
**What a Difference a Year Makes:
A Large Urban School District's Transformation from Remedial to an Enrichment Dual
Language Education**

Stacie Hill, M. Ed., Dallas Independent School District, Multi-Language Enrichment Program
Richard Gómez, Ph.D., The University of Texas at Brownsville
Leo Gómez, Ph.D., The University of Texas Pan American

Abstract

In an era of increasing accountability and a growing trend toward globalization, many urban school districts are finding themselves at a crossroads. Paramount among the challenges they face is the exponential increase in the population of English Language Learners (ELLs), particularly of Hispanic descent, coupled with a continued failure to provide these students an *equitable educational opportunity* that allows greater numbers to graduate from high school and prepare them for postsecondary education. In telling this story, it is important to share a philosophically and theoretically based discussion on the importance of moving bilingual education policies, programs and practices from a *remedial* to an *enrichment* paradigm (Collier & Thomas, 2004). While educators across the country have used varied approaches for meeting the needs of ELLs, the philosophical and theoretical bases for such decisions adhere to principles of either an enrichment or remedial perspective.

Contact Information:

Stacie Hill, M. Ed., Dallas Independent School District
slhill@dallasisd.org

Richard Gómez, Ph. D., The University of Texas at Brownsville
richard.gomez@utb.edu

Leo Gómez, Ph. D., The University of Texas Pan American
lgomez@utpa.edu

Introduction

In an era of increasing accountability and a growing trend toward globalization, many urban school districts are finding themselves at a crossroads. Paramount among the challenges they face is the exponential increase in the population of English Language Learners (ELLs), particularly of Hispanic descent, coupled with a continued failure to provide these students an *equitable educational opportunity* that allows greater numbers to graduate from high school and prepare them for postsecondary education. In telling this story, it is important to share a philosophically and theoretically based discussion on the importance of moving bilingual education policies, programs and practices from a *remedial* to an *enrichment* paradigm (Collier & Thomas, 2004). While educators across the country have used varied approaches for meeting the needs of ELLs, the philosophical and theoretical bases for such decisions adhere to principles of an either an enrichment or remedial perspective.

Remedial vs. Enrichment: An Important Distinction

There are two major and distinct differences that characterize enrichment or remedial bilingual education models. *Enrichment models* of bilingual education view the non-English language as a *learning language*, an asset that should be linguistically and cognitively developed and a strong resource for English acquisition. *Remedial models* of bilingual education perceive the non-English language as a deficit or a problem that must be corrected; the sooner the learner is moved out of first language instruction, the faster the acquisition of English. Remedial models typically aim for learners quickly acquiring *communicative abilities* in the L2 and immediate transition into the mainstream classroom. As Baker (2001) explains, unlike enrichment programs that promote pluralism, these models impact the degree of bilingualism and biliteracy and of social and cultural pluralism by emphasizing assimilation.

Research consistently states that ELLs are more academically successful in schools if they receive formal schooling in their first language, at the same time they are learning English (Cummins, 1981; Thomas & Collier, 2002). Thomas & Collier's (2002) program effectiveness studies clearly indicate that only enrichment forms of bilingual education that provide instruction in both the first and second languages close the *English* academic achievement gap between ELLs and native English speakers as they continue their schooling. They explain that the number one predictor for long-term ELL academic achievement *in English* is the *extent* and *quality* of L1 schooling. This type of education is centered on the *grade level* academic and cognitive strength that the first language provides as the ELL simultaneously learns the second language through language-rich and academically-based activities.

Enrichment bilingual education adheres to an instructional philosophy that all students, regardless of language background upon entering school, can achieve high levels of biliteracy, given that one of those languages is the first language. Enriched education, as described by Cloud, Genesee, and Hamayan (2000) are programs that give all students the opportunity to linguistically, academically, and culturally develop their first language while they similarly develop a second or possibly third language. Figure 1 provides a clear dichotomy explaining potential practices and outcomes between enrichment and remedial bilingual education and English as a Second Language (ESL) models serving ELLs.

