AMAE Co-Editors

Patricia Sánchez
University of Texas—San Antonio

Oscar Jiménez-Castellanos
Arizona State University

Antonio Camacho
Past AMAE President
Los Angeles Unified
School District

Managing Editor

D. Carolina Ramos
University of Texas—San Antonio

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editors' Message

We are pleased to introduce the 2014 *AMAE Journal* open issue. This issue includes two featured articles, two essays, and a book review. The published manuscripts address topics that directly impact the education of Mexican-American/Latino communities.

We provide a short synopsis of each featured manuscript. The first article by Elsbree, Hernández, and Daoud emphasizes the need for educators to take more ownership of Latina/o English Learners and identify effective lesson differentiation; it also highlights the need for teachers to draw from critical theory/pedagogy for effective practices that best serve long-term English learners. The next research article, by Alfaro, Durán, Hunt, and Aragón, examines the ways that a collaborative might join in the implementation of dual language programs, Common Core State Standards, and critical pedagogy at the school and classroom levels via a teacher, school administrator, and teacher professional development program; the research is based on an actual partnership in southern California. The third study in this open issue is by Schall-Leckrone and Pavlak, who share results from their work which assesses the influence of coursework within a teacher education program on preparing secondary teachers to teach Latina/o bilingual learners in English language arts, history, math, science, and world languages classes.

Finally, the issue closes with an essay and book review. In her essay, Kalinec-Craig provides a personal pedagogical reflection where she, as a White mathematics teacher educator, describes what she learned from three Latina pre-service teachers who were recent immigrants from Mexico while they completed an elementary mathematics methods course; her reflection has implications for teacher education. The book review that rounds out the open issue was written by Amelia Marcetti Topper; she examines the 2013 edited volume by David J. León and Rubén O. Martinez, *Latino College Presidents: In Their Own Words* (2013)—a text that features 11 bio-professional essays written by current and/or former college and university Latino/a presidents.

We hope you enjoy the open issue!

Juntos logramos más,

Patricia Sánchez, Co-Editor
Oscar Jiménez-Castellanos, Co-Editor
Antonio Camacho, Co-Editor

Equitable Instruction for Secondary Latino English Learners:
Examining Critical Principles of Differentiation in Lesson Design

Anne René Elsbree
Ana M. Hernández
Annette Daoud

California State University San Marcos

Abstract

The research emphasizes the need for educators to take more ownership of Latino English Learners (ELs) and identify effective lesson differentiation through subject area content (instruction), process (activities), and products (assessments). Based on the literature review, school achievement improves when practices address students' culture, experiences and learning styles in ways that are differentiated in academics. This study examined lesson plans from 35 teacher candidates (86% white, 14% Latino) in a Single Subject Credential Program in southern California. Candidates conducted clinical practice in districts that served up to 70% ELs, with the majority identified as Long-term English Learners (LTEL). Lessons analyzed a five-part differentiation plan: 1) student information, 2) differentiation, 3) appropriateness of differentiation, 4) assessment criteria, and 5) monitoring and adaptations. Results indicated 94% (33/35) of the candidates provided data on ELs' proficiency levels. All (35) lessons included at least one differentiation. About 26% provided a rationale for lesson differentiation, monitoring or adaption; however, only 9% described assessment criteria. Educating LTELs is more than just providing access to the curriculum or sheltering instruction. Lessons must draw from critical theory/pedagogy for effective LTEL practices. Teacher educators need to be more strategic in how they teach differentiation to candidates.

Introduction

At the secondary level, the majority of English learners (ELs) can be characterized as "long-term English learners." While there are variations in the definitions provided by researchers, common characteristics of long-term English learners or LTELs are: they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for approximately 6 years or more; they generally have grade point averages of below a 2.0; and they have not attained a proficiency level in reading and writing skills needed for academic success in content area classes (Olsen, 2010). LTELs perform at much lower academic levels than immigrant students who come to U.S. schools with a range of prior schooling experiences from their home countries (Callahan, 2005). One challenge facing secondary ELs is placement— the classes in which they are placed are often not those which are required for future attendance in four-year colleges. Secondary English learners often take multiple English as Second Language (ESL) or English Language Development (ELD) classes, thus limiting their access to "mainstream" content classes (Barron & Sanchez, 2007; Callahan, 2005; Rumberger & Gndara, 2004). Unfortunately, it is often the case that the curriculum in ESL or ELD classes is not challenging enough or aligned to college-track classes for LTELs to transfer the information learned and be successful in their content area classes.

Additionally, the academic demands for secondary ELs in content area classes are much more complex than those needed for success in elementary schools. At the secondary level, content in textbooks and that presented in content area classes are done so through an increasingly complex level of academic language or the specialized level of vocabulary, grammar and skills of secondary content area classes. For secondary

English learners, particularly long-term ELs, attaining and practicing a level of academic English is required for any level of success in content area classes. Secondary ELs come to content area classes with a wide range of backgrounds and experiences in school that require a varied level of scaffolding to access the content. To help ELs be academically successful, content area teachers should understand their students' literacy and content knowledge, previous academic experience in U.S. schools, and their knowledge of the English language (Dutro & Kinsella, 2010).

Preparing Teachers to Teach Secondary English Learners

The educational experiences of LTELs underscore the importance for teacher education programs to prepare teachers to equitably teach students from culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) backgrounds. In a survey of California teachers, Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, and Driscoll (2005) report on challenges that secondary teachers identify in teaching ELs. The most commonly cited challenge for secondary teachers is the language and cultural barriers between themselves and their EL students. The secondary teachers who participated in the survey stated that the most beneficial professional development trainings are those that focus on understanding the cultural characteristics and learning profiles of ELs they need to effectively teach them.

The more knowledge teachers have about their EL students, the better able they are to provide equitable educational opportunities to them. It is therefore imperative that secondary teacher credential programs and professional development trainings prepare secondary teachers to provide ELs in their content areas classrooms access to the core curriculum in ways that are both comprehensible and academically rigorous. It is also essential that teacher credential and professional development programs explicitly draw from the tenets of multicultural education, social justice and equity to prepare teachers to provide equitable educational experiences for all of their future students.

Common Core Standards—New Standards, New Opportunities

As teachers begin to incorporate rigorous Common Core standards and complex demands of using texts from various content registers, there is fear that ELs will continue to trail behind or further decline in academic achievement, since ELs lack understanding of knowledge and skills in disciplines that require high functioning levels of English proficiency (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2012). In addition, according to WestEd (Walki, et al., 2010), "In order to succeed academically, all ELs must overcome a 'double gap,' first to equal the achievement of their native-speaking counterparts, and then to reach a level of achievement that is considered grade-level proficient (p. 3)." However, Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and the new ELD Standards can offer a window of optimism to reconstruct the manner in which teachers instruct ELs with deeper understandings of content and language. It offers a fresh start to equip linguistically and culturally diverse students who have been denied the right to interact with rigorous content, opportunities to engage in effective communication skills, and ways to apply new knowledge of their English language skills in meaningful ways. For secondary ELs, this could signify a new dawn for their right to an equitable education and journey into college and career readiness.

The purpose of this article is to emphasize the need for educators to take more ownership for EL students' mastery of English and to identify the parts of an effective content, process, and product differentiation in a lesson. The research questions for the study include: 1) In what ways are teacher candidates addressing differentiation? 2) How do teacher candidates articulate their differentiation plan?

Literature Review

This inquiry draws from the theoretical foundations of critical theory/pedagogy to develop consciousness of instructional practices in traditional education. To address the educational issues facing secondary ELs, faculty in the teacher education program highlighted in this inquiry frame our practice in critical multicultural education,

use a social justice/critical pedagogy approach to design and deliver our program, and teach our candidates how to use effective practices for ELs in their instruction.

Multicultural Education

Based on the notion that all students learn when the curriculum is meaningful, comprehensible, and relevant to students' lives, the lesson planning process outlined in this article draws from the theoretical foundations of multicultural education and critical pedagogy to provide teacher candidates with the tools needed to motivate English learners, along with all students, to learn. Improving educational experiences through understanding and respect of all students is one of the foundations of the theories and practices of multicultural education (Banks, 2003; Gallavan, 2011; Nieto & Bode, 2008; Sleeter, 2005). School achievement improves when instructional practices address students' culture, experiences, and learning styles in ways that are differentiated to meet each student's individual academic needs (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2001).

Peer interactions and collaborative activities that are rooted in critical pedagogy are paramount in educating second language learners, particularly in states like California, where approximately 25% of students in public schools (K-12) are classified as ELs, either immigrants or the sons and daughters of immigrants living in poverty or below poverty level (California Department of Education, 2013). Educators need to understand that educating ELs is more than just providing access to the curriculum or sheltering instruction for comprehension of content. New standards call for students to be actively engaged in content learning through peer interactions, understand how to conduct research, provide evidence while reading and writing, analyze complex texts, and apply advanced levels of academic language skills to any subject area. Therefore, a reconstruction and transformation of the manner in which teachers/teacher candidates design lessons will be the new guiding principles for equitable instructional practices for English learners.

Social Justice Approach

Teacher education programs which are explicitly rooted in tenets of social justice and equity see teaching as the act of enhancing students' learning and their expanding opportunities both in and beyond school (for example, Cochran-Smith, et. al, 2009; Darling-Hammond, French, & Garcia-Lopez, 2002). Social justice teacher education programs highlight inequities that exist in schools and guide teacher candidates in understanding theories and practices that will help them provide equitable educational opportunities for all their future students. In this study, the steps needed to create a differentiation plan approximates social justice from a framework similar to the one described by Chubbuck (2010) on conceptualizing and implementing socially just teaching. Teacher candidates reflect upon and design their individual socially just and equitable pedagogy to address student learning difficulties using both individual and structural orientations (Chubbuck, 2010). To create a differentiation plan, teacher candidates first identify their EL students' proficiency levels, learning profiles and interests, then reflect upon how to choose differentiation strategies that lead to more equitable educational outcomes.

In a study of a teacher education program explicitly centered on social justice and equity, Cochran-Smith, et.al, (2009) found that teacher candidates' definitions of social justice and equity are placed into four categories: pupil learning, relationships and respect, teacher as activist, and recognizing inequities. Across the categories, the teacher candidates define and enact social justice through their own individual actions rather than through policy change or political actions (Cochran-Smith, et.al, 2009). In a study of two teacher education programs in California to examine how each program implements social justice and equity across their programs, McDonald (2005) found that translating these definitions into actions can be challenging for teacher candidates. Drawing from these studies, one can establish that teacher education programs should: present social justice in ways that the candidates are open to learning; teach candidates to define social justice on an individual level; and help candidates translate their definitions into concrete actions in their future classrooms. The steps that comprise the differentiation plan provide very specific "doable" actions that teachers and teacher candidates can integrate into their teaching practices which directly impact the equitable educational opportunities for secondary English

learners.

Students of impoverished communities, who are linguistically and culturally diverse, need to connect knowledge to power and freedom of oppression in order to achieve social reconstruction (Freire, 1970; Giroux, 1988). It is important for teachers to view educational opportunities for students who have been historically disenfranchised by inequitable systems. Teachers can transform students into thinkers for social change and active learners in their communities. Structures that allow a one-size-fits-all instructional program create a "culture of silence and oppression" for groups of students who are perceived as subordinates in educational stratifications, particularly English learners. This theory permits teachers to re-examine and reconstruct lesson development as a critical process for transformation, rather than to continue a status-quo approach in the classroom.

Effective Strategies for Teaching Secondary English Learners

Effective instructional planning is a necessity for meeting the needs in today's diverse classrooms, especially with English learners. Three instructional design practices that lend themselves to English language development include: Universal Design for Learning (Rose & Gravel, 2010; Rose & Meyer, 2002); Understanding by Design (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005); and Differentiated Instruction (Tomlinson, 2001). Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a pedagogical approach based on the universal design movement in architecture, where buildings provide accessible options for entry and use from the initial design, not as an afterthought that requires retrofitting. UDL addresses three networks: recognition, strategic, and affective (Rose & Gravel, 2010). UDL requires that each lesson provide multiple means of representation, action/expression, and engagement (Rose & Meyer, 2002). While it is critical that educators provide instruction in universally accessible ways, English learners often need further differentiation to guarantee that the access fits their proficiency levels.

Understanding by Design (Wiggins & Grant, 2005) is a backward planning process, where educators identify the learning outcomes of a unit first and then choose learning activities and materials that would support the identified learning objectives. The benefit of this instructional design is that it focuses on planning the learning tasks and evidence of the students' understanding. Educators can design the tasks with English learners in mind with set criteria to demonstrate language development as well as content understanding.

Tomlinson's (2001) differentiated instruction adds to both of these instructional plans by focusing attention on the three main areas of instruction: content (subject objectives, concepts and materials), process (student activities), and product (assessments). Each of the three areas can be adapted or modified based on the learner's readiness level—English proficiency level, learning profile, and interests. Tomlinson provides a framework for differentiating based on the specific information of a student. So this instructional design allows for more refined instruction, dependent on the needs of the learners.

Research findings on effective strategies for teaching secondary English learners provide the foundation for following the steps of designing differentiation plans. Teaching methods such as sheltered instruction or Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) provide secondary teachers with the pedagogy, methodology, and strategies to effectively teach English learners. In sheltered or SDAIE classrooms, language and content objectives are threaded throughout the curriculum so that English learners are able to learn content while improving English literacy skills (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2014). Research shows that incorporating language and content objectives based on state standards is an effective competency that teachers of secondary English learners use in their lesson planning (Faltis, Arias, & Ramirez-Marin, 2010). Using the standards and objectives as a guide, sheltered or SDAIE lessons include multiple strategies, methods, and assessments that help make academically rigorous content accessible to English learners at various language proficiency levels, and in multiple contexts including "mainstream" content classrooms (i.e., Diaz-Rico, 2013; Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2014; Faltis, Arias, & Ramirez-Marin, 2010).

Supporting academic language development is particularly paramount for secondary English learners who need academic language to be successful across all their content area classes. Effective strategies for supporting English learners' academic language development include explicit teaching of language forms and metacognitive strategies, building background knowledge, and providing opportunities to practice academic language across

multiple contexts (Bowers, et. al, 2010). Additionally, ELs need content presented through explicit scaffolding so that they can perform the academic task required (De Jong & Harper, 2005). The amount of scaffolding needed is based on the English learners' language proficiency levels as well as their background knowledge (language, content and culture). Building upon students' background knowledge is an effective strategy to develop language and content mastery as well as to make curriculum culturally and socially relevant to students' lives (De Jong & Harper, 2005; Faltis, Arias & Ramirez-Marin, 2010).

Methodology

This study uses qualitative methods to facilitate the collection and analysis of data using a "naturalistic" approach (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The study is an analysis of lesson plans from 35 teacher candidates. The candidates were enrolled in a two-semester fifth-year Single Subject Secondary Credential Program in Southern California. The program has been in existence for over fifteen years and offers single subject credentials in the following subjects: English Language Arts, Mathematics, Physical Education, Science, Social Sciences and World Languages (Spanish). The program philosophy centers on social justice, as well as clinical practice and teaching digital-age learners. To prepare teacher candidates to be effective teachers in our service area of southern California, it is essential that we focus on issues of social justice, specifically meeting the needs of diverse students from low socioeconomic statuses, English language learners, and other students traditionally underserved.

Participants

All of the candidates had a bachelor's degree and had passed the California Subject Examination for Teachers. In the fall semester, each candidate was enrolled in the following: three core methodology courses (Teaching and Learning, Literacy, and Multilingual Education), one subject-specific methodology course, and full-time clinical practice at a public middle or high school that serves English learners. Some of the districts served up to 70% English learners, with the majority of them identified as long-term English learners (Olsen, 2010). The demographics for teacher candidates (see Table 1) is as follows: 49% women (17) and 51% (18) men; 86% white (30) and 14% Latino (5). The candidates' subject areas were: 14% English (5), 20% Math (7), 5.71% Physical Education (2), 8.57% Science (3), 28.57% Social Studies (10), and 22.87% Spanish (8), earning a Spanish/ English Bilingual Authorization. It is important to note that of the eight Spanish teacher candidates, three were white, four were Latinos (three from Mexico and one from Honduras), and one was Latino/Hawaiian with roots from Mexico. In terms of language, almost 23% of the candidates were bilingual (Spanish/English) and 77% predominantly spoke English only. In addition 14% (5) of the candidates self-identified as English learners, with two of them experiencing high school education in California during Proposition 227—an anti-bilingual education initiative that passed in 1998. They have shared their experiences with their colleagues in terms of how their education changed under the reform.

Table 1. *Candidate demographic information by content area (N=35)*

Content Area	Gender		Ethnicity		Bilingual
	Male	Female	White	Latino	(English / Spanish)
English Language Arts	2	3	5	0	0
Mathematics	0	7	7	0	0
Physical Education	1	1	2	0	0
Science	2	1	3	0	0
Social Sciences	9	1	10	0	0
World Languages (Spanish)	4	4	4	4	8

NOTE: Candidates in this study only represented the two ethic groups listed above

Data Collection

The candidates were enrolled in Multilingual Education, which focuses on the goals of multilingual and multicultural education, specifically why and how to support English learners. The assignment for this research study was to design a lesson plan that included differentiation for English learners. The program provided a lesson template that was used across courses and in clinical practice. Each lesson included: standards, objectives, assessment, enduring understanding, essential questions, instructional steps, student information, differentiation, and materials. Prior to this class assignment, candidates were instructed on how to create a universally designed lesson (Rose & Gravel, 2010) using backward planning (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005) with specific differentiation for content, process, or product (Tomlinson, 2001) based on their class profile. First, the candidates created a personal learning profile for themselves, where they identified their strengths, their readiness levels for different content, their learning preferences, their collaboration and leadership styles, and their interests.

Based on their learning profile, the candidates identified learning activities where they would thrive. The purpose of this activity was to help the candidates understand how this information could inform instruction. Second, the candidates were instructed on how to locate student information at their clinical practice sites, such as English proficiency levels and individual education plans. Currently the data available for English learners is the California English Language Development Test (CELDT). The CELDT scores identify the English learners' ability to listen, speak, read, and write in English. The candidates learned how to match a student's CELDT score to an appropriate level English Language Development Standard: emerging, expanding, and bridging. Third, the candidates created and conducted a survey with their middle and high school students to identify their interests and learning profiles. Fourth, the candidates were asked to analyze the class profile to identify similarities in their students' learning profiles, identify students that needed differentiation, and to learn how to choose effective differentiation strategies based on the profiles.

Data Analysis

The analysis of the lesson plans focused specifically on the differentiation strategies for English learners. During the analysis, common themes (differentiation strategies) were identified through an open coding process and revisited until patterns emerged (areas of differentiation), allowing us to move from a broad analysis to the specific question of "how" teacher candidates were addressing differentiation (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995). We categorized the differentiation strategies into three areas: content differentiation for subject objectives, concepts, or materials; process differentiation for the student activities; and product differentiation for the assessments (Tomlinson, 2001). For each strategy we identified if the candidate articulated the five parts of the differentiation plan:

1) Identification of English learner's proficiency level, learning profile, and/or interests (Tomlinson, 2001);
2) Alignment of the differentiation to the English learner's proficiency level, learning profile, and/or interests;
3) Explanation of why the differentiation is appropriate for the English learner's proficiency level, learning profile, and/or interests (Tomlinson, 2001);
4) Description of the criteria for assessing the English learner's progress based on proficiency level;
5) Plan for monitoring and adapting strategy to support English learner's progress.
The research focused only on the lesson plan design and not the implementation, so there was no reflection analyzed to identify the effectiveness of the differentiation plan.

Limitations

There are at least two methodological limitations in this study: 1) only one lesson to represent all that each of the candidates learned, and 2) the fact that the data only covers lesson designs. The lessons were merely a snapshot in the candidates' understanding of differentiation in the first half of the credential program. More lessons over the entire program would make this study richer and more reliable. In addition, the data collected were only lesson designs—no lesson was taught, observed, or had a post-reflection.

Results

The research findings covered two areas: the types of differentiation and the plan for the differentiation. The intention of the original analysis was to identify what types of strategies the candidates designed, but we also were curious how the candidates articulated their differentiation plan—which parts were included in their differentiation plan and which parts the candidates needed more guidance and practice for designing socially just and equitable instruction.

Types of Differentiation

Process differentiation was the most common with 89% of the lessons (31/35); content was the second most common with 80% (28/35); and product was the least common differentiation with 57% of the lessons containing assessment differentiation (20/35). Of the 35 lessons, 20% (7) of the lessons contained only one type of differentiation with two that included content differentiation and the other five included process differentiation; 34% (12) of the lessons contained two types of differentiation (with seven that included content and process differentiation, two with content and product, and one that included process and product differentiation) and 46% (16) of the lessons contained all three types of differentiation.

> **Content.** The content differentiation consisted of content accommodations with no substantial content modifications. Content accommodations were minor differentiations that did not substantially change the instructional level, subject content, or assessment criteria for the EL, but addressed the delivery method, such as multisensory presentation (visual, auditory, kinesthetic) and vocabulary development supports.

