

Añiles, Alfredo J., Janette Kettmann Klingner, and Kathleen King. "Bilingual Special Education." Encyclopedia of Bilingual Education. 2008. SAGE Publications.

BILINGUAL SPECIAL EDUCATION

Bilingual special education is defined by Julia de Valenzuela, Leonard Baca, and Elena Baca as the instances in which student participation in an individually designed, special education program is conducted

in both the student's native language and English; in such a program, the student's home culture is also considered, framed in an inclusive environment. Special education is an interdisciplinary field that addresses the educational needs of English language learners with disabilities. The majority of this population is Latino, which is now the largest minority group in the nation's schools. This is a small field, partly because of limited understanding of the needs and developmental trajectories of this population but also because of a lack of programmatic research. A significant personnel shortage has been documented for years, as described by Leonard Baca and Hermes Cervantes. In the seminal text *The Bilingual Special Education Interface*, de Valenzuela, Baca, and Baca argue for a bilingual-special education interface as a way to address the limitations of fragmented and separate general, bilingual, and special education services. They recommend the seamless integration of these programs so that the needs of this population are addressed by various groups of professionals in general education.

The convergence of several contemporary reform movements is blurring the boundaries of these systems, though in rather complex ways. First, a growing anti-immigrant and antibilingual discourse has strengthened movements to curtail services for this population in some states. This situation has increased the pressure on general education, since English language learners (ELLs) are being educated in programs that offer few linguistic supports. General education is also absorbing this population at a time when federal accountability policies require states and districts to report high performance levels as measured by standardized achievement tests. This is an important challenge because ELLs have traditionally performed poorly in such measures. It is not clear how general education will address the need of these learners.

Because of the lack of specialized resources and the scarcity of qualified personnel in general education, it has been suggested that districts with significant ELL enrollment will likely place these students in special education; in fact, research conducted in California by Alfredo Artiles, Robert Rueda, Jesús Salazar, and Ignacio Higareda suggests that ELLs are disproportionately placed in disability programs. Historically, the so-called subjective disabilities have been overpopulated at the national level by ethnic minority students, particularly African American and American Indian learners, as explained by Suzanne

Donovan and Christopher Cross. These categories include learning disabilities (LD), mild mental retardation (MMR), and emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD). ELL overrepresentation has been reported in the past two decades, as Alba Ortiz and James Yates report in their chapter in *English Language Learners With Special Needs*. It is interesting that although general educators may be using disability diagnoses as a means to cope with the aforementioned contemporary reforms, special education is transforming its identity as a result of the inclusive education movement and preventive approaches. Indeed, more students with disabilities are being educated in general education classrooms, though it has been reported by Daniel Losen and Gary Orfield that ethnic minority students are placed in more segregated settings than are their White counterparts. In turn, preventive models such as "response to intervention" (RTI) promise to identify and treat early (i.e., while the student is still in a general education environment).

These new trends are creating unique and unprecedented conditions for the education of ELLs. This entry addresses the legal background of the special education programs geared toward culturally and linguistically diverse students designated as ELLs and the implications for assessment, curriculum planning, and the nature of inclusive education programs for those students.

Legal Background

Special education laws have had a substantial impact on bilingual special education. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), originally passed in 1975 and reauthorized in 2004, governs special education services in public schools. The law protects the rights of students with disabilities and their families and tries to ensure that ELLs are assessed fairly. The law includes numerous provisions outlined below.

1. *Informed consent.* Schools must obtain written informed consent from parents or guardians to evaluate a student. Parents must be fully informed of their rights, any records to be released and to whom, and the nature and purpose of the evaluation. Parents or guardians must be informed in their native language or primary mode of communication.
2. *Multidisciplinary team.* Students should be assessed by a team of professionals with varied areas of

expertise according to the student's individual needs. The team should include at least one general education teacher and one special education teacher. For ELLs, the team should include someone with expertise in the language acquisition process.

3. *Comprehensive evaluation.* Before an initial placement, the multidisciplinary team must conduct a complete assessment in all areas of suspected disability. No single procedure can be used as the sole criterion for determining an appropriate educational program for a child. Alternative procedures should be used when standardized tests are not considered appropriate (e.g., with culturally and linguistically diverse students). A comprehensive evaluation should include an analysis of the instructional setting and the child's instructional history.
4. *Exclusionary criteria.* A student should not be labeled if the academic struggles are primarily the result of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage. IDEA 2004 adds that a child should not be found to have a disability if the determinant factor is poor instruction in reading or math, or limited English proficiency.
5. *Nondiscriminatory assessment.* Assessments should be (a) selected and administered so as not to be racially or culturally discriminatory; (b) provided and administered in the child's native language or other mode of communication and in the form most likely to yield accurate information on what the child knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally, unless it is clearly not feasible; (c) used for the purposes for which the assessments are valid and reliable; (d) administered by trained and knowledgeable personnel; and (e) administered in accordance with any instructions provided by the producer of the assessments.