Figure 1

Characteristics of Enrichment and Remedial Instructional Paradigms

Characteristics of Enrichment and Remedial Instructional Paradigms

- **Enrichment**
 - Students learn academic/cognitive skills, while they develop/acquire English;
 - Learners learn at grade level or above;
 - Carefully sequenced content-based English development, no translation;
 - Additive, enrichment model, positive self-concept;
 - Learners are challenged, higher expectations;

- Produces balanced bilinguals with positive cognitive advantages;
 - Strong long-term academic achievement and increased graduation;
 - Fully closes the academic achievement gap;
 - Strong language arts instruction in first language; adds academic English;
 - Strives to assess initial reading achievement in first language.
- ***Remedial***
 - Students develop English, but learn weak academic/cognitive skills;
 - Learners *learn* below grade level;
 - Inconsistent English; concurrent translation;
 - Deficit, subtractive model, negative self-concept;
 - Low expectations; remedial, watered down curriculum;
 - Produces limited bilinguals with negative cognitive effects;
 - Poor long-term academic achievement;
 - Maintains or widens academic achievement gap;
 - Weak language arts instruction in first language; weak English;
 - Tests initial reading in second language; English testing encourages English.

There are also cognitive advantages to learning content through two or more languages.

Research studies demonstrate that strong bilingual/biliterate students acquire ***cognitive advantages*** over equally learned monolingual students (Cenoz & Genesee, 1998; Collier & Thomas, 2004; Cummins, 1981). Biliterate students typically outperform monolingual students in problem solving, divergent thinking, and recognition of patterns. Strong bilinguals typically also acquire enhanced metalinguistic awareness skills, or increased knowledge of language structures and usage. Simply stated, learning in two languages is just as normal and possible as learning in one (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000). The decision by educational leaders on which instructional model to use not only impacts achievement results as we have seen in recent research, but *limits* or *enhances* the educational, socio-cultural, and economic capabilities of students and future generations.

By contrast, remedial bilingual education perceives the first language as an obstacle—at best simply a bridge to the acquisition of English. The central purpose and goal of these instructional models is acquiring the English language, in most cases at the expense of the first

language. It does not perceive the first language as a viable language for learning *grade level knowledge and skills*, which allow ELLs to keep up academically with native English speakers. This type of remedial education typically produces ELLs who are linguistically and academically weak in *both* languages and incapable of functioning at grade level in a demanding English academic environment beyond fifth grade. This point is clearly stressed in Thomas & Collier's (2002) program effectiveness studies.

Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan (2000) explain that students who do not receive first language instruction struggle to learn both oral and written academic proficiency in their new language (English) while simultaneously remaining at grade level in their academic subjects. Some remedial bilingual education models provide limited first language instruction and instead emphasize English instruction and oral development. ELLs tend to focus on English language development and sacrifice grasping strong *grade level knowledge and skills* needed to stay on grade level. These remedial programs fail to recognize the original *purpose* of bilingual education as defined by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1971): (1) full proficiency and literacy (biliteracy) in English and the native language; (2) acquisition of basic and higher order thinking skills for academic achievement and beyond; (3) development of a strong self-concept; and (4) successful transition from completion of school to higher education, work, and community life (p. 21).

As schools across the country strive to provide greater educational parity for the students they serve, more and more seek out the research and knowledge base to do things differently as they move from a remedial to an enrichment instructional paradigm. The most commonly used program models for educating ELLs in the United States are Submersion, ESL, Early-Exit Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE), Late-Exit TBE, Maintenance Bilingual Education (BE)

and One-Way and Two-Way Dual Language Enrichment (DLE) Education (Gómez & Ruiz-Escalante, 2005). Figure 2 provides a brief description of each model or program, including its linguistic and cultural goals.

Remedial or subtractive models aim to minimally use the first language (or not utilize the ELL’s first language at all) while enrichment or additive models aim to use the first language for academic *grade level* learning while adding the second language. For ELLs, it is clear that the second language goes as the first language goes. That is, the academic level in the second language (English) is largely dependent on the academic level of the first language; the stronger the first language the stronger the second. Conversely, the weaker the first language is, the weaker the second.

