



International Schools / Dual Language Immersion Task Force Recommendations

**Part 1, Part 2, Part 3
2016 - 2018**

Seattle Public Schools is committed to making its online information accessible and usable to all people, regardless of ability or technology. Meeting web accessibility guidelines and standards is an ongoing process that we are consistently working to improve.

While Seattle Public Schools endeavors to only post documents optimized for accessibility, due to the nature and complexity of some documents, an accessible version of the document may not be available. In these limited circumstances, the District will provide equally effective alternate access.

For questions and more information about this document, please contact the following:

Thad Williams
Multilingual Instructional Coach, Multilingual Department
twilliams@seattleschools.org

This is a three-part report documenting background, issues and recommendations for International / dual language immersion schools in Seattle Public Schools. This report was compiled by the Dual Language Taskforce members and led by Michele Aoki from 2016 – 2018.



International Schools / Dual Language Immersion Task Force Recommendations Part 2: Issue C Program Models within Dual Language Immersion Programs

Prepared by Michele Anciaux Aoki, Ph.D., P.M.P.
International Education Administrator
maaoki@seattleschools.org
Seattle Public Schools Curriculum, Assessment, Instruction

March 21, 2018

http://www.seattleschools.org/academics/international_education/international_dual_language_task_force/

Contents

- Executive Summary 3
 - Recommendations for Issue C Program Models..... 4
- Introduction 5
- Issue C Program Models Overview..... 7
 - Recommendations for Issue C Program Models..... 7
- Program Time Allocation Model (50:50, 90:10)..... 8
- Number of Languages Taught per School..... 13
- Content Taught in the Partner Language 16
- Language of Initial Literacy 19
- Next Steps for the Task Force 22
- Appendix A: Models for Dual Language Immersion Programs 23
- Appendix B: DLI Fidelity Checklist..... 26
 - Background..... 26
 - Sources Reviewed..... 26
 - Fidelity Checklist for District Survey..... 28
 - Fidelity Checklist for Teacher and School Survey 29

Executive Summary

International Education in Seattle was an outgrowth of the late 1990's, reflecting the dual realities of globalization and the increasing number of students coming to school with home languages other than English. This was in the context of state and national education reform, the standards movement in education, and a desire to have all students achieve at higher levels by clearly identifying what students needed to know and be able to do. Between 2000 and 2014, Seattle Public Schools opened 10 International Schools with Dual Language Immersion programs in Spanish, Japanese, and Mandarin in the NW, SE, and SW regions of the city.

In spring 2016, Seattle Public Schools initiated a process for studying the impacts, risks, and benefits of sustaining and expanding Seattle's International Schools and Dual Language Immersion programs through the establishment of an International Schools / Dual Language Immersion Task Force. The Task Force set out to address four major issues of concern, and in August 2016, it published [Part 1](#) of its Recommendations, which addressed **Issue A Pathways** and **Issue B Assignment Plan Models**.

As the Task Force continued its work on the remaining two issues, the School Board decided to launch a district program review of the International Schools and Dual Language Immersion programs in the 2016-2017 school year. The Seattle Schools Research and Evaluation team presented their [final report](#) to the School Board in October 2017. The Task Force members served as a sounding board for the Program Review team, and findings from the Program Review have informed the completion of the Task Force's work.

Part 2 of the Task Force Recommendations addresses **Issue C Program Models** within Dual Language Immersion programs. Part 3 of the Recommendations, to be completed after Part 2, will address **Issue D Sustainability**.

The issues addressed in Part 1 of the Task Force Recommendations are directly connected to decisions by Enrollment Planning and Services and the School Board itself, since it is the body that ultimately approves the Student Assignment Plan. In contrast, the issues addressed in Part 2: Issue C Program Models are more closely tied to decisions in the Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction Department since program models impact the programs within the schools primarily, not district-level student assignment plans. While there is not a specific recommendation around forming an ongoing advisory committee to support the current and future program model questions that arise, the Task Force hopes that district leadership will work with the 10 International Schools principals, the Executive Directors of Schools, the school communities, and relevant central district staff to consider forming an appropriate group or organizational structure to carry out that role when the Task Force sunsets.

The five recommendations in this report were shared with the school communities during three community meetings in March 2018:

- March 12, 2018 at Hamilton International Middle School in the NW region
- March 13, 2018 at Denny International Middle School in the SW region
- March 20, 2018 at Mercer International Middle School in the SE region

Recommendations for Issue C Program Models

The International Schools/Dual Language Immersion Task Force has 5 recommendations for Issue C:

Recommendation C1: Program Time Allocation Model Elementary. Ensure that the current model in Seattle of elementary Dual Language Immersion programs using the 50:50 time model (half-day English, half-day Spanish, Japanese, or Mandarin) is truly providing 50% of the school day in the partner language and explore the 90:10 time model as an option when future DLI programs are opened.