Students with LDs represent about half of the special education population. IDEA 2004 includes major changes in how students should be identified as having LD (see above). States must permit the use of a process based on the child's response to research-based interventions. Multidisciplinary teams (MDT) must establish that the child was provided appropriate instruction in regular education settings, delivered by qualified personnel. Districts may now use 15% of the funds previously allocated for special education to provide students with early intervention. States must

report the number and percentages of children with disabilities by limited-English-proficiency status and gender, in addition to race, ethnicity, and disability categories. This additional record keeping will make it easier to learn more about subpopulations of ELLs identified with disabilities.

Assessment and Identification

Traditional tests have been demonstrated to be inappropriate for the assessment of ELLs. Richard Figueroa, Eugene García, and others have documented the challenges associated with test reliability and validity when tests that were not normed with ELL samples are used to assess these students. There is also considerable evidence of poor validity and reliability of tests translated prior to or during administration, a common practice in the assessment of bilingual students. The use of traditional assessment procedures that include norm-referenced tests may not be appropriate, and, instead, the assessment process must be conceptualized holistically and include the following components:

- *Preventive measures* include the adaptation of educational environments that recognize and support the potential for all students to learn, as well as utilize instructional and disciplinary approaches considered empirically valid for use with ELLs. Such measures include well-implemented bilingual and English as a Second Language programs.
- The *intervention measures* of diagnostic teaching and behavior management aim to locate the source of the ELLs' difficulties through the use of informal assessment and family input, as well as collaboration with those who have expertise in language acquisition. These data are then utilized in the provision of instruction and supports that are empirically validated for ELLs.
- *Eligibility assessment* for ELLs ensures that appropriate assessment personnel and measures are utilized following thorough review of student records; contextualized observations and less formalized testing of ELLs are implicated by assessors who have the technical knowledge and skills, as well as the cultural and linguistic awareness, to conduct bilingual assessments. Bilingual assessments must include equivalent instruments and procedures in the students' native language and English.
- Finally, *eligibility determination* for ELLs entails that MDTs include administrative, appraisal, and

instruction representatives, parent and family members, advocates and interpreters, and an expert in cultural/linguistic diversity. Ortiz and Yates explain that the MDT must rule out factors other than disability as source of difficulty, and assessment results should be reported in the student's native language and English in aggregate, complete with a description of the nature of assessments, as well as how items were administered (e.g., with interpreter, translated during administration, if items missed in English were administered in native language, etc.). Eligibility criteria for all special education categories being considered must be applied to both languages measured.

Curriculum, Planning, and Instructional Considerations

Bilingual special education programs incorporate supportive, culturally responsive learning environments as well as validated instructional practices. Optimal programs incorporate students' home cultures and include native-language instruction and a focus on English language development in addition to validated practices in literacy and the content areas. It is a heightened focus on language and cultural practices that makes bilingual special education distinct from generic special education.

Culturally Responsive Learning Environments

School climates that foster success are caring communities based on the philosophy that all students can learn. Such schools accommodate individual differences in a positive manner. Norma López-Reyna and Alba Ortiz characterize them by (a) strong administrative leadership; (b) high expectations; (c) nurturing, supportive environment and a challenging, appropriate curriculum and instruction; (d) a safe and orderly environment; and (e) ongoing, systematic evaluation of student progress.

Linguistic Support

Successful programs are those in which language development is a central focus, whether in students' native language or English. Students receive frequent opportunities to use language in an environment that promotes active engagement. Instruction focuses on higher-order thinking and active problem solving.

Teachers preteach and reinforce key terms, as explained by Marilyn Rousseau and Brian Tam, using visuals, graphic organizers, and realia to bring words to life and make them meaningful for students, as explained by Elba Reyes and Candace Bos. They help students make connections within and across the curriculum and to their own prior knowledge and experiences, as Mack Burke, Shanna Hagan, and Bonnie Grossen explain. Ideally, teachers provide students with multiple and varied opportunities to review and apply previously learned concepts.

Curricular Modifications

Baca and de Valenzuela describe modifications to make the curriculum more accessible to ELLs. These modifications are changes in content, pedagogy, and classroom instructional settings to meet the needs of individual students. For example, modifications may include adjusting the method of presentation, developing supplemental materials, tape-recording directions, providing alternative response formats, requiring fewer or shorter responses or assignments, outlining material, or breaking tasks into subtasks, as John J. Hoover and Catherine Collier explain in their chapter in *The Bilingual Special Education Interface*. Adaptations of content might also include the provision of native-language instruction and/or materials (see Table 1).

Validated Instructional Practices

Numerous instructional approaches have been found to be promising for ELLs with disabilities.