Figure 2
Remedial and Enrichment Models for Educating English Language Learners

Model or Program	Description	Linguistic and Cultural Goal
<i>Remedial and Subtractive Models of Bilingual Education</i>		
Language-Based ESL (pullout)	Language instruction in L2 for ELLs only. Typically, L2 language instruction, taught by second language specialist, is sequenced and grammatically-based.	Monolingual and full assimilation
Content-Based ESL	Academic instruction in L2 for ELLs only. L2 instruction is taught via a content-area by second language specialist. L1 minimally	Monolingual and full assimilation

	used for concept clarification.	
Early-Exit Transitional Bilingual Education	Academic instruction in both L1 and L2 for ELLs only, with initial but <i>not</i> sufficient emphasis on the L1, strong emphasis on L2. Quick reduction of L1. Typically implemented PK-3 rd grade.	Minimal bilingualism and full assimilation
Late-Exit Transitional Bilingual Education	Academic instruction in both L1 and L2 for ELLs only, with sufficient emphasis on the L1 and increased emphasis on L2. Gradual reduction of L1. Typically implemented PK-5 th grade.	Moderate bilingualism and assimilation
<i>Enrichment and Additive Models of Bilingual Education</i>		
Maintenance Bilingual Education	Academic instruction in both L1 and L2 for ELLs only, with strong and continued emphasis on the L1. Typically implemented PK-6 th grade.	Biliteracy Pluralism
One-Way Dual Language Enrichment Education	Enriched academic instruction in both L1 and L2 for ELLs <i>only</i> . Percentage of L1 & L2 instruction varies in 90/10 and 50/50 models.	Biliteracy Pluralism
Two-Way	Enriched academic instruction in both L1 and	Biliteracy

Dual Language	L2 for <i>both</i> ELLs and native English speakers	Pluralism
Enrichment	<i>learning together</i> . Percentage of L1 & L2	
Education	instruction varies in 90/10 and 50/50 models.	

Taking a First Step

As hope for long-term academic success for ELLs fades with the continued implementation of remedial bilingual programs, school districts are being forced to look closely at their instructional practices and make decisions that will affect the future of their students. The Dallas Independent School District (Dallas ISD) is a case in point. The second largest school district in the state of Texas, Dallas ISD serves approximately 159,000 students across 217 schools. Of the 87,000 students in pre-kindergarten through 5th grade, 36,700 (42%) are identified as ELLs. By far the greatest numbers of identified ELLs are Hispanic with a home language of Spanish; these ELLs are eligible to be served through the district's transitional bilingual education or ESL programs.

Historically, Dallas ISD followed the state trend of providing transitional bilingual education as the preferred instructional model for English language learners with a home language of Spanish. The goal of the program was to transition students as quickly as possible from native language instruction and support in pre-kindergarten through 1st or 2nd grade, to almost all-English instruction by 3rd grade. Success was equated with reaching a level of English proficiency that allowed students to transition from the bilingual classroom to the mainstream. This instructional model validated the public's *erroneous* perception of bilingual education as a remedial program for students who were not quite ready for the more rigorous curriculum of a

general education classroom and fostered a form of subtractive bilingualism that only set many of these students up for failure in the upper grades (Lessow-Hurley, 2000).

Also in line with the state trend were the poor academic results for Dallas ISD ELLs that unknowingly were largely attributed to this subtractive remedial bilingual education program. Poor results of ELLs on standardized reading tests in English continue to validate the research findings on the ineffectiveness of transitional bilingual programs and long-term student success that adversely affected the district's graduation rate. Based on state standardized assessments, students see their peak performance in 3rd grade, followed by a gradual decline in their academic success and the inevitable widening of the academic achievement gap over time, with many not completing high school, or at best graduating lacking college-level skills (Thomas & Collier, 2002). Unable to ignore the research and the continued struggles of ELLs in the district, the Dallas ISD Multi-Language Enrichment Program began the search for alternative programs with the hope of initiating a district-wide instructional paradigm shift.

