and practices.
The characteristics of a transformational leader in providing individualized support, as identified by Leithwood et al. (1999), are based in respectful, professional treatment of staff, providing for their professional development needs, maintaining an open-door policy, and taking staff opinions into consideration. In the dimension of providing intellectual stimulation, four strategies were identified: 1) changing norms or practices that may constrain the thinking of staff members; 2) challenging the status quo; 3) encouraging new
initiatives, and 4) bringing the staff into contact with new ideas. Modeling important values and practices includes three areas in which the transformational leader sets an example for staff members to follow. The first is a commitment to the school, evidenced by involvement in activities and enthusiasm for the work. The next is a deep personal commitment to professional growth, evidenced by accepting feedback about leadership practices and a willingness to change based on new learning. Finally, the leader models decision making processes and problem-solving techniques that staff may be able to use in their own work.

Funding

Over the past 20 years, the study district had experienced unprecedented growth, and had been described in the past ten years as the fastest growing school district in the nation. However, beginning in the 2009 fiscal year, the district began to experience a downturn in the local economy and a slowed rate of growth in its overall student population. Reduced revenues created budget shortfalls that affected every area of the district’s operations. Figure 13 displays the overall budget reduction over the 20 year period from 1992 through 2012.

The five dual language elementary schools included in this study were funded using the same per pupil allocation as the other 214 elementary schools in the study district. While the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Common Core of Data (2011) identified all five schools as eligible for Title I funding, not all received funding under existing district funding formulas.
Additional resources targeting dual language programs were set aside in the district’s Title III budget allocation as one of six major projects (Budget and Statistical Report, 2010b). The State Department of Education reported combined per pupil spending for each school on an annual accountability report, which allowed for year to year comparisons of total school revenues from the district’s general operating budget and various federal grant funds. Per pupil spending at the study dual language schools over a five year period, as reported by the State Department of Education, is displayed on Table 11.
Table 11
Per Pupil Spending in District and Schools: Five Year Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>$6,421.75</td>
<td>$6,913.14</td>
<td>$7,546.33</td>
<td>$8,246.31</td>
<td>$7,757.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspen ES</td>
<td>$6,793.76</td>
<td>$9,210.92</td>
<td>$9,042.32</td>
<td>$9,771.39</td>
<td>$10,069.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol ES</td>
<td>$6,763.13</td>
<td>$7,599.22</td>
<td>$9,014.95</td>
<td>$9,087.92</td>
<td>$9,356.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress ES</td>
<td>$10,903.69</td>
<td>$10,945.77</td>
<td>$9,998.73</td>
<td>$10,041.88</td>
<td>$9,862.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas ES</td>
<td>$7,955.39</td>
<td>$9,395.19</td>
<td>$10,076.70</td>
<td>$10,314.73</td>
<td>$10,119.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen ES</td>
<td>$7,037.42</td>
<td>$7,826.52</td>
<td>$7,502.73</td>
<td>$8,194.29</td>
<td>$8,893.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Annual Report of Accountability, 2012)

Schools received a per-pupil allocation of funds from the district, which was calculated based on the number of students enrolled in the school on the district’s official count day. Schools with enrollments of 650 students or more were allocated a full time assistant principal. Specialized personnel, such as elementary librarians, physical education and art teachers, school nurses and psychologists, and counselors were also allocated based on student enrollment numbers. Special education teachers and facilitators, as well as speech pathologists were allocated based on actual student caseloads. Magnet programs were provided with staffing enhancements to reduce class sizes and to provide for counseling and administrative support (Budget and Statistical Report, 2012). Dual language elementary schools did not qualify for these
enhancements; however, the English Language Learner Program provided additional staffing for non-Title I dual language elementary schools to provide full-day kindergarten in dual language schools that would not otherwise be able to offer a full-day kindergarten program.

In addition, schools received Title I funds based on the district’s grant funding formulas. During the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years, Title I eligible schools that were not funded under district formulas were provided with additional funds under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). Additional school improvement funds were provided to schools based on their Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status, with schools that had failed to make AYP targets for four or more consecutive years receiving additional resources.

Staffing

Because employee salaries and benefits represented over 88% of the district’s total operating budget, and 91.7% of those expenditures were at the school site level, the overall reduction in the district’s budget had a significant impact on staffing in schools. For the 2011-2012 fiscal year, the district reduced full time teaching positions by 921 positions from the 2010-2011 fiscal year, which represented a savings of over $150 million dollars to the district (Budget & Statistical Report, 2012).

In the case of a teacher reduction in force, or when the student population at a particular school did not meet enrollment projections, the district followed established policy for three types of teacher transfer: 1) voluntary transfer; 2) involuntary transfer; and 3) administrative transfer. Voluntary transfer was
defined as a teacher submitting a request for transfer to another location.

Involuntary transfer was defined as the reduction of staff at a particular location in order to distribute teachers in alignment with student enrollment, and administrative transfer was defined as the placement of a teacher by the district Superintendent or a designee in order to meet the needs of the district (Regulation 4141, 2001). The district’s negotiated agreement with the teachers’ association required that both reduction in force and involuntary transfer be conducted based on the employee’s seniority, defined as length of service with the district.

Because of widespread concern over the impending reduction in force and involuntary transfer at the end of the 2010-2011 school year, dual language schools lost program teachers. During spring voluntary transfer, Douglas Elementary lost its first grade team to a district “turn around school.” These were schools identified for restructuring, where teachers who interviewed successfully were offered a substantial signing bonus and the guarantee that they would be exempt from transfer and reduction in force for a period of three years. Although the teachers who transferred were not the lowest in seniority at their school, the prospect of a bonus and three years of security were difficult to resist. There were no incentives for remaining in a dual language school, no stipends for holding a bilingual endorsement, and no protections from reduction in force. When the school did not meet enrollment projections in the fall, the teacher lowest in seniority was a Spanish-speaking dual language program teacher. The
school lost three dual language program teachers, two of them bilingual, in one year.

According to dual language site leaders, teachers in dual language programs were exempt from transfer based on seniority only if they held a bilingual endorsement on their teaching license. However, three principals and one district leader stated that some of the best Spanish-speaking teachers did not have the required bilingual endorsement. Academic Manager Elizabeth Morris explained, “Two of the teachers that my kids had did not have that endorsement because they were in place before that became a requirement - two of the best years they had.” The principal at Bristol Elementary agreed, “We have some teachers who don’t have the piece of paper that says they’re qualified, but they can relate with the child. They can pull small groups, they can do everything fantastic.” Regardless of this popular view of teachers’ abilities, state law required school districts implementing a bilingual program to administer a test to ensure that teachers in the program were qualified to teach in a language other than English. Districts were further required to maintain records of those language assessments and submit reports related to teacher qualifications to the State Department of Education on an annual basis (NAC 391.019). The English Language Learner Program Director stated that the district had never enforced that regulation.

The English Language Learner Program did invest in a tuition reimbursement initiative intended to increase the number of teachers with bilingual and TESL endorsements. The director reported that she had set aside funds for 200
teachers to receive re-imbursement, and they were required to demonstrate proof that the endorsement was added to their teaching license in order to receive the reimbursement check. However, the number of teachers did not increase by 200 per year. The Dual Language Coordinator stated that they experienced difficulty in filling the classes, and the director indicated that teachers often removed the endorsement from their license once they received the reimbursement for their coursework.

The district did not offer a signing bonus or annual stipend to teachers with a bilingual endorsement, which made it difficult to recruit and maintain qualified staff in dual language programs. The English Language Learner Program Director said that she often participated in recruiting events, and bilingual teacher candidates would pass by the study district in favor of districts in other states, where they were offered substantial signing bonuses and annual stipends for their bilingual certification. Dual language site leaders also expressed concern that dual language teachers were not compensated for their work in the program and the additional educational requirements needed to be effective in the dual language setting. The principal at Bristol said,

Whether you’re the Spanish teacher or the English teacher in the dual language program, they’re working much harder because they have to do everything twice. It’s very demanding. I wish there were some advancement we could get for the teachers that are doing that.
Professional Development

The district provided extensive professional development for dual language teachers using grant funds during the initial implementation of the dual language program at Evergreen Elementary, the first dual language elementary school, in 2001 (Grant Performance Report, 2003). The principal at Cypress Elementary reported that the teachers there had received extensive professional development when the program was implemented in the 2005-2006 school year. Over the first two years of program implementation there, teachers visited dual language schools in another state, and consultants were brought in to provide training on site using funds from a National Education Association grant and Title I resources. However, at the time of the study, none of the schools reported professional development opportunities directly related to best practices in dual language education for their dual language teachers.

The Dual Language Program Coordinator reported that she had provided some training for dual language schools, but could not go into schools unless she was invited by principals. The *Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide* (2010) listed professional development as an essential element of a dual language program, and listed the following requirements for professional development in dual language program schools:

- All Dual Language Enrichment schools provide on-going systematic professional development support for new and veteran Dual Language teachers.

- All Dual Language Enrichment schools provide bilingual education theory and research, second language and biliteracy development to staff.
• Professional development consists of educational pedagogy, standards based teaching, literacy instruction, GLAD, high standards for all students, critical thinking, and educational equity (p. 44).

The researcher found no evidence of a professional development plan in any of the five dual language study schools, nor was any of the site leaders cognizant of the requirements for on-going, systematic professional development in the district’s dual language guide. A review of the district’s Strategic Plan for Professional Development 2005-2008, demonstrated that “Opportunities for ELL and Special Needs Students” was listed as one of the district’s instructional initiatives for the 2005-2006 school year. While the English Language Learner Program Director was listed as a member of the consortium of employees involved in developing the strategic plan, dual language was not mentioned specifically as a district initiative in that document (Strategic Plan, 2005).