Table 1 Suggestions for Curricular Modifications

1. The curriculum should emphasize enrichment rather than remedial activities.
2. Interactive and experiential pedagogical models should be used.
3. Language development must be emphasized across the curriculum.
4. Students' unique linguistic, cultural, and experiential backgrounds should be integrated into the curriculum.
5. Parental and community involvement in this process should be encouraged.

Source: Adapted from Baca & de Valenzuela (1994).

Sharon Vaughn and her colleagues found that some effective early interventions for ELLs who struggle with reading have been provided in the students' native language and in English. These have included focused reading interventions coupled with language development activities, such as the use of repetitive language, modeling, gesturing, visuals, and explicit instruction in English language usage, as explained in the work of Sylvia Linan-Thompson, Sharon Vaughn, Peggy Hickman-Davis, and Kamiar Kouzakanani.

Instructional approaches that promote reading comprehension and content learning include graphic organizers, as described by Bos, Adela Allen, and David Scanlon; modified reciprocal teaching and collaborative strategic reading, as explained by Janette Klingner and Vaughn; and classwide peer tutoring, as proposed by Carmen Arreaga-Mayer and Charles Greenwood.

Planning

Baca and Hermes Cervantes recommend several steps for developing a comprehensive bilingual special education curriculum. The planning process should involve the parents, the general education teacher, the bilingual teacher, and the special education teacher and follow the steps outlined in Table 2.

Table 2 Planning for ELLs With Special Needs

1. Meet as a team to begin the planning process; outline planning steps.
2. Become familiar with the culture and language background of the child as well as his or her education needs.
3. Prepare an individual instructional plan with short- and long-term objectives and goals.
4. Develop individualized lessons and materials appropriate to the child's exceptionality.
5. Modify individualized lessons and materials to match the child's needs.
6. Refer to resource people for assistance and cooperation in instruction; coordinate services.
7. Evaluate the child's ongoing progress and develop a new individualized education program (IEP), lessons, and materials as needed.

Source: Adapted from Baca & de Valenzuela (1994).

Considerations for Inclusive Education Programs

Inclusive education offers students many benefits, including access to the general education curriculum and opportunities to interact with their nondisabled peers in ways not possible with other models. The general education teacher (who may or may not be a bilingual teacher) remains responsible for the student, with support from others. Inclusion is a schoolwide approach to education that relies in part on collaborative models in which general and special education teachers coteach or the special education teacher might serve as a consultant. When the student is an ELL and neither teacher is bilingual or an expert in language development, it becomes essential to add a third collaborator who has this expertise.

ELL students with disabilities who receive support in general education classrooms need curricular modifications and supplemental materials to support their learning needs and allow them to participate as fully as possible in classroom activities.

Family and Community Participation

De Valenzuela, Baca, and Baca provide a three-part rationale for promoting family and community participation in the education of ELLs: (a) parental involvement in special education, which is required by law; (b) differences between the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of school personnel and the student body and the disproportionate representation of minority students in special programs; and (c) evidence of the positive correlation between academic achievement and family involvement.

Nancy Cloud has dedicated much of her work to developing specific guidelines on how to provide opportunities for parents and community members of ELLs with special needs. In her chapter in *English Language Learners With Special Needs*, she mentions considerations must be made that are related to the family's level of acculturation and attitude/acceptance of their child. In addition, the language of the family must be accommodated for; trained translators or bilingual educators must be involved in all family correspondence between the school and the home. Educators need to understand the family's perceptions of schooling, as well as their knowledge and comfort with the school environment and infrastructure.

The special education process is potentially confusing for all parents and families, including ELLs and their families. Careful attention must be given to the way each step of the process is presented and explained. There are specific considerations to be made related to meetings and paperwork for bilingual special education students, including the language of oral and written communication both prior to and at all special education meetings, and the need to determine goals and concerns of parents and family's before options are presented at eligibility determination and individualized education program meetings.

Finally, there are many misconceptions about the involvement of parents and families of ELLs in their children's education. However, research from the National Center for Education Statistics in 1995 shows similar patterns for minority and nonminority parents' involvement in their eighth-grade students' education. Educators need to be aware of and challenge their own biases that shape interpretation of different levels and types of parent and family involvement in their children's education. A useful principle is to consider that different communities and families have different norms pertaining to family involvement in the school setting.

Alfredo J. Artiles, Janette Kettmann Klingner, and Kathleen King

Authors' Note: The authors acknowledge the support of the National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCCRESt, at <http://www.nccrest.org>, under grant number H326E020003, awarded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs. Endorsement of the ideas presented in this article by the funding agency should not be inferred.