Creation of a Dual Language Planning Committee

In a district the size of Dallas ISD, it is difficult for any one department to move forward with a new initiative alone. The need for buy-in from the district at large, regardless of its size, is necessary for successful planning, implementation, and program sustainability (Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2005; Soltero, 2004; Sugarman & Howard, 2001). Luckily, the district's administration, including the district superintendent, were also ready to explore more effective instructional models for educating ELLs. As a result, the district created a Dual Language Planning Committee made up of stakeholders from a variety of departments and levels of administration.

In November 2005, the committee held its first meeting to discuss the impetus for the new program proposal. The need to improve the quality of education for ELLs had been a long-standing priority in the Multi-Language Enrichment Department, but the district at large was now primed for change. The goal of transitioning students as quickly as possible from native language instruction to English instruction was replaced with the desire to validate and develop the students' native language while developing both social and academic proficiency in English. The new vision and priority were bilingualism and biliteracy for all students.

The Multi-Language Enrichment Department was well-versed in the research on these enrichment forms of bilingual education and noted the increase in the number of dual language programs in the state and across the country, namely two-way dual language programs. Two-way dual language programs serve both English language learners and native English speakers in an enrichment setting with a focus on challenging students through a rigorous curriculum and developing high levels of academic vocabulary and proficiency in two languages.

The integration of language-minority and language-majority students in one classroom provides opportunities to model and support language and content development, not just between the teacher and students, but through peer interactions (Alanís, 2006; Genesee, Hamayan, & Cloud, 2000; Gómez, 2000; Gómez & Ruiz-Escalante, 2005). With the success of two-way dual language programs well documented in research, the committee began the search for the model best suited to meet the needs of the district's population of students. After the initial discussion about possible considerations and challenges for developing and implementing a plan, the committee adjourned with the task of formulating recommendations for the program design and reviewing the existing literature on two-way dual language models as well as reviewing different models and possibly visiting dual language schools currently in implementation.

The Dallas ISD Dual Language Planning Committee reconvened in December 2005. Members reported their findings from the literature reviews, and representatives from the Multi-Language Enrichment Program presented a proposal for the instructional model to be implemented. The Gómez and Gómez 50/50 Dual Language Enrichment (DLE) Content-Based Model was recommended to meet the district's need for structure and consistency across campuses through the strict adherence to specific instructional guidelines, including the separation of languages by content area (Gómez, 2006; Gómez, Freeman, & Freeman, 2005). Keeping in mind the question, "Who are we serving?" the committee began the evaluation of the different model components and initiated the discussion on the implementation timeline and the need for continued learning.

With a model in mind, but also with need for additional information, the Dual Language Planning Committee developed an itinerary for dual language school site visits in Ysleta ISD, located in El Paso, Texas, and Brownsville Independent School District in Brownsville, Texas, in January 2006. Several committee members utilized the site visits to further evaluate the recommended program model and witness in action the celebrations and challenges of a two-way dual language program. Of particular interest during the visits in Brownsville was the opportunity for committee members to see the implementation of bilingual pairs, one of the key components of the Gómez and Gómez 50/50 DLE Content-Based Model. In grouping students with different language proficiency levels or content area knowledge, the teachers were able to capitalize on peer teaching and tutoring to support comprehension (Gómez, 2006; Gómez, Freeman, & Freeman, 2005).

When the committee reconvened in late January 2006 to share information from the site visits, members learned that the district's superintendent requested that at least one Dallas ISD

school begin implementing the two-way dual language program in August of 2006, with up to three additional schools beginning implementation the following school year. With little time to spare, sub-committees were assigned to expedite the planning process. School selection parameters, staffing considerations, and community engagement were all critical topics to be discussed. Likewise, the sub-committees were given the goal to return in February to clarify and articulate program goals, finalize the model, and establish a timeline for implementation.