An example of a lesson that included content differentiation focused on vocabulary. The differentiation plan began with information about the EL. The candidate described an English learner with a CELDT score of 3, an intermediate level with strong English reading skills, but poor English speaking articulation. In addition he noted that the student enjoys playing soccer and consistently makes an effort to complete his class work. The differentiation plan described how the teacher candidate will directly teach the vocabulary word, "imperialism." The candidate described projecting the word and its definition on a SMART Board in bold black font and having the English learner copy the word and definition on a graphic organizer and describing the word verbally. Although the candidate did not explain why the differentiation was appropriate based on the student's information, the candidate did describe how he would check for the EL's understanding by checking what he wrote on the graphic

organizer and listening to the student's verbal definition and make any needed clarifications immediately to make sure that the English learner comprehended the correct definition.

The other content differentiations, 78.5% (22/28), merely described the student and named a differentiation with no specifications as to why the differentiation was chosen, how a plan would assess the effectiveness of the strategy, or how they would adapt the strategy if needed.

Process. The process differentiations included flexible grouping, graphic organizers, multisensory activities, and tiered lessons. The flexible grouping describes the different ways students can be grouped to maximize learning. The lessons that included graphic organizers were designed to help the student visually process the content. The multisensory activities included visual, auditory, and kinesthetic dimensions. The tiered lessons provided different participation roles for the ELs based on their proficiency levels.

In one of the lessons that included process differentiation, the candidate not only described the English learner's proficiency level at a CELDT 3 score—with visual and interpersonal learning style preferences, that enjoys one-on-one instruction—the candidate also described the Latino EL's interests in computers and video games, specifically, "Guitar Hero." He was earning a B in the math class and was interested in going to the local community college to pursue engineering. In the lesson, the students are to use their understanding of volume and surface area formulas to design a drink container for another country. In the differentiation plan, the candidate describes how the student would be assigned a group with a reclassified[1] Spanish-speaking English learner to assist with any translations as well as high-performing English-Only students to model proper language and math usage. The candidate provided a strong explanation of why the strategy was appropriate for the EL's proficiency level. Although the candidate neglected to address the criteria that would be used for assessing the EL's progress or a plan for monitoring the strategy and adapting it if necessary, the other three parts were very strong: information about student, differentiation aligned to student information, and explanation of why the differentiation is appropriate based on the student proficiency level, learning profile, and/or interest.

Product. The product differentiations were included in 57% of the (20/35) lessons. Over half of the (11/20) lessons included product differentiations that were minor accommodations— where English learners were expected to learn the same content as the rest of the class. Almost half of the (9/20) lessons that included a differentiated product (modification), used a rubric to communicate the different language development tasks based on the emerging, expanding, and bridging dimensions that refer to the English Language Development standard's proficiency level descriptors.

One lesson was a stellar example of product differentiation for a pickleball[2] formation in a physical education class. The candidate provided information on a Spanish-speaking English Learner with a CELDT 3 score, who spoke well in class and understood verbal instructions, but struggled with vocabulary, reading, and writing. In addition, the candidate shared that the EL was athletic, interested in sports, and enjoyed soccer and shooting video games. In the lesson, the students were instructed to create a pro and con list for each formation of pickleball. The teacher candidate described how he would strategically place the learner in a group with other strong readers and one student that was a Spanish-speaking English learner that was recently reclassified as proficient. He explained how this group would provide the necessary language supports for processing the

---

1. "Reclassified" is a term used by the California Department of Education to identify students who have met reclassification criteria. A district determines whether or not an English learner student has sufficient English proficiency to be reclassified as a fluent English speaker through the following: EC Section 313 (d) specifies multiple measures be used to reclassify ELs, including all four of the following criteria: Assessment of English proficiency Evaluation of performance in basic skills, such as the CST for English-language arts (CST- ELA) or the California Modified Assessment for ELA (CMA-ELA), teacher evaluation, and parental opinion and consultation. Retrieved on March 27, 2014 from http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/rd/.

2. Pickleball is a game based on a baseball play where a runner is "in a pickle", in jeopardy of being out when advancing to the next base. The game involves three players—a runner and two base players. The base players toss the ball back and forth until the runner is successfully tagged. When a base player tags the runner, the two exchange places and continue playing.

different pickle formations and to comprehend what the pros and cons would be for each formation. The candidate described how he would monitor the group discussion and ask the EL questions to evaluate his comprehension and to ask him permission if he could be called on during the whole class discussion to share his answers. This not only offered the candidate an opportunity to assess the effectiveness of the differentiation, but it would allow him to adapt the instruction to meet the EL's needs.

Differentiation Plan

The lesson plans were analyzed for evidence of the five parts of a differentiation plan: 1) Information about student, 2) Differentiation strategy aligned to student information, 3) Explanation of why differentiation was appropriate for student, 4) Criteria for assessing student progress, and 5) Monitor and adaptation plan. For the most part, the candidates were consistent in gathering information about their students' English proficiency levels, learning profiles and interests, and choosing a differentiation specifically for their identified students (see Table 2)

Table 2. *Differentiation used by candidates in lesson plans (N=35)*

Content Area	Design activities based on ELs' proficiency levels	Differentiate content based on student learning profiles	Differentiate assessments based on student learning profiles
English Language Arts	5 of 5 (100%)	2 of 5 (40%)	0 of 5 (0%)
Mathematics	6 of 7 (86%)	5 of 7 (71%)	5 of 7 (71%)
Physical Education	2 of 2 (100%)	2 of 2 (100%)	1 of 2 (50%)
Science	2 of 3 (67%)	3 of 3 (100%)	2 of 3 (67%)
Social Sciences	8 of 10 (80%)	8 of 10 (80%)	7 of 10 (70%)
World Languages (Spanish)	7 of 8 (88%)	8 of 8 (100%)	5 of 8 (63%)

First, ninety-four percent (33/35) of candidates provided descriptive data about their students' proficiency levels, learning profiles and interests. Second, 100% of the candidates provided at least one differentiation strategy that was aligned to the student, even the two candidates that neglected to provide information about their students included a differentiation for English learners and Students with Special Needs; in fact, one of the lessons provided differentiation for content, process, and product, and the other included content and process differentiation strategies. Third, the differentiation plans broke down from there, with only 26% (9) of the candidates providing a rationale for the differentiation. The candidates often did not explain how the differentiation strategy was appropriate for the specific learner's proficiency level, learning profile, or interests. Fourth, even less candidates described how they would know if the differentiation was effective. Only nine percent (3) of the candidates described the criteria for assessing the student's progress. Fifth, the last part of the differentiation plan, monitoring and adaption, was more likely to be described. Twenty-six percent (9) of the candidates described how they would monitor and adapt strategies to support student progress. Two candidates demonstrated a more thorough differentiation plan than other lessons: "Spanish Family Lesson" and "Cylinder Geometry." These candidates were both white women that are native English speakers, representative of the majority of teacher candidates in our program and across the nation.

Ms. Jones, a white, bilingual woman, designed a Spanish Family Lesson with content, process and product differentiation for six English learners (4 Spanish, 1 Vietnamese, and 1 Tagalog speakers). The objective of the lesson is for the students to converse in Spanish about their family. The lesson supports EL's content by modeling family vocabulary using a family tree for two different families [Modern Family television show and Graciela Repún and Elena Hadida's (2006) children's book, *Familias, la mía, la tuya, la de los demás*]. ELs are supported in

the process by making their own family tree using a graphic organizer. ELs are supported in the assessment by pairing them with a partner that has greater English proficiency as well as providing a script for the conversation and time to practice. This lesson addressed three of the five differentiation steps with a description of the students, aligned differentiation strategy, and an explanation of how the strategy is aligned with the students' strengths and needs.

The second candidate, a white monolingual English-speaking woman, Ms. Smith, designed a Cylinder Geometry lesson with content, process, and product differentiation supports for three Spanish speaking ELs. The lesson objective is for the students to apply their surface area and volume knowledge by designing and justifying a drink can for a Spanish-speaking county. ELs were supported with the content, by verbally and visually reviewing the surface area and volume vocabulary and formulas. Grouping them with Native English speakers and building time for the teacher to monitor and provide any necessary one-on-one instruction supported the EL's process. The ELs were supported in the design presentation (product) by rearranging all of the desks in a circle so students are seated facing one another to lessen the intimidation of a formal presentation. This lesson was thorough in its differentiation plan with a rich description of each of the ELs, strategies' alignment with the students' information, an explanation of how the strategy is a good match for the ELs, and a plan to monitor and adapt the strategies for the process as well as the product.

Conclusions and Educational Significance

The analysis of the parts of differentiation, helped us as instructors recognize what our students understood and where they needed more guidance and practice for differentiation. The conversations during our collaborative analysis led us to recommit ourselves to ownership of our teacher candidates' learning. As a result we are redesigning our lesson plan assignments and the learning activities and materials. We are making our rubrics more specific in regards to what evidence looks like for the five distinctive parts of the differentiation plan. We are condensing the lesson plan contents and making the differentiation a heavier weight for the graded assignment. By engaging in this research study, we realized we needed to take our own advice and be more strategic in how we teach the differentiation. We needed to first, start with our students in mind. Second, identify a differentiation that matches their readiness—proficiency level, learning profile, and/or interests. Third, explain the reason why the differentiation is appropriate for each teacher candidate. Fourth, describe what criteria we will use to assess the candidates' progress, and fifth, have a plan to monitor and adapt to support candidate progress. Returning to the literature reviewed for this study, the differentiation plans created by the candidates allowed them to take definitions of social justice and enact them into individual actions (Cochran-Smith et. al, 2009; McDonald, 2005). The lessons themselves focused on multicultural content that was differentiated to meet each student's individual academic needs while also addressing their culture, experiences, and learning styles (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2001). Further, each aspect of the candidates' differentiation plans represents effective instructional practices for English learners; they include language and content objectives, varied assessments, and academically rigorous content presented through accessible and comprehensible instructional strategies (Diaz-Rico, 2013; Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2014; Faltis, Arias & Ramirez-Marin, 2010). It is important to note that the majority of candidates in the program are white women, as is the case in most teacher education programs nationally. Regardless of their backgrounds, candidates can design socially just and equitable differentiated lessons in their content area classes for their secondary English learners.

The importance of this study is that educators of teacher candidates in secondary education must be clear on explanations and monitoring strategies for lessons designed for students who are linguistically, culturally, and educationally diverse. This research advances instructional practices for a transformative education and agency in designing lessons that are in accordance to the proficiency and academic levels of Latino English Learners. More research is needed in the instruction of secondary Latino ELs and long-term ELs, particularly on teacher credential programs in higher education. Teacher candidates in secondary education programs are likely to have long-term English learners enrolled in their content area classes. By teaching candidates how to differentiate by providing targeted strategies that match their English learners' needs, we are moving one step closer to providing ELs with more equitable educational opportunities.

References

Banks, J. (2003). Teaching literacy for social justice and global citizenship. Language Arts, 81(1), 18-19.

Barron, R. & Sanchez, F. (2007). Fulfilling the commitment: Excellence for all students. *Leadership, 36(3),* 8-10.

Bowers, E., Fitts, S., Quirk, M. & Woo, J. (2010). Effective strategies for developing academic English: Professional development and teacher practices. *Bilingual Research Journal, 33,* 95-110.

California Department of Education. (2013). *Educational demographics* unit. Retrieved on February 7, 2013 from http://www.cde.ca.gov/dataquest.

Callahan, R. (2005). Tracking and high school English learners: Limiting opportunities to learn. *American Educational Research Journal,* 42 (2), 305-328.

Chubbuck, S. (2010). Individual and structural orientations in socially just teaching: conceptualization, implementation, and collaborative effort. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 61(3), 197-210.

Cochran-Smith, M., Shakman, K., Jong, C,. Terrell, D., Barnatt, J. & McQuillan, P. (2009). Good and just teaching: The case for social justice in teacher education. *American Journal of Education, 115(3),* 347-377.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2012). *Framework for English language proficiency development standards* – Corresponding to the California state standards and the next generation science standards. Retrieved on March 20, 2014 from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2012/ELPD%20Framework%20 Booklet-Final%20for%20web.pdf

Darling-Hammond, L., French, J. & Garcia-Lopez, S. (2002). *Learning to teach for social justice.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

De Jong, E. & Harper, C. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly,* Spring, 101-124.

Diaz-Rico, L. (2013). *Strategies for teaching English learners.* 3rd Ed. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Dutro, S. & Kinsella, K. (2010). English language development: issues and implementation at grades six through twelve. In *Improving education for English learners: Research-based approaches.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education Press.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. & Short, D. (2014). *Making content comprehensible for secondary English learners: The SIOP model.* 2nd Ed. Boston, MA: Pearson / Allyn & Bacon.

Emerson, R., Fretz, R., & Shaw, L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Faltis, C., Arias, M. B. & Ramirez-Marin, F. (2010). Identifying relevant competencies for secondary teachers of English learners. *Bilingual Research Journal, 33.* 307-328

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* NY: Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.

Gallavan, N. (2011). *Navigating cultural competence in grades* 6-12: A compass for teachers. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Gandara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J. & Driscoll, A. (2005). *Listening to teachers of English language learners.* The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning, UCSC.

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research & practice.* 2nd Ed. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Giroux, H. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals:* Toward a critical pedagogy of learning. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

McDonald, M. (2005). The integration of social justice in teacher education: dimensions of prospective teachers' opportunities to learn. Journal of Teacher Education, 56(5), 418-435.

Miles, M. & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis (*2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Nieto, S. & Bode, P. (2008). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (5th ed). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Olsen, L. (2010). *Reparable harm: Fulfilling the promise of educational opportunity for California's long term English learners.* Long Beach, CA: Californians Together Press.

Rose, D.H. & Gravel, J.W. (2010). Universal design for learning. In E. Baker, P.

Peterson & B. McGaw (Eds.). International Encyclopedia of Education, 3rd Ed. Oxford: Elsevier. Retrieved from National Center on Universal Design for Learning Website http://www.udlcenter.org/ sites/udlcenter.org/files/TechnologyandLearning_1.pdf

Rose, D. & Meyer, A. (2002). Teaching every student in the digital age: Universal design for learning. Retrieved from CAST, Universal Design for Learning Website http://www.cast.org/teachingeverystudent/ideas/ tes/

Rumberger, R. & Gandara, P. (2004). Seeking equity in the education of California's English learners. *Teachers College Record, 106 (10),* 2032-2056.

Sleeter, C. (2005). *Un-standardizing curriculum:* Multicultural teaching in the standards-based classroom. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability differentiated instruction classrooms (*2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Walqui, A., Koelsch, N., Hamburger, L., et. al. (2010). *What are we doing to middle school English learners? Findings and recommendations for change from a study of California EL programs.* WestEd.

Wiggins, G. & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design expanded* 2nd Ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pear

Steps toward Unifying Dual Language Programs, Common Core State Standards, and Critical Pedagogy: Oportunidades, Estrategias y Retos

Cristina Alfaro
San Diego State University

Richard Durán
University of California at Santa Barbara

Alexandra Hunt
San Diego State University

María José Aragón
University of California at Santa Barbara

Abstract

Recent education reforms have begun to reframe academic discussion and teacher practice surrounding bilingual educational approaches for preparing "21st century, college and career ready" citizens. Given this broader context, in this article we examine ways that we might join implementation of dual language programs, Common Core State Standards, and critical pedagogy at the school and classroom levels via a teacher, school administrator, and teacher professional development program. We focus on a concrete example of a partnership between a progressive dual language school along the U.S.-Mexico border, known as Chula Vista Learning Community Charter School, and a bilingual teacher education program in the College of Education at San Diego State University, which prepares teachers and administrators to implement and develop dual language instruction aligned (but not beholden) to Common Core State Standards. We include discussion of a Freirian-based instructional program that helps unite the opportunities presented by dual language programs and standards-based reform initiatives in a deeper equity and social justice framework for educating students. We discuss opportunities (*oportunidades*), strategies (*estrategias*), and challenges (*retos*) encountered during this collaborative work between the bilingual teacher preparation program, a Dual Language school, and one exemplary fourth grade teacher team and their enactment of a critical pedagogy-based curriculum. We conclude with a discussion of implications of our work for education of multilingual learners and the educators that work with them.

Introduction and Significance

The educational inequities faced by Latino students and other students from low income, and multilingual immigrant backgrounds in the U.S. are well documented (Gándara and Contreras, 2010; Valencia, 2008). Ameliorating these inequities is a complex matter given the wide range of historical, economic, and systemic societal and educational structural issues, and racial/ethnic and linguistic discrimination dynamics at work (Oakes, 2013; Orfield, 2014). Progressive educators, researchers, and policy analysts have long argued that approaches to education reform that do not honor the cultural and linguistic resources of Latinos are likely to fail, now and in the future, as such positive concerns for social justice and equity have primarily done so in the past (Portes, 2013, Valencia, 2010). Despite these reservations, we are aware of ongoing efforts and opportunities for transforming education in a positive manner that addresses these concerns directly and can help ameliorate inequities. These efforts bring together the best of what we know about how to implement effective teaching and learning, culturally responsive pedagogies, and teacher preparation. At the same time, there is also awareness that any significant transformation of educational practice in everyday school settings must be configured so as to take into account the realities of educational policies and school governance, and funding regulations mandated at state and local school levels, and by the federal government.

Given this broader context, in this article we examine ways that we might join implementation of

dual language programs, Common Core State Standards (CCSS), and critical pedagogy at the school level and classroom level via partnerships with progressive teacher preparation, school administrators, and staff development programs. We focus on a concrete example of a partnership between a progressive dual language school along the U.S.-Mexico border, known as Chula Vista Learning Community Charter School (CVLCC), and a bilingual teacher education program in the College of Education at San Diego State University (SDSU), which prepares bilingual teachers and administrators to implement and develop dual language instruction aligned (but not beholden) to CCSS.

CVLCC is unique in that its vision for learning is informed by critical pedagogy and guided by both a global and local community perspective. This schooling context is also unique because of the ways in which the SDSU bilingual teacher education program in the Dual Language and English Learner Education Department (DLE) implements its partnership with school administrators and teachers. The partnership is dynamic and involves the active day-to-day sharing of knowledge and analysis of praxis across institutional and unit boundaries—from the bilingual teacher education program and its participants, to the school organization and leadership, to teacher and teacher aid collaboration in designing and implementing classroom instruction, and to non-teaching staff involvement in building a school-wide learning community joined with the community at large. We focus on opportunities, challenges, and given existing constraints.

Our article proceeds as follows. We start by first briefly mentioning general ways in which dual language programs and their focus on multilingualism provide opportunities for learning that serve but extend the goal of standards based learning. We also mention important ways that instruction drawing on critical pedagogy is an essential framing resource for ongoing meaning making in classrooms that likewise serves but goes beyond the goals of standards based learning. The discussion reviews challenges that emerge in the process of realizing opportunities.

We next turn to a more detailed description of CVLCC and the bilingual teacher education program of SDSU and how the partnership between these institutions takes advantage of opportunities and resolves challenges encountered along the way. We call attention in particular to strategies the partners invoke to attain common goals, as well as their respective interdependent program objectives pertaining to high quality dual language education for San Diego's large Latino Spanish speaking bilingual population.

In the next section of the article, we then drill down to the classroom level and discuss instructional decision making of a fourth grade teacher team at CVLCC. The selected classrooms demonstrate strategies in action at the ground level to highlight how the school vision comes to manifest in the classroom with teachers and students as intellectual partners in learning that is both consistent with tenets of critical pedagogy and standards based education.

We close with comments on implications of the work for thinking about externally imposed demands on teachers, especially teachers of multilingual learners, as a result of social change in the form of increasingly multilingual classroom realities and education reform.

Selected General Opportunities and Challenges Presented by Common Core State Standards

States' and schools' adoption of Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts, and in Mathematics create both opportunities and challenges that can be addressed by innovative partnerships between bilingual teacher preparation programs and progressive schools implementing dual language programs and critical pedagogy based learning philosophies. The CCSS stress students' acquisition of high level thinking and communicative practices in subject matter areas that build on close-in comprehension of written texts and their ideas, and the ability to author texts with complex and dense communication of ideas. The CCSS also call attention to the important role played by related face-to-face speaking and listening skills supporting higher level thinking, reading and writing skills—intersecting areas that are extremely important for English Learners (Valdés, Kibler, and Walqui, 2014).

It is important to note that while the CCSS were written so as to be pertinent to high level academic functioning in English, they address skills that can be realized in any language and not just English. Accordingly, bilingual programs, and in particular dual language programs, must create opportunities for students to transfer

skills across languages—from a more familiar language such as Spanish to English and vice versa. This opportunity for rigorous academic functioning in multiple languages faces a sociopolitical challenge in that many educational policy makers and many in the public at large assume that an end goal of schooling is monolingualism in English rather than elective multilingualism. A strategy ameliorating this concern is to provide evidence that students participating in dual language programs acquire English proficiency and learn as effectively or even more effectively in English and their non-English language as other students from similar backgrounds (Callahan & Gándara, 2014). Research exists showing such evidence, especially when consideration is given to students' need to develop English proficiency over an extended period of schooling—see Umansky and Reardon (2014).