The district had historically funded English Language Learner Specialists at each site, who were charged with providing professional development for teachers at the schools. Along with testing and compliance duties, these specialists were expected to model lessons in classrooms and support teachers in implementing best practices, as well as presenting theories of second language acquisition, strategies for teaching language learners, and related material during staff development events. Beginning in the 2011-2012 school year, this position was no longer funded by the district. The English Language Learner Program Director stated that principals were not pleased with the loss of this support, but the district’s belief was that specialists had been in the schools
for many years and should have built capacity at each site for supporting
teachers and language learners.

Three of the five principals at the study schools mentioned that the district
had held collaboration meetings for dual language principals, but said that it had
been two years since they had attended such a meeting. They remarked that
they missed the opportunity to learn from one another, and were concerned
about the lack of communication.

We met I think once or twice and got, finally, to discuss what we do, and
everybody did everything differently. It was amazing. So we’re supposed
to have this dual language guide, but... so what? How can we do things
differently if we have this guide?

Site leaders’ lack of knowledge about the contents of the *Dual Language
Enrichment Program Guide* (2010) was a strong indicator that little to no
professional development was conducted for principals or assistant principals
about the basic requirements for planning and implementing a dual language
program in the study district.

**Materials**

Site leaders all five dual language elementary schools indicated that the
district had provided all core curriculum materials in both Spanish and English.
This included the basal reading series, the core math series, and the science,
and social studies text books. The text materials that supported the inquiry-
based science curriculum offered as an option for district elementary schools
were available to schools in Spanish, but were not funded by the district. The
English Language Learner Program had also purchased supplemental materials in Spanish for the schools, including language learning software and leveled readers in Spanish. Three of the five schools had invested in additional leveled readers and novels in Spanish to augment their literacy libraries and provide teachers with access to a variety of literature for Spanish reading instruction.

Site leaders reported that dual language teachers spent their preparation time translating materials that were not available in Spanish. These materials included classroom and grade level expectations, strategies for math and reading comprehension, cognitive levels, levels of engagement, and other academic communication that the school or district published in English only. The scope and sequence for teaching reading in Spanish, as well as decisions regarding the methodology for Spanish literacy instruction, was generally the responsibility of the Spanish dual language program teachers; however, schools did report that teachers were provided with a supplemental Spanish early literacy program to assist with teaching phonological awareness and early reading skills in kindergarten and first grade. Dual language Spanish teachers were also responsible for translating parent communication during parent conferences and writing Spanish comments for report cards and progress reports. In some cases, they assisted with translating school-wide parent communication that went home in English and Spanish.
Collaboration and Shared Decision Making

The category described by Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) as *Redesigning the Organization* includes three dimensions, which are: 1) developing a collaborative school culture; 2) creating structures to foster participation in school decisions; and 3) creating productive community relationships. Figure 14 demonstrates how these dimensions were grouped with Strand 6: Family and Community and two components of Strand 7: Support and Resources, which were related to shared decision making, from the *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* (Howard et al., 2007).

Figure 14

Relationships between Transformational Leadership (Leitwood & Jantzi, 2006) Dual Language Goals, and *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* (Howard et al., 2007) in the theme *Collaboration and Shared Decision Making*
According to Leithwood et al. (1999), transformational leaders create, “working conditions so that staff have collaborative planning time and time to seek out information needed for planning and decision making” (p. 86). The five dual language elementary schools in this study built structures for collaboration to take place on a regular basis, and it was embedded in the culture of the schools. Each of the principals reported that teachers had common planning time each day, and this was supported by instructional schedules where they were provided. Time was set also set aside for dual language teachers to meet together across grade levels, often before or after school. The principal at Aspen Elementary explained how the process worked:

The Spanish teachers are collaborating with each other and the English teachers are collaborating with each other. Then they'll all get together and start collaborating as a whole group. They decide what they're going to do, and how they're going to do it. They provide a pacing calendar and everything. Then issues that come up – I'll get emails, I'll read their minutes. They'll have questions for me like, ‘We really need this or we need some more time to do that, and we were hoping that we'd get some more math resources.’ Whatever it is that they need - then I'll take those notes and we'll form a game plan.”

The process was similar at Bristol Elementary, as teachers worked together to identify common academic vocabulary:

The teachers in third grade will go back and work with first grade. That's why a lot of times when we do planning we can't just do grade level. It's
when we have both teachers, the English the Spanish, working together, but it’s also got to be vertical alignment because if we don’t have the third grade teachers talking to second grade and the kindergarten… We want to make sure everybody’s using the same academic vocabulary because if it’s different, then it’s going to be hard for the child to adapt and figure out what it means.”

Evergreen Elementary also was committed to teacher collaboration, as the principal explained:

The timing and collaboration makes a huge difference in their lives. They collaborate as a grade level and then among the grade levels. From second to third, so my own staff at my school already knows in kindergarten what they’re supposed to do in the Spanish unit going up to first grade, second grade, third grade and fourth. And they also work collaboratively with the rest of their grade level. The English teacher supports the Spanish instruction and Spanish teacher supports the English instruction.”

Structures for shared decision making were well-established for staff in the five dual language schools. The assistant principal at Aspen Elementary described what happened when difficult decisions had to be made about staffing at the school:

“So you know, it’s sort of a team decision. I’m not going to say, ‘Oh, I know that you know Spanish. You’re teaching this class now.’ That doesn’t seem to be the way the principal runs things. It seems like, ‘Here are the
choices I have. Here’s what I’m looking at. Does somebody see a different choice, or which one do you guys want to do?’ She brings in the people who would be effective and lets everybody voice their opinion.”

The principal at Evergreen Elementary stated, “They work very collaboratively together. They plan together, they assess together. It’s a culture that’s created - not just a classroom setting.” She attributed the success of the dual language program at the school, including the ability of the school to retain bilingual teachers, to teacher leadership.

“I see my teachers as leaders themselves. My staff at the school, actually my liaisons, at the grade level – my counselor my literacy specialist, my resource room teachers, my grade level chairs – are my leaders at this school. I give them the flexibility to make decisions on their instructional program and they feel that they’re free because they have the expertise. They know they’re very valued here and therefore they want to come back.”

For the site leaders at the five dual language schools in this study, there seemed to be little opportunity for collaboration. Values related to dual language programs, while stated clearly in the district’s Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide (2010), were not communicated by the superintendent or his designees in public speeches, documents, or policy statements. The district’s focus for educating English language learners was interpreted by site leaders as pressure to meet AYP targets, rather than a moral imperative to create socially just, democratic learning environments, where best practices were applied to
closing achievement gaps for all students. On the topic of collaboration, one dual language principal remarked, “It’s a shame we don’t get together and support each other. If people don’t know you’re backing them up and supporting them, they’ll quit. They’ll just give up.”

Family and Community

Within the Leithwood et al. (1999) transformational leadership framework, relationships with parents and community are characterized by, “1) high sensitivity and responsiveness to that community’s needs; and 2) realistically modest expectations for its direct involvement in school affairs” (p. 96). These relationships are particularly complex in the dual language context, where diverse communities come together within schools, and collaborative efforts center on the language and academic progress of diverse student populations. The principal at Cypress Elementary described the parent uprising at the school when she first arrived, and parents thought she intended to eliminate the dual language program:

When I first got here I had 150 signatures on a petition against me because the parent rumor mill went out that I was trying to get rid of dual language. That was not true, but that was the rumor that went out. So it took a few parent sessions to calm people down. There were people in the multipurpose room, 150 to 200 strong, just wanting me by the throat. But we made it through it, and now I have a parent group started that meets once a month.
All five schools reported similar structures for meeting with parents on a regular basis. At Evergreen, parents were invited into the school once a month, during the last hour of the day.

The parents come to this school an hour before dismissal, which is the perfect time; they’re coming anyway to pick up their kids in the classroom. We get about 150 to 200 parents at a time, and the teachers know the topic for the day will be on greeting strategies, comprehension strategies, or math problems. The parents are happy to be there because they get to see what their kids do in the classrooms, what the teachers do, how they learn, and they’re able to support them back.

According to the principal, families were anxious to enroll their children in the dual language program at Evergreen Elementary. Since enrollment was based on residence in the school’s geographic zone, she reported, “We have parents trying to - fake is the wrong word to use – change their residency to be able to come to our school.” The program coordinator at Evergreen Elementary described how the dual language program was the focus of parent and community conversations.

During open house we discussed what the dual language program is and how great it is for the student to be able to be literate in two languages and be bicultural. We’ve done parent nights where we bring in the community and they’ve seen what the dual language program can do.

Findings revealed that all five dual language schools maintained some type of parent center, with educational resources in both languages for parents to check
out. Aspen Elementary provided food and clothing for economically disadvantaged families through their parent center, along with English and parenting classes. Bristol, Cypress, and Evergreen Elementary Schools offered English classes and a variety of classes that focused on parenting and academic topics, such as homework, reading, and mathematics. Douglas Elementary maintained a large parent center with two full-time bilingual staff members funded by Title I. Through the parent center, parents had the opportunity to participate in the Family Leadership Institute, a program that taught leadership and advocacy skills.

The district level perspective of parent and community relationships to dual language programs was substantially different from that of school site leaders. At the time of the study, one of the district’s one-way foreign immersion dual language schools was in the middle of a community discussion regarding the future of its dual language program. The Deputy Superintendent of Instruction was sensitive to the political climate in the state and concerned about opinions in the majority language community related to dual language programs.

I think part of the conversation we have to change here is how do these programs fit in, and over the long run, how are they better for our kids? I think we have to actually help our community understand the value of these programs, and that’s going to take a little bit of time and a little bit of education for our community.

According to the English Language Learner Program Dual Language Coordinator, parents at the one-way foreign language immersion school went to
the school board with their concerns about the dual language program at their school. When parents at Cypress Elementary were concerned about losing their dual language program, they signed a petition and presented it to the principal. Both groups of parents took action on behalf of their dual language programs: the majority language parents’ voices resonated with policy-makers.