In February 2006, several Dual Language Planning Committee meetings were held to share sub-committee recommendations and make final decisions for implementation. With the Gómez and Gómez 50/50 DLE Content-Based Model chosen as the most appropriate model to meet the district's needs, the committee began work on how best to present the plan for implementation to the district's six area superintendents and select the campus to implement the program. Invigorated by the research and the possibility of not only serving ELLs through this program, but also giving native English speakers the opportunity to participate in an enriched dual language program, the area superintendents requested that the district allow for the selection of six campuses, one per area. Soon thereafter, each area superintendent selected a campus that would begin implementation in the fall of 2006.

Plan for Implementation with the Consultants

With the course set, the Multi-Language Enrichment Program began the monumental task of putting the implementation plan into practice. First on the agenda was the need to contact Dr. Leo Gómez and Dr. Richard Gómez, authors of the Gómez and Gómez 50/50 DLE Content-Based Model, to serve as consultants to ensure the district was on the right track with the implementation plan. The Drs. Gómez visited the district in late March of 2006. With a full itinerary, the consultants first met with the Multi-Language Enrichment Department to clarify

goals and discuss the planning process and the district's timeline. The area superintendents were then provided an opportunity to hear the program overview and expectations. The consultants discussed the research in depth and provided insight into the benefits and challenges of the program. Principals interested in implementing the program were also provided an opportunity to hear about the Dallas plan and recommend their campus for consideration.

With over 20 administrators attending the information meeting and evidence of support for implementation overwhelmingly positive, the consultants took the opportunity to present another critical concept to the Multi-Language Enrichment Department. They noted that in implementing a *two-way* dual language program, the district provides both ELLs and native English speakers the opportunity to learn in a dual language setting. However, by beginning with one campus per area the first year, and adding up to three schools the following year, it would take *too* long to provide all ELLs the opportunity to participate in a quality enrichment education in a district the size of Dallas. Keeping the goal of serving *all* ELLs through a quality enriched bilingual education program in mind, the consultants recommended that the district consider a *one-way* dual language model. One-way dual language programs provide instruction in two languages for *one* language group (Collier & Thomas, 2004; Gómez, Freeman, & Freeman, 2005).

The power of one-way dual language is that Dallas ISD would convert its current transitional bilingual program to a *one-way* dual language enrichment program following the Gómez and Gómez DLE Content-Based Model, exclusively serving *all* ELLs in the district! The incredible change from one year to the next was that, effective fall 2006, the district was to serve over 25,000 ELLs through an enriched bilingual education instructional model versus a remedial one. The plan now was for Dallas ISD to *officially adopt One-Way Dual Language as the*

district's bilingual education program serving its ELL population. The two-way dual language program would be implemented as a pilot program in addition to the new one-way program and would also provide native English speakers an opportunity to participate along with ELLs.

As the consultants described this new possibility, the Multi-language Enrichment Department staff reflected on the goals for bringing on an enrichment bilingual program. The original impetus for the program change was to ensure educational equity and success for the district's ELLs. Providing dual language instruction to native English speakers was an added bonus, but not the overarching goal. As a result, the department decided to follow the consultants' recommendation and propose that the district move forward with a one-way dual language model as the *new* bilingual education program and designate six campuses for the two-way dual language pilot program. What the consultants were not ready for was the department's drive and motivation to carry this plan out with not just a few campuses, but with all 132 schools implementing currently transitional bilingual program. The goal was now to roll out a comprehensive enrichment bilingual education program at the PK-1st grade level district-wide!

With support from the district's administration and with School Board approval, the Multi-Language Enrichment Department moved forward with its plans to offer one-way dual language enrichment beginning at the PK-1st grade level in fall 2006. In spring 2006, the department provided opportunities for staff and community meetings at each of the now seven identified two-way dual language campuses (changed from 6 to 7). As the consultants planned for the Dallas training, notices were sent to all pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, and 1st grade Bilingual teachers in the district to attend the 3-Day Dual Language Institute in summer 2006.

