Abstract

There are a variety of factors that have collectively created the impetus for the proposed set of National Dual Language Education Teacher Preparation Standards (NDLETPS). PK-12 student growth among non-English speaking learners has steadily increased and is projected to do so throughout the 21st century in the U.S. Continued national growth of dual language education programs is also evident, buttressed by empirical studies that show how well implemented dual language programs gradually and steadily close the achievement gap between emergent bilingual children and their monolingual English speaking counterparts. Given student growth, the proliferation of dual language programs, and program effectiveness, the need for well-prepared dual language education teachers (and other related school personnel) is clearly warranted. However, and to date, there are no NDLETPS that might provide guidance for the preparation of such educators and very few states provide such guidelines.

The present document draws from a variety of sources to alleviate this void. First, the established three central pillars that undergird the implementation of effective dual language education programs are integrated. A fourth pillar has recently been justified aimed at addressing program related inequities and has been integrated across the proposed six standards and their components. The document also draws on contemporary theory, research, and practice to give the standards substance and integrity. It should also be noted that the standards are intended to provide guidance, while allowing for the flexibility to address myriad local contextual realities and language groups, inclusive of and also beyond Spanish-English programs.

Moreover, the reader will notice that the format for framing the standards entails certain characteristics that are anchored to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation
Aligning the standards to CAEP is intentional in order to leverage this reputable accrediting entity, from a supportive stance for the greater merit of dual language education. Dual Language Education of New Mexico (DLeNM) recognizes the need for a set of standards that will not only provide guidance to educator preparation programs but that could also create a sorely needed vehicle leading to program accreditation. From this vantage point, the prospect of having access to visiting examiner teams that are experts in the field of dual language education to help support the design, development, and evaluation of educator preparation programs across the U.S. has formidable potential for moving the profession forward and better serving all learners.

The National Dual Language Education Teacher Preparation Standards
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Introduction

Innovative teacher preparation in the 21st Century continues to progressively examine best practices that prepare teachers across the U.S. to serve multilingual learners, emergent bilinguals, and native speakers of English in K-12 dual language classrooms. Institutions of Higher Education find themselves at the core of a transformational landscape in an era of teacher preparation reform, in both policy and practice. Given that nearly one third of all early elementary school children in the United States comes from a household where at least one parent speaks a language other than English, K-12 teachers and those who prepare them are juxtaposed to support the countless benefits of dual language education (Park, Zong, & Batalova, 2018). Furthermore, in addition to language development, other aspects of superdiversity in K-12 learners’ countries of origin, racial and ethnic identities, socioeconomic statuses, patterns of marginalization and minoritization contribute to dual language teachers’ need for specialized
professional preparation and development. Teacher preparation programs nationwide, grounded in empirical theory and recent research, serve to shape candidates’ competencies related to professional dispositions, critical thinking, ideological reflections and demonstrations, as well as curricular knowledge. Separately and collectively, these competencies have significant pedagogical implications which, must be given momentous preparation for successful dual language teaching and learning.

**The Genesis of the Standards**

The proposed NDLETPS were influenced by many professionals and scholars in the field of teacher preparation. The genesis of the project began in 2015 with a small group of scholars who met at a La Cosecha pre-conference institute sponsored by DLENM. Researchers came together and began conversations that led to engaging discussions, sketching out the needs of dual language teacher preparation from the institution of higher education (IHE) perspective, and the possibility of CAEP accreditation. Between 2016 and early 2018, a core group of researchers in teacher preparation from various states worked to solidify the efforts. Two more pre-conference institutes were also sponsored by DLeNM at their annual La Cosecha conference.

The idea to develop and author the NDLETPS has also been presented at various academic conferences, such as the American Educational Research Association (under the auspices of the Bilingual Education Special Interest Group) and the California Association for Bilingual Education with the purpose of gauging responses to drafts of the standards and receiving feedback from practitioners and scholars in the field. In sum, the proposed standards are essentially the culmination of numerous conversations, planned meetings, debate, reflection and most importantly long overdue action.
**Rationale for NDLETPS**

Since the year 2000, the number of dual language learners has increased by nearly 25% with projected continued growth. Nearly one third of all early elementary school children comes from a household where at least one parent speaks a language other than English. Likewise, the diversity within the dual language learner population continues to stretch beyond traditional immigrant groups. Recent data regarding dual language learners reported by the Migration Policy Institute (2018) indicate that a majority of dual language learners come from Spanish-speaking families. However, when viewed from state to state, there is sizeable difference in the language groups represented in U.S. dual language programs. For example, the top partner language represented in Alaskan dual language learners was Aleut while Tagalog was represented in Hawaii and, the state of Maine most commonly noted French. Likewise, second to Spanish-English dual language programs, substantial numbers of dual language learners participate in programs where English is partnered with Mandarin Chinese (Park, et al., 2018).

In the last decade alone, and despite the undeniable hegemony of English, dual language education programs have experienced a significant expansion of statewide initiatives, indicating increased investment in multilingualism across the United States. Thirty nine states and the District of Columbia reported offering dual language programs during 2012-13 (Boyle et al., 2015). Myriad states such as in New York, California, Utah, Georgia, Delaware, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and North Carolina, have strategically changed policy and practice to grow dual language education with a variety of partner languages (Center for Applied Linguistics [CAL], 2017), including twelve states offering such programs in Native American languages (Boyle et al., 2015). To date, legislation and policies regarding The Seal of Biliteracy is also present in 31 states plus the District of Columbia.
Following suit, universities and colleges are increasing collaborative efforts to develop new or expand existing coursework and pathways for specialized credential in dual language education, with the sound point of departure for guidance being the 3rd Edition of the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (Howard, et. Al., 2018). These developments, combined with continued expansion of dual language programs across the U.S. signify the national shift toward additive bilingualism/biliteracy to support emerging bilingual students, obliging an amplified pool of well-prepared dual language educators (López & Santibañez, 2018).

**Empirical Research**

Dual language education is widely supported by research as a highly effective additive bilingual education approach that is associated with significant academic and linguistic benefits as well as amplified sociocultural and socioemotional competencies or what might be called 21st Century skills. Rich, multilingual, and multicultural learning takes place via a curriculum that honors and integrates all students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds (August & Shanahan, 2006; Collier & Thomas, 2009; Callahan & Gandara, 2010; Howard, Sugarman, & Christian, 2003; Lindhom-Leary, 2001; Steele, et al., 2017; Thomas & Collier, 2012; Valentino & Reardon, 2015). The documented success of these programs has resulted in their dramatic proliferation over recent years (CAL, 2017, Gross, 2016; Harris, 2015).

In spite of the diversity in the dual language learner population, the consensus among the field is that well implemented dual language programs rest on three pillars aimed at the development of: 1) academic achievement; 2) bilingualism/biliteracy; and 3) sociocultural competencies for all students (Howard, et al., 2018). More recently a call from the field has been made to include a fourth pillar, the critical consciousness of educators working within the dual language landscape and particularly among teachers (Cervantes Soon et al., 2017). The driving
force behind this call stems from a number of researchers who have documented inequities within these programs that privilege the native English speaking student at the expense of the emergent bilingual learner. As such, dual language teachers need to be prepared to skillfully advocate for their students. DLENM views the addition of this fourth pillar as both necessary and compatible with the overarching and transformative goals of the standards.

**Existing Preparation Parameters**

Given the increased interest and rapid expansion of dual language programs across the United States, there is a need for a nationally systematized approach to preparing teachers to serve in dual language settings. In many states, teacher preparation programs focus on developing competencies and skills to teach in English-medium classrooms, or in transitional bilingual education classrooms where native language instruction is provided for English learners only until they become proficient in English and transition to general education classrooms (U.S. Department of Education Office of English Language Acquisition [USDE OELA], 2015). Even for states that have established bilingual teacher preparation standards and defined pathways to bilingual teacher certification/licensure, teacher preparation programs may benefit from additional standards that prepare teachers to promote biliteracy along with rigorous grade-level, core content in a language other than English, second language development in both English and the partner language, and sociocultural competencies to varying student populations (García, 2009; Howard, et.al., 2018; Park, et. al., 2018). Only eight states issue guidance to school districts on the qualities to look for when hiring teachers for dual language programs, and very few states have developed credentials for these teachers (Boyle et al., 2015).

In some states, preservice teacher candidates who are interested in teaching bilingual education and/or ESL are able to do so through an integrated preservice program that prepares
candidates for both initial certification\(^1\) in early childhood, elementary, middle school, or secondary education as well as the additional endorsement in bilingual education and/or ESL. In other states, the bilingual education and/or ESL endorsements are granted after acquiring the general teaching certificate with graduate coursework. It is important to note that there may also be inservice teacher candidates who are currently teaching in a particular subject yet, are new to the profession of language teaching and are therefore seeking both an initial teaching certificate in ESL or World Languages as well as bilingual education and/or ESL endorsement. In addition, certified dual language or bilingual teachers may seek a master's degree or continuing education credential coursework in dual language education.

Regardless, researchers and practitioners alike contend that effective dual language educators require a unique set of competencies and body of knowledge within their education coursework (Achugar & Pessoa, 2009; Diaz Soto, 1991; Guerrero & Guerrero, 2009; Menken & Antunez, 2001; Goulah and Soltero, 2016). The Standards may serve in many fashions as the basis for dual language teacher preparation curriculum, benchmark assessments aligned to national accreditation standards, as well as extended options for teacher licensure in the field of dual language (Lachance, 2017b; Knight, Lloyd, Arbaugh, Gamson, McDonald, Nolan, and Whitney, 2014; Darling-Hammond, 2012; Herrera, Cabral, & Murry, 2013).

**Accreditation within Teacher Preparation**

Federal and state contexts affirm the significance of institutional and programmatic accreditation in teacher preparation as noted in the United States Department of Education reports on quality assurance of teacher preparation. To date, numerous IHEs maintain regional, institutional accreditation as well as program-specific, professional accreditation for specialized

\(^1\) The authors use the term certification to also include what some states refer to as teacher licensure. This also includes the term teaching certificate to indicate what other states may refer to as a teaching license.
areas of study (U. S. Department of Education [USDE], 2010; U. S. Department of Education Office of Postsecondary Education [USDE OPE], 2017). Similar to programmatic accreditation, the professional organizations of Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) and the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) have national professional readiness standards for professional teaching in the fields of ESL and World Languages (WL) (CAEP, 2017). TESOL and ACTFL have been developing their present-day leadership and governance in educator preparation since the early and mid 1960’s with strong representation in the professional accreditation arena with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP, 2017).

This level of national standards representation for dual language education does not exist. The absence of national dual language education teaching standards leaves an incomplete pathway for programmatic accreditation processes, creating a barrier in states’ ample options in dual language professional teaching licensure. The void is also connected to compulsory benchmark assessments for accredited teacher preparation programs, serving as criterion measures for recommendations for state professional teaching licensure upon completion of an accredited teacher preparation program (American Association of Colleges and Teacher Education [AACTE], 2016).