Summary

This chapter presented the findings from collected data, including interview transcripts, site observation notes and photographs, and a variety of school and district level documents from the district and five dual language elementary schools that formed the collective case under investigation. Background information for study participants and the historical context of dual language programs in the study district were presented. Collected data were presented and analyzed based on best practices in dual language education as identified in the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (Howard et.al (2007) and the nine dimensions of Leathwood and Jantzi’s (2006) Transformational Leadership framework. Five integrated themes were identified and discussed within the context of the case. Chapter Five summarizes the findings in alignment with these themes to draw conclusions and make recommendations.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions and recommendations presented in this chapter relate to five central themes identified in the findings of the study. The chapter is organized in five sections, aligned to the dimensions of transformational leadership as defined by Leithwood & Jantzi (2006) and best practices in dual language education as articulated in the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (Howard et al., 2007). Recommendations for further study are presented, followed by the researcher's personal reflections on the research process.

Building Vision

Building, communicating, and nurturing a common vision is the cornerstone of transformational leadership theory, and the core work of transformational leaders (Nadler & Tushman, 1990; Burns, 2003; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). Working collaboratively with all stakeholders to create, “opportunities for all children to learn in school communities that are socially just and deeply democratic” (Shields, 2004, p. 110) is the fundamental work of transformative leaders in educational contexts. While the words transformational and transformative connote change, Burns (2003) did not recognize change as synonymous with transformation.

Transforming leaders define public values that embrace the supreme and enduring principles of a people….They are the inspiration and guide to
people who pursue and seek to shape change, and they are the standards by which the realization of the highest intentions is measured (p. 29).

The dual language initiative in the study district began in 2001 with 30 kindergarten and first grade students at one elementary school. Over the ten years that followed, the district went through three major reorganizations under the leadership of three different superintendents. Dual language schools were frequently moved within the organizational structure, and were generally assigned to organizational units based on their geographic location rather than common program designation. Organizational changes were compounded by leadership changes at the schools, as there were a minimum of three assistant principals at each school, and at least two different principals. Direct supervision of school principals changed two times at one school and three times at others. At one of the schools there were five different supervisors over ten years.

There was a two year period, from 2006 to 2008, when four of the five dual language elementary schools were grouped together in one organizational unit, Superintendent’s Schools, under the title Language Acquisition Models. During that time, dual language schools were recognized as a district initiative, meetings were held for principals, and work was begun on the district’s Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide (2010). When the district was reorganized at the beginning of the 2009 school year, dual language schools were returned to their geographic areas, while the Superintendent’s Schools retained supervision of empowerment schools and magnet schools as priority district initiatives. The Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide (2010) was published with the
authorization of the Board of School Trustees, but there was no expectation that any school comply with its contents.

The English Language Learner Program contributed resources and guidance to the development and implementation of dual language programs. A program coordinator was assigned to provide support to the schools; however, she was not permitted to provide technical support or evaluate program implementation unless invited by principals to do so. The English Language Learner Program was assigned to a separate organizational unit and reported to a line supervisor separate from the schools. The role of the program over the years, according to the Deputy Superintendent of Instruction, had been focused on keeping the district in compliance with state and federal regulations and funding instructional interventions. Both the English Language Lear Program Director and the Dual Language Coordinator expressed concern regarding the uneven implementation of dual language programs in the district, the historical lack of support from district level leaders for dual language education, and the lack of authority they had to ensure quality programming for students.

On the topic of organizational change, Leithwood et al. (1999) stated, “Attention to second-order change is essential to the survival of first-order change” (p. 25). Waters et al. (2003) further emphasized, “Effective leaders understand how to balance pushing for change while at the same time protecting aspects of culture, values, and norms worth preserving. They know which policies, practices, resources, and incentives to align, and how to align them with organizational priorities” (p. 2). The five elementary dual language programs in
this study represent a school reform initiative in a large school district that was not consistently protected or preserved through the process of extensive, relentless organizational change. At the time of the study, the five dual language schools were uncertain about the future, struggling to maintain qualified staff, and implementing dual language programs with varying degrees of fidelity.

Goal and Priorities

The development of specific goals and priorities flows from the common vision built by an organization, and provides focus for problem-solving and decision-making processes (Leithwood et al., 1999). This theme includes the dual language program goals of academic and linguistic proficiency in two languages, as well as the guiding principles for dual language education (Howard et al., 2007) grouped under Strand 7: Assessment and Accountability.

Dual Language Goals

The three goals of dual language education permeate all recommendations for effective program implementation, and undergird planning, model development, and day to day operations of dual language programs (Howard et al., 2003; Monatague, 1997; Soltero, 2004). According to Cloud et al. (2000), “strong leadership from school principals is essential to insure [sic] sound coherent decision making that promotes the objectives” of dual language programs (p. 12). In this case study, the district outlined dual language goals in its Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide (2010), and the expectations contained in the guide required, “systematic measurement of student progress in both languages and all
achievement objectives and program goals” (p 52). Findings revealed that, in spite of these expressed expectations, systematic measurement of program goals did not occur.

School leaders consistently referenced goals for academic proficiency in English as a primary concern, due to pressure exerted by the schools’ accountability for meeting AYP goals. In three of the five schools, academic proficiency in Spanish was also an expressed goal and the focus of instructional planning. However, the dual language program was not included in the annual school improvement plan at any of the five schools. School improvement goals were solely focused on academic proficiency on English assessments. Linguistic proficiency was assessed annually in accordance with state and federal regulations, but school leaders did not use that data to formally evaluate student progress or set goals for the dual language programs at their sites.

**Assessment and Accountability**

Best practices in dual language education require a comprehensive approach to assessment and accountability, which includes the alignment of accountability measures and program goals (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Cloud et al., 2000; Freeman et al., 2005; Howard et al., 2007). According to Collier & Thomas (2009), “All well-implemented, strong programs for English learners should allow all participating students to reach full educational parity with native English speakers on all schools subjects within five to six years of participation in the instructional program” (p. 110). Nevertheless, the overall achievement gap for
elementary English language learners in the study district for the 2009-2012 school year was 26.3% in English language arts and 16.7% in mathematics.

Dual language program students were regularly assessed in both program languages, both at the district and school-wide levels. School leaders reported that classroom teachers collaborated to develop common assessments in both languages that were aligned to state and district curriculum standards. However, there was no infrastructure in place to support the regular reporting and analysis of Spanish language proficiency assessment for students in dual language programs, nor were schools accountable for student progress in that domain. Available data from Spanish language proficiency assessments were not analyzed at the district level, nor was it included in the annual report of AMAOs as part of schools’ responsibility for English language learners’ achievement.

Current reform initiatives in education focus on raising academic achievement through the adoption of national standards, aligned to common assessments, with an increasing emphasis on the evaluation of teachers and school administrators based on student outcomes (Baker et.al, 2010; Mathis, 2010). At the time this case study was conducted, the district was in the process of developing systems for publishing school growth and achievement ratings, and making data available on the district website, with school names and rankings widely available to the general public. Elementary school leaders were accountable for student progress and achievement based on criterion referenced assessments (CRTs) administered to students in third through fifth grade. This resulted in a narrowed focus for dual language school leaders, where
standardized assessments in English took priority over a balanced approach to assessment and accountability aligned to the overall goals of dual language education.

The accountability process intended to close achievement gaps for English language learners had the opposite effect in the five dual language schools included in this study. District leaders, including the immediate supervisors of dual language schools, did not recognize the importance of balanced assessment practices in dual language programs, nor did they establish a reporting system that included multiple measures of student performance in two languages. Assessment was not structured to guide program improvement, which could have ultimately resulted in higher achievement on standardized measures of achievement in English for all program participants (Collier & Thomas, 2009; Genesee et al, 2005; Howard et al., 2007; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008). Soltero (2004) emphasized that, “Given the high-stakes nature of standardized testing, it is imperative to develop assessment procedures that allow all students to demonstrate what they know” (p. 196).

High Performance Expectations

In the transformational leadership paradigm, high performance expectations are associated with efficacy, excellence, and empowerment. Podsakoff et al. (1990) defined this dimension, in practice, as “the leader’s expectations for excellence, quality, and/or high performance on the part of followers” (p. 112).
Leithwood et al. (1999) included, “openly valuing justice, community, democracy, excellence, and equality” (p. 69). This theme encompasses the third goal of dual language education, cross-cultural competence, as well as the guiding principles for dual language education (Howard et al., 2007) found under Strand 2: Curriculum and Strand 3: Instruction.

**Cross-Cultural Competence**

Freeman et al. (2005) noted that in society certain groups are conferred with higher status based on their social group, linguistic knowledge, or cultural background. Those privileges, in most cases, extend to the school context, “In most schools, instruction is provided in English, books are in English, and tests are in English…The ways in which schooling is organized mean that students with certain social, linguistic, and cultural capital are more likely to succeed than others” (p. 70). While dual language programs exist with the intention of building on cultural and linguistic capital that English language learners bring to the school context, inequities in program structure and resources that reinforce the power and status of the majority language may only serve to reinforce the marginalization of certain groups occurring in the larger society. This concern was raised by Valdez (1997) in a review of dual language practices, where the slightest accomplishment of majority language students in a minority language was celebrated, while the English language learners were “expected” to gain mastery in English. While students may gain cross-cultural friendships in school, they remain sensitive to the differences that exist between groups in the larger
society, and which language denotes power and status in the community (Amrein & Peña, 2006; Palmer, 2008).

Findings in this study indicated that the district did not have a vision for dual language programs as a means for building cross-cultural competence for the students or staff who participated in those programs. The researcher reviewed a wide variety of documents, including available district budget and statistical reports, comprehensive financial reports, strategic plans for professional development, financial management reviews, and district improvement plans from 2003 through the 2011 – 2012 school year. Every year, dual language programs were listed as a district-wide accomplishment, or as a service offered by the district for English language learners to increase student achievement. The goal of cross-cultural competence was not mentioned in any of these documents, nor was there any evidence of professional development activities designed to prepare dual language administrators and teachers for addressing this goal.