Beginning in July 2006, the consultants provided district-wide training to future implementing teachers and campus principals and assistant principals on the Gómez and Gómez

50/50 DLE Content-Based Model. Scheduled in three-day cohorts, teachers received in depth training on the research and rationale for providing enrichment bilingual education through one-way and two-way dual language education. Additionally, participants acquired the knowledge necessary to implement the program with a high level of fidelity. The DLE model's components—a separation of languages by content area, language of the day, conceptual refinement, and bilingual pairs—were discussed in detail.

Training also included a strong preparation on best practices through *enriched pedagogy* based on the principle of creating *challenging, interactive, and authentic* dual language classrooms. Once all 11 cohorts were completed, more than 900 Dallas ISD bilingual teachers were prepared for program implementation as dual language teachers. The Drs. Gómez returned to Dallas in late August 2006. Teachers who were unable to attend the summer institutes were given an opportunity to attend a make-up three-day session. Additionally, campus administrators and area superintendents were provided the opportunity to attend additional *practical* training on the model that included the preparation and expectations for effective implementation at the campus level.

Throughout fall 2006, the Multi-Language Enrichment Program staff provided technical support to campuses, including classroom walk-through, phone and email support, and the development of instructional configurations to meet individual campus needs based on the student and staff demographics. To support implementation of the new enriched model, the department, in collaboration with several content area departments, began a series of training mini-sessions held after school to clarify and deepen understanding of the program guidelines and components. Session topics included science and social studies training in Spanish, math support in English, learning centers, and language of the day.

In October and November 2006, Dr. Leo Gómez and Dr. Richard Gómez, along with eight of their colleagues, began visiting the Dallas ISD schools implementing one-way and two-way dual language. Each classroom visit consisted of a 25-minute walk-through and a debriefing with the campus administrator and teachers. Summaries of the level or stages of implementation were provided to teachers, campus administrators, the bilingual department, and area superintendents. By November 10, 2006, more than 380 classrooms across 52 campuses had been visited, and by the end of January 2007, more than 900 classrooms across 132 campuses were visited and were well on their way to effectively implementing one-way or two-way dual language education and, more importantly, effectively serving ELLs.

The Key to Success: Administrative Knowledge and Support

During the 2005-2006 school year, as the Multi-Language Enrichment Program began an internal dialogue about alternative program models for Dallas ISD ELLs and the desire to move toward enrichment models of education like dual language, the district was going through a change of its own. A new district superintendent had recently joined the Dallas team, along with a host of other top administrators. The new leadership was poised and ready to lead Dallas ISD to become one of the top urban school districts in the nation.

The new district initiative, Dallas Achieves, had the mission to provide all students a coherent and rigorous education. With this move toward a more challenging, enrichment-based education for all students, including the district's ELLs, the move toward one-way and two-way dual language enrichment could not have come at a better time. As a result of the perfect alignment between the direction the Multi-Language Enrichment Department was taking with the education of ELLs, and the overall vision the district administration had for the entire student population, the district superintendent and deputy superintendents strongly committed to the

implementation of one-way dual language district-wide. The clear message was that all stakeholders, from administrators to classroom teachers, are accountable for providing students the best education possible. All stakeholders have become well versed in the research and rationale behind enrichment bilingual education, supporting the implementation of the district's new enrichment bilingual education program in their talk and practice.

In addition to the district level, the department itself has seen a change in administration. The new assistant superintendent for the Multi-Language Enrichment Department accepted the position in midstream of the planning process. Without hesitation, the department administration embraced and moved forward with the implementation plan. As the initiative has grown, so have the dedication and motivation of the department to seek out best instructional practices and support for Dallas ISD ELLs. The buy-in and support of the district's different levels of administration, along with an alignment between Dallas Achieves and the goals of the new enrichment bilingual program, have ensured a commitment to high levels of implementation of and fidelity to the program.