The CCSS were designed to be standards specifying goals for instructional outcomes known collectively as "21st century, college and career readiness skills" and were not intended to specify a curriculum to reach these goals. As we discuss in more detail later in this paper, this brings validation to programs such as CVLCC that envisioned similar goals for instructional outcomes even before the CCSS mandated them. The CCSS also presents further opportunities for implementers of dual language programs with value orientations and strategies for social justice and equity to reframe their curriculum based on a reading of "21st century, college and career readiness" that is consistent with their existing curriculum ideology, such as the case with CVLCC and its critical pedagogy approach. In particular it presents opportunities for teacher education programs, schools, teachers, students, and community members to frame education as fundamentally about teaching and learning activities constructed locally to reflect the linguistic, cultural, and social values of participants. A challenge is that some policy makers and members of the public at large may be fearful that students may be socialized to question existing patterns of distribution of power and privilege despite the democratic rights of U.S. citizens and residents. A strategy to address this challenge and support opportunities for an equity context in U.S. education is to show evidence that the beneficiaries of dual language and critical pedagogy based programs attuned to the CCSS produce active students, teachers, educators and community members concerned with the well being of not just their own immediate community, but of others, including a global community. We show how this goal of producing transformative global citizens is taken up in the partnership we will describe. We now turn to a brief description of the CVLCC school site and the SDSU bilingual teacher education program in the Dual Language and English Learner Education Department before describing how the partnership between these institutions takes advantage of opportunities and resolves challenges encountered along the way.

Chula Vista Learning Community Charter School: Promoting *Oportunidades* for Student Learning

Chula Vista Learning Community Charter School (CVLCC) was established in 1998 as a small elementary school serving primarily Latino students and has since increased its enrollment to over 800 students in grades K-10, with plans for further expansion. Currently, 95% of students are Latino, over 50% are enrolled in the free or reduced-price lunch program, and 53% are classified English Language Learners (ELLs) (California Department of Education, 2012). Over 65% of the school's teachers were credentialed at San Diego State University (SDSU) through the Dual Language and English Learner Education Department (DLE), formerly Department of Policy Studies in Language and Cross Cultural Education. The school has been widely recognized at the local and state levels for its innovative Spanish-English dual language program, which combines a biliteracy approach with a focus on critical pedagogy and global citizenship so that the goal of the teaching and learning process is to develop and strengthen a respect for human dignity, individual worth, and civic action in every student.

Within the school district, CVLCC is one of the highest performing schools and has drastically improved its Academic Performance Index scores from 680 in 2005 to 880 in 2012, exceeding the state goal of 800. In acknowledgement of this accomplishment the school was awarded the Title I Closing the Achievement Gap Award for the 2010-2011 academic year and was named a 2012 California Distinguished School (http://www.cvesd.org/Pages/home.aspx). In 2012, CVLCC adopted the national Common Core State Standards at all grade levels, one year before the standards were mandated (http://www.cvesd.org/Pages/home.aspx).

San Diego State University Dual Language Teacher Preparation Program: Promoting *Oportunidades* **for School Leadership and Collaborative Teacher Development**

The Dual Language and English Learner Education Department (DLE) prepares bilingual educators in policy and practice to meet the needs of English Learners in diverse settings from structured English immersion to dual language programs promoting biliteracy and global competence (http://go.sdsu.edu/education/dle/). The credential, certificate and Master of Arts programs prepares all students from undergraduate to graduate programs to be reflective and transformational practitioners for the purpose of elevating the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse learners through collaboration with schools, families and community. As of this writing, DLE has credentialed over 2,500 bilingual teachers.

Over a decade ago the DLE department at SDSU, seized an opportunity to promote transformative educational reform when it created a collaborative partnership with CVLCC's innovative school director and a group of highly qualified, progressive, and passionate dual language educators. The structure of this partnership is reciprocal in that teacher-leaders and administrators from CVLCC are also instructors in the credential, certificate, and Master of Arts programs. DLE faculty also provide professional development for the school teaching staff and engage in classroom observations as part of the practice that informs the pedagogy used in their methods courses. Furthermore, this partnership is reciprocal in that the school helps prepare pre-service, credential candidates with real time issues and strategies, and then, once candidates have received their credential they hire them to teach at the school, eventually helping to mentor the next generation of teachers. The school director explains, "Our purpose is to hire and retain teacher leaders that embrace a commitment to teaching and learning in a multilingual, global, and critically conscious environment. We actively seek graduates from the DLE program because teachers enter the classroom with a solid foundational knowledge about biliteracy/bicognition, biculturalism, and critical pedagogy" (Dr. Ramirez, personal communication, October 20, 2013).

The overarching mission of DLE is to prepare teachers to effectively serve students who come to school with a primary language other than English and to facilitate the learning process for students to become bilingual, biliterate/bicognitive, and multicultural. DLE's primary focus is to support educators at all levels in creating multicultural democratic practices and bring bicultural voices to the center of classroom discourse. In order to do so, the DLE faculty, program graduates, and administrators that hire these graduates have identified the "Five Things" graduates of the program know and are able to do in their classrooms.

1) **Ideological and pedagogical clarity:** DLE graduates develop a roadmap toward their ideological clarity as it relates to and informs their classroom practice. They know who they are as teachers, their personal beliefs about teaching and learning, and how this affects the students that they teach. This is a complex area of understanding that involves self-knowledge and dispositions that ensure that educators have a strong belief in the worth of all students and their ability to achieve.

2) **Biliteracy development and success across the content areas:** DLE graduates possess the theoretical knowledge on important socio-political issues and tensions surrounding language policy. Accordingly, graduates of DLE recognize their role as advocates for English and dual language learners in their classrooms and school communities. DLE graduates promote dual language learner student success through standards based instruction in Spanish and English. They create rich, authentic opportunities for students to read, write, speak, listen and think critically using the appropriate, grade-level academic language in order to develop biliteracy/bicognition in English and two or more additional languages.

3) **Collaborate with peers, students, parents, administrators, and community:** DLE graduates recognize that complex social relationships dictate equitable access to knowledge and power inside and outside of the classroom. The focus is to work side by side with key stakeholders in receiving and providing feedback at all levels. Critical to this process is the ability

to build authentic relationships by engaging in community scans and asset mapping to gain first hand information of community and students' funds of knowledge.

4) **Create inclusive learning environments:** DLE graduates are committed to creating inclusive learning communities, where teacher, school leadership, student, and parent each play an integral role in supporting student success. It includes considering students' cultural and linguistic background as assets, as well as using data on learning outcomes and performance, to inform differentiation and personalization of each student's instruction and services, and create partnerships between home and school.

5) **Global (linguistic and cultural) competence:** DLE graduates model and acquire teaching principles of global competence through respect of linguistic and cultural diversity in the classroom, school, and community. This perspective of critical-global literacy combined with their unique worldviews of respect for linguistic, cultural, and social perspectives empowers graduates of DLE to develop and enact 21st century pedagogies.

DLE prepares teachers to facilitate the development of students' bicultural/bicognitive identity and sense of belongingness as they negotiate at least two languages and two worlds. As Darder (2012) asserts, critical bicultural/bicognitive pedagogy holds the possibility for a discourse of hope in light of the social tensions, conflicts, and policy contradictions that students must face in the process of their bicultural development (p. 101).

We now turn to a discussion of particular on the ground strategies that have taken root in the collaboration between CVLCC and the DLE Department that have enabled fulfillment of the opportunities we have described.

A Collaborative Model for Preparing Critically Conscious Dual Language Educators: *Estrategias* for Realizing *Oportunidades*

Rather than following the status quo in teacher preparation and professional development, the DLE bilingual teacher preparation program and CVLCC entered into a partnership where the expectation and goal is for teachers to know and be able to engage all students in high quality instruction and full rigorous access to the curriculum regardless of students' language or socio-economic status. In order to do this well, teachers are guided to engage in the critical process of continuous learning and unlearning, conscious thinking and rethinking, and the commitment to change practice based on new understandings, with the desired outcome of improving student learning. This collaborative model was developed with the understanding that a student's school community, in this case the U.S.-Mexican border, provides the educator with the needed knowledge on how to contextualize and deliver the curriculum regardless of the restrictive language policies and standards waves. The infrastructure for this collaborative model sustains the bilingual community at the center. It is the heart—*el corazón*—of the program with the fundamental capacity to establish, cultivate, and support humanizing relationships that support the collective work of the community, pre-service teachers, practicing teachers, and the school leadership team.

Estrategia: Leadership Context

Given CVLCC's location, only eight miles from the California-Mexico border, the cultural and linguistic characteristics of the surrounding community are central to understanding school-level decision making and classroom practices. Romo and Chavez (2006) characterize the borderland as a hybrid space in which individuals are constantly negotiating multiple languages and identities: "the geopolitical border between Mexico and United States represents the beginnings, endings, and blending of languages, cultures, communities, and countries" (p. 142). Teaching and designing instruction for students in borderland contexts, consequently, raises a number of issues and challenges that are specific to the complex relationships between socio-economic status, race, culture, and language.

One of the ways in which the school's administration seeks to be responsive to the blending of cultures and hybrid language practices in their community is in the design of the dual language curriculum. Unlike other dual language programs in which students are primarily taught in their native language the first years—with incremental increases of English language instruction—students at CLVCC begin instruction in Kindergarten with 50% of instruction in English and 50% in Spanish. This decision, which has been contested by some proponents of the traditional dual language model, reflects the administration's knowledge of the community and understanding that most of their students are bicultural and biliterate upon entering school and benefit most from receiving equal instruction in both languages. The ultimate goal of the curriculum is for students to achieve and maintain fluency in both languages, not only in order to ensure high academic achievement, but to promote students' active membership and connection to the multiple languages and identities they navigate in their daily lives.

In their work on border pedagogy, Cline and Necochea (2006) have argued that teachers working in borderland communities require certain dispositions in order to appropriately serve their students. The characteristics identified in their research as contributing to effective teaching practices and supporting students in navigating two worlds are, "open-mindedness and flexibility", "passion for borderland education," "ongoing professional development", "cultural sensitivity", and a "pluralistic language orientation" (p. 271). At CVLCC, the close coordination and joint planning between teachers across language areas reflects a strong "pluralistic language orientation" and plays a critical role in reinforcing the status of Spanish within the curriculum. Students are held to the same rigorous standards and expectations in Spanish as in English and are taught to engage in critical thinking and reflection in both languages. As we describe in the next section, opportunities for ongoing professional development are designed to challenge and further develop teachers' thinking on key issues associated with teaching students in borderland contexts. Teachers are also prepared, supported, and expected to tailor instruction based on the specific characteristics and needs of their students and are encouraged to think of the classroom as a dynamic and ever-changing environment.

In addition to the role of teachers' practices and dispositions, Rodríguez and Alanís (2011) have identified three critical components of effective leadership in a dual language setting that draw heavily on the concept of "border epistemology of school leadership." These include advocacy, socially cognizant behavior, and curriculum expertise. CVLCC's school director, Dr. Ramirez, is a strong advocate for the benefits of the dual language approach and has been instrumental in creating a shared vision for the program, based on the critical pedagogy philosophy and its focus on social justice. He has worked to provide teachers with professional development and support that allow them to put key components of the curriculum, such as critical thinking, global citizenship, and community participation into practice. The fluid and open communication between the teachers and the school's administration, as well as the planning of instruction across subject areas and grade levels also helps to ensure that curriculum expertise, as well as knowledge of the community is shared and utilized to inform decision-making at all levels.

Beyond the CVLCC context, Dr. Ramirez is involved in advocating for the dual language approach as a member of the DLE bilingual teacher preparation program faculty. In this capacity, he applies his experience and expertise, in the form of concrete leadership and classroom examples, as well as school data, in support of implementing a critical pedagogy curriculum. CVLCC's strategies of leadership are mindful of the integration of the learner's language(s) and culture(s), promote the development of biliteracy/bicognition skills, and recognize the voices of students, community members, and teachers as crucial to the teaching and learning process.

Estrategia: **School-Wide, Ongoing Professional Development**

Because of the reciprocal nature of this collaboration, the DLE department chair, Dr. Alfaro, facilitated a one week Paulo Freire institute for the CVLCC teaching and administrative staff focused on the capacity to "begin anew," which constitutes one of the most critical qualities for fostering the transformation for teaching and learning: "The capacity to always begin anew, to make, to reconstruct, and to not spoil, to refuse to bureaucratize the mind, to understand and to live [life] as a process—live to become—is something that always accompanied me throughout my life. This is an indispensible quality of a teacher" (Freire, 1993, p. 98).

From a Freirean perspective, this professional development and many more that followed created a space

where everyone was challenged to rethink and renew their individual and collective vision beyond the standards and test results. Knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry human beings pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other (Darder, 2002).

This institute was grounded on the essentiality of inquiry through the process of critical dialogue among teachers with teachers, teachers with students, and students with students. Freire (1970) emphasized that dialogue is essential to the development of critical consciousness. The road to critical consciousness necessitates moving beyond the narrow focus on standards, methods, and test scores and toward a more humane and critical pedagogy that validates multiple perspectives and promotes students' engagement with their local and global world. In introducing the institute, Dr. Alfaro echoed this sentiment:

"I am humbled and honored to have the privilege of facilitating a team of highly talented, committed, passionate, intelligent and skilled educators from whom I learn so much. In our collective work this week we are aiming to interrogate through critical dialogue our ideology and our pedagogy to solidify our praxis and to begin anew. In closing the achievement gap, yes, we have shed the stereotypes and the deficit thinking attached to being a program improvement school and a school that teaches English Learners. But, we know there is more work to be done. We must be clear within ourselves and have this reflected in our own pedagogy and practice what it means to be transformational teacher-scholars."

It is important to note that this institute took place right at the height of the state and district acknowledgement of their success in closing the achievement gap from 680 to 880. When the CVLCC school director invited Dr. Alfaro to the school to facilitate this institute he mindfully stated, "At a time when we are celebrating and acknowledging our collective effort, passion, and hard work in leading our students' academic success, I don't want us to become complacent; I want us to be challenged to go deeper into our ideological and pedagogical clarity."

Bartolome (2008) has argued that pre-service and practicing teachers often emerge from teacher education programs having unconsciously absorbed assimilationist white supremacist, and deficit views of nonwhite, low-income, non-English speaking students. Despite there not being definitive research that links teachers' ideological stances with instructional practices, many scholars suggest that a teacher's ideological orientation is often reflected in his or her beliefs and attitudes and consequently reflected in the manner he or she teaches students (Alfaro, 2008; Bartolome, 2008; Cochran-Smith, 2004; Macedo, 2010; Nieto, 2010; Sleeter, 2001).

Facilitators and participants at the Paulo Freire institute shared a belief that equally as important to preparing teachers with the skills, strategies, cultural, and linguistic competence necessary to teach English and Dual Language Learners well, is the necessity for a teacher's mindfully-articulated ideological stance. In order for teachers to make an ideological shift that will positively impact the lives of students they must first confront the invisible yet pervasive nature of oppressive dominant ideologies and the harmful impact they have on the education of Latino immigrant children. It takes a teacher's conscious decision to juxtapose and better understand if, when, and how their belief systems uncritically reflect those of the dominant society and perpetuate unfair and inequitable conditions (Bartolome, 2008).

Ultimately we see that the collaborative model for preparing critically conscious dual language educators is sustained by a fundamental belief informed by critical pedagogy that teachers and their students must enter actively into posing problems within their curriculum context to consider possible strategies for intervening within their reality and thereby transforming their world. Through ongoing professional development, teachers and administrators at CVLCC alongside DLE faculty engage in a process of reflection and analysis to continuously evolve and re-conceptualize their pedagogy in order to best serve their students.

Teachers and Students as Intellectuals: *Estrategias* for Action and Interaction in the Classroom

The stance that CVLCC takes—that teachers and students are intellectuals—calls on teachers to develop a culturally relevant pedagogy that will not only authentically engage students, but also reinforces the inherent value and legitimacy of their knowledge and experiences and those of their community. The school's

Core Beliefs set expectations for students to "involve themselves in the community and establish awareness of global perspectives" (http://www.cvlcc.org/). The school's vision statement describes the school's "philosophy of critical pedagogy and international perspectives", and a desire to foster "critical and self-reflection" among students (http://www.cvlcc.org/). Together the school's Core Beliefs and vision statement announce a school-wide goal to promote academic achievement and a standards based education in English and Spanish that is concerned with worldwide equity through praxis. We highlight how the school vision comes to manifest in fourth grade classrooms by looking at fourth grade collaborative teacher planning, classroom interaction, and design and use of classroom environments.

At CVLCC, the fourth grade consists of a team of three teachers, a Spanish Language Arts/Social Science teacher, an English Language Arts teacher, and a Math/Science teacher. Each teacher has a class of approximately 30 students, who rotate to different classrooms to receive instruction in the three core content areas every day of the week. Teachers see approximately 90 students over three class periods each day. The Math/Science teacher delivers four days of math instruction and one day of science instruction per week. Instruction in the core content areas is reduced some days for instruction in Mandarin, Physical Education and a school-wide service learning component.

Estrategia: Collaborative Teacher Planning

In accordance with the CCSS, CVLCC teachers design curriculum and instruction with the aim of supporting students in both their acquisition of high level thinking skills and their ability to demonstrate understanding and create new knowledge through communicative practices that are academic and evidence-based. Significantly, these practices and goals were something CVLCC had done from the outset:

> "Since we first started the school, the vision has always been to make sure that we are producing transformative, critical thinking students. Basically, this means that they are able to adapt to any kind of situation, and we are providing them with tools to empower themselves and to become leaders. In order to do that, students need to be able to negotiate with each other. They need to be agreeing and disagreeing in a respectful manner so that they can be leaders. They need to be able to substantiate their opinions and what they stand for with facts and evidence" (Mrs. Maldonado, curriculum specialist interview).

CVLCC shares CCSS's emphasis on the production of high-level academic language for the specific reason that the school views language as the essential means through which students empower themselves. Mrs. Maldonado continues:

> "And we have always been about dialogue…We wanted to allow them to make mistakes; we had to make sure that we had a low affective filter, whether it was in an English classroom or in a Spanish classroom…We always wanted to make sure that our kids were able to use that craft of the language to become authors. Even before CCSS, we were having author fairs, where students were writing books and then presenting them to the community and putting them in the library, and having our kids being researchers, going out into the communities and doing service learning projects" (curriculum specialist interview).

The school's focus on developing literacy in English and Spanish, combined with expectations for students' high-level academic functioning positioned the school to use the CCSS as an opportunity to elevate teacher and student practices that were authentically generated from and, therefore relevant to, the socio-cultural context of the school community.

During collaborative teacher planning, the school administration and support staff, such as content specialists and literacy coaches, work with teachers to support their instructional decision making processes and to ensure that adequate progress is being made in terms of their team-and school-established, end-of-unit, and end-of-school year expectations. The fourth grade team has combined four hours of horizontal planning among themselves, as well as vertical planning with the fifth grade team each week, for curriculum design and to coordinate lessons. The addition of vertical planning with strategic grade clusters since CCSS implementation demonstrates how the school interpreted the CCSS—in this case, vertical alignment of anchor standards—in

order to elevate, with purpose and intentionality, what they had already been practicing around collaborative teacher planning (Mr. Lyons, teacher interview).

Estrategia: Classroom Interaction

Teachers' dialogic learning in their professional development and collaborative teacher planning, coupled with their commitment to a critical pedagogy philosophy impacts teachers' ideas about the important role of dialogue in students' learning process:

> "To think and dialogue about text and come out with a total changed thought is a mind-set that says, 'There is no wrong answer,' and 'I am going to enter into this process with my own thinking and I am going to leave with changed thinking due to what happened throughout this process.' This mind-set allows one to feel vulnerable to say, 'Oh, I don't get this,' or 'What do you mean by that?' These are things I like to celebrate with my students" (Mr. Lyons, teacher interview).

During one lesson, the fourth grade English Language Arts teacher, Mr. Lyons, directly addressed the fact that many students would encounter barriers along their close reading process, which is an area of emphasis in the CCSS. He explained as he drew a staircase with landings and roadblocks on the white board, "Each time someone in our community of learners encounters a barrier, dialogue breaks down those barriers and leads to better comprehension of the text." Mr. Lyons anticipates Shanahan (2013), who warned, "under the CCSS, students will be more frustrated by challenging texts, and this means other instructional supports will be needed to help and encourage them along this path. Teachers must learn to anticipate text challenges and how to support students to allow them to negotiate texts successfully, but without doing the work for them" (p. 6). On view of a critical pedagogy philosophy where the teacher is not the sole producer of legitimate knowledge, Mr. Lyons depends on student-to-student dialogue as instructional support.