Recommendation C2: Program Time Allocation Model Secondary: Fully implement the current recommended model at SPS for secondary level Dual Language Immersion continuation programs of two periods a day taught in the partner language.

Recommendation C3: Number of Languages Taught Per School: Encourage John Stanford International and McDonald International to engage with their staff and parents and Enrollment Planning and Services to review the pros and cons of keeping the current model or splitting into separate language schools.

Recommendation C4: Content Taught in the Partner Language: Develop a consistent SPS DLI Program Model K-5 across all schools with DLI programs. Schools that would like to depart from the standard model should consult with other DLI programs and district leadership, as well as families and community members, to explain and gain consensus for the alteration. All programs should provide explicit time for developing biliteracy, i.e. strong literacy skills in both English and the partner language.

Recommendation C5: Language of Initial Literacy: Provide initial literacy instruction in both English and the partner language starting in kindergarten, with a focus on teaching for biliteracy and careful consideration of the language development needs of both heritage speakers and second language learners of the partner languages (Spanish, Japanese, and Mandarin).

Introduction

In spring 2016, Seattle Public Schools initiated a process for studying the impacts, risks, and benefits of sustaining and expanding Seattle’s International Schools and Dual Language Immersion programs through the establishment of an International Schools / Dual Language Immersion Task Force. The role of the task force is to gather, analyze, review, and consider information and data and to prepare a report to the Superintendent of Schools regarding Seattle’s International Schools and Dual Language Immersion programs. The Superintendent will use this report, along with other important data, to make recommendations to the School Board for potential changes in the 2017-18 school year and beyond.

According to the Task Force Charter, the report should address the following issues:

- A. Analysis of pathways for Dual Language Immersion students, including recommendations about completing pathways in the SE and SW as well as additional pathways in other regions
- B. Assignment plan models for International Schools – geozone vs. neighborhood, and equity issues in relation to class size due to attrition in grades 2-8, as well as effective approaches to outreach to populations who could benefit from the program
- C. Program models within Dual Language Immersion programs, including number of languages taught per school, content taught in the partner language, language of initial literacy
- D. Resources required for maintaining and expanding Seattle’s International Schools, including the hiring of qualified bilingual teachers and instructional assistants in the Immersion classrooms and acquisition of appropriate curricular materials in immersion languages, and professional development of all teachers on teaching a globalized curriculum

[Part 1](#) of the Recommendations, published in August 2016, addressed **Issue A Pathways** and **Issue B Assignment Plan Models**.

As the Task Force continued its work on the remaining two issues, the School Board decided to launch a district program review of the International Schools and Dual Language Immersion programs in the 2016-2017 school year. The Seattle Schools Research and Evaluation team presented their [final report](#) to the School Board in October 2017. The Task Force members served as a sounding board for the Program Review team, and findings from the Program Review have informed the completion of the Task Force’s work.

Part 2 of the Task Force Recommendations addresses **Issue C Program Models within Dual Language Immersion Programs**. Part 3 of the Recommendations, to be completed after Part 2, will address **Issue D Sustainability**.

The five recommendations in this report were shared with the school communities during three community meetings in March 2018:

- March 12, 2018 at Hamilton International Middle School in the NW region
- March 13, 2018 at Denny International Middle School in the SW region

- March 20, 2018 at Mercer International Middle School in the SE region

The issues addressed in Part 1 of the Task Force Recommendations are directly connected to decisions by Enrollment Planning and Services and the School Board itself, since it is the body that ultimately approves the Student Assignment Plan. In contrast, the issues addressed in Part 2: Issue C Program Models are more closely tied to decisions in the Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction Department since program models impact the programs within the schools primarily, not district-level student assignment plans. While there is not a specific recommendation around forming an ongoing advisory committee to support the current and future program model questions that arise, the Task Force hopes that district leadership will work with the 10 International Schools principals, the Executive Directors of Schools, the school communities, and relevant central district staff to consider forming an appropriate group or organizational structure to carry out that role when the Task Force sunsets.

Issue C Program Models Overview

The Task Force Charter identified three aspects of program models that the Task Force should address: number of languages taught per school, content taught in the partner language, and language of initial literacy. However, there is an additional issue that is a precursor to making sense of the other three, and that is the program time allocation model (50:50 or 90:10). The Task Force also took time to explore and address that issue.