Lessons Learned: Recommendations

Rolling out any program district-wide in a school district the size of Dallas ISD is a challenge. While the level of implementation and growth experienced just a year after the initial discussion has exceeded all expectations, the department and district at large have learned a great deal from the challenges encountered. While a district-wide roll out is an expedient way to ensure *all* ELLs are served through an enrichment bilingual education program quickly, it is imperative that the district understand the need for at least one planning year. The planning year allows for district-wide information sharing and provides the opportunity for all stakeholders to develop a level of buy-in necessary to commit to implementation (Soltero, 2004; Sugarman &

Howard, 2001). School board members, district-level administrators, content area departments, campus administrators, and teachers should all have opportunities to dialogue and contribute to the development of a plan and provide input in regard to student needs. Also included in this planning year should be the anticipation of long term goals and future program plans.

Districts considering the implementation of one-way or two-way dual language programs should ensure identified campuses have staff and community understanding of the program goals and expectations, along with unwavering buy-in before moving forward with implementation (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000; Sugarman & Howard, 2001). For two-way settings, demographics should support an approximate 50/50 balance of ELLs and non-ELLs in the program, and families should be asked to commit to the program through 5th grade to avoid challenges arising through attrition.

The anticipation of the ripple effects from implementation should also be considered by districts moving forward with implementation of one-way or two-way dual language. The availability of instructional resources in both languages, including textbooks, teacher guides, and classroom libraries should be assessed ahead of time, and plans for the acquisition of necessary materials should be developed. Personnel resources should also be considered when planning for implementation. Not only are committed and knowledgeable departmental staff needed for the behind-the-scenes development and planning, they are also needed to provide training and field support at the district and campus levels. Likewise, district staffing needs should be considered when identifying the instructional configurations (self-contained vs. team-teaching classroom designs) to be used within the model. Curriculum alignment with the new instructional program should be discussed and developed in the spirit of collaboration between the content area departments.

Additionally, districts must consider changes to the existing grading policy, the local assessment policy, and the effect implementation will have on any existing grant or special programs. Finally, since the district has replaced its old remedial bilingual program serving ELLs with One-Way Dual Language, it now needs to consider modifying its existing policy documents so as to clearly describe its new enriched dual language program. This policy action will provide clear directive of the systemic change to all district and campus administration and the district's teaching staff regarding the newly adopted one-way and two-way dual language programs. Moreover, it will also provide greater long-term security for teachers, students, and their families that this enriched program will continue regardless of any future administrative changes at the district or campus level.

What the Future Holds

As year one of implementation raced along, the consultants returned to the district the following summer to continue the three-day training for the second grade teachers who picked up the first grade cohort of students, as well as provide more in depth training to campus administration. The Multi-Language Enrichment Program will continue to support implementation through campus visits and specialized training based on identified areas of need. With the commencement of the next two academic school years, the district saw the implementation of the one-way dual language program grow district-wide in grades PK–3rd along with increasing the number of two-way campuses to provide additional opportunities for *more* native English speakers to receive an enriched education.

An additional 21 two-way schools (at one time one-way schools) were identified based on a host of district approved criteria, including the level of school and community interest and support, and the school's level of implementation of the one-way dual language program during

the first and second years. Identified two-way dual language campuses began implementation of the program at the pre-kindergarten and kindergarten levels (serving both native English speakers and ELLs), while 1st-3rd grade levels at those schools will continue one-way dual language serving only ELLs.

As of 2008-2009, the district is implementing PK-3rd grade one-way programs and PK-1st grade two-way programs. Long-term goals include program growth into the secondary level. At this point, anecdotal data from teacher observations and annual benchmarks across implementing levels indicate that participating ELLs are achieving greater academic success and participating native English speakers are doing equally as well. We are in the process of collecting, organizing and analyzing this data as well as upcoming Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) data from current participating third graders that we hope to publish in a future article.

Conclusion

One of the greatest district epiphanies was the understanding of the power of One-Way Dual Language Enrichment Education to provide *equal educational opportunities* for our traditionally underserved ELL population. More and more school districts are recognizing that *One-Way Dual Language Enrichment Education* can more effectively serve large numbers of ELLs and be adopted as *the* official bilingual education program serving this population. For instance, in Texas, there is a growing realization and trend being promoted by both bilingual educators and school leaders where a significant number of large urban and small rural districts are replacing their existing remedial bilingual or ESL program (typically early-exit or ESL pullout) with an enriched One-Way DLE for serving their ELL population. It is important to note that regardless of population composition, *both* One-Way and Two-Way dual language

enrichment programs *close the academic achievement gap* between ELLs and native English speakers (Collier & Thomas, 2004).