The school's emphasis on dialogical classrooms, or as one administrator described, "productive noise in classrooms," makes the CCSS for Speaking and Listening of central importance because they provide the foundation for classroom interaction and student voice. Teacher designed work documents help students record and structure their thinking for subsequent communication; CCSS Speaking and Listening standards set expectations for their oral language production and reception. For example, after a pair of students completed a work document related to an informational text they had read, they formed a group of four students, exchanged documents, and engaged in dialogue to share feedback verbally. During this group dialogue one fourth grader said:

> "….it is important to understand what the author states in the text because they have their opinion, then we have the teacher's opinion, then I have my own opinion which I formed by looking at evidence in the text and, finally, my own experience—where I live in relation to the world. The dialogue with my classmates helps me to view things through different perspectives…"

The teacher's emphasis on critical thinking and the co-construction of knowledge through interaction are key elements of the teacher's critical pedagogy perspective. Throughout the peer editing activity students are continuously provided with opportunities to challenge and revise their own thinking, as well as that of their peers. Significantly dialogue was the centerpiece of this learning process: whenever students would hit a barrier or reach a plateau the teacher facilitated their collaboration and reliance on each other to push each other's thinking. Students possessed the language (using sentence frames earlier in the year) to say, for example, "Can you please rephrase your question, could you please clarify, I don't understand?" Collaborative, dialogical work built and sustained the learning community because students had the respectful language to be critical and the confidence to ask for clarification. The dialogical process of student empowerment is not just a student phenomenon, but takes place within the solidarity of relationships with others (Darder, 2002). Teachers create dialogical conditions within their classroom to support their student's process of developing a language of critique for both individual and collaborative empowerment.

Previous research has established the importance of a "facilitative social environment" (Flores, 2007, p. 34), where the teacher is "key not only in organizing the social uses and practices of language(s), both oral and written across social contexts, but also in the type of social interactions, socio-cultural rituals, expectations, and

respeto/respect that become the ways of knowing, the ways of being, the ways of acting, the ways of doing, and the ways of socially interacting in the classroom" (p. 34, original emphasis). At the beginning of a curricular unit, Mr. Lyons discussed with his students how he viewed their role in their own learning and that of their peers: "This year you are the teacher, you are responsible for your learning and that of your classroom community." It was common for Mr. Lyons to refer to students as teachers. For example, during the same activity discussed above, Mr. Lyons facilitated a discussion, "Ok, now, so your job as teachers: How can you help him?" In keeping with a Freireian conception of critical pedagogy, Mr. Lyons works to create a classroom environment where every teacher is a learner, every learner is a teacher (Freire, 1970).

Estrategia: **Classroom Environment and Artifacts**

The teachers' efforts to integrate the critical pedagogy approach with the Common Core State Standards in both languages are also reflected in the classroom environment and the various artifacts students interact with, which include, but are not limited to classroom displays and bulletin boards, worksheets and handouts, and student "cuadernos" (*journals*). The room environment reflects thinking process. Rather than room environments only posting student work, which can have limited and disconnected relevancy to ongoing learning, teacher and administrators ask, "Can my students use the room to help them think about the lesson that is being taught?" For example, in one fourth grade Spanish Language Arts classroom, the teacher designed a large bulletin board, which provided an elaborate visual representation of the process of analyzing and working with different types of texts. The board depicted the silhouette of a person holding up a sign (in a protest-like posture) displaying a phrase that was referenced and recited by the teacher and students regularly and included in other teaching materials: "Los seres humanos piensan libremente y pueden crear su propio entendimiento del mundo." ("*Human beings think freely and can create their own understanding of the world.*") The phrase, which is heavily influenced by the critical pedagogy perspective, highlights the importance of critical thinking as a universal value, applicable to all people and realms of life, rather than a skill necessary for academic achievement.

On the same bulletin board, underneath the person holding up the sign, there was a statement that read, "Somos críticos, distinguimos entre información" (*"we are critical, we distinguish between information* [*that is*]") followed by the words "objetiva" (*objective*) and "subjectiva" (*subjective*) and a list of features associated with each type of information. The board also illustrated the steps students are expected to follow when analyzing texts, which involve: "escribiendo notas en el margen" ("*writing notes in the margin*"), "analizando palabras desconocidas" ("analyzing unfamiliar words"), and using their notes to identify the author's main argument and supporting details. Alongside these steps, the teacher attached samples of students' work to the board, showcasing their note-taking practices, as well as the worksheets students were using to help them decipher unfamiliar terms found in the text.

The bulletin board described is an example of how the teachers at the school work to bridge some of the principles of a critical pedagogy-inspired curriculum with the Common Core State Standards, which represent a more teacher-directed and outcomes-based approach. The focus on text analysis, particularly of 'informational texts', as well as students' ability to extract an author's key arguments and supporting evidence from a text are all key components of the fourth grade CCSS reading standards. While the goal of developing these specific skills is visible in the bulletin board's content, there also appears to be a strong focus on the process of learning and on how to support students in engaging with and finding meaning in texts.

The blending of both approaches through classroom artifacts can also be seen in the English Language Arts classrooms. In Mr. Lyons' fourth grade class, the following phrase was displayed on one of the classroom walls: "A Community Conscious of Others." There was also a poster that specified the "Expectations of Dialogue" for the class, which included: "Listen to others' ideas with care," "Ask questions to check understanding of information," and "Respect your classmates' ideas." These statements and guidelines are oriented towards building community in the classroom and establishing values for learning with others and appear to draw from the emphasis in critical pedagogy on dialogue and reflection. Similarly to the Spanish Language Arts class billboard, these English classroom displays co-exist with others that provide definitions for terms, such as 'metaphors' and 'similes', as well as 'figurative language', which reflect a concern for acquiring specific grade-level skills and

concepts. Another large bulletin board titled, "We are critical readers and precise writers," provided students with a diagram outlining the features and structure of a narrative text, as well as the process involved in the close reading of text, which was broken down into steps very similar to those in the Spanish class.

The examples discussed illustrate some of the ways in which the teachers at the school negotiate and generate connections between the critical pedagogy perspective and the demands of a standards-based teaching approach. Some of the practices that are represented visually in the classrooms, such as close reading and analysis of texts, seem to be closely tied to the CCSS and the academic skills prioritized by the standards. The more philosophical and process-oriented elements, however, indicate 1) the teachers' self-perception not as technicians but as intellectuals who facilitate learning, and 2) the teachers' efforts to broaden students' understanding of learning beyond immediate education outcomes through the creation of classroom environments that are grounded in reflection and critical thinking.

Conclusion: Facing up to *Retos*

While the experience of one particular dual language program cannot provide answers to the many *retos* that arise in dynamic and linguistically and culturally complex education settings, the work of teachers and administrators at CVLCC sheds light on the type of problem-solving and strategies that come into play in trying to meet the many challenges presented by a growing bicultural and biliterate Latino population in the current education scenario. At the heart of CVLCC's approach lies a spirit of collaboration and partnership, which facilitates the flow of ideas between the SDSU bilingual teacher education program, the school's administration, and the teachers implementing the curriculum. In addition to reinforcing a common ideology and vision for the school, these partnerships help ensure consistency and quality at all levels of the program. The ongoing professional development opportunities and leadership of the administration also support teachers in articulating and unifying the goals of the CCSS with those of a critical pedagogy-based curriculum.

One of the challenges, which the case of CVLCC highlights, is the tensions teachers encounter when attempting to meet external education standards that demand immediate outcomes and often conflict with the goals of culturally and linguistically responsive curriculum. As some of the examples discussed illustrate, developing and exploring different strategies that can help align a dual language, critical pedagogy-based curriculum requires that, when analyzing and implementing the CCSS, teachers have knowledge of their students and the broader school community, and flexibility in classroom level decision-making. Meeting this challenge allows teachers to tailor content to best suit the interests and needs of their students and is essential to implementing a truly student-centered curriculum that positions students as intellectuals and agents of change in their own right.

Implementing a dual language curriculum that is both culturally responsive and attends to the academic language development of students is highly challenging. The CCSS place an emphasis, across grades, on students' developing the ability to comprehend and generate complex texts involving communication of information—and to do it in ways that involve high level reasoning skills and linguistic skills that increasingly support academic content learning. The primary focus espoused by many proponents of the CCSS is the preeminent need for students to process texts as isolated, decontextualized sources of information based on their linguistic features including vocabulary, sentence syntax, and intersentential discourse cohesion markers—the ways syntax structurally glues together the meaning of different statements and the ideas they convey (Durán, 2014). Accordingly, the CCSS does present a challenge for teachers to develop a teaching repertoire inclusive of English language development and, more specifically, of how English learners acquire sophisticated comprehension and productive fluency in a wide range of language registers, and language structures performing illocutionary functions common to academic work. We find it problematic that these CCSS standards do not include attention to ways that the design of pedagogy itself must connect issues of developing students' ability to deal with text complexity given the linguistic, sociocultural, and contextual demands of reading tasks and given student characteristics and social identities in school and classroom settings. This proves even more challenging in the context of dual language education where the status of two (or more) languages connects the life and languages of a community with learning at school. That stated, we welcome this challenge given the opportunities and strategies presented by joining dual language programs with efforts to implement schooling informed by a critical pedagogy through a

teacher preparation program. We have discussed one university and school partnership that refuses to implement the CCSS in a way that reduces language to a technical skill devoid of complex sociocultural meaning and power; and we argue that this partnership is sustained by a fundamental belief that teachers must be prepared to make the "ideological shift" necessary for providing all students with access to the state-adopted academic standards without standardizing their language, knowledge or creativity (Quezada & Alfaro, 2012). Ultimately, teachers and administrators at CVLCC and DLE faculty view the new standards reform, not as an astronomical shift, but rather as another instance when externally imposed demands of the state, county, and/or district must be used as an opportunity to reaffirm and elevate what the school has been doing for the last decade to successfully close the achievement gap.

References

Alfaro, C. (2008). Teacher education examining beliefs, orientations, ideologies & practices. In Bartolome, L. (Ed), *Ideologies in education: Unmasking the trap of teacher neutrality.* Vol. 319, Peter Lang Publishing Group.

Bartolome, L. (2008). (Ed). *Ideologies in education: Unmasking the trap of teacher neutrality.* Vol. 319, Peter Lang Publishing Group.

California Department of Education. (2012). *School Accountability Report Card: Chula Vista Learning Community Charter School.* Retrieved January 22, 2014 from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/

Callahan, R. & Gándara. P. (Eds.) (2014). *The bilingual advantage language, literacy and the US labor market.* Buffalo New York: Multilingual Matters.

Cline, Z. & Necochea, J. (2006). Teacher dispositions for effective education in the Borderlands. The Educational Forum, 70, 268-282.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity and social justice in teacher education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Darder, A. (2012). *Culture and power in the classroom: Educational foundations for the schooling of bicultural students.* New York: Paradigm Publishers.

Darder, A. (2002). *Reinventing Paulo Freire: A pedagogy of love.* Westview Press.

Durán, R. P. (2014). Beyond educational standards: Latino student learning agency and identity in context. In P. Portes, S. Salsa, P. Baquedano-Lopez, and P. Mellom (Eds.) *U.S. Latinos and education policy: Research-based directions for change* (pp. 204-215). New York: Routledge.

Flores, B. (2007). Biliteracy as social practice in schooling: Bilingual first grader's journey in learning to read and write in L1 and L2. In Y. Goodman and P. Martens (Eds). *Critical issues in early literacy: Research and pedagogy* (pp. 31-45). New York: Routledge.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the city.* New York: Continuum.

Gándara, P. C., & Contreras, F. (2009). *The Latino education crisis: The consequences of failed social policies.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Macedo, D. (2010, February 12). Personal communication.

Nieto, S. (2010). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives,* v. 2. New York: Routledge.

Oakes, J. (2013). Evidence and activism: Research to challenge structures of inequality. Social Justice in Education Award.

Orfield, G. (2014). Tenth annual brown lecture in education research: A new civil rights agenda for American education. *Educational Researcher,* 43(6), 273–292.

Quezada, R. & Alfaro, C. (2012). Moving pedagogical mountains: Cutting to the core. *Language Magazine,* 11(12), 19-22.

Portes, P., Salas, S., Baquedano-Lopez, P., & Mellom, P. (Eds.) (2013). *U.S. Latinos and education policy: Research-based directions for change.* New York: Routledge.

Rodríguez, M.A. & Alanís, I. (2011). Negotiating linguistic and cultural identify: One borderlander's leaderhip initiative. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice, 14(1),* 103-117. DOE: 10. 1080/13603120903386951.

Romo, J. J., & Chavez, C. (2006, June). Border pedagogy: A study of preservice teacher transformation. *In The Educational Forum, 70(2),* 142-153. Taylor & Francis Group.

Sleeter, C. (2001). *Culture, difference, and power.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Shanahan, T. (2013, Fall). Letting the text take center stage: How the common core state standards will transform English language arts instruction. *American Educator.* 4-11.

Umansky, I. M., & Reardon, S. F. (2014). Reclassification patterns among Latino English learner students in bilingual,

dual immersion, and English immersion classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal,* 51(5), 879–912.

Valdés, G., Kibler, A., & Walqui, A. (2014, March). *Changes in the expertise of ESL professionals: Knowledge and action in an era of new standards.* Alexandria, VA: TESOL International Association

Valencia, R. (2008). *Chicano students and the courts: The Mexican American legal struggle for educational equality.* New York: New York University Press.

Valencia, R. (2010). *Dismantling contemporary deficit thinking:* Educational thought and practice. New York: Routledge.

Methods and Beyond: Learning to Teach Latino Bilingual Learners in Mainstream Secondary[3] Classes

Laura Schall-Leckrone
Lesley University

Christina Pavlak
Quinnipiac University

Abstract

This article reports empirical evidence about the influence of a pre-service methods course on preparing aspiring and practicing content teachers to work with adolescent bilingual learners in secondary schools. Qualitative methods were used to analyze the extent to which participants developed abilities to plan instruction and to think complexly about instruction for bilingual learners in mainstream classes. Data sources included surveys, observations, interviews, and student work including an electronic blog. Findings suggest that although participants felt more prepared to teach bilingual learners, their skill in planning instruction for bilingual learners and ability to think complexly about such instruction varied. Secondary content teachers also recognized roles as language teachers and advocates for immigrant and bilingual adolescents. Further research is recommended to follow participants into the classroom, provide site-based coaching, observe continued teacher development, and assess pupil learning.

Introduction

Throughout the United States, schools are experiencing a dramatic increase in the enrollment of Latino youth who are rapidly immersed in "English-only" classes due to political and financial pressures as well as the accountability mandates of No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Pandya, Batalova, & McHugh, 2011). Currently, Latino bilingual learners (BLs)[4] must learn academic content through English as they develop English proficiency to pass high stakes assessments in English (Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008). Yet the vast majority of teachers have received little to no training to teach culturally and linguistically diverse youth (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008). Given these factors, it is no surprise that the academic achievement of Latino BLs lags behind native English-speaking peers on virtually all education measures (Seeking Effective Policy for ELLs, 2007). As a matter of social justice, teacher education programs must equip all teachers to work with Latino BLs. Accordingly, in this article we assess the influence of coursework within a teacher education program on preparing secondary teachers to teach BLs in English language arts, history, math, science, and world languages classes.

Teacher education programs with an explicit social justice mission envision a dual role for teachers: they provide quality instruction to all learners in the status quo while working to transform educational systems from within (Cochran-Smith, 2010). Arguably, the most important component of a social justice teaching practice is the ability to teach diverse learners well (McDonald & Zeichner, 2010). Aspiring teachers can learn to implement

---

3. With our title, we pay tribute to Bartolomé, L. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. Harvard Educational Review, 64(2), 173-194, whose work influenced our study.

4. We use the asset-based term "bilingual learners" instead of "English language learners" (ELLs) to represent these students in recognition of the fact that another language—Spanish— is spoken at home. Our research focuses on the population of BLs that is still developing academic English proficiency prerequisite to school success.

research-based instructional approaches that have been developed to teach BLs in content classes. For example, the Sheltered Immersion Observation Protocol (SIOP) was designed to guide planning, implementation, and evaluation of effective mainstream instruction for BLs (Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2013). With SIOP lessons, content and language objectives are identified, presented, and enacted through a variety of instructional practices (Echevarría, et al., 2013). See Table 1 for six SIOP tenets of effective instruction.[5]

Table 1: *SIOP Tenets of Effective Instruction (adapted from Echevarría, et al., 2013)*

Tenet 1	Activate Prior Knowledge and Build Background
Tenet 2	Provide Comprehensible Input
Tenet 3	Teach Learning Strategies and Strategic Thinking
Tenet 4	Create Varied Opportunities for Student Engagement and Interaction
Tenet 5	Provide Opportunities for Students to Practice and Apply Knowledge Using All Communicative Modes
Tenet 6	Review and Assess Learning Objectives and Provide Feedback to Students

SIOP teachers first activate prior knowledge and build background knowledge, for instance, by teaching key vocabulary. They provide comprehensible input by using extra-linguistic scaffolds such as visuals and graphic organizers, speaking clearly, and using gestures. They model strategic thinking and explicitly teach learning strategies, then create opportunities for students to engage in structured interactions through group/partner activities using all communicative modes: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. SIOP teachers assess students' mastery of content and language objectives, provide feedback and review their objectives at the lesson's conclusion. Researchers suggest that SIOP methods engage BLs in rigorous content learning in mainstream settings and improve learning outcomes (Echevarria, et al., 2013; Echevarría, Short & Powers, 2006; Short & Echevarría, 1999).

Nonetheless, teaching is more than a technical matter or a "politically neutral activity" (Bartolomé, 1994, p.178; Cochran-Smith, 2010); faithful mastery of particular teaching techniques does not guarantee student learning (Bartolomé, 2004). Teachers also must learn to critically examine instructional methods— intended to increase access to academic content—to understand their actual impact on diverse learners. As Richert, Donahue, and Laboskey (2010) noted in regard to teaching students of color, but also applicable to working with Latino BLs:

> [T]eachers need to learn . . . pedagogical approaches that have resulted in high achievement for students of color, but not in a rote fashion. If new teachers are to employ these strategies appropriately, they must understand their philosophical, theoretical, and empirical justifications. (p. 645)

In other words, teachers must think critically about instructional methods and the learning needs of BLs within the current accountability culture of U.S. schools (Bartolomé, 1994; Sleeter, 2009). Along these lines, Cochran-Smith (2010) suggests it is not just about "what teachers *do*" but "how [they] think about their work" (p. 454, emphasis in original). As part of teacher preparation, Bartolomé (2004) further recommends teachers examine the "ideology," that is, beliefs, values, and assumptions that may unconsciously inform their thoughts and actions when working with linguistic minority students (p. 97). Teachers can learn to think critically about their work during coursework according to Sleeter (2009), who developed a matrix for evaluating complex thinking. (See Table 2.)

---

5. We borrow usage of the word "tenet" to describe components of SIOP instruction and conceived of this table based on a presentation by Dr. C. Patrick Proctor within a secondary bilingual methods course at Boston College.

Table 2: *Matrix for Evaluating the Complexity of Teacher Thinking (adapted from Sleeter, 2009)*

	Perspective Taking	Self-reflexivity
Novice	Assumes there is a correct body of knowledge and way to teach.	Strives for certainty.
Developing	Willing to consider multiple ways of knowing and teaching.	Willing to acknowledge uncertainty.
Accomplished	Actively seeks multiple perspectives on knowledge and teaching.	Views uncertainty as a tool for learning.

Two components of complex thinking are *perspective-taking* and *self-reflexivity*. When teachers develop skills in these areas, "they actively seek multiple perspectives" and "view uncertainty as a tool for learning, monitoring, questioning, and evaluating practice and the ethical impact of work on students" (Sleeter, 2009, p. 5). Teachers, who think complexly about the instruction of BLs in mainstream secondary settings, learn to critically examine their role, the role of students, and the power dynamics of historically marginalized groups in schools (Martin & VanGunten, 2002). Similarly, Santoro (2009) quoting Palmer says, "When I do not know myself, I cannot know who my students are…and when I cannot see them clearly I cannot teach them well" (p. 41). Some researchers claim the ability to think complexly is an aspect of the development of reflective judgment within the larger context of adult maturation (Friedman & Schoen, 2009; Kitchener & King, 1990). Similar to Sleeter (2009), we believe the ability to think complexly about teaching Latino BLs can progress in the context of teacher education coursework.

There is a small body of literature that describes thoughts, attitudes or beliefs of teachers who demonstrate expertise in working with culturally and linguistically diverse learners (Bartolomé, 2004; Clayton, 2008; see especially Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Lucas, Villegas & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008). As part of a larger framework for preparing teachers to work with linguistically diverse students, Lucas and Villegas (2011) define three related "orientations" that should be integrated into teacher belief systems: "sociolinguistic consciousness, value for linguistic diversity, [and the] inclination to advocate for ELL learners" (see pp. 56-60). First, teachers with sociolinguistic consciousness understand how language, culture, and identity interconnect in the learning process. As Lucas and Villegas (2011) further explain:

> Such teachers [reflect on] their assumptions about ELLs and [understand] their perceptions of language, language use, and language learning are shaped by their own and their students' socio-cultural positioning. (p. 59)

Second, by valuing linguistic diversity: that is, use of home language and/or non-standard forms of English, teachers promote relationships with students that are conducive to learning and increase classroom interaction (Delpit, 2006; Heath, 1996; Nieto, 2000). With the third orientation, developing the inclination to advocate for BLs, teachers assume a role beyond the classroom to address systemic inequities that affect the educational experience of individual students or groups of students (Cochran-Smith, 2010).