See also Culturally Competent Teaching; Multicultural Education; Transformative Teaching Model

Further Readings

- Arreaga-Mayer, C., & Greenwood, C. R. (1986). Environmental variables affecting the school achievement of culturally and linguistically different learners: An instructional perspective. *Journal of the National Association of Bilingual Education, 10*(2), 113–135.
- Artiles, A., & Ortiz, A. (Eds.). (2002). *English language learners with special needs: Identification, placement, and instruction*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Artiles, A., Rueda, R., Salazar, J., & Higareda, I. (2005). Within-group diversity in minority disproportionate representation: English Language Learners in urban school districts. *Exceptional Children, 71*, 283–300.
- Baca, L., & Cervantes, H. (Eds.) (2004). *The bilingual special education interface*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Baca, L., & de Valenzuela, J. S. (1994, Fall). Reconstructing the bilingual special education interface. *NCBE Program Information Guide Series, 20*. Available from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/pigs>
- Burke, M., Hagan, S., & Grossen, B. (1998). What curricular design and strategies accommodate diverse learners? *Teaching Exceptional Children, 31*(1), 34–48.
- de Valenzuela, J. S., Baca, L., & Baca, E. (2004). Family involvement in bilingual special education: Challenging the norm. In L. Baca & H. Cervantes (Eds.), *The bilingual special education interface* (pp. 360–381). Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Donovan, S., & Cross, C. (Eds.). (2002). *Minority students in special and gifted education*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Figueroa, R. A., & García, E. (1994). Issues in testing students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. *Multicultural Education, 2*(1), 10–19.
- Harris-Murri, N. J. (2006). *Living the dream in the promised land: Features of highly successful schools that serve students of color*. Denver, CO: National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, H.R. 1350, 108th Cong (2004). Available from <http://nasponline.org/advocacy/IDEA2004.pdf>
- Klingner, J. K., & Vaughn, S. (1996). Reciprocal teaching of reading comprehension strategies for students with learning disabilities who use English as a second language. *Elementary School Journal, 93*, 275–293.
- Linan-Thompson, S., Vaughn, S., Hickman-Davis, P., & Kouzekanani, K. (2003). Effectiveness of supplemental reading instruction for second-grade English language learners with reading difficulties. *Elementary School Journal, 103*, 221–238.
- López-Reyna, N. A. (1996). The importance of meaningful contexts in bilingual special education: Moving to whole language. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 11*, 120–131.
- Losen, D., & Orfield, G. (Eds.). (2002). *Racial inequity in special education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1995). *The educational progress of Hispanic students*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

- Ortiz, A. A., & Yates, J. (2001). *English language learners with special needs: Effective instructional strategies*. Washington, DC: ERIC Education Reports.
- Reyes, E., & Bos, C. (1998). Interactive semantic mapping and charting: Enhancing content area learning for language minority students. In R. Gersten & R. Jiménez (Eds.), *Promoting learning for culturally and linguistically diverse students: Classroom applications from contemporary research* (pp. 133–152). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Rousseau, M. K., & Tam, B. K. Y. (1993). Increasing reading proficiency of language minority students with speech and language impairments. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 16, 254–271.
- Vaughn, S., Mathes, P. G., Linan-Thompson, S., & Francis, D. J. (2005). Teaching English language learners at risk for reading disabilities to read: Putting research to practice. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 20, 58–67.
- Willig, A., Swedo, J., & Ortiz, A. (1987). *Characteristics of teaching strategies which result in high task engagement for exceptional limited English proficient students*. Austin: University of Texas at Austin, Handicapped Minority Research Institute on Language Proficiency.

of the legislative branch of government to the already powerful voice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Since that time, there has been an emerging consensus in teacher education and academic communities as to the competencies or skills that were required for effective bilingual teaching. These were articulated as “guidelines” for bilingual teacher preparation programs by the Center for Applied Linguistics in 1974. Over time, organization and state licensure agencies developed and refined criteria for certification of bilingual teachers and outlined bilingual teacher education program standards and requirements.

Several federal and state court cases over the years since the *Lau v. Nichols* decision established the requirements for programs for ELLs. In 1981, *Castañeda v. Pickard* outlined a three-pronged test for programs that adequately meet the needs of language minority students, as James Crawford explains. This Texas case set the standards for determining what constituted “appropriate action” on the part of school districts to address the educational rights of students learning English. The court determined that under the provisions of the EEOA, programs had to meet three criteria: Programs for ELLs had to (1) be based on a pedagogically sound plan, (2) have sufficient qualified teachers to implement the program, and (3) have a system to evaluate the program’s effectiveness in educating limited-English-proficient students. Scholars such as Diane August and Kenji Hakuta, and María Robledo Montecel and Josie D. Cortéz mention that these requirements were based on recognition of the interrelationship between effective program implementation and the qualifications in academic knowledge, instructional skills, and language proficiency of bilingual teachers.