Of the ten school leaders interviewed for this study, four mentioned cultural competence in the context of their dual language programs. One believed that students gained cultural understanding by interacting with peers from a different cultural group. In two schools, leaders described activities within the social studies curriculum designed to increase cultural awareness. One assistant principal described the Spanish-speaking staff at the school as the mediators of culture for the English-speaking staff. This practice is questionable, as T. Howard (2010) explained, “One of the mistakes that can be made by teachers of
color is to assume that being a member of the same racial or ethnic group as one’s students automatically gives one a unique ability to connect to or effectively teach students of color” (p. 128). It is incumbent on the adults who work in dual language programs to, “be knowledgeable about and sensitive to the dynamics of culture in general, and their students’ cultures in particular….to understand their students and structure successful academic experience for them” (Cloud, Genesse & Hamayan, 2000, p. 36).

Curriculum and Instruction

Cloud et al. (2000) equated curriculum standards in dual language programs to a road map for all curricular areas, including language and academic content. They compared the lack of standards to “traveling without a road map and a clearly defined destination – you have no way of knowing where you are going, and you certainly do not know when you have reached your destination (or if you are lost)” (p. 10). At the beginning of the 2011 – 2012 school year, the study district began implementation of the Common Core State Standards, and school leaders at the five dual language schools stated that the curriculum in their dual language program was aligned to the Common Core State Standards. The English Language Learner Program funded the district’s online Curriculum Engine, where the district’s curriculum, pacing, and planning tools were available for teachers.

The district selected the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) standards to guide Spanish Language Arts in dual language programs. These standards were published in the Dual Language Enrichment Program
Guide (2010); however, dual language school leaders were not aware of their presence in the guide and reported searching for Spanish standards online. The English Language Learner Program Director stated that, in the future, the WIDA standards would be added to the Curriculum Engine for teachers to follow when planning for instruction, but did not have a timeline for implementation. Howard et al. (2007) defined effective curriculum in dual language programs as “aligned with the vision and goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, and multiculturalism” (p. 11). This is particularly important in schools serving minority students, where “silence about color and culture leaves some children’s traditions and tacit knowledge valued and validated and others’ excluded” (Shields, 2004, p. 119).

English & Steffy (2002) called for educators to transform the curriculum by including themes of social justice and empowerment in a context of critical reflection and “participative school environments and classrooms” (p. 128). Shields (2004) argued for opening the curriculum to “create spaces in which all children’s lived experiences may be both reflected and critiqued in the context of learning” (p. 123). These recommendations are aligned to the goals of dual language education and principles that guide the development of dual language curriculum and instruction (Cloud et al. 2000; Howard et al. 2007; Soltero, 2004). While classroom instruction was not the focus of this study, school leaders interviewed were able to articulate an understanding of the basic principles of dual language instruction. Nevertheless, the absence of district-wide standards for Spanish language instruction, coupled with discrepancies in program structure at two of the schools, impacted the quality of bilingual instruction for
students. When the lack of an overall vision for cross-cultural competence was added to this portrait of dual language programs in the five schools, it was impossible to infer that classroom instruction consistently met overall expectations for effective dual language programs.

**Resources**

The three dimensions included in the Leithwood & Jantzi (2006) transformational leadership framework category *Developing People* are: (a) providing individualized support, (b) providing intellectual stimulation, and (c) modeling important values and practices. These three dimensions were integrated in the theme *Resources*, along with *Strand 4: Staff Quality and Professional Development* and three components of *Strand 7: Support and Resources* from the *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* (Howard et al. 2007). Considered within this theme was the adequate and equitable distribution of resources within and among dual language schools in the study district, as well as professional development opportunities for dual language site leaders and teachers.

**Funding**

The five dual language schools were part of a large district that had experienced years of growth and economic prosperity. Beginning with the 2009 fiscal year, an economic downturn required district budget reductions that affected staffing levels and school budgets (Budget & Statistical Report, 2010). All five schools qualified for Title I funds under federal funding formulas, but
district funding formulas resulted in only four receiving Title I funding. The English Language Learner Program provided additional resources for dual language schools, which included teaching units to fund full-day kindergarten at sites not funded by Title I, supplemental teaching materials in Spanish, language-learning software, and English Language Learner Specialists. These resources were substantially reduced beginning in the 2009 – 2010 school year, with English Language Learner Specialists eliminated in the 2011 – 2012 school year. At the time of the study, funding was not equitably distributed among the five schools to support the implementation of dual language programs.

**Staffing**

Staffing represented one of the greatest challenges faced by dual language principals in this case study, a phenomenon consistent with case studies of dual language programs in other states (Armendáriz & Armendáriz, 2002; DeJesus, 2008; Fern, 1999). Echevarria, Short & Powers (2005) claimed that, “the supply of certified ESL and bilingual teachers is too small for the demand” (p. 196), and Howard & Sugarman (2001) listed “the limited availability of qualified bilingual teachers and support staff” (p. 2) as an area of serious concern in dual language programs. While recruiting and maintaining high quality teachers in dual language programs is a challenge for districts across the United States, the study district was remarkable in that it did not act to correct this universal problem. Bilingual teachers were not offered an original signing bonus, nor were they offered an annual stipend that would encourage them to continue teaching in dual language programs.
District leaders interviewed in this study all recognized staffing as a challenge. The *Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide* (2010), however, placed responsibility for staffing directly on the school. As part of the certification process, schools were required to address the question, “What steps will the school [emphasis added] take to ensure qualified bilingual and/or TESL endorsed teachers are hired to implement the program?” (p. 14). When schools struggled to maintain bilingual staff through district budget cuts and staffing reductions, they were advised, “Do what you have to do” even if it meant eliminating entire grade levels in an existing program. State laws requiring teachers to hold a bilingual endorsement and pass a competency exam demonstrating mastery of the language of instruction were not enforced. Yet, when staffing reductions were required, the only protection dual language teachers had from seniority-based transfer policies was a bilingual endorsement. The district maintained a budget line for supplemental staffing in magnet programs, but there was no similar budget line to maintain the integrity of dual language programs.

Staffing dual language programs for success is not a mystery, nor is it a process that can be accomplished by school leaders without district-level support. Howard et al. (2007) described exemplary practices in this area as, “an integrated process of recruitment, hiring, and retention that is systematically coordinated with district-level staff and takes long-term program goals into account. The program works with local universities to train dual language teachers who can work in their program” (p. 76). For the five dual language schools in this case study, the greatest barrier to effective program
implementation was the lack of staffing resources and supportive policies at the
district level.

**Professional Development**

When the district began its dual language initiative in 2001, grant funds were
utilized to provide extensive professional development for staff members at
Evergreen Elementary School. Grant funds were also employed to provide
professional development for Cypress Elementary during the first two years of
program implementation. Lindholm-Leary (2001) warned against relying on
temporary funding to support dual language programs and stated that successful
programs are, “integrated structurally and functionally within the total school
system. In addition, they receive strong support from central administration and
building principals” (p. 42). Armendáriz & Armendáriz (2002) cautioned,
“Successful initiatives come and go and even disappear immediately after the
special funding is exhausted” (p. 5). While the dual language initiative has not
disappeared in the district, ongoing professional development targeting dual
language teachers and administrators was not supported, nor was a permanent
source of funding identified to provide on-going professional development.

While the district’s *Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide* (2010)
required ongoing, systematic professional development for all program staff,
responsibility for developing a professional development plan and acquiring the
resources to carry out that plan were left to the school. There was no
accountability for professional development related to the dual language program
at the schools, plans were not requested or reviewed by the schools’ direct
supervisors or the English Language Learner Program. At the time of the study, professional development plans for dual language program staff did not exist at any of the schools. Because the dual language program was not mentioned in the school improvement plans developed at the schools, no additional funds had been set aside to target professional development activities for dual language program staff.

The Dual Language Coordinator was available to provide professional development for schools in language acquisition theory, biliteracy development, dual language pedagogy, and strategies for advocacy for dual language programs. However, schools did not choose to include her in their planning for ongoing professional development and support for dual language staff. At the beginning of the 2011 – 2012 school year, the district eliminated the site-based English Language Learner Specialists, who directly assisted teachers with instruction for English language learners. The district maintained a Department of Equity and Diversity capable of providing professional development related to cultural diversity, but their expertise was not accessed to support the third goal of cross-cultural competence at dual language schools. As new principals and assistant principals were assigned to dual language schools, there was no district requirement for minimal training related to district expectations and best practices in dual language programs. Without this basic foundation, school leaders were not adequately equipped to lead teachers in the development of dual language curriculum and instructional practice. Nor were they prepared to advocate for the
students, parents and programs in order to “sustain a programme of enriched learning” for students (Rodriguez & Alaníz, 2009, p. 114).

**Materials**

School leaders at the five dual language schools in this study reported that teachers had access to core curriculum materials in both program languages. This included the district’s adopted reading basal, the core mathematics, science, and social studies text books. In addition, three of the five schools had invested in leveled text in Spanish to augment instructional resources available to teachers in the schools’ literacy libraries. The English Language Learner Program had assisted in the purchase of these supplemental Spanish materials. Where instructional practices required use of materials beyond the adopted textbook, Spanish dual language teachers were required to translate materials. District and school-wide expectations and rubrics were translated for school use in Spanish language classrooms.

School library collections, on the other hand, were overwhelmingly dominated by English text. This was true even in schools where most classrooms were designated dual language classrooms in grades three through five. In a study of native-language literacy resources, Pucci (1994) found that, “the school library is the primary source of free-reading material for children” (p. 77). Findings from the study schools, like those in Pucci’s (1994) study, demonstrate that “school library holdings of Spanish reading materials are far below what even the bare minimum would warrant” (p. 78). Limited access to Spanish reading material was cited by Amrein & Peña (2000) as an example of asymmetry in dual language programs,
where an imbalance of resources reinforces societal inequities. “This suggests that the pool of available resources was deeper for the English speaking students, and that these resources may have been geared toward English-speaking students” (p. 14). Many would argue that the number of Spanish books in a school library is a small matter, hardly worthy of discussion in the grander scheme of school reform. Cummins (2009) refuted that perspective:

Articulation of choices involves re-examination of the normalized assumptions about curriculum, assessment, and instruction that constrict both the identity options for culturally diverse students and their cognitive and academic engagement. These normalized assumptions include the following beliefs (often implicit and unarticulated):

- Literacy’ refers only to reading and writing in the dominant language (henceforth English); literacy abilities in languages other than English and in modalities other than the written modality are ignored.