However, limited empirical research explores how teachers develop these attitudes/beliefs to work effectively with bilingual learners. Through case study research, Clayton (2008) found commonalities among exemplary teachers of BLs; they had experienced immersion in another culture and second language learning, understood second language development, and demonstrated kindness, sensitivity, and encouragement toward

students. Similarly, Bartolomé (2004) noted exemplary educators of non-White and linguistic minority students shared "border-crossing experiences" that enabled them to see how certain cultural groups are marginalized, empathize with them, and take action on behalf of students (see pp.109-112). Through surveys, researchers also have found experiencing another culture, learning a second language, and working with BLs results in more positive attitudes (Youngs & Youngs, 2001). However, O'Brien (2009) found that Florida history teachers who experienced 60 mandated hours of in-service training to work with BLs demonstrated negative attitudes toward BLs, which were perhaps "rooted in the teachers inability to effectively modify instruction" (p. 36). In this qualitative study, we built on prior research to examine whether teachers develop skill in particular instructional methods and the ability to think complexly about such teaching in the context of teacher education coursework, so they might work effectively with Latino bilingual learners within the current system while also working toward transforming it.

Research Design

Our practitioner research study (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009) took place within a secondary BL methods course in a teacher education program at a Jesuit university in a city in the northeastern United States. We explored the following two-part research question adapted from Sleeter (2009):

> What is the influence of a methods course on a) teacher development of instructional strategies
> to teach BLs in mainstream settings and b) to think critically about their role as educators?

To understand the influence of the methods course on participants, we drew on the following data sources: observations, surveys, and assignments. The second author observed while the first author taught the fall 2011 course section. Overall, however, surveys and class assignments were used most extensively in our analysis. Surveys were administered at the beginning, middle, and end of the semester. The pre-survey elicited basic demographic information from students and information about their "border-crossing" experiences. It also consisted of open response questions, prompting participants to consider what they hoped to learn (see Appendix A). Mid-term and post surveys asked participants what they had learned and still hoped to learn regarding teaching Latino BLs. Assignments included pre and post course reflections on how their beliefs, values, and assumptions would affect their teaching practice with BLs (see Appendix B), electronic blogs in which students responded to readings and one another, and a culminating assignment in which students wrote a complete SIOP lesson plan in narrative format (see Echevarría, et al., 2013, pp. 297-302 for sample SIOP lesson templates). (See Table 3.)

Table 3: *Research Methods*

Data Source	Participants	Frequency	Data Totals
Reflections	4 Students	6 times over the course of the semester: pre- reflection, 4 reading responses, and post-reflection	24 completed reflections
Surveys	All 54 Students	Pre, Mid- and End of Semester	162 surveys
Class Assignments	4 Students	Evaluation of SIOP lesson plan. (4 students)	4 completed SIOPs
Class Observations	33 Students 1 Instructor	Four times over the course of the semester	4 sets of field notes
Interviews	3 instructors	Once prior to teaching the course	3 Interview responses

We analyzed surveys from students in two sections of the bilingual methods course: one taught by the first author in the fall of 2011 and the other, by the second author in the summer of 2011. Students completed more assignments than those listed in Table 3. Since a choice was offered among several inquiry projects, including a school ethnography or interview with a BL, for consistency, we do not include them as data sources.

Four students were selected for in-depth study (see below) whose reflections and SIOP lesson plans are presented in more detail. In sum, we looked comprehensively at the influence of the course on all students via the surveys but more closely examined selected students' development in specific areas through their course assignments: namely, the abilities to develop targeted instructional strategies (see Table 1) and also to think complexly about their teaching (see Table 2).

Bilingual Secondary Methods Course

The bilingual secondary methods course is designed to promote awareness of methods that help BLs develop academic language and content concurrently in mainstream classes. Further, participants explore contextual factors that influence how BLs negotiate the secondary school experience including educational policy and issues of language and culture. Each session consists of an interactive PowerPoint presentation, practice with SIOP components, and discussion. The first class, students form content-based interest groups to provide structured peer interactions in which to explore discipline-specific readings and language demands, and to, ideally, develop more complexity in their thinking. Throughout the semester, students write reflections in which they consider their role, the role of students, and their responsibilities as teachers of linguistically diverse adolescents in the current accountability culture in U.S. schools.

Participants

Fifty-four of the 73 students enrolled in two sections of the course consented to participate in our study. Six were undergraduates and 48 were graduate students representing varied content areas: 21 English language arts (ELA), 12 history, 7 math, 6 world languages, 4 science, 2 math/science, 1 special educator, and 1 focused on ESL.

The four graduate students selected for further study were chosen to represent core content areas and a range of backgrounds but shared one common characteristic: they each appeared highly engaged in the course, so we felt we could learn the most from them (Sleeter, 2009). Table 4 provides basic information on each focus student.

Table 4: *Focus students*

Name	Content Area	Demographics	Age
Evelina	Math	White, female, monolingual from northeastern United States	24
Becky	Science	White, female, monolingual from southern United States	26
Victoria	History	White, bilingual (French-English) female from southeastern United States	23
Gabriel	ELA	Male of African ancestry who immigrated as a child from a Latin American country	30

Focal students ranged in age from 23 to 30 years of age. Three were white females and one, a man of color, reflecting a typical racial and gender balance in the female-dominated, predominantly white U.S. teaching force (Zumwalt & Craig, 2008). They also ranged in language-learning experience; Victoria is bilingual; Becky and Gabriel first spoke non-standard dialects of English, while Evelina is monolingual.

Data Analysis

We collected and analyzed data in an iterative fashion using inductive and deductive reasoning. Ryan and Bernard (2000) note, "researchers start with some general themes derived from reading the literature and add more themes and sub-themes as they go" (p. 781). Based on our review of the literature, we pre-established two themes connected to our research question: the development of targeted instructional strategies and the ability to think critically about such instruction. We evaluated participants' ability to plan instruction in SIOP lesson plans (Echevarria et al., 2013). We also rated the complexity of participants' thinking in reflections and electronic blogs using Sleeter's (2009) rubric. We coded surveys and participant reflections using constructivist grounded theory to identify additional themes (Charmaz, 2000). As Lather (1986) noted: Data must be allowed to generate propositions in a dialectical manner that permits use of a priori theoretical frameworks, but which keeps a particular framework from becoming the container into which the data must be poured. (p. 266) In sum, we started with two broad themes based on extant literature and added sub-themes during the research process (Ryan & Bernard, 2000). Multiple data sources: survey and class assignments (including reflections, electronic blogs, and lesson plans) were triangulated to identify and substantiate research themes. Further, the validity of findings was enhanced by a consensual approach to data analysis (Hill, Thompson & Williams, 1997). As such, the two authors agreed on themes and ratings for each of the focal students and student surveys. This iterative process of reviewing literature, data collection, coding (Charmaz, 2003; Strauss, 1987), and consensual data analysis allowed us to attend to the nuances of students' experiences in the methods course.

Results

Overall, we sought to ascertain the influence of the methods course on the development of targeted instructional strategies to teach Latino BLs in mainstream settings and to think complexly about such instruction. Analyses of participant reflections, blog postings, surveys, and SIOP lesson plans revealed three additional themes: content teachers as language teachers, the importance of getting to know students, and teachers as change agents. Accordingly, this section is divided into five parts: the development of instructional strategies; content teachers as language teachers; thinking complexly about instruction; getting to know students; and teachers as change agents.

The development of instructional strategies

On pre-surveys, the vast majority of participants reported wanting to learn effective methods to teach BLs. Fewer than half had worked with BLs previously, and only one third had prior teaching experience. On post-surveys, most students seemed to feel more prepared. One participant explained the importance of activating prior knowledge and making content comprehensible: key SIOP components:

> I must … be mindful day in and day out of how the material is . . . presented…. It is essential to
> value … students' backgrounds and … prior knowledge, and… to make the curriculum . . . relevant
> to every student.

Analysis of lessons from focal students, however, revealed a range in abilities to plan SIOP instruction. Becky's 21-page, single-spaced science lesson reflected painstaking attention to detail. An introductory section explained the class context and included a color-coded system of worksheets for BLs at different proficiency levels. Vocabulary was sub-divided into sections including "brick" terms, "mortar" terms (see Zwiers, 2008), primary, and secondary words. Similarly, in math and history lessons, respectively, Evelina and Victoria incorporated key SIOP elements: precise language and content objectives, vocabulary instruction, and opportunities for interactive and presentational communication in speaking and writing. Though less detailed than Becky, these two students also mastered how to plan a SIOP lesson. In contrast, Gabriel's ELA lesson featured some SIOP elements, such as a graphic organizer and group and pair discussions, but lacked sufficient detail to convey how various activities were connected. Even though he identified a content objective, "Students will demonstrate . . . they can use textual evidence to answer a posed question and justify an interpretation of a text," it was unclear how this objective would be implemented. He also called for students to share rituals related to their cultures, but there was no corresponding activity. Although Gabriel showed the ability to think complexly about issues of teaching

and learning, he struggled with lesson planning. While students felt better prepared to teach BLs having been exposed to SIOP, their ability to create SIOP lessons varied. Further, we recognized participants would need additional support for this preparation to translate to effective teaching practice.

Content teachers as language teachers

On post-surveys, many content teachers expressed awareness of the need to teach language— a key theme of the course. As one math teacher noted, "…I learned . . . every teacher, no matter their content area, is a language teacher." Similarly, Evelina acknowledged a shift in her language awareness: "I've. . . developed a deeper appreciation for providing students with the opportunity to produce language in a mathematics classroom." She sought to move beyond traditional math instruction characterized by "the teacher explaining information and the students listening, reading and taking notes, and then solving calculations-based problems." Instead, she aimed to "increase language production" by "explicitly encouraging . . . students to engage in mathematical conversations with each other." Evelina also recognized "specific [linguistic features] of mathematics (e.g. long, complex noun phrases; passive voice)," noting, "I now feel better prepared to address these challenges in the classroom." These results are encouraging; for BLs to succeed in grasping relevant content knowledge and develop proficiency in content language, content teachers must embrace their role as language teachers (de Jong & Harper, 2005) and provide students with abundant opportunities to interact (Verplaetse, 2008).

Thinking complexly about instruction

As mentioned, we used Sleeter's (2009) matrix to evaluate the complexity of students' thinking (see Table 2). Most participants began as novices "assum[ing] there is a body of 'correct' knowledge or attitudes to teach" and "striv[ing] for certainty." Over the semester, however, many shifted towards a developing stance, characterized as being "willing to consider multiple ...definitions of what is most worth knowing, ask what is most worth teaching, and why" and "able to acknowledge how one's ...identity shapes perspective [and] uncertainty" (Sleeter, 2009, p. 5). Some even stretched towards the "accomplished" category particularly in the area of self-reflexivity, described as "Consistently monitors, questions, and evaluates practical and ethical impacts of one's work on students. Questions how one's own positionality, experiences, and point of view affect one's work but can move forward while doing so" (Sleeter, 2009, p. 5). Overall, most participants articulated increasing complexity in their attitudes toward students and their role as teachers.

For instance, in an electronic post, Victoria emphasized the importance of thinking critically about her practice:

> The danger in studying research is to accept it as a panacea––when, in fact, as strong critical thinkers (which we must be in order to be effective teachers), we should rage against the blind acceptance of any **one** theory...We need to read these documents together and against each other in order to extract meaning relevant to our own practice.
> [Emphasis in the original]

This comment not only reflects the complexity of Victoria's thinking but also further demonstrates her tendency to emphasize the importance of practice. Victoria asked deep questions such as, "Where do our responsibilities begin and end as educators if our students lives do not begin and end in our classrooms?" She also critiqued the methods focus in one reading:

> The list of methods was useful insofar as it gets the discussion rolling, but without an explicit connection to students as individuals, I find myself growing frustrated with the onslaught of 'method...method...method...' Where is the human element?

To Victoria, teaching is about more than good strategies. Similarly, a critical thread runs throughout Gabriel's electronic posts.

> Teachers do need to realize that, with . . . schools, they are working within and against a system that reproduces what . . . society values and sees as norms. A teacher's ability to work outside [a] mentality that they themselves . . . have been brought up in and, maybe even held at one point, is

fundamental to their success with the current needs of our [students]."

Like Victoria, he seemed to consistently "question how one's own positionality, experiences, and point of view affect one's work" (Sleeter, 2009, p. 5). In contrast, Evelina, largely summarized course readings. Becky's postings showed the least complexity. She believed federal mandates would benefit BLs if teachers taught well, as expressed in the following: "In order for initiatives like NCLB to actually work, it is paramount that as a country we provide a more consistent curriculum to ELL students. Not only do these students all deserve to have qualified teachers, they also deserve to have a standard by which they are taught." Still, Becky recognized "there is no 'one size fits all' strategy for teaching BLs". She commented, "Each teacher has to discover what works best for them and for their class." Though the depth of participants' responses varied, electronic blogs seemed to provide a forum for students to explore their thinking about complex issues.

Course readings seemed to influence students' ability to locate themselves as learners and educators. One student whose family emigrated from Africa wrote, "Through selected reading assignments . . . I saw reflections of myself—many of my experiences were mirrored by those of children who were subjects of case studies..." In the closing lines of his post-survey, Gabriel described the impact of the course on his perceptions of BLs:

> I have served in various positions such as a counselor, a child care worker, a psychiatric attendant, youth advisor, case manager, student intervention specialist, and . . . as a teacher. . . . Yet, I have never served in a position that would have granted me such insight into the needs of ELLs the way . . . this course has.

Class readings, discussions, and assignments seemed to deepen the complexity of many students' thinking about teaching and the needs of their students.

Beyond methods: Getting to know students

Indeed, participants recognized teaching as more than learning methods. For example, "[T]his class . . . put faces on a too often intellectual issue. I learned specific methods for teaching BLs, but I also got into the heads of BLs." Many highlighted that getting to know students was of paramount importance: …"I've learned that the first step is . . . getting to know how [my] students learn, the knowledge they bring to the table, and allowing students to tell their stories within an environment that is comfortable and respectful." Similarly, Victoria commented, "We can read all the books we want, but unless we speak to students in real practice, this all means nothing." Evelina also expressed a commitment to getting to know her students, ". . . [T]eachers should get to know all of their students individually and must be careful not to make assumptions about individuals based on trends observed in the larger group." She continued, "It is important to strike a relatively even balance between adopting strategic methods of teaching and thinking complexly about individual student needs. Ideally, a teacher will get to know his/her students and use that knowledge to determine what methods, if any, are appropriate." She further noted, "it is dangerous to rely too heavily on teaching methods as a 'one size fits all' approach to education . . . .As a teacher I will work hard to get to know my students and provide multiple modes of representation so . . . all students can access the material." Evelina concluded, " I would like to have one-on-one conversations with BLs to learn what works for them . . . which teaching methods they prefer, whether they like to work in groups or independently and any other concerns they have about the class." Generally, participants became aware of the need "to teach the students, not the course," a mantra that we emphasized throughout the course, but we continued to wonder to what extent some students were able to think complexly about their own roles within the larger institution of schools.

Teachers as Change Agents

In post-surveys, a few students expressed interest in acting as change agents. One remarked, "Now I see that with more training, I can be that teacher, the one who advocates for them . . . I wish to be an agent of change for all students, not just the ones who are most easily taught." Another participant demonstrated awareness of her position in relation to students:

> I believe that I have a responsibility to . . . become the learner and allow [my students] to teach me about their lives, histories, and ideas—while also passing on to them my familiarity with the culture of power

in the U.S.

Yet another teacher thought more deeply about the high drop-out rate among Latino males in her school and what she might do about it: "Since January, I have lost three sophomore males, all Hispanic . . . I can't let go of the fact that these boys are 15 years old and out in the world with barely a tenth-grade education." She committed to identifying at-risk students earlier and contacting parents. Drawing from his own experiences as an immigrant, in his first reflection Gabriel noted:

> Because of my background I feel that it is my responsibility to convey to my English Language Learners that they can succeed in an environment that . . . might . . . at first be foreign to them. Understanding . . . what they . . . go through and being able to empathize with others, . . . it is my responsibility to encourage and support them while finding the most effective way to reach and teach them.

That some participants reflected on their own positionality and aimed to advocate for students is encouraging. Connections with supportive teachers can play a pivotal role in Latino BLs' academic success (Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Todorova, 2008).

Discussion

In this study, we sought to determine the influence of one methods course on participants' development of instructional strategies to teach BLs in mainstream settings and to think critically about their role as educators. In sum, our participants generally felt an increased sense of preparedness though their actual skill in creating SIOP lesson plans varied. Some embraced their roles as teachers of language and content and showed increasing ability to think complexly about their teaching. Most understood the importance of "teaching the students not the course," a promising development for secondary educators. Some even claimed expanded roles as advocates for students, which is significant since teaching practice aimed at promoting social justice presumes that teachers take on multiple roles within the school community as learners, teachers, researchers, and advocates (Cochan-Smith, 2010; Lucas & Villegas, 2011). In fact, mainstream content teachers who advocate for adolescent ELs can improve students' life chances (Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Todorova, 2008).

Analysis of varied data sources allowed us to understand in a more nuanced fashion that teaching is a complex profession, requiring a host of skills. The ability to think complexly does not necessarily translate into being an effective lesson planner and vice versa. Becky, for example, mastered SIOP lesson planning but we wonder if her attention to painstaking detail and desire to "get it right" precluded complex thinking. She assumed there was a "right way" to lesson plan and was determined to master it, which is compatible with Sleeter's characterization of "novice" in perspective taking, in that students see "...a body of 'correct' knowledge or attitudes to teach" and "strive for certainty" (Sleeter, 2009, p. 5). Evelina also developed strong SIOP planning skills but thinking complexly for her was more about differentiating instruction for individual students as a form of "best" practice. Gabriel thought complexly and demonstrated sociolinguistic consciousness (Lucas & Villegas, 2011), but struggled with lesson planning. His case, in particular, shows that teaching requires foundational knowledge and a repertoire of learned skills, fundamental among them the ability to plan and implement lessons. Of this small, focal group, only Victoria demonstrated attitudes/beliefs of effective teachers of BLs (Clayton, 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2011), and the abilities to develop a comprehensive SIOP lesson plan and to think complexly as she questioned the readings, her classmates, and her own presumptions throughout the course. We wonder whether people develop different propensities at different times influenced both by life experiences and adult maturation (Friedman & Schoen, 2009; Kitchener & King, 1990). Even if aspiring teachers demonstrate that they can plan effective SIOP lessons, this learning needs to be situated in a developmental perspective. We believe pre-service preparation is a key interval in learning how to teach for social justice (Cochran-Smith, 2010). Nonetheless, to ascertain whether pre-service preparation translates into effective teaching practice, it would be necessary to follow our participants into their teaching sites, observe them teach, and study the impact on pupil learning,

We also recognize the limitations of using a construct like a rubric to examine the complexity of participant thinking. Sleeter's (2009) matrix provides a heuristic to evaluate learning in particular categories,

namely perspective-taking and self-reflexivity, which we believe are integral to effective teaching practice. Still, we wonder whether mastery of lesson planning, thinking complexly, and the development of attitudes/beliefs consistent with effective instruction of Latino BLs progress along a continuum based on experiences in particular contexts and whether a foundational skill like lesson planning should take precedence in methods course instruction and novice teacher practice. Ideally, lesson implementation eventually could become a data source for subsequent lesson planning and further inquiry so that teaching and thinking complexly about one's practice become recursive, integrated, and habitual (McQuillan, Welch, & Barnatt, 2012).

Still, we noted a desire even at the graduate level for participants to be compliant students. During one observed class session, some students thought that because certain readings were included in the syllabus, we as instructors must agree with them. We clarified that readings were selected and juxtaposed because they presented opposing viewpoints. Like Becky, some students desired to find the right answer, which represents a novice way of thinking (Sleeter, 2009). Our hope is that students realize teaching is a fluid process; there is no "one right way." Rather, there are many ways to tackle certain lessons and decisions can be informed by taking an inquiry approach to one's practice, namely reflecting on the needs of one's students.

We learned there might be a dynamic tension between mastering particular lesson planning skills and being able to think complexly about instruction. There is discipline to getting SIOP right, demonstrated by Becky's extraordinary efforts, which can be situated in a complex framework (Sleeter, 2009), a developmental perspective, or the SIOP rubric itself. Certainly, evaluation of teaching skill and teacher thinking remains a controversial topic. Moreover, we question how successfully one course can balance learning how to teach with learning how to critically view the roles of teachers and Latino BLs in mainstream public school settings. Learning to teach and to think complexly about teaching linguistically diverse youth may only develop over time in a multifaceted, coherent teacher education program and with significant, supported classroom experience. As Evelina wrote:

> In terms of my own progress, I feel . . . [graduate] coursework has been doing a good job preparing me to think critically about the nature and context of education. However, I realize … such issues are continuous and dynamic. Hence, there will always be room for progress in this regard.

As evidenced in Evelina's comments, learning to teach is an ongoing process, which must be reinforced in multiple contexts.