Knowledge Base for Teaching ELLs

Efforts to establish teacher certification programs became more intense and focused in the late 1980s and early 1990s because of the growing population of immigrant students, primarily from Mexico and Latin America. Kate Menken and Beth Antunez documented in 2001 that 38 states had credential requirements for teachers of students with limited English proficiency, while 95 institutions of higher education had bilingual teacher education programs. States with the greatest number of bilingual teacher education programs were California, New York, and Texas. Although universities varied in the types of degrees in bilingual teaching offered and course and program requirements, there was a common core of standards

and competencies in the preparation of teachers for bilingual instruction. Menken and Antunez reported that this knowledge base included three main categories of coursework and certification requirements for bilingual teacher licensure in all states: (1) pedagogical knowledge, (2) linguistic knowledge, and (3) knowledge of cultural and linguistic diversity.

In addition to states’ requirements for bilingual teacher licensure, a number of organizations have established standards for teacher preparation and professional development. These include the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE) publication in 1992, *Standards for the Preparation of Bilingual/Multicultural Teachers*; the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) publication in 1998, *English as a New Language Standards*; the Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE) publication in 1998, *Standards for Effective Teaching Practice*; as well as the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) publication in 2002, *Pre-K–12 ESL Teacher Education Standards*.

The foundation for bilingual teaching is a body of theory and philosophy of second-language acquisition that preserves and promotes children’s ethnic identities and cultural integrity. The pedagogical basis for bilingual education is widely accepted by second-language educators and supported by a large body of research and evaluation studies, as noted by Diane August and Kenji Hakuta. Underlying successful bilingual education is the principle of the interdependent relationship between language development and cognitive academic skills. Stephen Krashen points out that research into second-language acquisition processes in academic settings has established that learning takes place when language and concepts are linked in meaningful ways, so that they produce growth in knowledge and competency in using the language to communicate knowledge and ideas. Therefore, bilingual teachers must be knowledgeable in how to design effective instruction to make linkages between linguistic and conceptual development, as well as between learning in the students’ primary language and English, as reported by Carmen Zúñiga-Hill and Ruth Helen Yopp.

Three-Tiered Approach to ELL Teacher Licensure

Teacher education programs and licensure policies have responded to the growing ELL population in classrooms in which bilingual teachers are not available. Non-bilingual-certified teachers provide specialized

instruction to ELLs through various models and programs of English-only instruction, including English as a Second Language (ESL) programs, structured English immersion, and mainstream programs. Patricia Gándara and Russell Rumberger reported in 2005 that more than half (55%) of the teachers of ELLs in California taught students through resource models and pull-out instructional services. Teachers of ELLs utilized knowledge from the disciplines of linguistics and second-language (L2) acquisition and the relationship between language and academic development. They used this knowledge to identify and select appropriate teaching strategies to address learners' developing knowledge of English and growth in literacy and content knowledge.

To address the growing population of ELLs, both historically and practically, teacher education programs have developed what can be characterized as a three-tiered approach. Based on a set of generic teaching competencies that all teachers possess, credential programs have focused on “emphasis” credentials to address the particular knowledge, skills, and abilities of nonbilingual and bilingual teachers of ELLs, as indicated by Josué González and Linda Darling-Hammond. (See Table 1 for a description of the components of three levels of expertise that are addressed in teacher preparation programs.) California’s licensure structure is an example of the implementation of this conceptualization of teacher competencies for educating ELLs.

Table 1 A Three-Tiered Analysis of EL/Bilingual Teacher Competencies

<i>Effective Generic Teaching</i>	<i>Effective CLAD Teaching</i>	<i>Effective Bilingual Teaching</i>
1. Careful and thorough lesson planning based on an understanding of a coherent and sequenced progression of the curriculum according to state and local school district frameworks and standards.	1.1. Lesson planning based on a selection of subsets of vocabulary, concepts, skills, and processes so that L2 learners are not overwhelmed with academic content, but are still challenged and engaged. 1.2. Ability to plan the curriculum around themes or “essential questions” so that L2 learners can make connections between each lesson and the overall curriculum and standards, while also being provided multiple exposures and vehicles to comprehend the content.	1.3. Lesson planning in students’ L1 builds linguistic and conceptual knowledge based on the principle that new knowledge is introduced in the known language (L1) and new language is introduced and linked to the known concepts, usually learned in L1. 1.4. Bilingual teachers plan for cross-linguistic transfer of learning, including contrastive analysis of L1 and L2 language structures, to maximize metalinguistic knowledge stemming from proficiency in two different language systems.
2. Clear presentations and delivery of content based on important ideas, principles, and concepts.	2.1. Careful attention to modeling and scaffolding learning to provide a structure for L2 learners in order to sort out important ideas and reduce the “language load” for different levels of English proficiency, based on the need for comprehensible input.	2.2. Planning for systematic and consistent use of L1 and L2 as mediums of instruction and language support for learning, without resorting to concurrent translation that could diminish conceptual learning and/or the level of challenge in L2 learning.
3. Differentiated teaching to meet individual students’ needs.	3.1. Differentiate instruction according to each student’s language proficiency by adjusting the focus of instruction and the level of difficulty (complexity, abstraction, reading level, etc.) of the content.	3.3. Use whole-group and skills-group instruction according to language dominance and proficiency to ensure that students work at the appropriate level of challenge and complexity in both L1 and L2.