**Implications for Policy and Practice: A Call to Action**

DLENM continue to emphasize that dual language education is an educational program model that is highly effective in increasing academic outcomes for all students, especially those who come from historically marginalized backgrounds including linguistically and culturally diverse students, particularly emergent bilingual learners (EBs) (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000; Collier & Thomas, 2009; Collier & Thomas, 2017; de Jong and Bearse, 2011; Howard,
To this point, students who are developing English as a second language are commonly referred to as English Learners (ELs). Garcia (2009) contends that these students should be authentically illustrated as those who demonstrate promise in developing bilingualism. Not only does dual language education provide the best pathway for developing solid biliteracy foundations but also serves as a fundamental platform for advocacy, equity, and social justice within U.S. schools (Beeman & Urow, 2013; Escamilla, Hopewell, Burvilofsky, Sparrow, Soltero-Gonzalez, Ruiz-Figueroa, & Escamilla, 2013).

The challenge is that quality dual language programs heavily depend on qualified educators with highly specialized preparation. Given the current expansion of DLE programs, districts across the nation face extensive barriers due to the shortage of DLE educators (Howard & López-Velásquez, in press; Lachance, 2017b; Thomas & Collier, 2014). The National Dual Language Education Teacher Preparation Standards provide much needed guidance in the field of dual language teacher preparation that can also inform inservice professional development. Moreover, key stakeholders, including organizations such as Dual Language Education of New Mexico (DLENM), the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), Center for Equity and Biliteracy Research (CEBER), and the Bueno Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Colorado at Boulder have had ongoing dialogue and collaborations about the urgent need to develop national standards to guide the preparation of dual language educators.

The primary goal and nexus of the work has been to develop clear, effective, and applicable dual language teacher preparation standards that are appropriate for a variety of dual language/immersion models that use a variety of partner languages, including indigenous
languages. As presented previously, while the majority of U.S. dual language programs are Spanish-English or Mandarin-English, the increase of other program languages calls for the Standards to prepare dual language educators who may work in programs that provide instruction through any number of languages. Moreover, because English counterpart teachers in dual language programs have typically been excluded from certification requirements, the standards have been developed to address their needed professional capacities as well. With this in mind, the National Dual Language Education Teaching Standards are conceptualized without a specific focus on any one language. This intentionally all-inclusive focus of the Standards aims to ensure that university preparation programs have the flexibility to be responsive to local and regional demographics and needs.

**The Six Standards**

The Standards as they are now written are framed and presented in two ways. The first portion of each Standard is introduced by a brief review of the literature that provides the theoretical and research foundations for the Standard’s Domain and its corresponding components. Across the Standards, competencies related to Critical Consciousness are rooted within each of the six Domains, solidifying their significance as a foundational aspect of each Standard. The Standards’ Domains include:

1) Bilingualism and Biliteracy

2) Sociocultural Competence

3) Instruction and Pedagogies

4) Authentic Assessment

5) Professionalism, Advocacy and Agency
6) Program Design and Curricular Leadership

[THERE WILL BE A GRAPHIC IMAGE INSERTED HERE]

The second portion of the Standards indicates their corresponding four components, strategically aligned to the *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* (2018) and then cross-walked to CAEP Principles, as well as to relevant TESOL and ACTFL professional standards. The *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* are widely used by schools and school districts to plan, improve, and support dual language education programs. CAEP Principles serve as guidelines for accreditation in PK-12 teacher preparation programs and inclusion of educator professional standards. Finally, dual language education resides at the nexus of bilingual education, ESL, and world language education; as such, it is important to align the professional standards for dual language teachers to those for TESOL and ACTFL teachers as appropriate. Unlike the ACTFL and TESOL Standards, however, the language strand is framed around bilingualism and biliteracy to stress the fact that dual language teachers are charged with promoting oral and written language development in not just one language, but two. Moreover, teachers’ language proficiency is not included as its own standard as it is in ACTFL, but rather, is subsumed within the bilingualism and biliteracy standard.

Like the TESOL and ACTFL standards, the National Dual Language Education Teacher Preparation Standards also include accompanying, measurable indicator rubrics designed to facilitate their implementation and evaluation for the Standards’ corresponding components. The rubrics are strategically created to measure transformative, dual language specific outcomes for evaluation parameters for teacher educators and the preparation of dual language education teachers. The indicator rubrics may also serve candidates for self-reflective and transformative professional development purposes once they are in the field.
In conclusion, the National Dual Language Education Teacher Preparation Standards provide an innovative and critical approach for transforming many teacher education colleges nationwide at a time when demographic shifts are considerably altering population trends and challenging the PK-12 educational system to prepare all learners in an equitable manner for the 21st Century. Even so, DLeNM recognizes that the proposed standards only mark the beginning for what will hopefully become an all new activity to advance the profession.
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**Standard One: Bilingualism and Biliteracy**

There are at least four basic and integrated dimensions associated with language that the dual language teacher candidate (hereafter candidate) must appropriate in order to effectively facilitate the development of the learner’s bilingualism and biliteracy and overall academic well-being. Each is required and no single dimension is more critical than the others. Consequently, the order of their presentation is linear by default and does not reflect any ranking of sorts. It is perhaps best to think about the candidate’s language ideologies, knowledge about language and bilingualism, understanding of micro level language planning, and language abilities as an integrated, interdependent and dynamic whole that must be nurtured over the course of the candidate’s preparation and beyond.

**Critical Language Awareness**

One dimension concerns the teacher’s degree of critical language awareness (Achugar, 2015; Fairclough, 1992) regarding the language ideologies (Tollefson, 2011) that give life to bilingualism and biliteracy in the context of the U.S. This critical consciousness (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017) about bilingualism entails knowledge linked to abstract notions such as language ideologies, beliefs, attitudes, and values and how they become interwoven with policies and practices that influence what transpires linguistically in the social context of schools (Kroskrity & Field, 2009; Padilla, Fan, Xu, Silva, 2013; Palmer & Martinez, 2016) where two or more languages coexist, often in asymmetrical linguistic power relationships (Montrul, 2013).

There are myriad state laws and rules and regulations that govern medium of instruction language policy and practice and the candidate must understand that they are not always neutral (Tollefson & Tsui, 2011). The use of language as a means to power has a very long history. Penalosa (1980; also see Garcia, 2014), explains that over five hundred years ago, Queen
Isabella of Spain came to realize that the first printed grammar of the Spanish language represented “the perfect instrument of empire”.

More specifically, the candidate needs to be mindful about how these language dynamics influence their own language ideologies, those of the school personnel and, by extension, the development of bilingualism and biliteracy of the learners at the site where they engage in daily language practices (Ek, Sanchez & Cerecer, 2013; Palmer, 2011; Zúñiga, 2016). The hegemony of English within bilingual education, including two way immersion programs, must be understood by the teacher candidate so that s/he may be able to exercise some kind of agency aimed at creating a more socially and linguistically just school and community milieu (Garcia, 2009).

**Language, Brain, and Mind**

A second dimension entails the theoretical or psycholinguistic underpinnings of the development of bilingualism and biliteracy. By this we mean that the candidate must have a working knowledge of the more contemporary theories and or concepts that bear on explaining how these two constructs come to be and develop over time in the brain and mind of the learner and given community. In line with comprehending the hegemony of English and schooling in the U.S., the candidate must be aware of the myths that continue to be propagated which cast bilingualism and biliteracy as some kind of cognitive anomaly or deficit (Flores, 2005) when in fact the majority of the world’s people are bi- and multilingual and some empirical evidence supports the cognitive benefits of bilingualism (Bialystok, Craik & Luk, 2012). Garcia (2009) and others (Grosjean, 1985) have been quite forceful in their position that bilingual learners are not two monolingual learners in one person and that monoglossic views of bilingual children must be abandoned.
The candidate must be aware of the fact that bilingualism and biliteracy development exist on a continuum of contextualized proficiency (Hornberger, 1989) and that while this development is influenced by social practices, there are also biological, cognitive and individual psychological factors that influence the development of bilingualism and biliteracy (Spolsky & Hult, 2008). The candidate must also understand how the age of the learner can wield an important influence in the development of bilingualism and biliteracy, though age of acquisition is also tempered by a host of other contributing factors (Bhatia & Ritchie, 2008). For example, the candidate must have knowledge about the linguistic structure of languages, including discourse and pragmatic features, and how two different languages might dynamically evolve over time through processes of bidirectional transfer, cross-linguistic influences, fossilization, and perhaps eventuating in language shift, loss or revitalization.

**Micro Level Language Planning**

The third dimension concerns the candidate’s ability to facilitate the learner’s bilingual and biliteracy development through a conscious awareness of classroom, program, school and community level language planning and implementation akin to what Baldauf (2006) refers to as language in education planning. This is distinct from, though obviously related to, the candidate’s knowledge of language development methodologies, strategies and techniques. In a dual language context, language in education planning entails understanding and managing matters of classroom and program level language allocation, for instance. Understanding, implementing, and evaluating decisions associated with how much time will be allocated to which language, subject area and grade level is no simple matter (Izquierdo & Espitia Mendoza, 2017) and not directly related to teaching methodologies. Beyond the school building, language in education planning might also entail leveraging the families and community in an effort to
reverse language shift (Fishman, 20--) given the inflated value generally assigned to English in and out of school.

In an integrated manner the candidate must also use critical language awareness and knowledge of language to carefully select and or evaluate plans for the use of language. For instance, the traditional approach to biliteracy development anchored to first developing literacy in the learner’s first or native language and then the learner’s second language has recently been challenged by a paired literacy approach (Escamilla, et al., 2014). In this case, the candidate needs to be able to understand why paired literacy might or might not be most appropriate for the learners in question. That is, what might best suited for simultaneous Spanish-English bilinguals may not be for Mandarin-English learners who are sequential bilinguals or perhaps for students whose languages vary dramatically in terms of language relatedness (Amado, Fan, Xu & Silva, 2013).

However, and more contentious, the practice of the careful separation of languages for instructional purposes, a central language allocation matter, has recently been challenged by advocates promoting a translanguaging pedagogy which allows for the strategic use of the learner’s entire semiotic repertoire for oral and written communicative acts (Garcia & Wei, 2014; Palmer, Martinez, Mateus, & Henderson, 2014). On the other hand, Ballinger, Lyster, Sterzuk, and Genesee (2017) raise specific issues related to translanguaging in immersion programs. Soltero-Gonzalez and Butvilofsky (2017), in turn, make a strong case for separating simultaneous Spanish-English learners from native English speakers for literacy development given that their literacy needs are different and each merit their own approaches in the early years.
In sum, the candidate needs to understand that conscious micro level planning in dual language education ought to take place at the classroom, program, school and community level, and that it is likely to vary depending on the non-English language (e.g., Navajo, Arabic, Mandarin, Spanish) and social contexts in question. Varghese and Stritikus (2005, p. 84) conclude that, “Courses in teacher preparation programs should specifically address how teachers can respond to, change and even create policy—specifically language policy—at different levels.” This entails the candidate understanding that teachers have agency and may or may not choose to execute a theoretically substantiated and explicit language in education plan (Zuniga, Henderson & Palmer, 2018). How a candidate might be prepared to challenge language policy is addressed under Standard Five: Professionalism, Advocacy and Agency.