Implications

Our inquiry provides evidence about the influence of a methods course on aspiring and novice teachers of adolescent Latino BLs. Pre-service and practicing secondary content teachers exhibited increased confidence in their ability to plan instruction for BLs in mainstream content classes as demonstrated in SIOP lesson plans, embraced roles as language teachers, and developed complexity in their thinking about their role as teachers in varying degrees (Sleeter, 2009). We recommend further research to follow participants into early teaching experiences, provide site-based coaching/support, and assess continued teacher development and pupil learning.

Developing an inquiry stance toward teaching, learning, and getting to know students is a process rather than an outcome. Since teachers serve at the "front lines" and as "the bottom line" for the instruction of Latino BLs, (Gandara, Maxwell-Jolly, & Driscoll, 2005), improvements to how teacher education programs prepare teachers to work with BLs in mainstream content classes can be developed by listening to the teaching candidates, themselves (Friedman, 2002). We engage in inquiry to better meet the learning needs of our students with the hope that they will better meet the needs of their own Latino bilingual students in an ever-changing society.

References

Bartolomé, L. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 64(*2), 173-194.

Bartolomé, L. (2004). Critical Pedagogy and teacher education: Radicalizing prospective teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 31*(1), 99-122.

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research,* 2nd edition, (pp. 509-535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Charmaz, K. (2003). Grounded Theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N.K.

Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry,* 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Clayton, C. (2008). *Whatever it takes: Exemplary teachers of English language learners.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Boston College. Retrieved from ProQuest.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2010). *Toward a theory of teacher education for social justice.* In A.

Hargreaves et al. (Eds.). *Second International Handbook of Educational Change.* (pp. 445-467). Dordrecht, Springer.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (2009). *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation.* NY: Teachers College Press.

De Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2005). *Preparing mainstream teachers for English-language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough?* Teacher Education Quarterly. 101-124.

Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom.* New York, NY: The New Press.

Echevarría, J. Short, D. & Powers, K. (2006). School reform and standards-based education: A model for English language learners. *The Journal of Educational Research,* 99 (4) 195-210.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M.E., & Short, D. (2013). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP Model (Third Edition).* Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Friedman, A.A. (2002). What we would have liked to know: Preservice teachers' perspectives on effective teacher preparation. In Z.F. Beykont (Ed.). *The power of culture: teaching across language difference* (pp. 193-217). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.

Friedman, A., & Schoen, L. (2009). Reflective practice interventions: Raising levels of reflective judgment. *Action in Teacher Education,* 31(2), 61-73.

Gandara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Driscoll, A. (2005). *Listening to teachers of English language learners: a survey of California teachers' challenges, experiences, and professional development needs.* Santa Cruz, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.

Heath, S.B. (1996). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Hill, C. E., Thompson, B. J., & Williams, E. N. (1997). A guide to conducting consensual qualitative research. *The Counseling Psychologist,* 25, 517-572.

Kitchener, K.S., & King, P.M. (1990). The reflective judgment model: Transforming assumptions about knowing. In J. Mezirow (Ed.). *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning* (pp. 159-176). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lather (1986). Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review,* 56(3), 257-277.

Lucas, T., & Grinberg, J. (2008). Responding to the linguistic reality of the mainstream classroom: Preparing classroom teachers to teach English language learners. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring issues in changing contexts* (pp. 606-636). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lucas, T., Villegas, A.M., & Freedson-Gonzalez, M. (2008). *Linguistically responsive teacher education: Preparing classroom teachers to teach English language learners.* Journal of Teacher Education, 59, 361-373.

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A.M. (2011). Teacher preparation for linguistically-diverse classrooms: *A resource for teacher educators.* New York, NY: Routledge.

McDonald, M., & Zeichner, K.M. (2010). *Social justice teacher education. In A. Hargreaves et al. (Eds.).* Second International Handbook of Educational Change. (pp. 445-467). Dordrecht, Springer.

McQuillan, P.J., Welch, M. J., & Barnatt, J. (2012) In search of coherence: 'Inquiring' at multiple levels of a teacher education system. *Educational Action Research.*

Martin, R., & Van Gunten, D. M. (2002). Reflected identities: Applying positionality and multicultural social reconstructionism in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 53(1), 44-54.

Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: the socio-political context of multi-cultural education.* White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing Group.

O'Brien, J.L. (2009). High school social studies teachers' attitudes toward English language learners. *Social Studies Research and Practice,* 4(2), 36-48.

Pandya, C., Batalova, J., & McHugh, M. (2011). *Limited English proficient individuals in the United States: Number, share, growth, and linguistic diversity.* Washington DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Richert, A.E., Donohue, D.M., & LaBoskey, V.K. (2010). Preparing white teacher to teach in a racist nation: What do they need to know and be able to do? In A.Hargreaves et al   (Eds.) *Second international handbook of educational change* (pp.445-467). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Ryan, G.W., & Bernard, H. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 769-802.

Santoro, N. (2009). Teaching in culturally diverse contexts: what knowledge about "self" and "others" do teachers need? *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy, 35(1)* 33-45).

Seeking effective policies for ELLs. (2007). Cambridge, MA: Rennie Center. www.renniecenter.org.

Short, D. &, Echevarría, J. (1999). *The sheltered instruction observation protocol: A tool for teacher-researcher collaboration and professional development.* (Educational Practice Rep. No. 3). Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Excellence, and Diversity.

Sleeter, C. (2009). Developing teacher epistemological sophistication about multicultural curriculum: A case study. *Action in teacher education, 31(1),* 3-13.

Suárez-Orozco, C., Suárez-Orozco, M., & Todorova, I. (2008). *Learning a new land: Immigrant students in American society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Verplaetse, L.S. (2008). Developing academic language through an abundance of interaction. In L.S. Verplaetse & N. Migliacci (Eds.). *Inclusive pedagogy for English language learners: A handbook of research-informed practices.* New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Youngs, C. S., & Youngs, G. A. (2001). Predictors of mainstream teachers' attitudes toward ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly,* 35, 97–120.

Zumwalt, K. & Craig, E. (2008). Who is teaching? Does it matter? In Cochran-Smith, M., Feiman-Nemser, S., McIntyre, D.J. & Demers, K. (Eds.) *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts. Third edition.* New York: Routledge.

Zwiers, J. (2008). *Building academic language: Essential practices for content classrooms, grades 5-12.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix A

A QUICK SURVEY

1. What is your status (circle 1)?   Masters   Senior

2. Have you been a classroom teacher before? ___Yes ___No If Yes, for how long? _____

3. What content area(s) are you teaching, or interested in teaching?

_____

_____

4 What is your place of birth? _____

5. What is your first language? _____

6. What is your second language (if applicable)? _____

7. What is your third language (if applicable)? _____

8. Have you ever lived outside the US? ___Yes   ___No

   If yes, where and how long? _____

9. Have you ever worked with bilingual students? ___Yes ___No
What do you think is the most challenging aspect of working with bilingual students?

_____

_____

_____

10. What do you hope to get out of this class?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix B

ED 346 Teaching Bilingual Students
Required Course Assignment: Self-Study: Reflections on Beliefs[6]

Teachers' beliefs affect their practice. This course requires participants to reflect on their beliefs twice during the semester. The purpose of these reflections is to engage participants in critical reflection on their beliefs in order to raise awareness of these beliefs and their impact on their current or future practice. Grading of reflections will be based on timely submission and depth of reflection; actual beliefs and assumptions are not graded.

Self-Study and Beliefs Reflection 1
Due by date indicated on syllabus.
The overarching question for this self-study is: How do you see yourself in relation to your bilingual learners or ELLs (or your *future* bilingual learners or ELLs)? How do you see your role and responsibility?

Of critical importance to this question is thoughtful reflection on the following:
a. How do you think your own culture, language, ethnic background, socio-economic status, personal family history, place of birth and education affect your assumptions about yourself?
b. How do you think your culture, language, ethnic background, socio-economic status, personal family history, place of birth and education affect your assumptions about your bilingual learners or ELLs (or your future bilingual learners or ELLs)?
c. How do your assumptions about yourself and your learners affect your perception of your relationship to them and your roles and responsibility within that relationship?

Two pages.

Self-Study and Beliefs Reflection 2

Due by date indicated on syllabus.
Re-read your first self-study and beliefs reflection. Record your reaction to your earlier statement and note any changes and the rationale for the changes. Two pages.
[Or four pages if you actually comment on the same document (in bold, for example)].

---

6. Dr. Anne Homza, who teaches the bilingual methods course for elementary teachers at Boston College, shared this assignment with us.

Examining My Window and Mirror: A Pedagogical Reflection from a White Mathematics Teacher Educator about Her Experiences with Immigrant Latina Pre-service Teachers

Crystal A. Kalinec-Craig
University of Texas at San Antonio

Abstract

In this pedagogical reflection, a White mathematics teacher educator describes what she learned from three Latina pre-service teachers who were recent immigrants from Mexico while they completed an elementary mathematics methods course. Using Rochelle Gutierrez's (2012) metaphor of a window and mirror, the author interrogates her own identity and experiences as a mathematics student and teacher in order to learn more about her students who came from a different background than herself. The reflection concludes with implications for teacher education.

Introduction

As classrooms become more culturally and linguistically diverse, particularly with an influx of immigrant children from Mexico (Passel & Cohn, 2008), teachers and teacher education programs need to be more responsive to the diverse learning needs of all students (Hollins, 2011). Although we have mathematics teaching strategies that promote equity for all students, such as culturally responsive mathematics teaching (Bonner & Adams, 2012; Gay, 2002) and Complex Instruction (Cohen, Lotan, Scarloss, & Arellano, 1999), there are still some students who face limited opportunities to learn mathematics (Gutierrez & Irving, 2012). Furthermore, many of these children who face limited opportunities to learn come from non-White backgrounds, speak a native language other than English, and/or are typically unsuccessful in traditional classrooms.

To address this need, research has begun to closely examine the backgrounds of Latin@[7] teachers and pre-service teachers (PSTs) as one way of rethinking how we prepare new teachers for the changing student demographic (Achinstein & Aguirre, 2008; Cavazos, 2009; Gomez, Rodriguez, & Agosto, 2008; Hernandez-Sheets, 2004; Tellez, 1999; Vomvoridi-Ivanovic, 2012). The specific resources that new teachers from Latin@ backgrounds bring to their teacher preparation programs can prove useful when thinking about helping more PSTs adopt mathematical practices that promote equity for all students. Therefore, it follows that mathematics teacher educators should model similar practices with all of their PSTs, especially those PSTs who reflect the cultural and linguistic diversity of their own students. But before teacher educators learn about and honor the specific knowledge and experiences of their PSTs, we might consider how teacher educators turn the lens back upon themselves and first examine their *own* prior experiences (Aguirre, 2009) and assumptions about mathematics with respect to preparing new PSTs for the diverse classroom.

The purpose of this pedagogical reflection is an opportunity for me to share what I learned from my study of three bilingual, immigrant Latina PSTs who were learning to teach mathematics to students from primarily Latin@ backgrounds. I briefly review what we know about preparing new teachers for classrooms with Latin@ students (and in particular, Latin@ teachers) and will provide an overview of the framework for my reflection. After I describe my positionality, I will discuss what I learned about myself and about the three Latina PSTs when they shared their experiences of learning mathematics in Mexico and in the United States. The purpose of this reflection is to consider how we might learn more about *ourselves* and about *our PSTs* if we first reflect upon the assumptions we had about teaching and learning mathematics and about recognizing the knowledge and

---

7. I have adopted the signifier of "Latin@" to honor those persons who do not identify with traditional male and female gender-specific roles (Gutiérrez, 2013).

experiences our students bring to the classroom. I conclude with some implications for my future practice as a mathematics teacher educator.

Existing Literature

Few mathematics teachers would disagree that all students should feel successful when learning mathematics. Yet, some students still do not experience equitable opportunities to succeed in learning mathematics, and many of these students come from non-White backgrounds, speak a native language other than English (Civil & Planas, 2004; Gutierrez & Irving, 2012), and/or are in traditional, decontextualized classrooms where typically feel disconnected from their mathematics learning (Silver & Stein, 1996). Unless teachers adopt systematic changes to their practice, the cycle of inequitable learning opportunities may be reproduced for future students. As such, teacher education programs need to help PSTs and in-service teachers adopt pedagogies that honor the knowledge, experiences, and language of all students, especially in the field of mathematics (Aguirre et al., 2013; Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Leonard, Napp, & Adeleke, 2009).

To help teachers adopt mathematics pedagogies that encourage equity for all students, research has explored the knowledge, experiences, and resources that teachers bring to the classroom. With the majority of our PSTs coming from a fairly homogeneous background and little experience with students who represent a cultural and linguistic diversity (Hollins & Guzman, 2005), we are learning more about providing all PSTs with worthwhile experiences for teaching children who do not represent their own backgrounds (Sleeter, 2001; Turner et al., 2012). We are learning even more about the knowledge, experiences, and resources of Latin@ teachers and those teachers whose native language is not English to see how they take up pedagogies that promote equity (Achinstein & Aguirre, 2008; Cavazos, 2009; Gomez et al., 2008; Tellez, 1999; Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Vomvoridi-Ivanovic, 2012). For example, Cavazos (2009) recognized how her experiences as a bilingual Latina immigrant helped her as a new teacher to specifically identify and address the low expectations for success her colleagues placed on many of their immigrant Latin@ students. Specifically, Cavazos reflects that "many Latina/o students are labeled as regular or at-risk, and they do not need another label (i.e., Non-College Material) as they endure their educational journey" (p. 77). Similarly to Tellez's (1999) study of the Latina PSTs who leveraged knowledge of Latin@ students in the mathematics classroom, teachers bring knowledge and experiences to their practice that can serve as a resource for teaching students from similar backgrounds (Flores, Keehn, & Perez, 2002).

Although we should never assume that teachers who share the background of their students will successfully provide all students with an opportunity to learn (Achinstein & Aguirre, 2008), we still have much to learn about the particular experiences of our Latin@ teachers and PSTs. However, the question remains as to why should we know more about our Latin@ PSTs and students? As a teacher educator in San Antonio, Texas where many of our schools have large populations of Latin@ students and non-native English speakers, I want to learn about how my new teachers might leverage their diverse backgrounds when learning to teach students with diverse needs. If my PSTs are expected to learn about the diverse needs of their students so that all students have an opportunity to be successful in mathematics, then I need to engage in a similar process in my university classroom. Ultimately, I hope that by modeling this exploration in class, more of my PSTs will take up similar practices with their own students. In the next sections, I describe how I came to know Miria, Maricela, and Sara[8] as well as my positionality as a mathematics teacher educator.

The Setting and Reflection Framework

In the fall of 2010, I began my dissertation on the experiences of four PSTs in a particular elementary mathematics methods course within a teacher preparation program at a large university in an urban city in the Southwestern United States. This course was part of a larger research project, TEACh Math (Teachers Empowered for Advancing Change in Mathematics) (Bartell et al. 2010), and the instructor was one of six

---

8. All names have been changed to maintain the confidentiality of the participants.

principal investigators on the TEACh Math project. This methods course was designed to explore how PSTs incorporate children's mathematical thinking (Carpenter, Fennema, & Franke, 1996) and children's funds of knowledge (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005), into their practice.

The PSTs were concurrently completing their coursework in science, social studies, and literacy, and as a part of their coursework, they were placed in classrooms with children who were mainly from Latin@ communities and/or from low socioeconomic homes. For my dissertation, I recruited PSTs who self-identified on an optional demographic survey question as a cultural group other than White and/or spoke a native language other than English. From 27 students in the course, four agreed to participate in my dissertation, and of those four, Miria, Maricela, and Sara were three bilingual, recent immigrants from Mexico. For the focus of this pedagogical reflective essay, I will focus on these three PSTs because of their similar backgrounds.

For my dissertation, I conducted individual and focus group interviews and observations of the PSTs in the field as well as retrieved their assignment reflections[9]. I also recorded their small and whole group methods discussions. But for the purpose of this particular self-reflection, I focus on only the interview transcripts, their assignment reflection papers, and belief surveys because in this set of data, the PSTs shared their specific prior mathematical knowledge and experiences as a student. Future publications about the PSTs' experiences across the semester and the entire data set will focus on issues of status (Berger, Cohen, & Zelditch, 1972; Cohen, Lotan, & Catanzarite, 1988) in the classroom as it relates to their particular cultural and linguistic knowledge and experiences as immigrants.

In this reflection, I relied on Rochelle Gutierrez's (2012) and Botelho and Rudman's (2009) notion of "the window and the mirror" to help me see commonalities and differences among myself, my focal PSTs, and the students they might eventually teach. Gutierrez states: "I had introduced to them [PSTs] the notion of quality curricula including a window and a mirror —a mirror in the sense of offering students a chance to see oneself; a window in the sense of being able to see a different view onto the world" (2012, p. 44). As I reflected on my dissertation, I noticed the similarities and differences of my prior experiences as a mathematics student with those of my PSTs. Therefore, this mirror/window perspective enabled me to learn more about my PSTs who came from different backgrounds than my own, to find commonalities among our prior experiences, and to challenge my own misconceptions about teaching and learning mathematics. This reflective essay is the result of that introspective work. I hope this exploration will facilitate a discussion among both my fellow teachers and teacher educators about how we can model similar practices for our new teachers while honoring the resources they bring to the classroom.

Positionality

I identify myself as a White, female mathematics teacher educator. My first language is English and I know very basic Spanish and German. As a military child and later as a military spouse, I moved extensively and needed to quickly learn about my new surroundings and those around me. When I was in Germany in 2004 as an adult, I found myself in unfamiliar, foreign surroundings again. Yet, in many instances, I realized that I did not necessarily need to be fluent in German in order to successfully navigate my neighborhood.

When I began teaching in Germany, I held fast to the misconception that mathematics was a universal language. Yet when my German friends described their experiences learning mathematics, I reexamined these beliefs because there were striking differences between our experiences as mathematics students (e.g., symbolic notation, orchestrating conversations). Because of this reexamination and more, I became interested in the lives, culture, language, and experiences of immigrants in my home country and how teachers can help educate immigrants who are new to the United States. If I were to expect my PSTs to honor the culture and language of students from backgrounds different than their own, then I needed to replicate this experience with my own PSTs. As a result, I would learn more about myself.

In the following sections, I briefly address two misconceptions that I held early in my teaching career about mathematics and how Miria, Maricela, and Sara challenged my misconceptions about mathematics as a universal language: a) Students needed to develop fluency in English before they developed their mathematical

---

9. Many of these assignments were part of the learning modules developed by TEACH Math (Bartell et al., 2010).

mastery and b) mathematical strategies and algorithms are universal. Specifically, I discuss the opportunities to see commonalities (mirror) and insightful differences (window) between the PSTs and myself with respect to teaching and learning mathematics.

Misconceptions behind the Notion that "Mathematics is a Universal Language"

The argument that "mathematics is a universal language" rests in the beliefs that those who use mathematics should also use similar practices, symbols, algorithms, and problem solving strategies (White, 1992). The Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) (National Center for Education Statistics & National Science Foundation, 1996) refuted this claim by providing research-based evidence that teaching and learning mathematics is a varied and culturally-specific activity. For example, children and teachers in various parts of the world use different mathematical symbolic notations, learn different "standard algorithms" for operating on a number system (Perkins & Flores, 2002; Philipp, 1996), and work under a particular set of sociocultural norms (Zevenbergen, 2000). Some of these norms may also encourage children to communicate their mathematical thinking in a language other than the dominant language of instruction. Teachers can support their students by mapping their mathematical thinking to their native and second languages (Abedi & Lord, 2001; Gutierrez, 2002; Moschkovich, 1999). Based on this research, I will describe how Miria, Maricela, and Sara challenged my first misconception that students should develop fluency in English before they develop their mathematical mastery.

Developing English Fluency before Mathematical Mastery

At the beginning of their semester, the PSTs completed a mathematics autobiography in which they described their prior experiences as mathematics students (e.g., What do they remember about learning mathematics in school? How did they use mathematics outside of school?). Miria, Maricela, and Sara had very similar stories regarding their prior learning experiences in both Mexico and the United States. The following are excerpts from their autobiographies on August 25, 2010:

Miria: Even though I said that math is a very important subject, for me it is very hard to begin a new math class [feeling] positive and without feeling fear, especially since I moved to live here. I said this because my first two years in high school were really hard, since I was in the process of learning English. I remember that the first year I had a teacher named Mr. John, and during the lesson, he [would] begin and ended (sic) the class by only explaining different problem[s] on the board and asking questions about who understood [the problems] and who didn't. We never did any hands-on activities. I also remember one time I went to him because I was having problems understanding one of the questions [and] when I got there, I couldn't explain to him what was my problem, and he didn't do anything to help me. I got out of his classroom feeling really miserable. *That day I understood that if I couldn't communicate in my new language, I was never going to be good at math, and it also made me start hating math* [emphasis added].