- The cultural knowledge and first language (L1) linguistic abilities that bilingual students bring to school have little instructional relevance.

- Culturally and linguistically diverse parents, whose English may be quite limited, do not have the language skills to contribute to their children’s literacy development. (p. 262)

The decisions leaders make about the allocation of resources have important implications for the teachers and students who depend on those resources for
learning. Starrat (2004) reminded leaders that the priority for allocating
resources is the learning of all students, and in difficult economic times,
“Budgetary constraints force difficult choices, but those choices should reflect
clear priorities” (p. 53). The imbalance of resources for children to read in
Spanish was an indicator of the value assigned to the Spanish language and the
priority placed on dual language programs in the district.

Collaboration and Shared Decision Making

Transformational leaders, according to Leithwood & Jantzi (2006), build
inclusive cultures of collaboration, shared decision making, and productive
community relationships. These ideas align with the guiding principles for dual
language education found in Howard et al. (2007) under Strand 6: Family and
Community, and the components of Strand 7: Support and Resources related to
support of the program from school staff, parents, and the community. Freeman
et al. (2005) described collaboration as essential for teachers in dual language
programs, both within and across grade levels, to ensure curriculum articulation
and consistent program implementation. Senesac (2002) emphasized the role of
parents and community members in program planning and advocating for
excellence in implementation. When collaboration becomes the norm in a school
community, all members of the community are empowered, as Cummins (2009)
explained, “Within collaborative relations of power, ‘power’ is not a fixed quantity
but is generated through interaction with others. The more empowered one
individual or group becomes, the more is generated for others to share” (p. 263).
School leaders in this study established structures for teacher collaboration and shared decision-making was embedded in the school cultures. Common planning time was allocated for teachers to work together, and leaders maintained an “open door” policy that welcomed teacher communication. Opportunities were available for teachers to make decisions about their programs and to assume leadership roles in their schools. Leaders conveyed respect and admiration for the work teachers did in the dual language program, and spoke of them as knowledgeable professionals. Teachers collaborated to plan instruction, design assessments, conduct parent conferences, and report grades. This component of the dual language program stood out as an area of strength at all five schools.

The district, on the other hand, did not consistently create a collaborative space for school leaders to work together for the improvement of dual language programs. The Dual Language Enrichment Program Guide (2010) was clear in its intent when it required schools to answer questions framed to place responsibility for basic program components squarely on the backs of schools:

- How will you [italics added] fund supplementary materials required to provide appropriate grade-level instruction in both languages?
- How will you [italics added] fund professional development of Dual Language program components for all staff?
- How will you [italics added] fund at least one additional teacher to coordinate program implementation and student progress monitoring in the target language? (p. 14).
School leaders were anxious to collaborate with their colleagues at other dual language schools, to learn from one another and work together to solve problems they encountered in their day to day practice. Without the support of their immediate supervisors or district-level leaders, they were left to “do what they had to do” for the teachers, students, and families in their dual language programs.

**Family and Community**

Each of the five schools maintained a parent center and offered classes for parents. One school offered parents the opportunity to participate in a Family Leadership Institute, where parents were taught leadership and advocacy skills. Parents volunteered in classrooms and school leaders met regularly with parents to engage in dialogue about school policy, procedures, and academic topics. Of the ten school leaders interviewed in this study, only two spoke Spanish, which made parent communication more difficult. Interpreters were used for parent meetings at the three schools where none of the administrators spoke Spanish.

Missing from the parent and community activities was the opportunity for parents and community members to take an active role in the planning and implementation of the schools’ dual language programs. Rather than viewing parents as a resource, school leaders seemed to view them as a responsibility. They recognized the needs of families and acted to meet them, but did not provide opportunities for parents to reciprocate in meaningful ways. Cummins (2009) claimed that educators’ interactions with students and their communities are never neutral. “They either reinforce coercive relations of power or promote...
collaborative relations of power” (p. 263). Valuing parents as strategic partners is a crucial step for school leaders in the effort to, “provide opportunities for all children to learn in school communities that are socially just and deeply democratic” (Shields, 2004, p. 110).

Research Questions

The purpose of this case study was to identify leadership practices that contribute to the sustainable implementation of dual language programs. Research Question One asked the question, “What are the leadership practices that contribute to the implementation of established dual language programs?” Practices were examined based on the extant literature in dual language education and aligned with the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (Howard et al., 2007). Findings indicated that the district failed to provide stable supervision, supportive policy, and equitable resources that could have resulted in continuous improvement and consistent implementation of the dual language programs. School leaders were uncertain about the future of their programs, struggling to maintain minimum levels of staffing, and working in isolation. Issues of social justice and cultural competence, as articulated in the third goal of dual language education, were not addressed at expected levels. In spite of these challenges, school leaders worked to build collaborative school cultures, where teachers planned instruction together and parents were welcome on their campuses.
Research Question Two posed the question, “Which, if any, of the nine dimensions of transformational leadership, as defined by Leithwood and Jantzi (2006), are evident in the observed leadership practices of dual language administrators?” Findings indicated that the dimensions of transformational leadership in the category Setting Directions, which included the dimensions, Building Vision, Setting Goals and Priorities, and Holding High Performance Expectations (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006), were not consistently evident in the practices of district leaders responsible for the oversight of dual language programs. While the district articulated these values in its Dual Language Enrichment Education Program Guide (2010), it did not implement written policies and procedures, nor was the dual language initiative treated as a district priority. School leaders articulated a vision for dual language programs in their schools, but did not include the initiative in school improvement plans or consistently implement dual language programs in alignment with best practice in dual language education.

In the category Developing People, the dimensions Providing Intellectual Stimulation, Offering Individualized Support, and Modeling Desirable Professional Practices and Values, (Leithwood & Janzti, 2006) findings indicate that district leaders did not require or provide on-going professional development for school leaders, nor did they allocated funds for consistent professional development for dual language teachers. School leaders provided limited on-site professional development, but did not seek the assistance of the English Language Learner Program staff to develop professional development plans for
their dual language program teachers. Two of the ten sight leaders were fluent in the program language, which allowed them to model bilingualism, biliteracy, and the value of professional dialogue in two languages.

The category *Redesigning the Organization* includes the three dimensions *Developing a Collaborative School Culture, Creating Structures to Foster Participation in School Decisions, and Creating Productive Community Relationships* (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). District leaders held collaborative meetings for school leaders at four dual language schools between 2006 and 2008. Further opportunities for collaboration and participation in decision-making were not available for school leaders, nor did the district establish a structure for community participation in dual language programs. At the school level, leaders created collaborative cultures for program development, instructional planning, and resource acquisition. Parents and community members were involved in the schools; however, they did not participate as strategic partners in the planning, development and implementation of dual language programs. Overall, of the nine dimensions of transformational leadership identified by Leithwood and Jantzi (2006), findings identified leadership practices in use at the school level in the category *Redesigning the Organization*. Specifically, school leaders created collaborative cultures, fostered participation in school decisions, and developed positive community relations.
Summary

Collier & Thomas (2009) challenged educators to envision transformed schools, formed from existing kernels of genius, where students learn challenging academic content at high levels in two languages. These are schools that open doors to the world through creativity and fresh perceptions, valuing the knowledge that exists in their communities; these are schools that close achievement gaps. Because the education of English language learners cannot be separated from the politics of nationalism, immigration, and language, building a vision of this magnitude requires leaders who can weather the storms of political upheaval and economic crisis without losing their moral compass (Rolstad, Mohoney & Glass, 2005; Starrat, 2005). When leaders commit themselves to transforming schools, to creating communities of excellence for the children and communities they serve, they commit themselves to a higher calling. Leaving the work half-done is not an option.

Creativity, conflict, empowerment, efficacy – these and other causal elements make leadership the single most vital force in struggles for real, intended, durable, comprehensive change. Still, if leadership is not a neutral, mechanical process but the transforming human moral factor in converting values into outcomes, leadership must then be held accountable for the progress – or lack or it – that has been achieved (Burns, 2003, p. 227).
Recommendations for Further Study

This case study provides a view of leadership practices in dual language programs limited to the self-reported interview data collected from district and school level leaders, along with site observations and analysis of district and site level documents. These data were reported, analyzed, and interpreted within the confines of the research questions. Based on the extant literature in educational leadership and dual language education, as well as significant themes present in the collected data, the researcher proposes five areas for further investigation.

First, studies related to transformational leadership employ teacher perception data to measure the effects of transformational leadership behaviors on teachers’ job satisfaction, changed instructional practice, and potential for increased student achievement (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). The structure and goals of dual language programs require school leaders to respond to diversity in ways that may not present themselves in other contexts (Schwabsky, 1998). An investigation including teacher perception data related to leadership practices that impact the implementation of dual language programs would offer a perspective of these leader behaviors not available in self-reported data.

Second, the programs in this study were not consistently implemented in accordance with best practices in dual language education. Schools had not experienced consistent policy guidance and fiscal support from district level leadership. Examples of successful dual language programs are presented in the literature, with descriptions of program features and practices of school leaders contributing to successful implementation (Cloud et al., 2000; Freeman et
Research designs employing cross-case analysis between district/schools that struggle with implementation of dual language programs and district/schools with a record of successful implementation and increased student achievement would inform the practice of dual language educators at all levels.

Third, the educational leaders in this study were participating in the construction and application of language policy at the local level as they developed policies for the implementation of dual language programs (Stuart, 2006). Further, written policies published at the district level were not enacted at the school level. Analyzing the relationship of dual language program policy to federal and state regulations governing the education of English language learners was beyond the scope of this study. As districts plan for the implementation of dual language programs, policy makers could benefit from further research focusing on the development of district policy related to dual language programs for English language learners, how the development of district policy is influenced by federal and state regulations, and the level to which written policy is enacted at the school level.