**Candidate Language Ability**

The final dimension that the candidate must possess is the ability to effectively use the language(s) of interest to teach across the curriculum and within the broader school and community context (Guerrero & Guerrero, 2017). While there is no substantive strand of research aimed at exploring the influence the dual language teacher’s own bilingual and biliteracy abilities might have on the learner’s, it stands to reason that the candidate must serve as the more capable linguistic other who is able to use and explain features of the language(s) that lie just beyond the level of the learner. More importantly, the candidate must be able to use the language to guide and scaffold the learner’s conceptual development (Trueba, 1989).

Professional organizations such as the Center for Applied Linguistics (1974) and the National Association for Bilingual Education (1992) have long advocated for the bilingual teacher to possess native or near native levels of proficiency in the languages used for instructional purposes. Other experts in the field of two-way immersion programs (Boyle et al.,
2015; Howard et al., 2018) also recommend that the teachers in these programs ought to be native or near native speakers of the academic languages. Thomas and Collier (2002) have taken an interesting albeit indirect position on this matter. Based on their longitudinal research, they maintain that the most critical feature of effective two-way immersion programs is the provision of sustained cognitively complex grade level academic language at least through the elementary school years.

Wong Fillmore (2014), along with a host of other researchers (Kibler, Valdes, & Walqui, 2014), have been quick to point out the learning and linguistic challenges that the Common Core Standards pose both for learners and their teachers particularly as the standards relate to English. For the candidate in Common Core states who will be assisting the learners in acquiring and developing the non-English language, a deep knowledge about the structures of complex academic texts is required including the ability to have meaningful instructional interactions about the texts—both orally and in writing—in the non-English language.

Since the inception of bilingual education nearly fifty years ago, many states across the nation have been remiss in terms of the kinds of language policies and practices that have been used to gauge or measure the non-English language proficiency of teacher candidates. As such, the candidate needs to understand that being certified to teach in a bilingual setting without having to demonstrate proficiency in the target language that is both cognitively and linguistically complex may undermine fully meeting the learner’s needs. Furthermore, candidates must be able to interrogate his or her access or lack thereof to the non-English language (Guerrero & Guerrero, 2017) and secure—perhaps demand—the language learning opportunities needed in order to continually deepen the target language ability.
In sum, the candidate must be critically conscious of his or her language ability and be willing to exercise agency on his or her behalf and perhaps on behalf of other fellow candidates. To this end, the candidate must be willing to pose difficult questions to the program faculty and administration who may fail to recognize how entrenched English based monoglossic language policies and practices undermine the cultivation of the non-English language. The candidate ought to reflect on and question issues like the following: (1) Why bilingual education courses taught almost exclusively in English; (2) Why course readings, textbooks, and media are mostly in English; (3) If bilingual education professors can be critically conscious when they publish and teach their courses almost exclusively in English; (4) Changes needed at the teacher preparation program level in order to move the profession forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard One: Bilingualism and Biliteracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The candidate must be able to critically analyze how languages are used to structure (PK-16) educational opportunities in society, and identify the strengths and weaknesses of prevailing and contemporary theories and concepts associated with the development of bilingualism and biliteracy in the context of the schools and communities where they intend to practice. The candidate must also be able to use these insights in order to inform language planning matters at various levels, while demonstrating the ability to use language, and where applicable, the non-English language, to effectively promote the academic well-being of the learner. The candidate assumes responsibility for critically examining his or her own language abilities, deepening the target language abilities needed, and advocating for teacher preparation program level language policies and practices that promote target language development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Standard One</th>
<th>DL Guiding Principle(s)</th>
<th>inTASC Crosswalk</th>
<th>TESOL Standards Crosswalk</th>
<th>ACTFL Standards Crosswalk Communication Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strand 2</td>
<td>Standard 1</td>
<td>Standard 2</td>
<td>Domain 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strand 3</td>
<td>Standard 4</td>
<td>Standard 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strand 5</td>
<td>Standard 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strand 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 1

1.1.a The candidate demonstrates understandings that language ideologies may not be generally neutral and that they are sometimes used to benefit certain segments of a given society to the detriment of others.

1.1.b The candidate demonstrates understandings that educational language policies and practices, such as a state’s related rules and regulations, judicial cases, and federal policies, are used to establish, sanction, and perpetuate a given society’s language ideologies.

1.1.c The candidate is able to evaluate and advocate for those language policies and practices that best represent the interests of the learner within their local context.

Component 2

1.2.a The candidate is knowledgeable about contemporary theories and concepts associated with the study of bilingualism and biliteracy development of the individual learner in the social contexts of family, community and schooling.

1.2.b The candidate demonstrates a general understanding of how two or more languages are acquired, structured, and organized yet subject to influences of a cognitive and maturational nature, including language relatedness and the learner's age, motivation, and identity development.

1.2.c The candidate demonstrates understandings that one’s degree of bilingualism and biliteracy are best represented along a continuum that can vary contextually and over the lifetime of a learner.

Component 3

1.3.a The candidate is knowledgeable and critically aware of micro level language planning at the classroom, program, and school levels and is able to develop and evaluate plans designed to leverage family and community support to augment the learner’s language development.

1.3.b The candidate understands that there is no single best approach to promoting bilingualism and biliteracy for all learners in all dual language contexts (e.g., sequential
versus simultaneous versus translanguaging literacy development approaches; grouping of learners; time and subject area allocation, etc.) and can understand and explain why one approach may be better suited than another for a particular context.

1.3.c The candidate understands that teachers are central to enacting established micro level language policy and planning, may mitigate the implementation of a policy and plan, and are key to evaluating and improving micro level language policy.

Component 4

1.4.a The candidate is able to explain why and how a teacher’s language ability may or may not aid the development of the learner’s ability in the target language.

1.4.b The candidate is critically aware of his or her own language potential, seeks out opportunities to continue to advance the language skills needed, and is critically conscious of the language policy and practices governing his or her teacher preparation program.

1.4.a The candidate demonstrates the oral, aural, written and reading language abilities that support the pedagogical delivery of meaningful and cognitively complex instruction and demonstrates the needed language ability to effectively communicate with families and community.
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Standard 2: Sociocultural Competence

As one of the pillars of dual language programs, the candidate must be able to promote the development of sociocultural competence among the learners who generally come from at least two differing cultural backgrounds (e.g., Chinese and Anglo American cultural origins). The goal, however, is much more than merely teaching each cultural group about each other’s cultural world (i.e. cross-cultural competence). A deeper goal is to positively influence their individual identity or how they perceive themselves as members of their local community and broader society (Bearse, C., & de Jong, E., 2008; Feinauer & Howard, 2014; Gort, M., 2008; Lindholm-Leary, K., 2011; Norton, B., 2010; Palmer, D., 2008; Potowski, K., 2007; Werito, 2013).

In the film documentary centered on immersion programs, Speaking in Tongues (2009) produced by Marcia Jarmel and Ken Schneider, one of the focal students experiences and voices this deep cultural transformation. Julian, an Anglo native English speaking learner, comes to question whether or not he is Chinese like some of his classmates and provides testimony that the Mandarin language and related culture are very much a part of who is or how he sees himself. Because Julian attended a well-implemented two-way immersion program for several years, he has become a global citizen able to communicate with a relatively large portion of the world’s inhabitants. In order to move the learners towards such a goal, the candidate must come to appropriate intermeshed knowledge, dispositions, and curricular and pedagogical practices.

Positionality and Learner Background Knowledge

It is essential that the candidate engage in self-reflection as part of their own professional development and honestly examine his or her own beliefs and attitudes in order to deal with any prejudices that might influence the candidate’s system of values and treatment of the learners and
their families (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). The candidate must also understand that moving the
learners towards a heightened sense of cross cultural understanding and identity formation entails
understanding and critically examining the historical, social, economic and political relationships
between the two target cultures beyond the school walls and into the community and broader
society. While conditions of genocide, slavery, colonization, and internment of specific ethnic
and racial groups may seem to represent historical events long gone, such events run deep and
may still linger in subtle and not so subtle ways (e.g., racism, linguicism, ethnocentrism)
privileging one group over the other.

Further, the candidate must recognize that there is very little related research on
sociocultural competence. Defining, influencing the development of, and measuring this
psychological construct represent a complex empirical undertaking (Feinauer & Howard, 2014).
Moreover, the authors cited suggest that this third goal of dual language education is sometimes
construed as less important than either the goal of academic achievement or the development of
bilingualism and biliteracy. On the other hand, they note (citing Cummins, 2014) that identity
formation is intertwined with academic and linguistic outcomes. Recent research on learner
positioning and investment represents an effort to more fully understand how identity and
language development are linked (Lee, Hill–Bonnet, & Raley, 2011; Potowski, 2007; Werito,
2013). Candidates ought to be able to again weigh the available evidence and formulate their
own position on the matter and be open to questioning and adjusting their related beliefs and
practices.

**Curricular and Instructional Practices**

Understanding how the prescribed or mandated program curriculum contributes to the
development of sociocultural competence also entails a series of qualities the candidate will need
to develop and appropriate over time. The candidate must understand that a central source of cultural content is embedded within the curriculum spanning each content area. Oliva (2009) broadly defines curriculum in the following manner:

…curriculum is perceived as a plan or program for all the experiences that the learner encounters under the direction of the school. In practice, the curriculum consists of a number of plans, in written form and of varying scope, that delineate the desired learning experiences. The curriculum, therefore, may be a unit, a course, a sequence of courses, the school’s entire program of studies—and may be encountered inside and outside of class or school when directed by the personnel of the school. (p. 7)

Oliva also maintains that there are at least four discernible philosophies of education each of which relies on a different orientation to curriculum. At some point the candidate must critically engage with questions like: Is the purpose of the curriculum to develop a learner that is able to reconstruct and improve society, preserve society and its supposed truths, transmit a given cultural heritage, or to meet the needs and interests of individual learners? Or is the curriculum concerned with issues of power, economics and ideologies as Apple (2009) argues?

With this challenge in mind, the candidate must be prepared to respond to a curriculum that may mitigate the goal of creating a learner who is socioculturally adept. This entails coming to better understand the cultural backgrounds of the target learners, including their histories, and again reflecting on how the learners’ cultures are depicted (or not) in the prescribed curriculum. Beyond recognizing culturally related stereotypes and misrepresentations about the target cultures, the candidate must also be able to find ways to make the curriculum culturally relevant. Valero (2017, p. 140) points out that the dual language educator must be aware that curriculum may well be monocultural and offer few meaningful opportunities for emergent bilingual
children to learn and calls for dual language educators to create a more equitable, socially just, culturally sensitive and linguistically enriching student centered environment.