Maricela: I received mathematics instruction in Spanish all my life, and coming to the United States was not an easy step. I already knew the language when I came here, so it was not that bad, but it was still frustrating sometimes—especially in math class because all [of] my math knowledge was in Spanish. I never took a math class in English before coming to the University, so it was even worse. It is not easy to take a college math class for the first time if you are not a native English speaker, so I had a hard time figuring out the math terminology in English. Some terms are very similar to Spanish, but some of them are completely different. Unfortunately for me, it was a college class, so the teacher did not care if I understood or not.

Sara: When I started college, I had had only one year of English. The first semester I took a math course, and it was really difficult for me to understand everything the teacher explained; I was frustrated about that class. I wanted to drop it, but at the same time, I did not wanted (*sic*) to waste my time, so I just try (*sic*) hard and I looked for help. The teacher did not do anything to support my learning because I never asked; I really quiet, so maybe he did not even notice my need.

Because the PSTs were learning to communicate in English, the dominant language of instruction in their United

States classrooms, they felt trepidation when asking their mathematics teacher for help. When their teachers did not initiate a bridge between their mathematical thinking in Spanish and English, they sought out help from others or exercised more efforts into their studies in order to be successful in mathematics.

Miria's words evoked sadness and frustration in myself because she felt that she needed to be fluent in English in order to be successful in mathematics. I could envision a young Miria seeking help on her mathematics homework, but was unable to communicate her needs to her teacher. Ultimately, Miria concluded that her mathematical proficiency was dependent upon her English fluency. Scholars such as Khisty and Chval (2002), Mosckovich (1999, 2002), and Gutierrez (2002) would argue that Miria's conclusion is an unfortunate misconception in mathematics education— students learning English as their second language should not believe that valid mathematical thinking requires a mastery of the English language. Although it typically takes second language learners on average seven years to develop their cognitive academic language proficiency (Cummins, 2008), they still bring mathematical knowledge and experiences to the classroom that serves as a resource for developing new knowledge (Celedón-Pattichis, Musanti, & Marshall, 2010). Even more so, linguistically diverse young students can solve challenging mathematics problems if given the chance to model the actions in that problem (Turner, Dominguez, Maldonado, & Empson, 2013).

Although I initially thought my experiences in Germany might have mirrored the stories told by the PSTs, their experiences were a window into the isolation that some non-native English speakers experience when learning mathematics in a second language. Maricela's experiences were particularly insightful because, although she was fluent in conversational English, she still needed a bridge between her mathematical knowledge in Spanish and her new mathematical knowledge in English. The PSTs' stories served as windows to the experiences of those learning mathematics in a second language and as a way to inform the goals of my course. I realized I needed to provide more subtle opportunities for my non-native English-speaking students to communicate their thinking such as drawing pictures or using their hands to model their thinking. My students should not need to master English first in order to have these opportunities.

The issues of learning mathematics in a second language resurfaced in the PSTs' pre- and post-methods belief survey responses. When asked, "How does your own background (e.g. language, culture, class, gender, race) impact your mathematics teaching?" they said,

Maricela: Background is useful because I am bilingual and know what all they [new Mexican immigrants] went through to be in this country.

Miria: My second language is English and I think students might have a hard time understanding me because I do not speak fluently. But I also know that I am going to be able [to teach] students who speak Spanish because that is my native language.

Maricela and Miria both viewed their opportunity to communicate in English and Spanish as a resource to their practice, but Miria also recognized that her emerging English pronunciations also could pose a challenge to her students. As another window moment for me, her story helped me to question my belief that mathematics was a universal language. As a young teacher, I required students to emphasize the "key words" and use correct mathematical terminology. In doing so, I could have neglected to notice the diverse ways that my students could communicate their mathematical thinking. As such, I probably missed opportunities for some of my students to see themselves as smart in mathematics; I now see some of the complex issues facing students who are learning mathematics (or PSTs learning to teach mathematics) in a second language. In order to recognize these complex issues, I needed to find more opportunities for PSTs like Miria to share her experiences with other PSTs.

Mathematical Strategies and Algorithms are Universal

In the PSTs' description of their prior learning experiences, they described other ways in which learning mathematics in Mexico was different than in the United States, specifically the mathematical strategies and algorithms. In one example, Maricela described how she became frustrated when her teachers wanted her to mimic the traditional algorithm for a long division problem because they refused to honor her shorter, valid way of solving the problem. While explaining the difference between learning mathematics in Mexico and the United States, she said, "[A difference for me was] knowing everything from memory. I did everything in my mind [when

I was in Mexico]. [It was] hard for me to do it the way they [my teachers in the United States] wanted me to."

Maricela found it challenging to replicate the American "traditional algorithm" even though the method she learned in Mexico for dividing whole numbers was still valid. Her teachers in the United States did not validate Maricela's mathematical strategies from Mexico, and it was challenging for Maricela to learn this new algorithm. When I asked her what this experience meant to her as a future teacher and the challenges that she might face in the classroom when students present their own mathematical strategies, she noted in her initial interview that

> [A challenge might be] teaching them the way you were taught, but you need to teach them the way they learn here [in the United States]. The way I learned isn't the way [that they are taught here in the United States], doesn't make sense [to teach them differently]. [I] cannot teach them in a way they haven't been taught before.

Sara similarly echoed Maricela's sentiments about being aware as to the different ways that mathematics can be taught. Sara more specifically stated in her pre-methods survey "Math is not taught using the same methods everywhere. What seems common to one child may not be common for another." As a future teacher who learned mathematics in Mexico, Sara was aware that her students might express their mathematical thinking in different ways and that she might not be familiar with all of the strategies at first.

In another excerpt from the pre- and post-surveys, Sara and Miria reiterated that their experiences with learning different mathematics strategies in Mexico might play a role in how they will teach mathematics in the United States; they explained:

Miria: When I was in my classes [in the United States], it was hard [to learn math] because when the teacher was teaching something new, it was different from what they had teach (*sic*) me in my hometown [of Mexico].

Sara: It [my background] will have a big impact because I was taught in a different way.

Although both Miria and Sara recognized a difference between how they learned mathematics in Mexico and in the United States, they also realized that they needed to be responsive to their students' learning needs and that this difference in learning and teaching styles might not necessarily be problematic to their practice as a mathematics teacher.

As I listened to Sara and Maricela describe potential challenges in their practice, I had a mirror moment—the challenges she mentioned were now challenges I was facing myself. Even as a young teacher, I was confident that if I encouraged my students to use explicit traditional algorithms and procedures (or what I thought to be "traditional"), then my students should easily learn mathematics. Yet, by teaching only the algorithms and procedures that are familiar to some United States students, I may have limited opportunities for my students to communicate their mathematical thinking. After learning some other mathematical strategies in Germany, I came to realize that there is no one "traditional algorithm" (Philipp, 1996). I needed to move away from a first-person perspective of teaching and step into my students' mindset as they solved mathematical problems. As I slowly made this shift, more of my students became successful in mathematics.

Maricela's words resonated with my new awareness for the cultural differences between *doing* mathematics and *knowing* mathematics (Gorgorio & Planas, 2001). Maricela's experiences mirrored my developing beliefs about teaching mathematics—I, too, did not want to replicate practices that were only familiar to my style of learning. As Maricela shared her prior experiences with me, I realized that the work of helping my students to learn mathematics rested with *me*, not the other way around. Even more so, I needed to go beyond honoring the native language of my students; I also needed to honor the *valid mathematical strategies* of my students, even if I was unfamiliar with these strategies. Now, in my methods courses, we explore different, valid mathematical strategies used in other parts of the world.

Finally, Miria returned to the issue of recognizing and validating children's mathematical strategies as she elaborated in another post-methods survey question: "Another thing is that I want to be opened (*sic*) mind[ed]. When coming to school [as a teacher], I want to make everyone learn and value everyone['s] background and do not tried (*sic*) to make them believe the same way as me." Miria recognized that even though her experiences were different than many of her future students, she valued these differences and wanted to always search for new ways to honor how her students learned mathematics.

As I read about how Miria and Sara recognized the difference between their mathematics education

in Mexico and traditional mathematics pedagogy in the United States, I was met with both a mirror and a window moment. As a student, I was successful in a very traditional setting where algorithms, procedures, and memorization were emphasized. Early in my career, I replicated these ways of teaching mathematics for my students and I found little success. Yet, as I grew with experience, I shifted my practice from one that mirrored my own experiences to one that explored my students' ways of learning mathematics. My experiences in Germany and then later with Miria, Maricela, and Sara further solidified this shift in my thinking—I was eager to seek new ways to elicit and honor how my students learned mathematics and communicated their mathematical thinking. This shift was now a resource to my practice as a mathematics teacher educator.

After I finished my study with the three PSTs and my reflections on the experience, I reexamined what any of this might mean for my future practice. How did my own perceptions of mathematics influence and inform my teaching? How might my experiences in Germany influence my growth as a teacher? How might my process of seeking windows and mirrors with my PSTs inform my goals to model responsive pedagogies in my methods courses? More importantly, how might I provide more opportunities to create similar experiences for my PSTs with their own elementary students?

Mathematics Teachers and Teacher Educators Recognizing their Own Windows and Mirrors

Before I met the three women in this essay, I believed mathematics was one body of knowledge that transgressed language, culture, and experience—math was just math. But Miria's, Maricela's, and Sara's personal stories of learning mathematics in a second language as new immigrants informed my vision for mathematics and mathematics education. Mathematics is not just a body of knowledge, but it can be an activity that we engage in outside of school (Foote, 2009; Wager, 2012) and can be contextualized in different ways for different people and/or cultures (Barton, 1996; D'Ambrosio, 1990). We as teacher educators need to provide more window opportunities for our PSTs to learn new ways that mathematics is used, learned, and interpreted. The process of finding more window opportunities may include the PSTs watching videos of immigrant children correctly solving a mathematical task and noticing their particular strategies. In the process of finding these new ways of doing mathematics, our PSTs may identify new mirrors among themselves and their students. My ultimate goal as a teacher educator is to help my PSTs develop an emerging framework that honors the diverse ways our students are mathematically smart—exploring our own mirrors and windows might be one small step towards that goal.

If I were to answer the same survey question as to how my background impacts my practice as a mathematics teacher, I might say that with each year in my career, my background changes. I learn something more than I did the day before about myself and about others. These new experiences add another layer to my role as a mathematics teacher educator. Each new experience also adds another opportunity for me to challenge how I position myself in the field of mathematics education research and my assumptions about teaching and learning mathematics. Given the dynamic nature of teaching, it is no surprise that we continue to change who we are and how we teach.

Miria, Maricela, and Sara provided me another window by which to explore the first-hand experiences of immigrant students and to consider the complex negotiation of how they learned in Mexico with how they might teach in the United States. As our classrooms become more diverse, we need to help our new teachers explore their own backgrounds (and the backgrounds of others) in order to reconceptualize how mathematics is indeed a universal language—*a complex, diverse language that we all use.*

References

Abedi, J., & Lord, C. (2001). The language factor in mathematics tests. *Applied Measurement in Education* 14, 219-234.

Achinstein, B., & Aguirre, J. (2008). Cultural match or culturally suspect: How new teachers of color negotiate sociocultural challenges in the classroom. *Teachers College Record,* 110(8), 1505-1540.

Aguirre, J. (2009). Privileging mathematics and equity in teacher education: Framework, counter-resistance strategies and reflections from a Latina mathematics educator. In B. Greer, S. Mukhopadhyay, A. B. Powell & S. Nelson-Barber (Eds.), Culturally re*sponsive mathematics education* (pp. 295-319). London: Routledge.

Aguirre, J., Turner, E., Bartell, T. G., Kalinec-Craig, C., Foote, M. Q., Roth McDuffie, A., & Drake, C. (2013). Making connections in practice: How prospective elementary teachers connect to children's mathematical thinking and community funds of knowledge in mathematics instruction. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 64(2), 178-192.

Bartell, T. G., Aguirre, J., Drake, C., Foote, M. Q., Roth McDuffie, A., & Turner, E. (2010). Preparing preK-8 teachers to connect children's mathematical thinking and community based funds of knowledge. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the thirty-second annual meeting of the *North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education,* Columbus, OH.

Barton, B. (1996). Making Sense of ethnomathematics: Ethnomathematics is making sense. *Educational Studies in Mathematics,* 31(1/2), 201-233.

Berger, J., Cohen, B. P., & Zelditch, M. (1972). *Status characteristics and social interaction. American Sociological Review,* 37(3), 241-255.

Bonner, E. P., & Adams, T. L. (2012). Culturally responsive teaching in the context of mathematics: A grounded theory case study. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education* 15(1), 25-38.

Botelho, M. J., & Rudman, M. K. (2009). *Critical multicultural analysis of children's literature: mirrors, windows, and doors.* New York: Routledge.

Carpenter, T. P., Fennema, E., & Franke, M. L. (1996). Cognitively Guided Instruction: A knowledge base for reform in primary mathematics instruction. *The Elementary School Journal,* 97(1).

Cavazos, A. G. (2009). Reflections of a Latina student-teacher: Refusing low expectation for Latina/o students. *American secondary education,* 37(3), 70-79.

Celedón-Pattichis, S., Musanti, S. I., & Marshall, M. E. (2010). Bilingual elementary teachers' reflections on using students' native language and culture to teach mathematics. In M. Q. Foote (Ed.), *Mathematics teaching & learning in K-12.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Civil, M., & Planas, N. (2004). Participation in the mathematics classroom: Does every student have a voice? For the *learning of mathematics,* 24(1), 7.

Cohen, E. G., Lotan, R. A., & Catanzarite, L. (1988). Can expectations for competence be altered in the classroom? In M. Webster & M. Foschi (Eds.), *Status generalization: new theory and research* (pp. 27-54). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Cohen, E. G., Lotan, R. A., Scarloss, B. A., & Arellano, A. R. (1999). Complex Instruction: Equity in cooperative learning classrooms. *Theory into Practice,* 38(2), 80-86.

Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 487-499): Springer.

D'Ambrosio, U. (1990). The history of mathematics and ethnomathematics: How a native culture intervenes in the process of learning science. *Impact of Science on Society, 40*(4), 369-378.

Flores, B. B., Keehn, S., & Perez, B. (2002). Critical need for bilingual education teachers: The potentiality of Normalistas and paraprofessionals. *Bilingual Research Journal,* 26(3), 501-524. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2002.10162575

Foote, M. Q. (2009). Stepping out of the classroom: Building teacher knowledge for developing classroom practice. *Teacher Education Quarterly,* 36(3), 39-53.

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. (2001 AACTE Outstanding Writing Award Recipient). *Journal of Teacher Education,* 53(2), 106-111.

Gomez, M. L., Rodriguez, T. L., & Agosto, V. (2008). Life histories of Latino/a teacher candidates. Teachers College Record, 110(8), 1639-1676.

González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). Funds of knowledge: theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Gorgorio, N., & Planas, N. (2001). Teaching mathematics in multilingual classrooms. Educational Studies in Mathematics, 47(1), 7-33.

Gutierrez, R. (2002). Beyond Essentialism: The complexity of language in teaching mathematics to Latina/o students. American Educational Research Journal, 39(4), 1047-   1088.

Gutierrez, R. (2012). Embracing Nepantla: Rethinking "knowledge" and its use in mathematics teaching. Journal of Research in Mathematics Education, 1(1), 29-56. doi: 10.4471/redimat.2012.02

Gutiérrez, R. (2013). The sociopolitical turn in mathematics education. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 44(1), 37.

Gutierrez, R., & Irving, S. E. (2012). *Latina/o and Black students and mathematics.* Chicago, IL.

Hernandez-Sheets, R. (2004). California's emergency credential teachers: examining program conditions for sustainability and effectiveness. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 17(2), 183-198.*

Hollins, E. (2011). Teacher preparation for quality teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 62(4), 395-407.

Hollins, E. R., & Torres Guzman, M. (2005). Research on preparing teachers for diverse populatons. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Jacobs, J. (2008). What is equity in mathematics education? NCTM news bulletin. Retrieved August 8, 2014, from http://www.nctm.org/news/content.aspx?id=15973

Khisty, L. L., & Chval, K. B. (2002). Pedagogic discourse and equity in mathematics: When teachers' talk matters. Mathematics Education Research Journal 14(3), 154-168.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. American Educational Research Journal, 32(3), 465-491.

Leonard, J., Napp, C., & Adeleke, S. (2009). The complexities of culturally relevant pedagogy: A case study of two secondary mathematics teachers and their ESOL students. *The High School Journal,* 93(1), 3-22.

Moschkovich, J. (1999). Supporting the participation of English language learners in mathematical discussions. *For the Learning of Mathematics,* 19(1), 11-19.

Moschkovich, J. (2002). Chapter 1: An introduction to examining everyday and academic mathematical practices. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education.* Monograph, 11, 1-11.

National Center for Education Statistics, W. D. C., & National Science Foundation, A.V.A. (1996). *Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS).*

Passel, J. S., & Cohn, D. V. (2008). U.S. population projections: 2005-2050. *Pew Research Hispanic Trends Project.* From http://www.pewhispanic.org/2008/02/11/us-population-projections-2005-2050/

Perkins, I., & Flores, A. (2002). Mathematical notations and procedures of recent immigrant students. *Mathematics Teaching in the Middle School,* 7(6), 346-351.

Philipp, R. A. (1996). Multicultural mathematics and alternative algorithms. *Teaching Children Mathematics,* 3(3), 128-133.

Silver, E. A., & Stein, M. K. (1996). The QUASAR project: The "revolution of the possible" in mathematics instructional reform in urban middle schools. *Urban Education,* 30(4), 476-521.

Sleeter, C. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 52(2), 94-106.

Tellez, K. (1999). Mexican-American pre-service teachers and the intransigency of the elementary school curriculum. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 15(5), 555-570.

Turner, E., Dominguez, H., Maldonado, L., & Empson, S. (2013). English learners' participation in mathematical discussion: Shifting positionings and dynamic identities. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education,* 44(1), 199-234.

Turner, E., Drake, C., Roth McDuffie, A., Aguirre, J., Bartell, T. G., & Foote, M. Q. (2012). Promoting equity in mathematics teacher preparation: A framework for advancing teacher learning of children's multiple

mathematics knowledge bases. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education.* 15(1), 67-82.

Villegas, A., & Lucas, T. (2002). Educating culturally responsive teachers: *A coherent approach.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Vomvoridi-Ivanovic, E. (2012). Using culture as a resource in mathematics: the case of four Mexican–American prospective teachers in a bilingual after-school program. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education,* 15(1), 53-66.

Wager, A. A. (2012). Incorporating out-of-school mathematics: from cultural context to embedded practice. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education,* 15(1), 9-23.

White, H. (1992). *Artificial neural networks: Approximation and learning theory.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Zevenbergen, R. (2000). Cracking the code of mathematics classrooms: School success as a function of linguistic, social and cultural background. In J. Boaler (Ed.), *Multiple perspectives on mathematics teaching and learning* (pp. 201-224). Westport, CT: Ablex.

Latino College Presidents: In Their Own Words (2013)
by David J. León and Rubén O. Martinez (Editors)
Bingley, U.K.: Emerald Group Publishing Limited

Amelia Marcetti Topper
Arizona State University

Abstract

This book review examines *Latino College Presidents: In Their Own Words* (2013), a recent volume edited by David J. León and Rubén O. Martinez and part of the "Diversity in Higher Education" series. The volume features 11 bio-professional essays written by current and/or former college and university Latino/a presidents. This collection of stories is particularly relevant to Latino/a graduate students and junior faculty and staff who are seeking insight into the realities of pursuing executive leadership positions in higher education.

To fully understand what an individual has accomplished one must hear their story, and *Latino College Presidents: In Their Own Words* does just this by providing Latinos/as in executive leadership positions a space to share their varied pathways to the college presidency with a new generation of aspiring Latino/a leaders, including their successes, challenges, and advice. Part of the "Diversity in Higher Education" series, this pioneering work is a thoughtful collection of bio–professional, and often very personal, essays written by 11 current and/or former Latino/a college presidents with additional contextualization by the volume's editors, David J. León and Rubén O. Martinez. The volume is particularly relevant as recent studies suggest that the percentage of Latinos/as in postsecondary faculty and leadership positions has declined despite increasing Latino/a undergraduate and graduate student enrollment (Cook & Kim, 2012; U.S. Department of Education, 2013). It is the hope of these authors that this collection of stories will encourage and inspire the next generation of Latino/a college leaders–and, as argued by the editors, that these future provosts, presidents, and chancellors will work against the pervasive neoliberal[10] ideology that currently dominates the American higher education system.

Alfredo de los Santos, Jr.'s forward to the volume draws on his rich experiences as El Paso Community College's founding president, his position as former Vice Chancellor of the Maricopa County Community College System, and his connections to the authors of this volume—illustrating how small the world of higher education Latino/a leaders is. In the first two chapters, León and Martinez discuss the volume's genesis, which began with their earlier survey of Latino/a college presidents, followed by a brief review of the (limited) literature on Latino/a executive leaders and a preview of the themes apparent across the essays. Contributing authors were asked to explore their upbringing and family life, educational experiences, how they negotiated the administrative ladder and discrimination, examples of successful and less successful programs they helped to create, and advice to Latinos/as aspiring to executive leadership positions in higher education.

