

!Capacitación bilingüe para todos los niños!

Session Objective/Description

Inculcar un reconocimiento a los participantes que hay que respetar y valorar ambas idiomas y reconocer que el desarrollo de la lengua materna y de la cultura debe ser el derecho de todos los niños. Hay que promover el concepto de que todos los niños reciban una educación bilingüe que respeta, valora y desarrolla a alto nivel la lengua materna tanto como la lengua Inglés. Hay que *enriquecer y retar* y no remediar.

Review of the Literature

No education field has been more widely debated than that of bilingual education (Baker, 1996; Cummins, 1981; and Porter, 1990). However, the debate has centered on the purpose for or extent of non-English speakers receiving instruction in their native language, versus the identification and dissemination of "**best practices**" for effectively educating these students. The discussion has also focused simply on short-term language development and academic achievement efforts versus long-term educational reform and equal educational opportunity for non-English speaking populations that addresses positive educational and social change. Freeman (1998) in her descriptive study of a two-way bilingual school, suggests that a two-way program can serve as models for educational reform that promote social change. The true benefits of *bilingualism* that can be delivered through an effective maintenance or two-way bilingual education program have traditionally not been enjoyed by its participants due to historical, societal and political limitations imposed upon them. Much of the debate comes from a lack of understanding of the purpose and methodology of bilingual education programs, as well as the narrow mindedness among educators (Rong and Peissle, 1998).

The Failure of Transitional Bilingual Education

The transitional bilingual education approach typically uses a subtractive and deficit model. It is subtractive bilingualism in that children are forced to set aside or "subtract" out their native language and assimilate to the majority language. Subtractive bilingualism states Lambert (1987) is recognized and highly related with low levels of second language acquisition, academic underachievement, and psychosocial disorders. It is also a *deficit model* in that it operates from a perspective that LEP students are lacking in a skill (*English*), and thus in need of "remediation." What is evident in all transitional bilingual models is a deficit model that focuses on the urgency for English acquisition regardless of the child's proficiency or validation in the L1. Although proficiency in a given language does not necessarily ensure academic success, its absence does enhance the possibility of poor academic achievement.

Transitional programs are considered weak in that often, their end result is a person who is often not fully bilingual and biliterate, but rather monolingual. The most common bilingual education programs, early and late exit transitional bilingual models, have consistently been undermined by external factors. Factors ranging from a successful completion of standardized tests in *English*, to community and educator misconceptions about the urgency for language minority children to be fully immersed within an *English* environment as soon as possible. As described by Ventrone and Benavides (1998), English-only proponents perceive English as the primary method of assimilation and native language loss as a consequence of English acquisition. Their academic success is measured primarily through achievement in English, so they deliver most instruction through the English language. The L2 is seen as needing replacement as soon as possible. This makes it abundantly clear to students, teachers, school staff, and

administrators that the L1 and English clearly do not enjoy equal status (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; Baker, 1996). Ramirez et al. (1991) in their study on bilingual models found TBE had certain inherent limitations that impact its effectiveness in that LEP students rarely receive enough instruction in their native language, resulting in low levels of L1 and L2 proficiency.

Cummins (1981) and Baker (1996) argue that transitional bilingual programs are inherently flawed due to their disabling of LEP children in the educational process. Baker (1996), in his discussion of the rationale for the implementation of transitional bilingual programs, presents it as a matter of "perceived priorities." He suggests those educators' urgency for English acquisition is the need for Spanish speaking children to *not* fall behind their English-speaking peers. Thus, these programs are grounded on a false premise of equality of opportunity for language minority children. An errant application of equality based not on the same curriculum, for curriculums in all English classrooms are identical to their respective bilingual counterpart classrooms, but rather an equality based on proficiency in English. Conversely, Two-Way programs validate and develop the L1 while simultaneously developing the L2 in *all children*, an essential element for academic success.

The Promise of Two-Way/Dual Language Education

The whole discussion of TBE assumes that the ultimate goal is a child that is academically successful in *English*. Even if transfer of skills and knowledge into the *English* curriculum were successful, due to well-implemented *late exit transitional programs*, is monolingualism what we want for children? With the rapid increase of culturally and linguistically diverse students populating today's schools, changes in pedagogy, programs and practices that address the changing demographics is not only necessary, but inevitable.

Common characteristics of effective Two-Way/Dual Language programs have been clearly substantiated in the literature. However, what is needed is a tested model that incorporates these characteristics and is easily understood by administrators and teachers for effective implementation. Presenters share **eight** components of a successful campus-wide Two-Way Bilingual Partial Immersion Curriculum Model currently being implemented in the South Texas.

Two-Way Bilingual Education Partial Immersion Curriculum Model

Although Two-Way Bilingual education programs show great promise for the success of language minority children, and for the development of biliteracy for all children, effective implementation of this model is just as crucial. There are several critical researched-based elements that must be in place if student outcomes are to be maximized. The lack of these essential elements can limit the effectiveness of a Two-Way program that can lead to erroneous perpetuation that bilingual education *does not work*. In fact, findings by Thomas and Collier (1997a) in their study on effective bilingual/ESL programs for second language learners concluded that *all* bilingual education programs are successful if they are *well-implemented*. They note the following predictors found in effective bilingual programs that positively impact student academic success: (a) both L1 and L2 must be used in academic instruction, (b) authentic and interactive teaching approaches and (c) changes in the socio-cultural context of schooling.

This presentation will address the practical application of these elements through a successful *campus-wide* model currently being implemented. This *Two-Way Bilingual Education Partial Immersion Model* is successfully operating in 12 campuses across 5 school districts. The following *eight* major

components of the model are easily understood by administrators and teachers and effectively applied in the school and classroom:

- (1) *Heterogeneous Instructional Grouping* (variations from grade level to grade level)
- (2) *Separation of Languages for Content Area Instruction* (variations PK-1 and 2-5)
- (3) *Learning Centers* (PK-1) and *Resource Centers* (2-5)
- (4) *Language of the Day* (includes all non-instructional language)
- (5) *Computer Lab L1 & L2 Instructional Content-Area Support* (variations PK-1 and 2-5)
- (6) *Instructional Staff* (team-teaching models: pairs, triads)
- (7) *L2 Conceptual Reinforcement/Refinement* (support process for instruction via L2)
- (8) *L1/L2 Specialized Content Vocabulary Enrichment* (vocabulary enrichment in other language)