Such ability requires that the candidate engage in actual observation and study of the target communities, neighborhoods, and families where cultural practices are instantiated. Moreover, the candidate must be able to integrate the learners’ previous knowledge, experiences, and interests into the curriculum in order to enhance its relevancy for the learners (Valero, 2017). Riojas Cortez (2017), citing Esteban-Guitart & Moll (2014), would add that the dual language teacher must identify and leverage the learners’ funds of knowledge as well as funds of identity. These funds must be considered in light of the mandated curriculum as learners must be able to see themselves and how they are represented in the curriculum; this is paramount to the development of a healthy identity.

Howard et al., (2018) make clear that the candidate must be prepared to both understand the need for conscious programmatic planning and the use of specific instructional strategies to promote the development of sociocultural competence. On a macro level, candidates need to understand that a program wide plan is needed that details the roles that the school personnel, students, their families, and the community might play to promote such an outcome. At a more micro level, the candidate must be prepared to create and or use particular instructional strategies that might foment the desired goal. The authors recommend that dual language teachers demonstrate the following pedagogical ability:

Teachers consistently use a variety of strategies (e.g., conflict resolution, perspective-taking, empathy development, cross-grade buddies) to promote the sociocultural competence of all students during instructional time in both program languages. (p. 66)
Finally, the candidate will need to engage in the use and or design of assessment tools aimed at gauging sociocultural competence. Again, while this is not a simple matter, the complexity of assessing this construct (Phinney, J. & Ong, A., 2007) is not unlike the challenges associated with defining, curricularizing, promoting, and assessing bilingualism. The candidate in this sense must be able to understand the limitations and promise of dual language education, persevere, and continue to grow.

### Standard Two: Sociocultural Competence

Teacher candidates are prepared to design and deliver engaging, student-centered, standards-based dual language lessons that transcend cross-cultural competence and foment the transformation of student identities with the goal of promoting social justice and global understanding. The candidate regularly reflects on his or her own cultural positioning and is informed by a keen sense of sociohistorical knowledge as well as current knowledge of the students’ cultural practices and experiences. The candidate is able to critically examine the cultural content embedded in the curriculum, act on any discrepancies and design learning experiences that promote sociocultural competence. The candidate is also aware of the difficulty associated with assessing the development of such a complex yet crucial construct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Standard Two</th>
<th>DL Guiding Principle(s)</th>
<th>inTASC Crosswalk Standard 10</th>
<th>TESOL Standards Crosswalk Domain 2</th>
<th>ACTFL Standards Crosswalk Cultures Connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strand 2</td>
<td>Standard 2</td>
<td>Standard 7</td>
<td>Connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 2.1 The candidate has a thorough understanding of the socio-historical backgrounds of the learners (both past and present) and understands matters of power relations between and among groups and how these might influence academic achievement.

2.1.a The candidate understands how the learners’ sense of identity is intimately linked to his or her past, present, and future.

2.1.b The candidate understands the various political, social, economic, psychological and linguistic events of the past and present that influence the learners’ sense of identity whether privileged or subordinated locally, regionally, nationally or globally.

2.1.c The candidate is able to discern the causes of historical patterns of achievement characterizing the student groups being served.

Component 2.2 The candidate is critically aware of his or her sociocultural positioning in society in general and in relation to the local communities, the school, the program, and the learners and their families.

2.2.a The candidate demonstrates the ability to critically reflect on how his or her own sociohistorical positioning (e.g., based on race, gender, language, class, etc.) might influence the quality of interactions with members of the school and community.

2.2.b The candidate demonstrates the ability to critically examine how his or her own sociohistorical positioning might positively or negatively influence equitable interactions with the learners.

Component 2.3 The candidate understands that curriculum is a sociocultural construction and cultural content is embedded within the curriculum, including content associated with language and literacy.

2.3.a The candidate is able to identify racist, stereotypical or culturally biased content within the prescribed or mandated curriculum.

2.3.b The candidate is able locate, modify, and create curricular content that is equitable and enhances the learners’ sociocultural competence.

2.3.c The candidate understands that the learners possess deep personal, familial, and communal cultural knowledge and draws on such knowledge to co-construct new cultural
knowledge.

2.4 The candidate is able to promote the development of sociocultural competence at the classroom, program, family and community levels.

2.4.a. The candidate is able to design learning activities with related assessments that are firmly anchored to the development of the learners’ cross-cultural and sociocultural competence.

2.4.b The candidate is able to plan activities designed to promote the development of cross-cultural and sociocultural competence among the program and school personnel.

2.4.c The candidate is able to plan and design activities aimed at building a mutual appreciation and respect for the targeted cultural groups among the families and community members.
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Standard 3: Dual Language Instructional Practices and Pedagogy

For decades, research and literature related to best practices with English learners, emergent bilinguals, and other multilingual student populations have given emphasis to the importance of specialized pedagogies for increased language development in the context of school (August, McCardle, & Shanahan, 2014; García, 2015). Supportive lesson design and delivery frameworks strongly advocate for skillful classroom use of high-leverage practices, increased student interaction and multidimensional pedagogies, recognizing students’ full potentials and strengths (Ball & Forzani, 2010; de Jong & Bearse, 2014; Echervarria, Vogt, & Short, 2016). Teachers working with dual language learners are vitally positioned to increase opportunities for students’ use and application of new, contextualized academic language in content-based classrooms, while also empowering students to realize their own potential.

To this point and beyond, solid, empirical lines of inquiry and scholarly works have confirmed that language learning is an innately social process which, is most-beneficial for development when students learn from each other in supportive settings (Walqui & van Lier, 2010; Vygotsky, 1978).

Specifically, for teacher preparation programs, dual language teachers must be skilled to create and foster highly supportive, culturally compatible classroom climates where rigorous, thematic concepts promote student agency (Walqui & van Lier, 2010). Extraordinary language development for the future must be reflective of students’ fierce intellectual grit as they forge their way to academic success by building upon each other’s thinking (Wong-Filmore, 2014). In this manner, dual language learners develop themselves and each other as they collaborate to expand their linguistic and conceptual knowledge. Standard Three, with authentic, critically conscious teaching methods at the heart, spotlights preparing candidates’ instructional practices
and pedagogies that cultivate students’ academic, linguistic, and cognitive development from a constructivist approach.

**Dual Language Pedagogy: Infusing Myriad Standards for Equitable Literacy Development**

Standard Three: Instructional Practices and Pedagogies recognizes that effective dual language teacher preparation programs require highly specialized pedagogies, inclusive of distinct shapes and labyrinthine aspects of dual language teaching and learning. To start, candidates must be prepared to design and deliver instruction that is autonomously beneficial for both groups of learners, recognizing and avoiding instances of “flat” mainstream methodologies that prevail at the expense of emergent bilingual learners. Fundamental aspects for candidates’ multidimensional pedagogical development begin with the uniqueness of dual language pedagogy and its complex nature that infuse elements of myriad standards. Unlike any other discipline, dual language teaching and learning obliges teachers to draw from multiple sets of standards, consistently blending them into their instructional and assessment practices on a daily basis. Educator preparation programs must ensure that well-prepared candidates’ pedagogical practices demonstrate applications considering the Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL) standards for academic English language development, world languages via the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) standards addressing learner modes of communication, and states’ content curriculum standards that serve as the nexus for all dual language instruction.

The complexities of dual language teachers being prepared to infuse multiple standards are also influenced by the critically conscious point that language groups are undoubtedly associated with social and systemic structures of power. Decades of large-scale, empirically defended research has resulted in The Prism Model for Bilingual Learners: Language
Acquisition for School (Collier & Thomas, 2009). Specifically, the work of Drs. Wayne Thomas and Virginia Collier examined English-only programs, transitional bilingual programs, and dual language programs in several states across the U.S. to measure students’ levels of achievement as well as first and second language acquisition processes. The essence of the Model’s framework supports the notion that linguistically diverse students who are learning academic English must be provided with educational conditions that recognize and equitably mirror the language majority group with whom they share the schooling experience (Collier 1992; Collier & Thomas, 2009). The Prism Model’s four components of sociocultural, linguistic, academic, and cognitive processes indicate that sustained responsiveness in these developmental areas is necessary for all learners. With regard to dual language education, teacher candidates must know how to address all aspects of the prism, in both languages, doubling the Prism Model’s components from four to eight (Collier & Thomas, 2009; Thomas & Collier, 2012).

Active Engagement and Learner Motivation

Accordingly, in tandem with the complexities associated with utilizing multiple standard sets, dual language teacher preparation programs must give attention to candidates’ pedagogical competencies regarding students’ active engagement and learner motivation. Research, including the area of educational neuroscience, strongly supports the vast, dynamic connections between learners’ personal meaning-making processes, active engagement, and the impact of motivation in the context of language learning (Immordino-Yang & Gottlieb, 2017; Sousa, 2016). While factors such as internal desire and sociocultural demands also impact learners’ motivation, the work of Dornyei & Al-Hoorie (2017) suggests that students’ actual experiences of being engaged in the language learning process significantly shape their levels of motivation. They contend that in most language learning environments, including countries other than the U.S., students are
carrying out assigned tasks, most often determined by the teacher and/or curricular parameters. While educators may lean toward agreeing that students benefit from having direction within their learning, it is vitally important that teachers also consider that the learners benefit more when they see themselves as actively participating in the learning processes. On point, two-way dual language programs substantially increase all students’ academic outcomes by capitalizing on improved critical thinking, increased student motivation, and collaborative learning strategies (Calderón, Slavin, & Sánchez, 2011; Thomas & Collier, 2012). Dual language teacher candidates must also be prepared for the cautionary underlying dominance of English in students’ active participation. Often times, without even knowing it, students themselves will adhere to social norms with regard to power dynamics and may simply select English as their language of use (Nuñez & Palmer, 2016).

Along the research continuum, best instructional and pedagogical practices give measure to students’ cognitive investments and emotional engagement to provide ample, accessible pathways for student success. Himmele & Himmele (2017) make the connection to the importance of teaching methods that steer away from teacher-centered “delivery of content” in lecture-based lessons. They state “After 24 hours, average students retain an average of 5 percent of what was lectured, 10 percent of what was read, 50 percent of what was learned as a result of being involved in a discussion group, and 90 percent of what they immediately used or taught to others.” (page 7). With this in mind, sadly, research also suggests that lectures are still the predominant teaching method in our schools, especially in middle grades and high school classrooms (Sousa, 2017). Therefore, Standard Three obliges active participation and student engagement as non-negotiables in dual language teaching and learning. Ultimately, students’ interaction and teacher facilitated strategic connections to content-based concepts in meaningful,
motivating ways are essential for successful language development in the context of school (Lindholm-Leary, 2016).