Fourth, dual language programs promote the goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, and cross-cultural competence. Bilingual leaders interviewed in this study spoke with passion about their own experiences with learning language, particularly when early experiences with formal school were negative or difficult. These experiences seemed to inspire leaders’ work with English language learners and may have influenced their practice as leaders in dual language programs. Of the ten school leaders interviewed in this study, eight did not speak the program
language fluently. Further study to investigate the role of dual language program leaders’ prior experience with language learning and their fluency in the program language could benefit districts as they select and develop school leaders for dual language programs. Studies of this sort could provide information related to the impact these experiences have on leaders’ perspectives on program development, culture, and the supervision of teachers who teach in the language other than English.

Finally, the literature in dual language education contains extensive recommendations for teacher professional development (Cloud et al., 2000; Soltero, 2004). Recommendations for the initial and ongoing professional development of dual language leaders are not explicit in the literature. In this study, best practices in dual language education were aligned with concepts related to transformational and transformative leadership. The development of a professional development framework for leaders in dual language programs, integrating best practices in dual language education with current research in educational leadership, would provide a structure for leadership preparation and continuous improvement.

Reflection

There was never any doubt, throughout my doctoral studies, that this study would focus on leadership in dual language programs. I worked over the course of four years to develop research questions, identify a research design, learn the basics of field work, analyze collected data, and finally write, write, and re-write.
As I look back over that process, the unfortunate fact is that I am just learning to be a researcher. I am just now getting the hang of interviewing participants, and have much more to learn about observing in research contexts. I lament my own lack of skills, and know that if I were to start all over, I would still have much to learn. I would still agonize over which pieces of data to include and which to leave out, questioning my own motives and biases at every turn. There would still be that nagging doubt, “Did I ask the right questions? Did I observe at the right time? Did I stay long enough? Did I see what I should have seen? Did I interpret the data fairly? Did my own bias color what I heard and saw?”

The answer to the last question is, “Yes!” No matter how hard I worked to hear only what was said – see only what was there, I am certain my personal bias colored my interpretation of the collected data. Dual language programs are of value to society because they promote bilingualism, biliteracy, and cross-cultural competence. They are of value to educators because they hold promise of closing achievement gaps for English language learners. Where they are not supported or well-implemented, these values are subverted. As a citizen and an educator, I found it impossible to separate my belief in equity and social justice from my role as researcher. In the research process, member checking and feedback from critical readers helped provide balance and perspective.

At the end, the question any researcher must ask is, “What does it all mean?” The answer for me is clear. The role of district leaders in the sustainable implementation of dual language programs is important. If districts do not consistently build vision, enact supportive policy, and provide equitable funding
for dual language initiatives, programs cannot succeed over time. At the school level, the person selected to lead a dual language program is important. School leaders need initial and ongoing professional development, along with opportunities for collaboration, if they are to lead dual language programs effectively. The promise dual language programs hold for English language learners depends on leaders who will not settle for a job half done. The vision calls for leaders who demand excellence from their districts, their schools, and themselves. Without them, the vision is just a dream – the promise no more than an illusion.
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GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS

District Leaders

Date of Interview:
Time:
Place:
Interviewer:
Interviewee:
Position of Interviewee:

1) What is your role in the design and implementation of programs for English language learners in the district?

2) What background/education do you have that prepares you to make decisions in a district with approximately 50,000 English language learners?

3) What is the district’s vision for English language learner programs, and how does dual language fit into that vision?

4) What is the process for determining which schools will offer dual language programs and which will offer only content-based ESL instruction?

5) What support does the district provide for dual language programs?
   a. Advocacy
   b. Staffing
   c. Curriculum
   d. Professional development

6) How are principals and assistant principals selected for dual language schools?
1) Describe the dual language program at your school.

2) How do you evaluate the effectiveness of your dual language program?

3) How does the dual language program affect your day to day activities?

4) How have your personal and/or educational experiences prepared you to lead a dual language program?

5) How do you select/develop bilingual curriculum?

6) What are your expectations for your dual language program staff?

7) How is supervision different in a dual language program?

8) What support do you provide for your dual language program staff?

9) How are decisions that affect your program made?

10) Describe the processes you use for building relationships with your community.

11) How do you advocate for your program?

12) What are your greatest challenges? Inspirations?
### APPENDIX 4

**DUAL LANGUAGE SITE OBSERVATION FIELD GUIDE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student progress tracked in both languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data communicated publicly/transparently with stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and linguistic backgrounds of all students recognized/valued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic content provided in both languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program design faithfully implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders hold high expectations for staff and students in DL program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology is integrated into instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff and specials teachers include dual language model in their programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader demonstrates energy and enthusiasm for DL program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active learning strategies are evident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is cultural and linguistic equity in classrooms/common areas/instructional materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting, staff evaluation, and professional development support the dual language program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and resources are allocated for collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs, announcements, and daily routines reflect bilingualism and multiculturalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders model best practices in DL education for teachers and staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership advocates for the program in the school and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making is aligned to the program’s mission and vision and includes stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program is designed to meet the needs of the school population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program is articulated within and across grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office staff have bilingual proficiency and cultural awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development includes equity and diversity topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents have opportunities to participate and feel valued in a variety of ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school makes use of community language/culture resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders are knowledgeable about/supportive of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and staff are knowledgeable about/supportive of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families and community members are knowledgeable about/supportive of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders listen to ideas and opinions for improving practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding is adequate to meet program goals (staffing, equipment, materials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school collaborates with other DL schools, participates in associations to seek program support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DL program students have equal access to resources (library, technology, etc.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader displays appreciation for individuals and groups for their efforts in the DL program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students are engaged and take ownership of learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other observations/notes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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POSSIBLE QUESTIONS FOR REFLEXIVE INQUIRY

Inquirer

- What in my autobiography led me to this topic?
- Why did I select each particular person who is in this study?
- Why did I form the particular interview questions I use?
- Why do I observe where I observe?
- What kind of relationships have I developed with research participants and why?
- What kind of relationships do I desire and for what purposes?
- What do I think I know and how did I come to know it?
- What values and experiences shape my perspectives and my research decisions?
- As I analyze and interpret the data, what do I choose to include and what do I choose to omit and why?
- What became the important analytical themes and what is it about who I am that makes these themes important?
- With what voice do I share my perspectives?
- How much do I insert myself into the text and how do I present myself when I do?
- What do I do with what I have found?
- What are the consequences of my choices?
Participants

- How do they know what they know?
- What shapes and has shaped their worldview?
- How do they perceive me? Why? How do I know?
- How do/would they respond to what I am writing?

Audience

- How do they make sense of what I give them?
- What perspectives do they bring to my presentation?
- How do they perceive me?
- How do I perceive them?
- How do these perceptions affect what I say and how I say it?

(Glesne, 2006, p. 126)
APPENDIX 6
SAMPLE INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT

R: Tell me about your role in the design and implementation of programs for English learners in our district. In other words, what is it that you do?

I: My role is, for the schools that will have me – unfortunately that’s what it boils down to – I offer support and my expertise as to how I can help; recommendations I make; how I can support student achievement for the ELL kids at varying levels from your level ones that come in and don't speak any English at all, all the way to your level fives. And then on the dual language end of it I offer my expertise in that realm as to best practices – what should be happening on campus. But again it’s all suggestions because no one is required to take the advice.

R: You were designated dual language coordinator. Are you still in that role or have they changed that job description?

I: I’m in with – since I started this position the district has restructured at least two times, maybe three. And so the way that it works is the dual language schools have their own coordinator, but when the issues are dual language related they kind of come back to me because now I’m the one that has the most knowledge of everyone around the program.

R: And you’ve been working with the dual language schools for how long?

I: This January is my fifth year.
R: So talk to me about your background in education and what prepared you to work in a district with over 50,000 language learners.

I: Actually, my bachelor’s is in psychology. I was getting ready to go back to school to do graduate stuff when the ARL program opened and I started as the bilingual teacher. And so I worked for six or seven years as a bilingual teacher in kindergarten, first, second grade. And then from there, all of a sudden bilingual was a bad word and it was out, and I still worked in a heavily populated ELL population. However, no more bilingual education – that was TESOL, ELL and then after doing that for three or four years – three and a half years because I left midway. I was midway in a year then this coordinator position opened and I applied for that. So all of my educational experience has been around either bilingual education and/or working with ELL populations.

R: And what about personally? What are your personal experiences with learning language?

I: I started - when I started my family is from Cuba. I’m first generation here. When I started school I did not speak English, but I’m one of those lucky ones that I learned in spite of everything that they didn’t do for me. But I do have cousins and stuff that went to the same school that I did that struggled. And so I do have that to pull from, and I know – when I got into this job it made me reflect: How do I know how read in Spanish? Nobody ever taught me. I learned how to read in English. And so it makes you think back and be reflective so I have, obviously, the connection with the families, with the students, and the rapport from when I was teaching. I had great success with my kids because that’s
something - that wasn’t a barrier. I understood, I was in their shoes and then the 
other thing is I speak the language. There was no communication barrier there. 
They could express to me all of their concerns, everything, and I understood and 
could express back and I never had silly rules that some people - even when 
bilingual education was taken away. I know that some teachers don’t allow any 
Spanish being spoken in their classroom, and I would hear it from my neighbors, 
and I would address that and why would you do that? So I’ve been where they’re 
at, and my family has been where the parents are at. I know not to judge a child 
and say their parents don’t care ‘cause they didn’t do their homework. They don’t 
have the resources perhaps to do the homework. So I had the advantage of the 
culture, the language. I’ve been in their shoes so I think that my life experiences 
helped me be successful with that population.

R: Can you talk to me about the district vision for language learners? And how 
dual language programs fit into that vision?