Note that all of these recommendations pertaining to Issue C will need to be reevaluated in the context of the earlier Task Force recommendations for Issue A Pathways and Issue B Assignment Plan Models, as well as the upcoming recommendations for Issue D Sustainability.

Recommendations for Issue C Program Models

The International Schools/Dual Language Immersion Task Force has 5 recommendations for Issue C:

Recommendation C1 Program Time Allocation Model Elementary. Ensure that the current model in Seattle of elementary Dual Language Immersion programs using the 50:50 time model (half-day English, half-day Spanish, Japanese, or Mandarin) is truly providing 50% of the school day in the partner language and explore the 90:10 time model as an option when future DLI programs are opened.

Recommendation C2 Program Time Allocation Model Secondary: Strive to fully implement the current recommended model at SPS for secondary level Dual Language Immersion continuation programs of two periods a day taught in the partner language.

Recommendation C3 Number of Languages Taught Per School: Encourage John Stanford International and McDonald International to engage with their staff and parents and Enrollment Planning and Services to review the pros and cons of keeping the current model or splitting into separate language schools.

Recommendation C4 Content Taught in the Partner Language: Develop a consistent SPS DLI Program Model K-5 across all schools with DLI programs. Schools that would like to depart from the standard model should consult with other DLI programs and district leadership, as well as families and community members to explain and gain consensus for the alteration. All programs should provide explicit time for developing biliteracy, i.e. strong literacy skills in both English and the partner language.

Recommendation C5 Language of Initial Literacy: Provide initial literacy instruction in both English and the partner language starting in Kindergarten, with a focus on teaching for biliteracy and careful consideration of the language development needs of both heritage speakers and second language learners of the partner languages (Spanish, Japanese, and Mandarin).

Program Time Allocation Model (50:50, 90:10)

One of the most important decisions that a school community must make when planning for a Dual Language Immersion program is what time allocation to use for each language. The basic choice is whether to be a full immersion model (more than 50% of the day taught in the partner language) or a partial immersion model (about 50% of the day taught in the partner language and 50% in English).

The benefits and challenges of each model have been documented for many years, for example in the February 1999 American Council on Immersion Education (ACIE) Newsletter article, [Choosing an Immersion Model: The Moorhead Experience](#) (accessed 8/13/2017). Generally, students will attain higher proficiency in the partner language (or Target Language (TL) as it is called in the article) in a full immersion program faster than in a partial immersion program. However, students' English development in a full immersion program may lag initially (which could impact their test results in content areas such as Math that are tested in English), while that initial lag does not necessarily occur in a partial immersion model.

Even Wikipedia provides a helpful description of the two time allocation models:

- Full immersion, or 90/10, programs teach in the partner language 90% of the time in the primary grades (usually kindergarten and first grade) and 10% in English, and gradually adjust the ratio each year until the partner language is used 50% and English is used 50% by [third](#) or [fourth grade](#) (sometimes later if the program extends through [eighth grade](#) or beyond). 50/50, programs teach 50% of the day in English and 50% of the day in the partner language at all grade levels.
- Partial Immersion teaches less than 50% of the time and usually focuses on one content area, either language arts, math or science.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dual_language (accessed 8/13/2017)

Seattle's five elementary Dual Language Immersion programs are all currently partial immersion (50:50 time allocation) models. At the time the first Spanish partial immersion program was launched at John Stanford International School in September 2000, there was less research done about 90:10 (or 80:20) time models. It was generally felt that the 50:50 model was less risky to implement since it would displace fewer non-bilingual teachers and would help students continue developing English concurrently with the partner language, so would have less negative impact if the students transferred to another school. See Appendix A: Models for Dual Language Immersion Programs.

Now there is extensive research (such as Collier and Thomas, 2012) showing that in well-implemented Dual Language programs, students in 90:10 (or 80:20) time models can demonstrate higher gains academically sooner (by 6th grade) than students in 50:50 models (by 8th grade). For English Language Learner (ELL) students in a two-way model, where about half the students are native speakers of English and half are native speakers of the partner language (see Appendix A for more definitions), this is because they are able to achieve higher literacy in their home language and thereby learn content better during the early years. For the English native speakers (second language learners of the partner language), the extra "dose" of the partner language and literacy development

gives them an advantage in studying more complex content in the immersion language through the upper elementary and middle school years. During the elementary years, students’ test scores in English and math, which are tested in English, may lag behind their non-DLI counterparts, but by middle school, the students may demonstrate higher test scores than comparable

Table 1 below summarizes the pros and cons for three options that the Task Force considered with regard to changing the current program time allocation model from 50:50 to 90:10 (or 80:20).