**Scaffolding for Language Development**

Similarly, another significant component within dual language instructional practices and pedagogies for teacher candidates is that of scaffolding. Dual language classroom configurations include students who are learning rigorous content concepts in two languages. Consequently, the importance of scaffolded instruction is amplified, making it vitally necessary that teacher candidates implement methodologies to facilitate comprehensible input for a wide range of language learners, in both the partner language and English (Echevarria, et. al, 2016; Gibbons, 2015). Dual language teacher candidates’ considerations of students’ diverse grammatical competencies, pragmatics and sociocultural norms, directionality and communicative patterns, as well as discourse and metalinguistic competencies are especially essential while designing engaging lessons in two-way immersion programs (Collier & Thomas, 2007; SCALE, 2016). In short, dual language teacher candidates must learn and apply theoretically-based methodologies encompassing increased student collaboration, visual aids, varied grouping configurations, and authentic dual language materials in both the partner language and English to ensure effective dual language learning (Echevarria, et. al., 2016).

Likewise, dual language teacher candidates must also study and reflect upon the vital language development and acquisition principles related to students’ common underlying proficiencies when designing and delivering multilingual lessons (Cummins, 2005). With some current deliberation, there are differing viewpoints with regard to firm separation of languages during dual language teaching and learning. On one side of the debate, research supports the idea that students may benefit by tapping into both languages when necessary in order to utilize
multiple cognitive and linguistic resources as they make meaning of new language (Freeman, Shook, & Marian, 2016). Emergent bilinguals may benefit when they are able to use both the partner language and English, meaning their all-inclusive linguistic repertoires in a more fluid way during instruction (Hopewell & Escamilla, 2015). Conversely, literature also cautions teachers regarding the use of translanguaging pedagogies in some dual language contexts, especially when dual language learners are in the earlier stages of biliteracy development (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2015). Ultimately, with regard to dual language instructional practices and pedagogies, dual language teacher candidates need to understand translanguaging and its operationalization to determine when it may be supportive to learners’ successes and, when a more notable separation of languages is needed (Howard, et. al., 2018).

Using New Language in New Ways

The third point within Standard Three for dual language instructional practices includes candidates’ development of pedagogical competencies that afford dual language learners with various, multiple ways to collaboratively practice new language. Meaning, via authentic, active engagement, students are guided to frequently interact with each other in diverse grouping configurations with both structured and unstructured opportunities to use language as often as possible (Howard, et. al., 2018; Schleppegrell, 2013). To avoid active disengagement teacher candidates must give special attention to rigorous, content-based language production, in both languages. Albeit similar to best practices for other language learning scenarios, the nuances of language production in two languages play a significant role in students’ increased content concepts and language development. The process is reflexive as students are learning two languages through content while learning content through two languages (Beeman & Urow, 2013; Lachance, 2017).
Furthermore, research also supports the notion that students’ comfort-levels have a direct impact on effective learning. In order for students to be successful they must be in a supportive learning environment (Swain & Lapkin, 2013). The supportive nature of instructional practices in dual language classrooms is considerably intensified given that students must be willing to take risks with content concepts in two different languages, with diverse language learning peers (Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013; Zwiers, 2013). Therefore, it is essential for dual language teacher preparations standards to consider the doubled layers of pedagogical complexity in order for candidates to address the creation of inclusive, student-valued classroom environments.

**Oracy for Biliteracy**

Finally, Standard Three gives attention to specialized pedagogies regarding oral language development which, simultaneously support increased content-based writing skills (Calderón & Minaya-Rowe, 2011; Walqui & van Lier, 2010; Zwiers & Crawford, 2011). Dual language teacher candidates must demonstrate instructional strategies, including leading group discussions for eliciting and interpreting students’ thinking, that recognize the linguistic and sociocultural relationships between oral language, bilingualism, and biliteracy in the instructional design and delivery processes (Ball & Forzani, 2010; García, 2009; Gottlieb & Ernst-Slavit, 2014). Dual language learners, including emergent bilinguals and native speakers of English, need explicit instruction emphasizing vocabulary, sentence-level, and discourse-level patterns, in both the partner language and in English (Kroll & Bialystok, 2013). To emphasize the point, students need multiple, relevant, language-rich opportunities to practice new language in relation to the subject-area in order to fully comprehend content concepts. Dual language teacher candidates must recognize high-leverage practices that address the nuances associated with phonological patterns, vocabulary, syntax, register, and language functions and how these factors influence
students’ comprehension in two languages (Ball & Forzani, 2010; Klingelhofer & Schleppegrell, 2016; Howard, et.al, 2018).

Standard Three and its competencies foster and shepherd dual language teacher candidates’ development and demonstrated application of instructional practices and pedagogies unique to dual language settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Three: Dual Language Instruction and Pedagogies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher candidates are prepared to design and deliver engaging, student-centered, standards-based dual language lessons. Informed by principles of biliteracy development, sociocultural competence, authentic assessment, professionalism, agency, and advocacy within the programmatic and community contexts of learning, candidates must demonstrate abilities to structure instructional practices for all language learners in the dual language setting, including those with special needs. Candidates must demonstrate pedagogical applications of scaffolding and differentiated instruction with deliberate and consistent attention to students’ active engagement, interaction with each other via the curriculum, sociocultural motivation, developmentally appropriate learning strategies, and the development of both partnering languages through content-based instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Standard Three</th>
<th>DL Guiding Principle(s)</th>
<th>inTASC Crosswalk Standard 1</th>
<th>Standard 2</th>
<th>Standard 3</th>
<th>Standard 4</th>
<th>Standard 5</th>
<th>TESOL Standards Crosswalk Domain 3</th>
<th>ACTFL Standards Crosswalk Communication Connections Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards-based Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.a The candidate is familiar with all relevant standards and is able to draw on them appropriately to design instruction, considering the subject matter and student population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.b The candidate is able to develop integrated <em>(ideally thematic)</em> lessons that are based on a combination of academic and language/literacy standards as well as guiding principles for sociocultural development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.c Independently or with a co-teacher (depending on the program model), the candidate is able to map instructional standards across languages to create a cohesive instructional plan that promotes biliteracy development and the transfer of learning objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 3.2

**Standards-based Instruction**

3.2.a The candidate demonstrates student-centered, asset-based pedagogies that draw upon all students’ linguistic, cultural, and academic funds of knowledge.

3.2.b. The candidate demonstrates lesson delivery that incorporates a variety of grouping strategies to promote students’ active engagement and to provide sufficient opportunities to practice all four language modalities.

3.2.c The candidate demonstrates methodologies that effectively provide language-rich instruction through the use of a wide variety of strategies, including those that support minoritized students as well as students with special needs.

3.2.d The candidate is able to design and implement instructional activities that promote the transfer of learning objectives across languages with an emphasis on the significance of student-relevant lessons that facilitate and encourage students to utilize broad linguistic repertoires from an assets-based perspective.

Component 3.3

**Standards-based Curricular Materials**

3.3.a The candidate is able to select and/or create appropriate pedagogical materials that are standards-based and reflective of students’ backgrounds and experiences.

3.3.b Candidate effectively uses a variety of materials to foster the development of biliteracy and the transfer of concepts.

3.3.c The candidate understands the linguistic and sociocultural relationships between oral language, bilingualism, biliteracy, and instructional materials.

3.3.d The candidate demonstrates pedagogical practices that afford students’ use of grammatical, pragmatic, discourse, and metalinguistic competencies, with ample, opportunities for structured and unstructured language production, in both the partner language and in English.

3.4

**Scaffolding**

3.4.a In cohesion of Components 3.1-3.3, the candidate demonstrates a broad scope of skills in scaffolding instruction, encompassing vast features of sheltered instruction, thematic instruction, and other methodologies ensuring student engagement and participation for a wide range of language proficiency levels, in both the partner language and in English.

3.4.b The candidate also demonstrates understanding the significance of scaffolding
rigorous lessons to promote a safe, supportive classroom environment where all students, are valued and encouraged to take new risks with new language, whether it is English for English learners or the partner language.

3.4.c The candidate demonstrates knowledge and skills with regard to scaffolding for the language of instruction and separation of languages along with appropriate points for transliteracy.

3.4.d The candidate demonstrates understanding the phonological, lexical and syntactic differences between the two languages and scaffolds instruction accordingly.
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Standard Four: Authentic Assessment in Dual Language

Research widely supports the importance of authentic assessment with language learners (Gottlieb, 2016; Solano-Flores, 2016). At the same time, literature universally acknowledges the vast challenges associated with authentic assessment given the academic, linguistic, programmatic, sociocultural, and socioemotional complexities of all dual language learners (Collier & Thomas, 2009, 2007; García, 2009; Umanksy & Reardon, 2014; Wong-Fillmore, 2014). A crucial portion of effective dual language programs obliges specific emphasis be given to systems of assessment that truly reflect what students know about content and language, avoiding diluted interpretations of learners’ performance due to the use of monolingual assessments (Hopewell & Escamilla, 2014). Dual language programs require teachers to be fully prepared to design and implement formative and summative assessments that sincerely capture inclusive information. Teacher candidates need to display competencies showing they use and interpret relevant multimeasures to steer away from solely relying on large-scale assessments for informed dual language practices (Beeman & Urow, 2013; Gottlieb, 2016; Escamilla, et. al., 2013; Herrera, Cabral, & Murry, 2013). To this point, authentic assessment in dual language programs must allow teacher candidates to consider the measurement of content-based language progression and discourse patterns as well as the academic and social conventions shared by dual language learners and their teachers (Solano-Flores, 2016). Ultimately, teacher candidates need preparation to understand the distinct relationships between the assessment of academic language development, biliteracy acquisition, and grade-level content concepts in two languages that ultimately shape and reshape dual language instruction (Lachance, 2017a; Solano-Flores, 2016; WIDA, 2007, 2012).
Standard Four, Authentic Assessment in Dual Language and its four components signify the genuine symbiosis between highly specialized pedagogies and authentic assessment measures within the unique multidimensional aspects of dual language learning. The premise for Standard Four is that teacher candidates must be prepared to authentically and holistically assess dual language learners for specific purposes, including program evaluation, using multiple, intricate measures with multilingualism in mind. Authentic assessment in dual language is fundamentally informed by principles of additive biliteracy development, pedagogy and instructional design, as well as holistic, formative and summative multilingual assessments inclusive of learners with special needs.