I: Well, it’s my understanding that the dual language vision is by the new 
leadership that they are interested in expanding it because they’re very 
interested in the research and what a successful program it can be. However, 
there’s more to - you can’t just have, say, we are on board with this let’s do it. A 
lot needs to come with that. The extra funding, the resources, and, unfortunately, 
as much as we hear that the district – and even in the past – is backing these 
programs there’s a lot of things that make the programs not be as successful as 
they can be. The staffing issues, the - during surplus it’s just - and I’m sure I’m 
speaking to the choir when you know you have your whole program lined up and
then staffing comes around and you lose two teachers and they don’t care if the
two teachers that you’re going to lose is going to completely shut down the
program in this grade. It is what it is. There’s no special consideration for the
program to keep it intact, to keep it going. There’s no extra funding. A lot of
things are amiss, and as an ELL department we try to go in again and offer
support, offer recommendations, offer resources. And then about two years ago
the state department told us that we could no longer spend Title III money, which
is mainly what we operate on, on Spanish materials. So we said, how are the
other districts doing it? Because as far as all the confrontations I have these
moneys come from Title III. How are we supposed to support these programs if
they barely have general fund money to cover English materials? How are they
expected to supplement? And so the state consultant at the time said absolutely
not - only English materials. So we were under those constraints for two years.

R: Did that come from the feds or did that come from the state department?
I: According to him, it came from that we had been interpreting the federal laws
incorrectly and in order to stay in accordance with the mandates that we were no
longer to buy Spanish materials. So for two years we had to try to get a little bit
more creative and so we bought software licenses, then the schools could
choose what language - you know, we had to try to do little things but this is what
we were told. This year we have a new state consultant. We brought the issue up
to him. He’s in agreement with us. So now we went back and were able to help
support the schools again with the bilingual materials. Little things like that
impede the progress because we have dual language schools and we say that
we’re on board and we say that the district is backing, yet there’s all these silly little rules and procedures and this and that. That shouldn’t apply to these special schools in order for them to do the work and not have to worry about all the laws and it’s still not - it’s almost like the empowerment issue. They need to have that empowerment so certain rules don’t apply to them so they can concentrate on running an effective dual language program. But there are always issues at all of our schools from staffing to resources to something – that even when we try to intervene nothing gets done.

R: You mentioned staffing and I hear that a lot as I talk to school leaders. What do you see as a solution for that? Do you see solutions coming or do you see…?

I: I don’t. The only way I see solutions coming is if you’re a dual language school and we know that the research says the best way to implement the program is the separation of language and for there to be an English teacher and a Spanish teacher and not one half day cut. And so come surplus if you have to lose a teacher, well, these dual language schools should have special consideration because if they have to lose a teacher then what happens to that program? And then on top of that, the one teacher that’s the least seniority happens to be the bilingual end of that then there’s no way around it. It’s done for those group of kids and that’s - how do you decide which group of kids continues to get their dual education and which ones don’t. So there has to be special consideration for these schools. Once they staff them unless there’s a classroom that’s standing with five kids that they could be placed into the other classrooms they need to be left alone because it messes with the program. And then you end up with a
second grade class that - then you have schools like at XXX right now during surplus two of their first grade - they had to lose three teachers. And their two first grade Spanish dual teachers decided to surplus themselves, so that’s it. So they’ve got dual in kinder, dual in second, and dual in third but now no more dual in first because those teachers decided to surplus themselves so there was no more Spanish in first grade. So now those first graders get into second grade next year and you can’t give them the part of their day in Spanish because they missed a whole year. So those are the silly little things that get in the way.

R: Is anybody talking about fixing that? Is anybody supporting changing regulations?

I: As far as I know, no, because this is one specific example this year but every year there’s a different example. Another example is back to staffing. We need good language models in both languages. Unfortunately, when we get the good language models the people that have been educated in their home countries these are the people that have the strong academic vocabulary in Spanish. Well, with that comes the challenge of these teachers having to pass all of these tests in English. No one - we voiced that concern over and over again because we’ve seen lots of good teachers lose their licenses because they can’t pass these proficiencies in English. However, they’re instructing in Spanish. Can they be tested in Spanish? They don’t need to speak English in their whole entire day. That’s what their partner is for. And so that’s also an issue because you walk into classrooms and you hear - you have Anglo, for example, teachers or even first generation Hispanic American teachers that they’ve got what you got what we
call kitchen Spanish and just because you teach Spanish doesn’t mean you’re a
good teacher or that you even have good enough Spanish to teach, so we have
all of these other issues that really could be resolved by giving the same tests to
these teachers but in their native language because that’s what they’re teaching.
That’s why we want them because their Spanish is so strong and we need these
strong models to teach this academic language. And so we have just the same
issues that we bring up over and over and over again but nothing gets
addressed. So then you have to say I don’t know how serious this district is. It’s a
good idea but it takes commitment and it takes support and it takes a lot of effort
and district backing that the only backing that it’s had has been our department
and our department doesn’t have a very loud voice in this district.
R: So do you have a - can you describe for me the process for determining which
schools will offer dual language and which offer content based ESL?
I: When I came on board the schools already existed and from what I know very
few of the elementary schools had the option of even… of the choice. Some of
the schools, it was said, “starting in August you’re going to be dual language –
good luck with that.” Without surveying the community or having even the
administration or the teachers on board. And at those schools when I started on
board those are the schools that were not doing very well because it was very
evident that no one on staff believed in the program, no one had the vision, no
one had - they just wanted - and that was many schools that just wanted it out.
Then you have other schools that they were very passionate about it and they
worked hard at implementing and at making sure that everything was following
with fidelity. All of that happened before I came on board, so I really don’t know what the procedure was to identify - If a school identified themselves. I know that since I’ve been on board there have been other schools that said, “hey we want a part of this!” and the directive from the higher beings was we don’t have any funding to add schools to this because it does take extra personnel and what have you. We did create a dual language cookbook what we call as to procedures that you have to take, too if you’re interested in becoming dual language school. No one has officially gone through those steps to become and I would imagine it is because every year we’re losing more and more funding and people just know there’s - we’re barely hanging on to the schools we have and trying to keep those afloat. So I think it’s pretty obvious that there’s no funding to add new schools. I don’t really know how that happened prior to me coming but from what I’ve heard its most of them were just selected by whoever their region leadership was.

R: Talk to me about what support the district is providing at this point for dual language programs. And the things that I’ve written down here are advocacy, in other words how do we advocate for dual language programs? What additional support do we provide for staffing? What curricular support do we provide? And professional development? And maybe you can talk about over the life of dual language programs what was provided and what’s provided now.

I: The advocacy… we… well, I know that when Mr. XXX had taken over the Superintendent’s Schools we had a lot of different - we had the dual language of New Mexico and they came out and they had provided different types of training
and - so that we could really look at where is your program? Where does it need to be? Let’s focus on that. We talked about the advocacy and having parent nights and what have you and that seemed to be heading in the right direction and then in the year after that when we wanted to bring them back was when the kibosh was put on any out of state consultants, so we couldn’t bring them back. So personally, me, when I talked to the schools, that’s part of - I could come out and do that. In all the years that I’ve been here I believe only three of the seven schools, elementary schools, invited me to go to a parent night. And, as a matter of fact, at one of the schools when I was invited to do a parent thing and talk about the dual language the majority of the parents there were Spanish speaking, Hispanic, and they weren’t understanding and I asked the principal can you set up another date where we can have the same discussion but I deliver the information in Spanish and I was told no. So what drives - we don’t have any team behind what we have to just have that relationship with the principal and have the invitation. And, unfortunately, the principals that are on board and they believe in it they’ve got it covered and they take care of the advocacy. They have these nights and they talk it up and the dual is a big deal on site and they don’t really tap into us. They don’t need it. They’ve got it covered. And then the schools that we do need to be in there advocating we’re not welcome there and stay out type thing. So what we have – we can only go where we’re invited. Staffing, the only staffing that we provide are for the schools that are not Title. The Title schools have the full day kinder so we provide staffing to the schools
that are not Title to make sure the full day kinder’s there so that by the time they get into first grade they have something to work with.

R: You provide teaching units? Or?

I: Yes

R: Do you provide any aides? Or?

I: Yeah, we also provide at those - some - schools we provide aides. Not at all of them. And I should also say that we as the department provide some and then the - when we were under Student Support Services they provided additional aide positions to the dual language schools as well that didn't necessarily come out of ELL budget but came out of Student Support Services. So they did understand that they needed extra support. The curriculum - when we came up with the cookbook we included in there different things and we worked with the schools to identify and we had lots of samples in there of the different kinds of things that should be going on at the school and we did offer professional development but again it was easier when five of the schools were under Mr. XXX. He required this to happen and then shortly after that reshuffle we went from regions to areas they were spread out again and then it’s hard to mandate them to - and then the other thing is they have other issues going on, so with their - have deficiencies. One example would be at a parent because they were a needing improvement school. The least thing that they wanted, they meaning the leadership, the state, when they would re - “We’re not doing any training on dual language. We’re not touching that because we need to concentrate on the bigger pieces of what’s going on. We need to” - So that would continuously get pushed
back not necessarily by the leadership at the school but by the higher beings that said, that maybe didn’t believe in the program, and said “this dual language what we need to do is - it just needs not to be here and we need to concentrate on other things at this school. And so on and so forth... As the department we’ve been there as a support and we’ve tried to offer as much support as we can and, unfortunately, the schools that need our support the most are the ones that don’t - usually aren’t wanting us on their campus or maybe they do but the directive from high above is you’re not going to worry about that now. You have more pressing issues to worry about. So forget the dual language.

**R:** Maybe this is something that you’re - that doesn’t fall under your purview because it may be directed more to people who directly supervise schools, but can you tell me what you know about how - because you talked about the difference between a school where leadership really believes in the program and where maybe they don’t, how are principals and assistant principals selected to lead those programs?