(Continued)

Table 1 (Continued)

<i>Effective Generic Teaching</i>	<i>Effective CLAD Teaching</i>	<i>Effective Bilingual Teaching</i>
	3.2. Knowledge of when language should be the focus of the lesson rather than the content and when the content should be the focus, with modifications and adjustments to the language used in instruction and students' tasks.	3.4. Distinguish between challenges to students' learning based on their lack of language proficiency to express their knowledge of content and when the concepts or content knowledge needs to be developed through language that students have mastered (either L1 or L2).
4. Design of appropriate learning activities and instructional materials.	4.1. Knowledge of how to modify and adapt textbooks and other reading materials through processes such as summarizing, paraphrasing, outlining, etc., to use instead of, or in preparation for, work with grade-level textbooks.	4.2. Knowledge of effective grouping patterns according to students' dominant language and L2 proficiency.
5. Providing ample opportunities for students to practice and apply their learning.	5.1. Awareness that L2 learners need to practice their language skills in interactions with the teacher and with each other, before they are expected to read and write independently using that same language. 5.2. Careful selection of authentic tasks that encourage use of language for communicating for specific purposes. 5.3. Avoidance of artificial and excessively abstract and complex language tasks.	4.3. Selection and adaptation of L1 and L2 materials and texts for grade-level instruction in L1 and developmentally appropriate materials in L1. 5.4. Knowledge of cross-linguistic transfer theory and the connections between students' academic knowledge and their growth in L2 proficiency. 5.5. Ability to develop critical thinking skills in L1 and to present increasingly challenging content material in L2 as students' proficiency increases. 5.6. Ability to determine what content needs to be introduced, practiced, and assessed in either L1 or L2 at points in time in the curriculum.
6. Setting high expectations for student performance and achievement.	6.1. Knowledge of what is reasonable and realistic to expect of L2 students as their language skills develop over time, according to the characteristics of the stages of L2 acquisition. 6.2. Ability to find alternative ways for L2 students to express and demonstrate their content knowledge without being hindered by limited proficiency.	6.3. Knowledge of the benefits of bilingualism and the expectation that students become fully bilingual and biliterate. 6.4. Knowledge of bilingual language use in the students' homes and community and affirmation of the use of two or more languages as a resource. 6.5. Expectations that students will become fully linguistically and culturally integrated into society as bilingual individuals.

<i>Effective Generic Teaching</i>	<i>Effective CLAD Teaching</i>	<i>Effective Bilingual Teaching</i>
<p>7. Ongoing assessment and adjustment of curriculum according to students' learning.</p> <p>8. Integration of the language arts (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) in teaching and in planning students' performance tasks and activities.</p> <p>9. Effective classroom management and creation of a positive classroom environment.</p>	<p>7.1. Knowledge of standardized and observation-based language assessment procedures, scoring, and interpretation.</p> <p>7.2. Knowledge of the features of language to observe through reading assessments, such as running records, informal reading inventories, and miscue analysis</p> <p>7.3. Skill in the analysis of L2 students' writing for patterns of errors based on cross-linguistic transfer and/or language development.</p> <p>8.1. Adjustment of the focus of reading/language arts instruction according to the proficiency level of each student (4x4 model)</p> <p>8.2. Attention to the "buildup" steps required to prepare L2 learners for the more abstract and complex tasks of reading and writing.</p> <p>8.3. Knowledge of the importance of a meaning-based approach to literacy instruction.</p> <p>8.4. Awareness of the concept of interlanguage and how to identify the possible origins of linguistic errors.</p> <p>9.1. Awareness of self as a "cultural mediator" and "interpreter" with openness to learning from and about L2 students and their cultural backgrounds.</p> <p>9.2. Awareness of cultural factors in children's learning styles and preferences that impinge on motivation to learn and interact with the teacher and their peers.</p> <p>9.3. Knowledge of flexible and varied patterns of grouping to meet individual needs of L2 students according to their levels of language proficiency and mastery of content.</p>	<p>7.4. Knowledge of language assessment in determining language dominance and acquisition in bilingual development.</p> <p>7.5. Knowledge of biliteracy development and the cross-linguistic transfer of reading skills and strategies from L1 to L2.</p> <p>7.6. Knowledge of comparative and contrastive linguistics between L1 and L2 and didactic strategies for presenting these concepts to facilitate bilingual and biliteracy development.</p> <p>8.5. Ability to differentiate instruction through thematic teaching and to coordinate content presentation and learning tasks in L1 and L2, according to a theoretically sound model of dual-language instruction.</p> <p>8.6. Ability to assess students' readiness for transition into greater amounts and higher levels of L2 instruction in transitional bilingual education programs.</p> <p>8.7. Ability to assess students' L1 language maintenance needs and sustain their linguistic and cognitive development as bilinguals.</p> <p>9.4. Deep knowledge of students' culture and role modeling of positive aspects of bilingual and biculturalism.</p> <p>9.5. Creation of a classroom environment that affirms use of L1 and L2 for all functions and levels of classroom interaction and academic study.</p>