**Dual Language Learners and Monolingual Assessments**

In addition to the grapples associated with the national shortage of dual language teachers, educators also continue to find themselves cemented in an era of high-stakes testing whereby there is grave concern about the validity of standardized measures with multilanguage learners (Abedi & Linquanti 2012; Baily & Wolfe, 2012; Escamilla, Chávez, & Vigil, 2005; Howard & López-Velásquez, in press; Lachance, 2017b). While some progress can be noted since researchers and practitioners agree on the importance of rigor and dual academic language development across the content areas, it can also be debated that discouraging voids in equal and equitable authentic assessment options in language-rich dual language programs still exist (Howard, et al, 2018; Lindolm-Leary, 2012). This widespread gap and its implications are noteworthy given the current national emphasis on K-12 Common Core State Standards along with globalized College and Career Readiness multilingual goals (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2013; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2013; U.S. Department of Education Office of English Language Acquisition [USDE OELA], 2015; Walqui, 2015).
Dual language programs remain significantly challenged with systemic parameters that “lock-in” schools to show students’ language development and growth using assessment measures intended to capture grade-level competencies from, what some argue, is a perpetually monoglossic perspective (García, 2009). With this in mind, by way of a fractured accountability system, many dual language programs are forced to function with insufficient time parameters and questionable tools to accurately describe the broad range of successful dual language development and the limited testing conducted in languages other than English (Escamilla, et al., 2013; Howard, et. al., 2018). The work of Soltero-González, Escamilla, & Hopewell (2012) and Hopewell & Escamilla (2013) provides a clear picture of how bilingual/biliterate learners are often inappropriately assessed, as if they were two monolinguals within one bilingual student when subjected to labels based on assessments created for native speakers of English. An example scenario is presented as an adapted version of the research.

*Cristina is learning about the parts of the human cell in her middle school science class, with Spanish as the language of instruction. Even though her teacher provides opportunities for her to take science tests in Spanish, the program’s site administers end-of-grade tests in English. This means Cristina’s measure of progress about science will be measured separately in both languages. As a result, she unauthentically appears to know less in both languages (SEE Figure 1).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Science Vocabulary in Spanish for Spanish Assessment</th>
<th>Science Vocabulary in English for English Assessment</th>
<th>Total Science Vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cristina (bilingual)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John (English only)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1:* Performance Interpretation, adapted from Hopewell & Escamilla, 2013

The scenario embodies the need for dual language teacher candidates to demonstrate abilities to effectively design and administer inclusive content-based assessments as well as
collect, analyze, interpret, and report on a broad spectrum of students’ assessment data. Candidates must also demonstrate the ability to consider formative assessments and how they relate to broader systems of accountability and program evaluation.

**Formative Assessment in Engaged Teaching and Learning**

Standard Four, as with the other Standards, makes conceptual connections to the importance of dual language learners’ engaged learning through active participation in daily learning experiences. Soltero-Flores (2016) presents the importance of both formal and informal formative assessments in language learning. The research contends that formative assessments in language learning must be social by design, providing learners with opportunities to engage with each other while also facilitating teachers’ multiple points of reference to measure students’ contextual use of language (p. 106). Furthermore, and importantly, formative assessments provide ample ways for teachers and learners to set learning targets that promote learners’ self-assessments. In doing so, students are afforded increased clarity regarding learning expectations, and, with appropriate, meaningful teacher feedback, are able to review and reflect upon their own progress.

From the teacher candidates’ perspectives, formative assessments with dual language learners as a communication process is vital to inform instructional design and delivery (Ruiz-Primo, Solano-Flores & Li, 2014). Trends in education indicate an over-emphasis on assessments needed for grading, we are reminded to focus on the importance of assessment being an authentic source of information that teachers must use for informed pedagogies (Linquanti, 2012).
Components of Authentic Assessment in Dual Language Programs

Component One of Standard Four emphasizes candidates’ understandings regarding the assessment of biliteracy using multiple, inclusive, holistic, valid, and reliable measures to assess literacy development, oral language development, and content concepts in both the partner language and in English. Component one also considers the complexities of early literacy patterns with emerging bilinguals, English learners, and other multilingual learners. Moreover, candidates must demonstrate understandings on how systems of assessment change along the continuum with adolescents and young adults in high school for biliteracy development. The context of increased language demands and high school graduation requirements greatly influence teacher candidates’ working in secondary dual language programs.

Component Two focuses on assessment and equity, including dual language learners’ community assets. This component includes details regarding dual language learners’ myriad, complex features such as broad linguistic backgrounds that impact the assessment process, inclusive of myriad home languages. Furthermore, the component addresses nuances and relationships between accuracy, reliability, and validity within large-scale standardized tests and the frequent misuse of translated testing materials. The hallmark of this component is the significance of advocacy for equal and equitable assessment practices to reflect a broad range of ways to authentically measure dual language learners’ demonstrations of many funds of knowledge, even within the confines of high-stakes, monoglossic systems of assessment.

The third component of Standard Four is centered on the purposes and structures of formative, summative, and diagnostic assessments, their importance, and how they shape dual language pedagogies, reconnecting to Standard Three. Teacher candidates must have strong foundations in this area in order to create, administer, interpret, and report summative assessment
results regarding both a program’s partner language and in English, even when there are voids in available measurement tools. Similarly, teacher candidate competencies must also be reflective of a broad range of informal, student-centered, formative assessment strategies to gather information on student learning and adjust pedagogical patterns accordingly. Inclusive, candidates’ competencies must encompass aspects of accessibility, multilingual, sociocultural cognition, and appropriate accommodations for language learning and special needs.

Finally, the fourth component in Standard Four is with regard to the relationship between authentic assessment, program evaluation, and national, state, and local accountability systems. Teacher candidates require strong assessment data-analysis and data-management skills aligned with biliteracy development, dual language programmatic features, and myriad systems of accountability to accurately depict students’ progress for content-based learning and biliteracy development.

**Standard 4: Authentic Assessment in Dual Language**

Teacher candidates must be prepared to authentically and holistically assess dual language learners for specific purposes using multiple measures that are informed by principles of biliteracy development, equity and advocacy, holistic multilingual assessments inclusive of learners with special needs. Candidates must demonstrate abilities to effectively design and administer inclusive formative and summative content-based assessments as well as collect, analyze, interpret, and report on a broad range of students’ assessment data. Candidates must also demonstrate the ability to consider systems of accountability and program evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Standard Four</th>
<th>DL Guiding Principle(s) Crosswalk Strand 4</th>
<th>inTASC Standards Crosswalk Standard 2 Standard 6 Standard 7 Standard 9</th>
<th>TESOL Standards Crosswalk Domain 4</th>
<th>ACTFL Standards Crosswalk Connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Component 4.1
**Assessment and Biliteracy**

4.1.a The candidate understands assessment of biliteracy and demonstrates knowledge of how to use multiple, inclusive, holistic, valid, and reliable measures to assess literacy development, oral language development, and content concepts in both the partner language and in English.

4.1.b The candidate understands the complexities of early literacy patterns with emerging bilinguals, English learners, and other multilingual learners and, demonstrates understanding how systems of assessment change along the continuum with adolescents for biliteracy development.

Component 4.2
**Assessment and Equity**

4.2.a The candidate understands the nuances and relationships between accessibility, accuracy, reliability, and validity within large-scale standardized tests, including misusage of translated tests.

4.2.b The candidate demonstrates skills and knowledge related to assessment and equity. This includes understanding dual language learners’ myriad, complex features that impact the assessment process.

4.2.c The candidate demonstrates understanding the importance of advocacy for equal and equitable assessment practices to reflect a broad range of ways to authentically measure language learners’ demonstrations of what they know and can do, even within the confines of high-stakes, monoglossic assessment systems.

Component 4.3
**Assessment and Variation**

4.3.a The candidate understands the purpose and structures of formative, summative, and diagnostic assessments and how they shape pedagogical practices.

4.3.b The candidate demonstrates knowledge and skills to create, administer, interpret, and report summative assessment results in both the partner language and in English.

4.3.c The candidate demonstrates knowledge and skills reflective of a broad range of informal, student-centered, formative assessment strategies to gather information on student learning and adjust pedagogical patterns accordingly in both the partner language and in English.

4.3.d The candidate demonstrates understanding the nuances associated with testing, evaluation, and assessment in dual language, including accessibility and appropriate
accommodations for language learning and special needs.

Component 4.4  
**Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability**

4.4.a The candidate understands the relationship between authentic assessment, program evaluation, and national, state, and local accountability systems.

4.4.b The candidate demonstrates appropriate assessment data-analysis and data-management skills aligned with biliteracy development, dual language programmatic features, and national, state, and local systems of accountability to accurately depict students’ progress for content-based learning and biliteracy development in both the partner language and in English.
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Standard 5: Professionalism, Advocacy, and Agency

As the authors of this document have laid out in the introduction and each of the previous standards, the candidate must develop critical consciousness (Cervantes-Soon, et al., 2017) by understanding the histories of the learners, their families and communities within broader society and bring this knowledge to bear on addressing inequities in dual language programs. More specifically, researchers have taken the position that White native English speaking children enrolled in this program are benefiting more so than the emergent bilingual learner for whom the program was originally intended. This situation has readily been linked to the cautionary note set forth by Valdes (1997) over two decades ago.

Advocacy and Agency

The present standard anchored to professionalism is primarily aimed at preparing the candidate to act on their critical consciousness or as Cervantes-Soon et al., call for, to combat inequalities in Two-Way language immersion programs in order to push the field of dual language education toward more equitable learning spaces for both groups of learners, their families and communities. To act or to engage in combat entails advocacy and agency, however. Athanases and Oliveira (2007) characterize advocacy in the following manner:

This concept of advocate for equity relates to those teachers as change agents who critically examine school conditions and work to create empowering school cultures for students of color (Banks, 1995); develop commitment and skills to make change (Villegas & Lucas, 2002); and engage as activists for more equitable urban schooling (Oakes, Franke, Quartz, & Rogers, 2002). In such views the teacher takes action—on behalf of students underserved or on the academic margins—to re-envision teaching and school policies and practices to meet all students’ needs. (p. 125).
The roots for bilingual teacher advocacy and agency can be traced to the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) (1974, p. 6) calling for bilingual education teachers to understand the significant role that the community and families play in the educational process and to act on this understanding. Under Guideline VII. School-Community Relations, CAL recommended that bilingual/bicultural teachers serve as catalysts for the integration of diverse cultures within the community, acquire skills to facilitate basic contacts and interaction between the learner’s family and school personnel, serve as facilitator for the exchange of information and views concerning the rationale, goals, and procedures for the instructional programs of the school and to demonstrate leadership. Conversely, the National Association for Bilingual Education standards (1992) for preparing bilingual educators do not include explicit standards associated with advocacy.

More recently, Howard et al., (2018) make clear that families and communities are key to implementing an effective dual language program. Under Strand 6: Family and Community, the authors detail six related principles each of which entail a number of key points. Briefly, some of the points speak directly to addressing issues associated with managing power of one group over another, maintaining shared governance, ensuring for equitable participation of families, empowering parents and pursuing social justice. Other scholars have been especially transparent about the key role that family and community involvement play in creating and maintaining an effective and socially just dual language program (Izquierdo & Espitia Mendoza, 2017).

In an effort to more deeply understand teacher advocacy, Dubetz and de Jong (2011) examined 30 empirical studies describing examples of teacher advocacy for emergent bilingual learners. They highlight that advocating emphasizes action and activism, enacted at the individual and collective level. The studies centered on pedagogy, curriculum, and language
matters as well as instances of advocacy at the school, district, and family and community level. In the studies beyond the classroom, the authors report that few details were provided with regard to how the acts were planned or implemented. They also point out that teacher educators need to help teachers develop the skills to manage confrontation and conflict especially when engaging with more powerful constituencies (e.g., school administrators, veteran colleagues).