**I:** Well, and I'll go back again to Mr. XXX. When Mr. XXX was over the dual language schools he asked me to sit on interview panel and we had - one of his questions on there was about how passionate? What they knew about dual language and how they would feel? And when we first started he interviewed the people on his own and then he asked me and some other people from the ELL to be there and just to have a conversation with the candidates and talk to them about dual language, see what they know, asking different questions and then later on officially the panel would consist of ELL people to ask dual language.
And that’s critical because we kept seeing over and over that the schools where dual language wasn’t, I guess, implemented with fidelity or whenever something came up it was right away the dual language is what had to be put on hold because it was the dual language piece that was impeding progress. It was so obviously people that didn’t have full understanding of the research. We kept seeing that over and over so he wanted to make sure whoever got put on that campus was going to be a real advocate and fight for the program and do what was best. And the people that he did hire it did work out that way. After the schools were split up mistakes had been made because number one we were never consulted and number two people have made the assumption that just because you have a Hispanic surname that a) you’re bilingual and b) you’re in agreement with the dual language program and that’s not the case at all. And we have one particular school that we have in that predicament now that the principal is not on board yet he was assigned to the school and its dual language and he does not want it to be. And so those are assumptions that are made and people not doing their homework that do the hiring and it ends up just really… pretty much just finishing a program. A program that has been in place for however long and now we’re at a point with one of the schools that we are getting ready to have a parent information meeting because changes were made this year that were so drastic to the program that the parents complained to the board members and it became something very huge and the board members were hearing both ends. “Let’s just get rid of it.” “No I moved into this area specifically for this program.” So now we’re having to have this parent information
meeting, lay down the facts, and then a survey is going to put out to see what the future of this program is that has been there for years but all of this was stirred up by the leadership that was placed there that does not believe in it.

R: I guess that’s all. Is there anything else that you want to say? What I’m looking at is site leadership and practices at sites that really contribute to the sustainability of programs and district structures that support the sustainability of programs. So is there something I missed from the work that you’ve done?

I: I think the only thing I want to add to that is that in the initial stages when we were trying to get all the schools on board to implement the fidelity and be consistent and just follow best practices we got a lot of feedback from who was the higher leadership there that would say things are working just fine at the school leave them alone grandfather them in. Grandfather them in to what? A program that is not following the recommendations so as much as the structure that has to be in place again it goes back to district level because we are here as a support but as we’re supporting these programs and we’re reporting back to people that do have the authority that things are not running the way that they should so that by the time these kids get out in fifth grade they’ve had the - they’ve maximized their time there to have the highest level of proficiency possible in this target language. And we see it repeatedly in some schools that that’s not the case, yet, nothing’s - year after year things stay the same.

R: When I look at your document, your guide that you call a cookbook, it’s based in research. If that were followed, then the district would have very solid programs, and there’s enough flexibility there that site leaders should be able to
create really solid programs across the variety of demographics. So it seems to me like the structure is there if it were followed.

I: correct

R: So if I understand you correctly - help me if I'm - because I need to interpret what I'm hearing - you created a document that provides a research based structure and requirements, minimum requirements for programs, but there’s no teeth in it, nobody requires schools to follow the district requirements?

I: correct

R: so they aren’t requirements, they’re suggestions?

I: They’re supposed to be requirements. We were asked to - we came up with it with that intention, these are the requirements, it’s in writing, this is what CCSD supports, they’ll support nothing else, however…

R: And so is there anybody saying let’s require schools to follow our requirements?

I: Well, Mr. XXX started that and that got busted up and then last year Ms. YYY ended up with four or five of the schools under her. So that was good because here we go again and we have the bulk of them. So she did start that. So we met once with the principals, everyone got the book and she was striving for “we need to all be on the same page. I want all programs to look like this.” And she was trying. She really did try to head in that direction and at that level I don’t know the conversations that go on at that level but I know that there were issues and nothing changed. So I know even though she was trying it wasn’t happening and so I don’t know what - I don’t know what were her obstacles, I should say,
but I know that that’s what she was striving for and I sat in several meetings with her where she was pushing for that. And so, I mean, if an academic manager can’t make it happen…and she tried.

**R:** I understand where the power lies. I do.

**I:** And so it baffles me because I don’t know, because at that level I thought here we go. Because Mr. XXX had started the work and we were seeing stuff getting done but then the restructuring and he lost schools and then when he lost schools we had to go back again and start having the conversations with the different academic managers and this is what should be happening. And for some it was important and they wanted the information and they wanted to monitor and for others it was “you know what? They’re doing fine let ‘em keep doing whatever they’re doing because the school’s doing fine.” And then when we said “well, these are the non-negotiables of the program.” Because we did do that, we tried to do that and because they don’t follow the non-negotiables perhaps you should no longer be called a dual language school because you actually aren’t. And then, “we’ll take that conversation up with the deputy superintendent and we’ll let her…” And then we got a call that said leave the school alone. We do what we can and so I really don’t know. I know that I’ve heard Mr. Rojas say that he is really impressed with the dual language schools and I’ve heard him say that that model – he’s done his research and he knows. And so that’s why I’m saying ok, what I have - my concerns that I’ve expressed to my director is I think that’s great that they want to expand, however, my feeling is before you expand on anything let’s get it right on the ones that exist because
they’re still lacking and there’s a bunch of holes so before we go adding however many more schools let’s get the ones we have under order and get them on the right track because we’re still nowhere near where we need to be and so I haven’t heard anything.

**R:** What do you think would change the staffing issue? Changes in policies and procedures? Would it take changes at the state level? In the law? What would it take?

**I:** What’s funny is I don’t think state levels in the law - there’s already state level endorsement issues and for the five years I’ve been here - we’ve been telling the principals your teachers need endorsements. For some reason our HR department and this conversation has gone round and round they will endorse a PE teacher to have their endorse - they will require a PE teacher to have that endorsement, they will require an art teacher, however, they will not enforce that a Spanish speaking teacher has to have a bilingual endorsement. Which any of us that have been in this field long enough we know that in Nevada you could get a bilingual endorsement and not speak a lick of Spanish. Not everybody knows that but the point is that at least you will have the curriculum, the classes and it’s not just what we see. We enter a classroom and it’s someone with some kitchen Spanish that has never had formal education in Spanish and they don’t know what they’re doing. The principal is not bilingual, the AP isn’t bilingual. Nobody knows what’s going on, yet, and so even at the state level they have those licenses but who’s enforcing that. So we go around and so one year we even
said - and we’ve been offering reimbursement all the years we’ve been there.

And one year I remember…

R: reimbursement for the coursework?

I: Yes. So they get their bilingual endorsement, they get reimbursement for all the money they spent getting it, we offered - we opened up - the first year we offered it we opened. We had two sessions with occupancy for 25 participants. We had to close one down because there were so few and the other one as a favor the college still held the class because they only had 11 participants. They require a minimum of, I think, 12 or 15 and they said we'll do this but we’re not offering these courses again because we lined up all these teachers and there’s no interest. And then one teacher, Mr. ZZZ - oh here’s another great one – Mr. ZZZ, who was at ABC Elementary, and he did great things over there. He actually told his teachers that they had to, he required them, he told them they had to otherwise they were going to lose their job. And we know that because we got all kinds of calls from the union saying “what is this? This principal over there?” and we said, “well, we did say that eventually they shouldn’t be in that classroom without the endorsement. Now, we’ve been trying to catch up hiring teachers every year but it’s going to come to a point where we’re not going to be there anymore and people will lose their jobs to someone that does have the endorsement.” And so there was movement there for grievances. I’m not sure whatever ended up happening but the funny thing out of the 12 students that did take up the class the majority of them were from his school because he had made that statement. But there was people that challenged it and called the
union and they said that’s not true we don’t have to take this. So some principals tried to be very active in trying to get their people endorsed and some - and another interesting story about ABC Elementary is when we first started they were a Reading First school so Mr. ZZZ was very challenged that he was trying to implement with fidelity both programs and the literacy department at the time told him that he could not do any of the 90 minute reading block in Spanish, that it was against the grant. Well, we looked into the grant and nowhere in there did it say that, so we ended up having to have a huge meeting. And at this meeting where I sat and heard with my own ears that they said if - we’ve talked to the person - Whoever at the state department of Reading First, the literacy people said if you decide to move forward and implement the dual language and do 90 minute blocks in Spanish we’re going to remove all the resources we have given you. From the projector to the laptop to the this - and they just rattled off everything that they had been given in support of Reading First - and it will be removed. And you will no longer be a Reading First school and we will take away everything we have given you. And we just sat there with our mouths open not understanding. And this is a district that supports it and yet you have a department that comes in here and says that. So you just sit there and you just… wow!

R: How much of that do you think is a lack of belief and how much of it is a lack of value for Spanish as a language and a respect for culture? And I know I’m finished with this and you can stop me tell me you want to stop and say I don’t
I want to talk about that. That’s fine. But how much of it has to do with cultural proficiency and respect and value for the cultures and languages?

I: I think a lot of it has to do with that because as we were sitting there at that meeting the research was talked about and the benefits of it not just for the ELL kids but the benefits for the English only students and that was just a very one way conversation. This is the best way to close the achievement gap for these ELL kids. The school is 50% - almost 50% - ELL. The resource is already there, your teachers - you have a lot of bilingual teachers, and we went over how literacy instruction is literacy instruction. It doesn’t matter what language it’s in it’s going to be beneficial, especially in languages that share the alphabet. It’s not like Chinese and English. So we went around and around and they weren’t having it. And, as a matter of fact, the first meeting we had they told us that their recommendation was going to be XYZ and then by the second meeting they had they had already talked to this person at the state level and they were delivering his message which was everything will be pulled ‘cause he’s not in support of it. So it is a lack - I mean and that’s - I see it as that way. I don’t know if that’s my biased from the skin I wear but that’s what I see it as and from my office the phone calls that I get and say “my kid’s starting school at such and such and we live in United States and I don’t want my kid learning Mexican and…” you have to deal with. And it’s sad when you’re working with people that aren’t saying those words but the actions are coming across that way and it’s huge. When you’re taking away a school’s resources that you had already told the school they could
keep but listen, if you decide to do this thing we're taking it all back. So that's kind of…
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