(Continued)

Table 1 (Continued)

<i>Effective Generic Teaching</i>	<i>Effective CLAD Teaching</i>	<i>Effective Bilingual Teaching</i>
10. Knowledge of grade-level programs and how his or her teaching fits into the larger curriculum plan and progression for a particular group of students.	<p>10.1. Knowledge of the goals and objectives of the designated language minority student program (transitional bilingual education, structured English immersion, etc.) and what responsibilities he or she has for L2 students' long-range progress.</p> <p>10.2. Knowledge of the legal boundaries under which teachers operate in instructing L2 learners and where to go for clarification of policies and procedures.</p> <p>10.3. Awareness of shared decision-making processes and opportunities for collaboration in his or her role and responsibilities in educating language minority students.</p>	<p>10.4. Knowledge of the goals, objectives, and structures of models of dual-language instruction and their means of implementation across grade levels and subject areas.</p> <p>10.5. Ability to create a coherent and progressive scope and sequence of learning language, literacy, and academic content with appropriate time frames and academic goals for instruction in L1 and L2.</p> <p>10.6. Knowledge of the limitations and benefits of various forms of language and academic achievement tests and assessments in planning students' entry into, progress in, and/or exit from L1 and L2 programs.</p>

The California Model

In 1992, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) established a new system for preparing teachers for linguistically and culturally diverse student populations to respond to these changing demographics, as reported by Priscilla H. Walton and Robert Carlson. Two categories of teaching credentials were created to prepare bilingual and monolingual teachers for instruction with ELL students: The Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) emphasis credential, authorizing teachers to provide instruction in students' native languages in bilingual education classrooms, and the Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) credential, authorizing nonbilingual teachers to provide English language development and specialized content area instruction for ELLs. The CCTC also established a structure for teachers who held a basic credential to add CLAD or BCLAD certification through additional university courses and/or state examinations. The BCLAD/CLAD system designated six domains of required knowledge. CLAD certification candidates were required to demonstrate competencies in Domains 1 through 3, while bilingual

candidates are required to demonstrate mastery of all six domains:

1. Language structure and first- and second-language development
2. Methodology of bilingual, English language development, and content instruction
3. Culture and cultural diversity
4. Methodology for primary-language instruction
5. The culture of emphasis
6. The language of emphasis

The CLAD credential was originally designed to qualify nonbilingual teachers for teaching assignments with ELL students who had completed and transitioned out of bilingual education programs or who were in classrooms where certified bilingual teachers were not available. However, with passage of Proposition 227 in 1998, which restricted bilingual education programs in California schools, the focus of the CLAD credential shifted to qualifying teachers for the implementation of "structured English

immersion” programs of short duration according to the provisions of the new law. Simultaneously, the number of students enrolled in dual-immersion or two-way bilingual programs grew, increasing the demand for bilingual teachers to staff these programs (which served 13,000 students in 2006, according to a CCTC report). In 2002, teacher education reform legislation resulted in the elimination of the CLAD credential as an “add-on” of specific coursework and content to the basic teaching credentials. In 2006, the CCTC changed the name of the certification to California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) and approved a new and expanded set of standards as a knowledge base for coursework and testing, as described by CCTC in 2006.

The California BCLAD/CLAD and CTEL requirements share a common core of competencies for teaching ELLs in three domains of knowledge: Language structure and language development, second-language methodology, and culture and cultural diversity. In addition to the multicultural and linguistic core courses for the CLAD, bilingual BCLAD teachers are prepared in methodology for primary-language instruction, the culture of emphasis, and must demonstrate proficiency in the students’ primary language. In many universities in California, programs for certifying bilingual teachers are housed in separate departments within a college of education, while, in others, the programs are combined but with different course requirements within the same department, as explained by Walton and Carlson. Both nonbilingual and bilingual certified teachers are required to complete coursework in foundations of bilingual education and second-language teaching methodology. Required courses cover the legal requirements of limited-English-proficient student education, program models for ELLs, language assessment, and instructional strategies for developing language, literacy, and content knowledge. Teacher candidates complete methods courses emphasizing specially designed academic instruction in English and English language development, as well as courses in theories of second-language acquisition, as Menken and Antunez indicate.