**Becoming a Professional Collaborator**

Athanases & Oliveira (2007) offer valuable insight into how programs might prepare teachers to advocate. Their study examined the ways a credential program prepared teachers to advocate for equity in schools. Stated as an explicit program goal, the role of advocate for equity entailed becoming a reflective practitioner, inquirer into one’s practice and a professional collaborator. Program graduates traced the advocacy they engaged in to assignments and experiences embedded in course work as well as apprenticeships, and the provision of role models as advocates. What can be drawn from the study is that the targeted experiences need to vary in terms of the contextual level where they unfold (e.g., classroom, program, school, community, state), the participants involved (e.g., students, parents, teachers, administrators, etc.), and in terms of their substance (e.g., issues related to language, curriculum, pedagogy, evaluation, resources, services, policy, etc.).

Athanases and Oliveira (2007) highlight that managing conflicts and confrontations entail varying degrees of risk (e.g., being labeled a trouble maker, retaliation from veteran faculty, formal reprimand, loss of job) and teacher candidates need to clearly understand this. Study participants felt particularly underprepared for managing confrontation and conflict with parents and other educators. The researchers recommend that programs explore the use of role-playing within varied scenarios to prepare the teacher candidates. While not directly aimed at the
preparation of dual language teachers, Cervantes-Soon et al., (2017) propose problem-posing as espoused by Freire (2007) for reframing two way immersion spaces with the goal of examining power relations and oppressive conditions.

**Managing Cultural Nuances**

It is important to keep in mind that dual language contexts are clearly challenged by inequities and matters of power relations (see for example, Cervantes Soon et al., 2017; Palmer & Martinez, 2013), but that these challenges sometimes blur the role of race, culture, and even language. Guerrero and Guerrero (2017) clearly point out that the prospective dual language teachers they studied in the Texas-Mexico borderlands, primarily Mexican-American, encountered a variety of inequities being perpetrated by Mexican-American certified bilingual education teachers. Consequently, role playing or problem posing must take this very complex dynamic into consideration; a candidate needs to be prepared to confront and do battle with individuals that may share the same racial and cultural orientations, including language abilities. Clearly, this challenge is different from confronting an Anglo mainstream teacher opposed to dual language education. On the other hand, it is similar to a situation where a Latino parent of a monolingual English-speaking child confronts a bilingual Latino dual language teacher.

Moreover, it is important to bear in mind that varying cultures may approach problem solving or conflicts in different ways (Holt & DeVore, 2005), again even among seemingly similar cultures (Kim, Wang, Kondo, & Kim, 2007). Boyle et al., (2015) report that while the vast majority of dual language programs in the U.S. were Spanish-English, there were programs being offered in 29 other languages ranging from Chinese, Navajo, Arabic, Russian and French Creole. Thus, candidates ought to have the opportunity to explore and reflect on the ways by which the varying cultures associated with their local contexts might manage conflict (e.g.,
stances associated with smoothing, withdrawing, compromising, forcing, or problem-solving).

**Transcending Combat**

While it is duly noted that the candidate must be readily prepared to combat inequalities in two-way language immersion programs (Cervantes-Soon, et al., 2017) and to manage cross-culturally hued conflicts in defense of the oppressed (Athanases & Oliveira, 2008), learning how to pursue peaceful resolutions to the inequities would also make for a more sophisticated and better prepared candidate. Perhaps it is not beyond the possibilities of dual language teacher preparation to integrate peace pedagogies (Cook, 2014) into the experiences of the candidates. These pedagogies are much in line with what has already been surveyed under this standard. As Cook explains:

> In peace education, students are expected to listen to and understand the views of others, especially where these views contrast with their own (Pike & Selby, 2000; Wahlstrom, 1992). Beyond the interpersonal level, pedagogies of critical peace building democratic citizenship requires practice discussing “conflictual global and local multicultural issues and viewpoints” (Bickmore, 2007, p. 238), and to “embrace dialogical, problem-posing, and participatory/praxis methods; multiple, varied and alternative viewpoints and content; and flattened organizational structures that foster collaboration and connection rather than hierarchy and compartmentalization” (Hantzopoulos, 2011, p. 225). (p. 503)

La Paz Community School in Costa Rica represents a case in point. In this dual language school the students pursue the following peace practices:

> Develop the self into a peaceful, lifelong learner by improving physical and mental well-being through critical thought and extension of comfortable limits.
Cultivate peace amongst family and community by disseminating and sharing love and compassion.

Create peace within the community by preserving the environment and respecting the delicate balance between local and foreign cultures.

Spread peace throughout the world by effectively communicating thoughts and ideas as well as actively listening to all perspectives.

(Retrieved from: https://www.lapazschool.org/we-are-la-paz/about-la-paz/the-la-paz-peace-practices/)

In sum, while preparing candidates to engage in combat is critical, equipping candidates with some of the pedagogies to build peace—and potentially better global citizens—would complete the candidates’ initial preparation.

### Standard Five: Professionalism, Advocacy, and Agency

Teacher candidates understand that part of their professional responsibility will be to advocate for learners and act on their behalf in order to address matters of inequities and conflicts. The candidates understand that said matters might be rooted in different contexts, involve different participants, and entail potential risks. Thus, the candidates have practiced a range of conflict management strategies and have insight into cultural preferences for managing and resolving conflicts within and between two cultural groups. The candidates also understand that the goal of advocacy and agency is not solely anchored to resolving the conflict but also to pursuing peace through the application of peaceful pedagogies in the classroom setting with the goal of assisting learners to become better global citizens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Standard Five</th>
<th>DL Guiding Principle(s) Strand 5 Strand 6 Strand 7</th>
<th>inTASC Crosswalk Standard 3 Standard 5 Standard 9 Standard 10</th>
<th>TESOL Standards Crosswalk Domain 5</th>
<th>ACTFL Standards Crosswalk Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Component 5.1

The candidate has a broad understanding of advocacy and agency and can explain how advocacy and agency may take on different forms depending on the cultural orientations of the participants.

5.1.a The candidate has a keen sense of self in relation to past personal experiences with school based inequities and or privilege that can be linked but not limited to race, culture, language, class, and gender.

5.1.b The candidate is able to recognize, name, and summarize the similarities and differences in cultural practices among program target cultural groups by drawing on related social science and empirical research.

5.1.c The candidate understands that advocating, confronting, speaking up, managing conflicts, taking risks, taking a stance, questioning authority, or exercising one’s agency can vary across cultures, social classes, race, ethnicity, gender, and legal status.

Component 5.2

The candidate is able to render a valid interpretation of a passed inequity or conflict anchored to dual language education and or the profession.

5.2.a The candidate is able to analyze past examples of teacher and or educator advocacy and agency (based on research articles, important judicial cases, mass media, and other media) highlighting the context of the situation, the risks entailed, the strategies used to address the inequity, related challenges, and a critical assessment of the outcomes of the action taken on the part of the educator(s).

5.2b Through role-playing (and or Teach Live technology), the candidate is able to study and respond to a variety of problems or conflicts, within varied levels of contexts, audiences (e.g., students, peer teachers, supervisors, parents, etc.), and levels of risk. The candidate is able to render an informed position on the matter and orally articulate his or her case. The candidate is able to critically reflect on the simulated experience and propose alternative approaches to the problem.

5.2.c Using a problem posing, social justice, and or peace based pedagogy, the candidate is able to design lessons aimed at fomenting the development of the learners’ critical
consciousness, their ability to manage inequities and conflicts, and to embrace the possibility of creating a more just society.

**Component 5.3**
The candidate is able to construct a defensible solution to a current inequity or conflict anchored to dual language education and the local school community.

5.3.a The candidate is able to identify (through data analysis, direct observation, and/or conversation) a particular inequity that should be addressed in the local school community. The candidate, in writing, is able to describe the problem, the participants, potential risks, and provide an informed plan of action linked to the literature.

5.3.b The candidate is able to simulate delivery of the course of action either orally (e.g., video addressing the school board) or in writing (e.g., a formal letter to the Parent Advisory Council) in the partner language. The candidate is also able to critically reflect on the simulated experience and propose alternative approaches to the problem.

**Component 5.4**
The candidate is able to construct a defensible solution to a directly observed inequity or conflict identified within the context of the candidate’s student teaching experience or practicum.

5.4.a During the student teaching assignment or practicum, the candidate maintains a confidential journal highlighting any observed inequities or conflicts. The candidate, in collaboration with peers and a faculty mentor, is able to summarize the noted observations and to critically analyze them.

5.4.b During the student teaching assignment or practicum, the candidate is able to discern (through data analysis, direct observation or conversation) a particular inequity that ought to be addressed. The candidate, in writing, is able to describe the problem, potential risks, and provide an informed plan of action linked to the literature.

5.4.c The candidate is able to simulate delivery of the course of action either orally (e.g., video addressing the dual program director) or in writing (e.g., a formal letter to the district superintendent). The candidate is also able to critically reflect on the simulated experience and propose alternative approaches to the problem.
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Valdés, G. (1997). Dual language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the
Standard 6: Program Design and Curricular Leadership

As the numbers and types of K-12 dual language programs continue to exponentially increase nationwide, Standard Six of Program Design and Curricular Leadership makes full circle connections, both literally and figuratively as it relates to the other five Standards. With the Standards’ goals of providing a solid framework for preparing highly qualified dual language teachers, grounded in the pillars of academic achievement, bilingualism/biliteracy, sociocultural competencies and, critical consciousness, Standard Six is vital in its capacity to bring sound yet malleable structures to dual language programs. This Domain includes components to establish candidates’ conceptual and demonstrable constructs in the areas of 1) program design; 2) partner languages and time; 3) dual language learner variation; and, 4) curricular leadership for assets-based language learning.

Standard Six also strategically provides an essential arena to reiterate dual language program designs to work in conjunction with myriad partner languages and the families and communities they serve. The U.S. Department of Education’s Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA) indicates that while the majority of dual language programs couple Spanish and English as the two languages learners use to develop literacy and content, there are 30 partner languages reported as used in dual language programs in the U.S. (OELA, 2015). After Spanish, the most common language of English learners in the U.S., Mandarin Chinese is the most frequently reported partner language in dual language programs, significantly representing the nearly nine million Mandarin-speakers worldwide (Thomas & Collier, 2017). In addition to OELA’s reporting, there are several comprehensive resources declaring the scope of dual language programs in the United States. Combined calculations by the Center for Applied Linguistics maintains the national Dual Language Program Directory (2017), Dual Language
Schools (https://duallanguageschools.org), and other collective research, suggest that nearly 2500 dual language programs exist with more two-way immersion programs being established annually (Thomas & Collier, 2017). Within the rapid program expansion, other prevalent partner languages listed include Arabic, French, Japanese, German, Korean, Hmong, Russian, and, most significantly, 12 states report Indigenous languages as partner languages [also referred to Native American in some states] such as Arapahoe, Cherokee, Crow, Navajo, Lakota, and Shoshone to name a few. Therefore, Standard Six and the accompanying other five Standards take the broad scope of partner languages into consideration with dual language teacher preparation (CAL, 2017).