The editors made an intentional decision to organize the remaining chapters by institutional type, moving from less selective community colleges to more selective universities "because that is both how Latino students and presidents are distributed" (Martinez & León, 2013a, p. 10). Part I contains essays by four community colleges presidents, Part II includes essays by six presidents at different types of public and private four-year institutions, and Part III includes an essay by the Chancellor of The University of Texas System. While many of the presidents featured in this volume have worked at multiple and varied colleges and universities, as the editors point out there are still no Latinos/as in executive leadership positions at any of the nation's Ivy League institutions.

---

10. Neoliberalism is the set of economic, political, and social practices that enable individuals to be economic actors. Privatization, deregulation, and the valuing of individual agency over public welfare are some examples of neoliberal practices. In higher education, these market-based practices also include viewing students as "consumers" and education as a private good, reductions in federal and state tax support, and the emphasis on "innovation"–such as Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs)–to increase institutional efficiency.

Although these authors come from different parts of the country, including Puerto Rico, have diverse family backgrounds, and have followed both traditional and non-traditional pathways to the college presidency, León and Martinez identify four themes that are consistent across their stories: 1) family support for education and character development; 2) perseverance when faced with discrimination and discouragement; 3) the importance of mentors; and, 4) a deep commitment to public service. While many of the contributing authors were the first in their family to graduate from high school and pursue a college education, all of these current and former presidents came from families that valued education and hard work. For President Rodolfo Arévalo, his family's commitment to education was reflected in his father's decision to stop migrating out of Texas for seasonal farm work for the sake of his children: "Education was important to both my parents, as they understood the lack of it" (2013, p. 119). Likewise, "college became a given not an option…" for President Erlinda J. Martinez and her siblings, "…they wanted us to succeed and believed in us" (Martinez, 2013, p. 52).

Similarly, almost all of the authors cite encouragement from a critical friend–a professor, colleague, or supervisor who encouraged them to go to graduate school, apply for fellowships, and urged them to pursue "unobtainable" positions, as well as painful instances of discrimination and prejudice. President Leslie Ann Navarro, who holds the distinction of being the youngest college president appointed to date, shares her stories of having her car vandalized and being sexually assaulted by a community member during a party held by the board in celebration of her second year as president. Other presidents, such as President Mildred García and President Arévalo, encountered high school counselors who discouraged them from applying to college or faced biased hiring practices: "…I [President Arévalo] was informed that even though [the dean] thought I was the best suited for the position, he could not support my application because the university was not ready to appoint a Hispanic (Mexican) as a full dean" (Arévalo, 2013, p. 124). The authors persisted despite these barriers, often driven by their commitment to public service and a deep-held belief that these positions would allow them to positively affect the lives of a greater number of students.

It should be noted that many of the authors in this volume attended college during a time when higher education was commonly viewed as a public good and received national support through a variety of social and financial programs that made attendance more affordable (e.g., the G. I. Bill, *the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Higher Education Act of 1965*). In addition, the massification of the American higher education system in the years following World War II–in both number of institutions and enrollment growth–allowed for more faculty and administrative opportunities across all institutional levels (Gumport, Iannozzi, Shaman, & Zemsky, 1997). Today, however, future college and university leaders face declining state and local appropriations for public higher education institutions, the pressure to increase access and efficiency, the pervasive focus on student and institutional accountability, and in general a more competitive academic and employment market (Thelin, 2011). These new realities, which the authors attribute to the adoption of neoliberal policies and practices across higher education, make pursuing and obtaining an executive leadership position more challenging, and perhaps less appealing, for Latinos/Latinas as education has come to be seen more as a private good.

Martinez and León's concluding chapter revisits the essays' major themes and includes suggestions for Latinos/as interested in pursing senior administration positions. Many of the presidents cautioned aspiring leaders that the pathway up the administrative ladder is fraught with setbacks. President William V. Flores advises that Latinos/as should "not expect it to be easy to advance up the ranks…work twice as hard and achieve results that no one can question. Think big and achieve big" (2013, p. 171). The editors also provide an overview and critique of professional development programs for aspiring higher education leaders, which in their view have "had a limited positive impact in positioning Latinos to assume leadership roles" (Martinez & León, 2013b, p. 271) given the decline in Latino/as pursuing these types of positions. Leon raises concerns about how these programs treat the topic of diversity: programs that primarily serve White administrators and include diversity as only a small part of a larger leadership curricula or programs that target diversity but primarily serve a non-White population.

While all of the stories shared in this volume are engaging and insightful, what distinguishes the collection from similar literature are the stories from the Latina college presidents and how they have successfully negotiated the cultural and social tensions associated with tradition and educational and professional aspiration.

President Martinez shares the challenges she faced in pursuing her graduate degrees and career goals while balancing her responsibilities as a young wife and mother, and the anger she incurred when she moved her family away from Southern California to accept a position as Administrative Dean for Student and Community Affairs: "My father did not speak, write or call me for months. I knew that I had angered him. I was no longer the dutiful daughter doing what was encouraged and expected…I doubt if he truly came to understand my desire to use my education" (Martinez, 2013, p. 54). For President Herlinda Martinez Glasscock, being the only female and only Latina in a leadership position was a source of both isolation and opportunity–"As one of the few Latinas in college administration from the Panhandle of Texas, I was called upon to serve on many state-wide committees…This level of work gave me a broader perspective of higher education in Texas and exposure to committee members who became colleagues, role models, and friends" (pp. 66-67), and when asked to serve as Interim President: "I was treated with courtesy, but at an arm's length. It was evident that I was not an insider, not only because I was different, but also because of the campus I represented" (p. 67). For these Latina presidents, professional success required them to work harder and be better than their male counterparts while also renegotiating cultural norms that preferred women to stay close to home and out of the workforce.

In perhaps an equally interesting contribution to the literature, the final chapter of the volume also includes the editors' elaboration on the impact of neoliberalism on Latinos/as in higher education. León and Martinez challenge the research community to consider why Latinos/as are being left behind and/or choosing not to pursue leadership positions within higher education, as well as the extent to which neoliberalism is at fault (for the reasons mentioned above). However, their suggestion that we look outside academe for accomplished Latinos/as to fill executive leadership positions would seem to undermine their initial critique of neoliberalism. By looking to the market for future administrators, are we not then eating our cake and having it too? While the editors argue that "outsiders who promote the Public Good would be much more acceptable to the internal constituents of higher education" (Martinez & León, 2013b, p. 275) than perhaps others who come from industries and occupations outside the university, it may be challenging to find candidates who view education as a public good if they have been successful in private industries where neoliberalism is most pervasive. It would seem that investment in national and institutionally based professional development programs that develop and enhance the leadership capabilities of Latino/a graduate students and junior faculty and staff would be a more promising in the long run, even if their impact is currently limited.

Latino College Presidents: In Their Own Words is a necessary read for undergraduates, graduate students, junior faculty and staff, and all those who are considering senior administrative and leadership positions in higher education, particularly Latinas who often face additional cultural and institutional barriers to advancement. This collection of stories is a reminder that assuming the presidency is a process built on hard work, developing and sustaining professional relationships and networks, perseverance, and a deep commitment to public education and service. This volume is hopefully the first of many collections focusing on the leadership stories and pathways to the college and university presidency.

References

Cook, B., & Kim, Y. (2012). *The American college president.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Gumport, P. J., Iannozzi, M., Shaman, S., & Zemsky, R. (1997). *Trends in higher education from massification to post-massification.* Stanford, CA: National Center for Postsecondary Improvement. Retrieved from http://www.stanford.edu/group/ncpi/documents/pdfs/1-04_massification.pdf

Thelin, J. R. (2011). *A history of American higher education.* Johns Hopkins University Press.

U.S. Department of Education. (2013). *Digest of education statistics.* Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Author Biographies

Cristina Alfaro is an associate professor and chair of the Department of Dual Language and English Learner Education (DLE) in the College of Education at San Diego State University (SDSU). She earned her Ph.D. in Teacher Preparation for Multilingual Learners, from the Claremont and SDSU joint graduate program. Dr. Alfaro teaches credential and graduate level courses where her work focuses on preparing teachers in the area of English language and biliteracy development with a global perspective. As a teacher researcher she has examined and published on the role of teachers' pedagogical and ideological clarity related to teaching practices for ethno and linguistically diverse students. Dr. Alfaro is the principal investigator of a 1.5 million dollar grant, funded by the U.S. Department of Education Office of English Language Acquisition, whose primary focus is to make the Common Core State Standards accessible to English learners.

María José Aragón is a doctoral student in Education at the University of California, Santa Barbara. She received an M.A. in International Educational Development from Teachers College, Columbia University, an M.A. in Education from Universidad de San Andrés in Argentina, and a B.S. in Human Development from Cornell University. Her research in Argentina and Guatemala has examined the relationship between local teacher education programs and education policies related to linguistic and cultural diversity. Her areas of interest include language and identity, bilingual education, immigration, and sociocultural linguistics.

Annette Daoud is a professor at California State University San Marcos where she teaches courses in multicultural and multilingual education. Throughout her 15-year career in higher education, Dr. Daoud has taught courses at several institutions in their secondary teacher education programs. Here courses focus on teaching secondary teacher credential candidates how to teach content and English language development to their English learner students in middle and high school content area classes. She has conducted numerous professional development trainings for content area middle and high school teachers to effectively teach English learners in their classes. She began her career as a high school English as a Second Language teacher in Morocco with the Peace Corps and since that time has focused her teaching and research on improving the educational experiences of secondary English learners. Dr. Daoud is currently the principal investigator for a National Professional Development grant funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of English Language Acquisition.

Richard Durán is a professor at the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education at University of California at Santa Barbara. After receiving his Ph.D. from UC Berkeley he was a research scientist at ETS, where he conducted investigations and published findings on the validity of the SAT, GRE, and TOEFL. His research interests include assessment and education policy, and education interventions serving English language learners and Latino students and families. He serves as director of the UCSB component of the California Engaging Latino Communities for Education (ENLACE) Project and its family and community school engagement strand. Dr. Durán is a Fellow of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and recently served as chair of the Social Justice Action Committee. He has published extensively on issues related to bilingual education and the assessment of English learners.

Anne René Elsbree is Associate Professor at California State University San Marcos where she teaches courses in teaching and learning in the Single Subject Credential Program and the Masters in Education Program. She is dedicated to making schools socially just, where all students are valued and provided the educational services to succeed. Her work focuses on effective strategies to differentiate curriculum at the secondary level for English Language Learners and Students with Special Needs. Her P-12 teaching experiences were in special education, where she worked to create inclusive schooling experiences in California and Wisconsin. Her research areas not only address inclusion and differentiation, but also how to disrupt homophobia in schools. Dr. Elsbree is an out lesbian. Guided by the social injustice of homophobic actions of others and the irreparable harm those

actions have on our most vulnerable children, Anne René does not take the "safe road" of staying closeted. She researches and writes about how teacher educators prepare pre-service teachers to avoid the perpetuation of homophobic oppression in schools.

Ana M. Hernández is Assistant Professor of Multilingual and Multicultural Education and coordinator of the Bilingual Authorization Program, CA Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) Certificate, and Dual Language Certificate at California State University San Marcos. She teaches in the Masters in Education and teacher credential programs, including bilingual courses in Spanish. She has also taught for 32 years in CA's public schools as a bilingual teacher in elementary and secondary education in Los Angeles and San Diego County. Dr. Hernández is a national trainer for teachers and a presenter at national and international professional conferences. Her research areas include: dual language instructional strategies, biliteracy development, English Language Development, and cross-cultural competence.

Alexandra Hunt is a research assistant to a five-year grant funded by the U.S. Department of Education Office of English Language Acquisition. Since 2010, her research and professional development activities have revolved around the necessary pedagogical foundations in preparing both pre-service and practicing teachers to make the Common Core State Standards accessible to English and dual language learners. She received an M.A. in Liberal Arts from San Diego State University, and a B.A. in Global Cultures and Spanish from University of California at Irvine. Her interdisciplinary research examined the relationship between dominant ideologies and multilingual education policy and practice.

Crystal Kalinec-Craig is an Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Instruction with a focus on mathematics teacher education at the University of Texas at San Antonio. Dr. Kalinec-Craig teaches elementary mathematics methods courses and her research focuses on both pre-service and in-service teachers. She is interested in learning about the particular knowledge and experiences of teachers who are recent immigrants and helping more elementary mathematics teachers develop a culturally responsive pedagogy that attends to issues of status in the classroom. She is also interested in how teachers might incorporate elements of art and music into their mathematical practice.

Christina Pavlak is an Assistant Professor of Education at Quinnipiac University. Before earning her doctorate in Curriculum & Instruction from Boston College, she worked as a bilingual educator in Santa Fe, NM. Her research interests include critical perspectives on schooling, literacy education for English language learners, and social justice issues in teacher education.

Amelia Marcetti Topper is a researcher and teacher whose work focuses on issues of student success. She is a doctoral candidate in Arizona State University's Education Policy and Evaluation program specializing in higher education, and holds a Master's in Leadership in Teaching from the College of Notre Dame of Maryland and a Bachelor's in Philosophy and the History of Mathematics and Sciences with a minor in Classical Languages from St. John's College. Ms. Topper currently coordinates the Mary Lou Fulton Teacher College's Scholarly Communications Group for the edXchange initiative, and is a managing editor of Education Policy Analysis Archive.

Laura Schall-Leckrone is assistant professor of TESOL and bilingual education in the Language & Literacy Division of the Graduate School of Education at Lesley University in Cambridge, MA. Prior to completing her doctorate, Laura worked for seventeen years as a bilingual educator and K-12 curriculum director in public schools. Her research focuses on two related areas: how teachers develop "orientations," knowledge, and skills to meet the needs of bilingual learners; and, how bilingual adolescents learn critical literacy skills of academic and civic engagement.

CALL FOR PAPERS
Association of Mexican American Educators (AMAE) Journal Special Issue

Complicating The Politics of Deservingness:
A Critical Look at Latina/o Undocumented Migrant Youth

Guest Editors: Genevieve Negrón-Gonzales (University of San Francisco), Leisy Abrego (University of California, Los Angeles) and Kathleen Coll (University of San Francisco)

The separation of marginalized people into categories of deserving/undeserving, civil/uncivil, and worthy/ unworthy is not new; yet it took on a new dimension when, in the summer of 2014, tens of thousands of Central American refugee children crossing the U.S.-Mexico border made headlines. Although the migration and settlement of Mexican and Central American children has a long history, for the first time, the public saw images of children packed into bare rooms, sleeping on the floor, in overcrowded and unsanitary conditions. The collective, if short-lived, outrage was later followed simultaneously by angry protests that blocked buses of children from entering towns and supporters who welcomed them. Protesters considered them dangerous invaders while supporters invoked notions of innocent childhood. The media coverage and competing actions opened the space for conversations about what is now very clearly a "broken" U.S. immigration system tied to violently consequential foreign policies in the region. Indeed, undocumented youth in the immigrant rights movement have been mobilizing to put an end to the reprehensible immigrant detention and deportation system that makes them and their families vulnerable.

In this special issue, we aim to highlight the complex and important ways in which the experiences and institutional interactions of refugee children, undocumented youth, and young immigrants are both distinct and interconnected. Challenging notions of deservingness that distinguish between "good" versus "bad" immigrants, we solicit contributions informed by a structural analysis of childhood and youth as it has played out in the discourse about the lived experiences of immigrant youth and their families. Our goal is to open the space for a critical immigration scholarship that grapples with the production of illegality, citizenship as a commodity, and a disruption of the deserving/undeserving immigrant narrative. We invite pieces that complicate the contemporary conversation about undocumented young people as well as those that problematize the myth of a U.S. context that protects childhood and families of color.

The special issue will bring together conversations about "DREAMers," unaccompanied migrant children, and grassroots struggles working to transform the current immigration system and end the institutional violence it engenders. Together, submissions will acknowledge U.S. intervention, global capitalism, geopolitics, and racism in this multi-layered migration regime. We are particularly interested in manuscripts that are interdisciplinary and that engage with the complexity of these dynamics and the nuances in the broader field. We welcome manuscripts that offer theoretical perspectives; research findings; innovative methodologies; pedagogical reflections; and implications related to (but not limited to) the following areas:

- Political subjectivities of "DREAMers" & unDACAmented youth
- The unaccompanied child migrant "crisis"
- Grassroots activism around immigrant rights
- Deportation, detention, and the state
- The politics of a divide between "deserving" children and "undeserving" adult immigrants
- Undocumented children and the educational system
- Legal services provision and due process for youth
- Local and municipal responses to federal policies
- The relationship between immigration debates and the welfare and carceral systems

Submissions suitable for publication in this special issue include empirical papers, theoretical/conceptual papers, historical work, essays, book reviews, and poems. It is important to note that the special issue is interested in the broader Latina/o experience and not solely focused on the experiences of Mexican Americans (per the title of the journal).

The selection of manuscripts will be conducted as follows:

1. Manuscripts will be judged on strength and relevance to the theme of the special issue.

2. Manuscripts should not have been previously published in another journal, nor should they be under consideration by another journal at the time of submission.

3. Each manuscript will be subjected to a blind review by a panel of reviewers with expertise in the area treated by the manuscript. Those manuscripts recommended by the panel of experts will then be considered by the AMAE guest editors and editorial board, which will make the final selections.

Manuscripts should be submitted as follows:

1. Submit via email both a cover letter and copy of the manuscript in Microsoft Word to: Dr. Genevieve Negrón-Gonzales (gnegrongonzales@usfca.edu).

2. Cover letter should include name, title, short author bio (100 words), and institutional affiliation; indicate the type of manuscript submitted and the number of words, including references. Also, please indicate how your manuscript addresses the call for papers.

3. Manuscripts should be no longer than 7,000 words (including references) and have an abstract of 200 words or less. Please follow the standard format of the American Psychological Association (APA). Include within the text all illustrations, charts, and graphs. Manuscripts may also be submitted in Spanish.

Deadline for submissions is April 15, 2015. Please address questions to Dr. Genevieve Negrón-Gonzales (gnegrongonzales@usfca.edu) or Dr. Patricia Sánchez (patricia.sanchez@utsa.edu). Authors will be asked to address revisions to their manuscripts during the summer months of 2015. This special issue is due to be published in December 2015.

Journal Reviewer Form

The following is the rubric to be used for the evaluation of manuscripts considered for the *AMAE Journal.*

To the Reviewer/Evaluator: please feel free to make embedded changes to the article to improve the quality and/or the delivery of the message. Please do not change the message that the author intended, however. The edited piece will be forwarded to the original author for feedback. The name of the reviewer/evaluator will remain anonymous to the original author.

Reviewer/Evaluator_____   Date_____

Email: _____   Phone: _____

Article Title:

Article addresses the general scope of the Association of Mexican-American Educators Journal	1	2	3	4	5
Timeliness and relevance to current Latino/Mexican-American scholarship and issues	1	2	3	4	5
Theoretical framework/review of the literature is well grounded, focused, and is aligned to the topic/ methods of manuscript	1	2	3	4	5
Research methods are clearly articulated and supported with appropriate data to substantiate findings.	1	2	3	4	5
Article is accessible and valuable to researchers and practitioners.	1	2	3	4	5
Clarity, Style, organization and quality of writing	1	2	3	4	5

Overall Score on the Rubric: _____/30

Do you recommend inclusion of this article in the AMAE journal?

Yes, as submitted ☐

Yes, but with minor revisions ☐

Yes, but would need significant revisions and another review ☐

No ☐

Comments/ suggestions to improve the article (for the author)

Comments/ suggestions about the article (for the guest editors) (these comments will not be shared with the author):

v

Application to Join AMAE
Association of Mexican American Educators, Inc.

634 South Sping Street, Suite 602 • Los Angeles, CA 90014
(424) 261-2623 • ExecutiveDirector@amae.org
www.amae.org

EL FUEGO NUEVO

Local Chapters (Check One)

	Central Coast (San Luis Obispo County)
	Central Los Angeles (Metro Area)
	East Los Angeles
	Fresno Area
	Inland Empire (San Bernardino and Riverside Area)
	Los Angeles Harbor Area
	Madera
	North Central Valley (Stanislaus County Area)
	Oxnard/ Ventura Area
	Pajaro Valley (Watsonville)
	Parlier
	Porterville
	San Diego
	San Fernando Valley
	Santa Maria
	Santa Monica/ West Los Angeles
	South Central Los Angeles
	Visalia Area
	I'm not sure. Please place me or make me a member at large
	The chapters are too far away. I'd like to start a new chapter. Contact Executive Director.

Date:		New:	Renewal:
Name:			
Address:			
City:	State:	Zip Code:	
Home Phone: ( )		Cell Phone: ( )	
E-Mail:			
District:			
School:			
Position:		Membership Type:	

Type of Memberships   State Dues + Chapter

Regular: Open to all certificated personel (Teachers, Counselors and Administrators) $50 + Chapter Dues
Retired: Open to all Regular AMAE Members Retired. $25 + Chapter Dues
Paraprofessional • Associate • Student (non-certificated or community member) $10 + Chapter Dues

Please mail this form to the AMAE Office:
Attention Memebership, 634 South Spring Street, Suite 602, Los Angeles, CA 90014