Conclusion

State licensure policies for bilingual teachers reflect a common knowledge base about what knowledge, skills, and abilities are required for effective bilingual

program implementation and classroom teaching. In California, as elsewhere, state agencies and institutions of higher education continue to refine and augment the knowledge and research bases for teacher certification. This expanded knowledge has been applied in teacher education and credentialing programs for enhancing the effectiveness of teachers who work with ELLs in various types of programs. Policy initiatives that increase the rigor of testing and academic demands for earning bilingual teaching certification are responses to changes in federal and state laws and policies regarding the education of ELLs and the demand for teachers with bilingual teaching skills. As the research evidence supporting effective bilingual teaching practices expands, programs and licensure regulations for certifying bilingual teachers will benefit.

Jill Kerper Mora

See also Teacher Certification by States; Teacher Preparation, Then and Now

Further Readings

- August, D., & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (1997). *Improving schooling for language minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2006). *Proposed standards for California Teachers of English Learners Certificate Program: Knowledge, skills, and abilities for the California Teacher of English Learners (CTEL) Examination*. Sacramento: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Professional Services Division.
- Center for Applied Linguistics. (1974). *Guidelines for the preparation and certification of teachers of bilingual-bicultural education in the United States of America*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners: Language diversity in the classroom* (5th. ed.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.
- Gándara, P., & Rumburger, R. (2006). *Resource needs for California’s English learners*. Santa Barbara: University of California Linguistic Minority Research Center. Available from http://lmlrc.ucsb.edu/publications/07_gandara-rumberger.pdf
- González, J. M., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *New concepts for new challenges: Professional development for teachers of immigrant youth*. McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics.

- Krashen, S. D. (1999). *Condemned without a trial: Bogus arguments against bilingual education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Menken, K., & Antunez, B. (2001). *An overview of the preparation and certification of teachers working with limited English proficient (LEP) students*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (ERIC Reproduction Service Document No. ED455231)
- Midobuche, E. (1999). *Certification and endorsement of bilingual education teachers: A comparison state licensure requirements* In J. M. González (Ed.), CBER occasional papers in bilingual education policy (pp. 1–62). Tempe: Arizona State University, Intercultural Development Research Association.
- Montecel, M. R., & Cortéz, J. D. (2002). Successful bilingual education programs: Development and the dissemination of criteria to identify promising and exemplary practices in bilingual education at the national level. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 25, 1–22.
- Mora, J. K. (2000). Staying the course in times of change: Preparing teachers for linguistically diverse classrooms. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51, 345–357.
- National Association for Bilingual Education. (1992). *Professional standards for the preparation of bilingual/multicultural teachers*. Washington, DC: National Association for Bilingual Education.
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2007). *English as a new language standards*. Available from http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards/standards_by_cert?ID=22&x=38&y=8
- Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. (2002). *ESL Standards for Pre-K–12 Students*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Tharp, R. G. (1999). *Effective teaching: How the standards came to be*. Berkeley, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence. Retrieved from <http://crede.berkeley.edu/standards/development.shtml>
- Walton, P. H., & Carlson, R. E. (1997). Responding to social change: California's new standards for teacher credentialing. In J. E. King, E. R. Hollins, & W. C. Hayman (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for cultural diversity* (pp. 222–239). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Zúñiga-Hill, C., & Yopp, R. H. (1996). Practices of exemplary elementary school teachers of second language learners. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 23(1), 83–97.

BLACK ENGLISH

See EBONICS

BOARDING SCHOOLS AND NATIVE LANGUAGES

The history of American Indians/Alaska Natives and their experience with boarding schools is highly complex and has created a legacy that profoundly affects their lives today. It is widely recognized that an explicit mission of the boarding schools was to aggressively replace native languages and cultures with a dominant culture and language. The pursuit of this mission, coupled with the systematic maltreatment of native children during the boarding school era, contributed to many of the psychosocial ills that persist in American Indian/Alaska Native communities today. However, the boarding school experience also unintentionally invigorated its own form of cultural resiliency among native people. Though boarding schools were a direct assault against native being and identity, the lived experience is now woven integrally into the fabric of American Indian/Alaska Native identity and serves, ironically, as a driving force in the present-day political, cultural, and linguistic self-determination of native people throughout the United States.

Boarding schools for American Indians and Alaska Natives exist to this day, although they are not as prevalent as in the past. Attendance is voluntary, and most schools now work closely with surrounding American Indian/Alaska Native groups, employing tribal members as staff who reflect, and at times even integrate, the cultures and languages of American Indian/Alaska Native students as part of their educational programming.

Foundation of the Boarding School Movement

The boarding school movement was conceived in the late 1800s and was intended to be a social reform, based in a belief that with proper education and treatment, American Indians/Alaska Natives could be assimilated into mainstream society and transformed into productive, useful citizens. The movement gained impetus after the Civil War with the establishment of Carlisle Indian School in Pennsylvania in 1879, founded by Captain Richard Henry Pratt, whose dictum was “Kill the Indian and save the man.” To attend the school, native children were sent, in many cases,