**Program Design: Students, Families, and Communities at the Heart of Dual Language**

National reports also continue to indicate dual language program design parameters vary greatly from state to state with many key decisions left to district and school stakeholders (OELA, 2015). It is also important for teacher educators to be deeply mindful of the tumultuous and marginalizing history of bilingual education in the United States. Far too many communities and families continue to live in the shadows of punishments from the English-only movement, demoralized by and disempowered of being bilingual (Aquino-Sterling, Rodríquez-Valls, & Outes, 2017; Gándara & Hopkins, 2010). It therefore stands to reason that dual language teachers will experience dual language programs that are highly contextual based on the state, district, school, and community where the program resides. Dual language learners themselves have mixed levels of empowerment as bilinguals and inclusively, all their parents play a key role in their community schools. Candidates must be prepared to essentially involve families, advocating for parental involvement even when additional resources are needed for immigrant parents to fully participate (Izquierdo & Mendoza, 2017). Furthermore, candidates must be
prepared for programs that are situated as a strand within a school, with some student populations being bused in from locations across town. Other programs may be school-wide, also with community and non-community learners. Ultimately, these programs are vastly different from one another with regard to the families and communities where they reside. In any case, The National Dual Language Teacher Preparation Standards recognize the need for candidates’ preparation to attend to many options for dual language program design, beginning with the program type based on the learners, families, and communities to be served.

The four main types of dual language programs include developmental (also referred to as maintenance) bilingual programs that essentially serve learners who primarily speak the partner language. Another program type is that of one-way immersion programs (also referred to as foreign language immersion) that mainly serve native speakers of English. There are also Heritage Language programs to serve learners whose primary language is English yet, they resolutely represent families and groups who are dominant in the partner language. Finally, there are two-way (bilingual) immersion programs which, aim to serve a balance of native speakers of the partner language and native speakers of English (Dual Language Education of New Mexico [DLeNM], 2018; Howard, et. al., 2018). While these National Standards are fundamentally geared toward preparing teachers to support the design and sustainability of two-way immersion programs, it should be noted that they are fully intended to also present structural tenants with sufficient flexibility to inform teacher preparation programs that serve the broad range of program types.

More specifically, teacher candidates will need to demonstrate readiness to provide informed consultancies with many stakeholders regarding well-designed two-way immersion dual language programs. School administrators, teacher colleagues, parents, and students
themselves often look to dual language teachers with questions regarding the rationale for the “ideal” 50% balance between learners who are native speakers of the partner language and 50% of the learners being native speakers of English. The candidates must therefore be comfortably versed to explain the rule of practice, also demonstrating praxis from Standard One on biliteracy. Additionally, given programmatic variations even within two-way immersion programs, candidates must also be prepared to toe the mark regarding program composition that includes more than two-thirds/one-third of either learner population, clarifying how the configuration veers away from the benefits of a two-way immersion program design. In all cases for two-way immersion, candidates must be disposed to articulate the principles of authentic dual language learner interactions for additive bilingualism and biliteracy, standards-based, accelerated learning as well as equal and equitable linguistic practices.

A crucially important lateral aspect of program design in Standard Six relates to candidates’ encounters with the programmatic span of dual language education. While there are elementary, middle grades, and high school programs, the national trend continues to position most dual language programs at the elementary level (CAL, 2017). By the same measure, research also supports substantial benefits associated with two-way immersion as established in the prior five Standards. Even with the higher academic and linguistic demands of high stakes testing and graduation requirements, secondary dual language learners continue to demonstrate increased cognitive, metacognitive, metalinguistic, and culturally compatible outcomes, consequently justifying the goal of expanding middle and secondary programs (Collier & Thomas, 2012; de Jong & Bearse, 2011; Howard & Sugarman 2009; Lindholm-Leary 2008, 2012, 2014; Lindholm-Leary and Hernandez 2011).
Partner Languages and Time

Dual language teachers are frequently in a position to inform program stakeholders on the topic of allocated time for partner language instruction and allocated time for English instruction. While dual language educators agree on the academic benefits of the program, beginning with the closure of the academic gap when compared to English-only students, many are still uninformed or, misinformed about time allotments for partner languages. The idea that “more English” doesn’t always result in higher test scores remains a debate. Howard & Sugarman’s research (2009) on two-way immersion program models and the language of initial literacy presents details regarding the basic recommendations as well as variations in time allocations and program duration. Candidates will need preparation to distinguish between dual language programs that range from 90/10 where the partner language is used for most of the school day across curricular areas to 50/50 programs where the partner language and English are used for equal amounts of time. Additionally, they will have to clarify programmatic nuances that reveal approaches including team teaching versus self-contained classrooms. The candidates will also need to be well informed on programmatic changing ranges in instructional times in both languages, moving from 80/20, 70/30, and 60/40 before reaching the 50/50 allocation (Howard & Sugarman, 2009).

Another point of alignment with Standard One is the portion of Standard Six that focuses on the candidates’ need to demonstrate understandings of the programmatic benefits and challenges of the three options for approaching initial literacy. They are: 1) all dual language learners begin reading in the partner language; 2) all dual language learners begin reading in both languages simultaneously; and 3) all dual language learners being reading in their native language first and then add on the second language literacy. A key component of teacher
preparation related to this topic while aligned with Standard Two also connects to articulating the contextual details to the families and communities these programs serve. Stakeholders with minoritized student populations at the forefront of advocacy agendas will need specialized reassurance regarding the benefits of two-way immersion and literacy instruction, including the realistic time spans required for academic gains. Likewise, many parents and community members, including those of native English speaking students will benefit from candidates’ explanations of the socioculturally relevant, critically conscious details in tandem with the brain-based literacy research to support the determined approach (Bialystok, 2011; Hamayan, Genesse, & Cloud, 2013; Perry, 2013). With these details in mind, and also aligned with Standard Four on Authentic Assessment, teacher candidates will need strong skills to articulate programmatic data on the successes and literacy progressions of their learners.

**The Array of Dual Language Learners**

As presented in the Introduction to the Standards, the notion of Superdiversity in the field of dual language learning is ever-present. Scholars as well as practitioners in education are called to lead the charge with informing a broad audience about the variability within all-encompassing terms such as *diversity* or *multicultural* in the context of dual language programs. To this point, the majority of the English learners in U.S. schools are born in the United States (OELA, 2015). Furthermore, the widening population of emergent bilingual students represents multidimensional families and communities, all with deep-rooted sociocultural, racial, and linguistic ties to equal and equitable educational access (Potowski, 2007; Valdés, 2001). Dual language teacher preparation programs are in the vital position of facilitating candidates as advocates for all dual language learners.
Related to the wide array of dual language learners is the point that there will be great variation in students’ backgrounds, regardless of their native languages. Some will have parents with high levels of education, employed in professional occupations. Other dual language learners will have parents who completed high school or the equivalent and work in vocational fields. Some will have parents who were unable to complete their own primary school educations or be from refugee populations. Additionally, dual language learners will come from a wide range of socioeconomic backgrounds and, may or may not be attending a dual language school in the same community where they reside. Similarly, many teachers work in schools in communities apart from where they live, requiring them to be prepared to serve the school, its program, its students, and parents in its actual context.

Finally, the array of dual language learners also shapes the ways in which dual language teachers demonstrate leadership, while simultaneously implementing district and state-led, standards-based instruction. Leadership in this capacity also makes the connection to Standard Five with its focus on professionalism, advocacy, and agency. Given the rapid expansion and variation in dual language programs dual language teacher candidates must be prepared to recognize programmatic patterns of curriculum and instruction to support high-quality program implementation (Howard, et. al., 2018). Researchers, including Lindholm-Leary (2014) agree that dual language programs with positive academic and sociocultural results are contingent upon high-quality program design and implementation, especially when considering early literacy through the partner language. Dual language teachers are also positioned to inform others regarding the avoidance of elitist dual language programs that solely aim to serve language majority students (Gándara and Callahan, 2014). Dual language learners from many linguistic and sociocultural backgrounds, with teachers fully honoring the wide variety of family structures
to facilitate rigorous curricular engagement, are the very heart of successful two-way immersion programs (Riojas-Cortez, 2017).

Conclusively, Standard Six, while presented in a liner, numerical fashion, embodies ties and connections to all of the previous Standards. The authors present the Standard while also exhibiting its alignment with principles of bilingualism and biliteracy, sociocultural awareness, pedagogy and instructional practice, authentic assessment, professionalism and agency, and considerations for critical consciousness.

### Standard 6: Programs, Models, and Curricula

The candidate understands dual language program and curricular design including: theoretical and research foundations of program components; dual language program models and organizational structures; characteristic and components of high-quality models; factors and criteria that determine model selection appropriate to each school context and demographics; equity and access in two-way model; and the role of stakeholder involvement and advocacy in program sustainability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components Of Standard Six</th>
<th>DL Guiding Principle(s)</th>
<th>inTASC Crosswalk Standard 3</th>
<th>TESOL Standards Crosswalk Domain 2</th>
<th>ACTFL Standards Crosswalk Cultures Connections Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strand 1</td>
<td>Standard 9</td>
<td>Domain 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strand 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Domain 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strand 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Domain 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strand 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Domain 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Component 1: Program Design**

6.1.a The candidate demonstrates understandings of numerous dual language program types and models (one-way, two-way, partial, or full immersion, strand and schoolwide; team-teaching, self-contained, and pattern of initial literacy instruction).

6.1.b The candidate can identify and support the rationale for a dual language program types and models, including varying stakeholders, that are most beneficial to the context
and demographics of a school, district, and community.

6.1.c The candidate is knowledgeable about sustainability, advocating for current and ongoing professional development for engaged leadership, including family and community participation for programmatic decisions.

Component 2:
Partner Language & Time

6.2.a The candidate demonstrates understandings of time and partner languages, scheduling; programmatic classification, including appropriate and available language assessments in the partner language and English;

6.2.b The candidate demonstrates knowledge regarding integration of socioculturally relevant curricula including authentic instructional materials in the partner language and English, aligned with content areas for standards-based instruction.

6.2.c The candidate demonstrates understanding vertical dual language program articulation, its developmental connections to biliteracy development, and strategic curricular planning to support the PK-12 continuum for biliteracy development.

Component 3:
The Array of Dual Language Learners

6.3.a The candidate demonstrates understanding of considering learners’ goals related to program implementation across the PK-12 continuum and can distinguish programmatic needs across grade-cluster levels, including secondary considerations for high school graduation and bilingual diplomas.

6.3.b The candidate demonstrates knowledge regarding linguistic and social power dynamics in two-way dual language programs, inclusive of student, parent, teacher, and administrator populations from different socioeconomic and sociocultural backgrounds, and can respond with appropriate programmatic and curricular solutions to promote equitable access to dual language.
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