It is important to keep in mind that educators and researchers continue to learn from the past and have come a long way in efforts to achieve *educational equity* in our schools. Bilingual education policy has been greatly affected by both state and federal policies, and there continues to be a lack of understanding of the purpose of bilingual education and the benefits of first language instruction, particularly among political and educational leaders.

There is still extensive misunderstanding in the field among policymakers and educational leaders on the benefits of an enrichment bilingual education. This gap in understanding at both a policy and pedagogical level must be closed if we are truly committed to closing the academic achievement gap between ELLs and native English speakers. In light of the ever increasing number of Hispanic ELLs in America's schools, can we afford not to close the equity and achievement gap between these two groups?

According to Berliner and Biddle (1995), by the year 2030, approximately 40% of school-age population in the U.S. will be linguistically and culturally diverse. To do this, we must have a complete understanding of the historical, socio-political, and theoretical factors affecting the quality education of ELLs. By more effectively educating Hispanic ELLs at the K-12 level, we can only increase the pool of these students entering college and completing higher education degrees. Discussions on the pipeline for increasing the recruitment pool of Hispanics entering higher education must begin at the elementary level and be a K-16 issue.

While the development and implementation of one-way and two-way dual language programs in Dallas ISD have exceeded expectations, the district is by no means content with the status quo. The district as a whole must move from simply following the model to *embracing*

the philosophy and goals of quality enrichment education for all students. The development of a stronger instructional pedagogy is of utmost importance, and supporting the implementation of a more student centered, constructivist curriculum is a priority, and will take time. It will not be easy, but look how far we have come.

References

- Alanís, I. (2006). Teacher perspectives on the implementation of a dual language program. *TABE Journal*, 9:1, 94-108.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd Ed.). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Berliner, D. C., & Biddle, B. J. (1995). *The manufactured crisis: Myths, fraud, and the attack on America's public schools*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Cenoz, J., & Genesee, F. (1998). Psycholinguistic perspectives on multilingualism and multilingual Education. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds) *Beyond bilingualism: Multiculturalism and multilingual education*. Clevedon, Eng.: Multilingual Matters, 16-34.
- Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 2:1 Winter.
- Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In J. Cummins (Ed.) *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3-49). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, California State University.
- Freeman, Y., Freeman, D., & Mercuri, S. (2005). *Dual language essentials for teachers and administrators*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. Gómez, L. (2000). Two-way bilingual

- education: Promoting educational and social change. *The Journal of the Texas Association for Bilingual Education*, 5(1), 43-54.
- Gómez, L., Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (2005). Dual language education: A promising 50-50 model. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29:1, 145-164.
- Gómez, L., & Ruiz-Escalante, J. (2005). Achieving equity through enrichment bilingual education. In M. Littleton, A. Pankake & Schroth (EDs.) *Administration and Supervision of Special Programs*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall Hunt.
- Gómez, R. (2006). Promising practices: Dual language enrichment for ELL students K-12. *TABE Journal*, 9:1, 46-65.
- Lessow-Hurley, J. (2000). *The foundations of dual language instruction*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Soltero, S.W. (2004). *Dual language: Teaching and learning in two languages*. Boston: Pearson.
- Sugarman, J., & Howard, E.R. (2001). *Development and maintenance of two-way immersion programs: Advice from practitioners*. Retrieved November 21, 2005, from <http://www.cal.org/crede/pubs/PracBrief2.htm>
- Thomas, W.P., & Collier, V.P. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement*. Retrieved November 21, 2005, from http://www.crede.org/research/llaa/1.1_final.html
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (1971). *A better chance to learn*. Washington: U.S. Printing Press.