Table 1: Options for Program Model (50:50, 90:10):

Option	Pros	Cons
<p>1. All schools 50:50: All elementary Dual Language Immersion programs continue to be 50:50 time model</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the model that Seattle has used since 2000; we have experience with making it be successful. • It is easier to staff than 90:10 (or 80:20). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the new research, our students might ultimately do better academically if we did a 90:10 model. • It is hard for students to get enough literacy instruction in the partner language in elementary to do content-based instruction meaningfully in middle school.
<p>2. All schools 90:10: All elementary Dual Language Immersion programs move to 90:10 time model</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the newer research, our students might ultimately do better academically if we did a 90:10 model. • There are 90:10 models in Bellevue and Portland that we could learn from. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be very disruptive to change all the schools (all grades) at the same time; we would probably need to phase it in. • We would need to redesign literacy development in all 5 schools for the partner languages, as well as English. • Students who did not get any (or minimal) English instruction in K-2 could have a difficult transition if they transfer to another school. • Changing the time model to 90:10 would displace a number of English language teachers in grades K-2 across the 5 elementary schools and would make recruitment of additional partner language teachers difficult.
<p>3. Each school chooses preferred model 50:50 or 90:10: Each elementary Dual Language Immersion program chooses which</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This approach would only disrupt the schools or DLI programs that changed models. • It could benefit the students in schools with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it would require more overhead to maintain multiple curricula for different programs for literacy development, math, etc. • It could create a greater gap in language skills from different Dual

Option	Pros	Cons
time model would be most appropriate for their context	<p>more stable enrollment to move to 90:10.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We could learn from Bellevue and Portland how they are implementing 90:10 model in their two-way immersion programs. 	<p>Language Immersion programs (depending on the model) if students from different elementary programs fed into the same middle school DLI program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be very complicated to explain all of the different models for DLI programs to families and the public, as well as district leadership.

Overwhelmingly, the Task Force members agreed that the current model of 50:50 at elementary schools has worked effectively and balances the desire to teach the new partner language with the need to provide solid English language competency. Furthermore, Task Force members determined that changing from a 50:50 to 90:10 program model at this time would have a very disruptive impact on the current programs and schools, including:

- Reduction of staffing opportunities for non-bilingual teachers at the five International elementary schools
- Increased hiring needs for bilingual teachers of Spanish, Japanese, and Chinese (further exacerbating the current challenges of a teacher shortage for DLI teachers)
- Increased funding needed to acquire or develop more curricular materials in Spanish, Japanese, and Chinese because in the first few years, all content areas would be taught in the partner language
- Significant professional development costs to prepare our current DLI teachers to teach all content areas in the early grades

Although the Task Force held these conversations before the new K-5 English Language Arts (ELA) adoption was approved and funded in spring 2017, it is important to note that moving to a 90:10 program model at this time would make it impossible for the schools to meet the expectation of teaching the new ELA adoption “as intended.” In a 90:10 model, there would be very little time allocated to teaching English Language Arts to the K-2 students. This could jeopardize the schools’ ultimate success in using the program in grades 3-5.

In addition, the [Intl/DLI Program Review](#) that was presented to the School Board on October 11, 2017 showed that even with the current time allocation model, there were positive effects for students participating in a DLI program.

After controlling for student demographics and school-level effects, **we found statistically significant, positive effects of DLI program on 2016-17 and 2015-16 Smarter Balanced results in both ELA and Math.** (Intl/DLI Program Review page 40)

Therefore, the argument for moving to a 90:10 time allocation based on the desire for students in DLI to demonstrate long-term higher academic gains does not carry the same weight that it might if the 50:50 model were leading to lower academic achievement. In addition, as pointed out in the [Intl/DLI](#)

[Program Review](#), the DLI students overall are meeting our language proficiency goals for the partner languages (Spanish, Japanese, and Mandarin), even without the additional time in the partner language in grades K-2.

Recommendation C1 Program Time Allocation Model Elementary: Ensure that the current model at SPS of elementary Dual Language Immersion programs using the 50:50 time model (half-day English, half-day Spanish, Japanese, or Mandarin) is truly providing 50% of the school day in the partner language and explore the 90:10 time model as an option when future DLI programs are opened.

The Task Force also discussed extensively the current challenge to meet the national best practice and district's recommended model for secondary Dual Language Immersion programs to offer more than one period a day in the partner language, including both a language and content class. At this time, only Denny International Middle School is able to offer two periods of Spanish Language Arts and Social Studies in Spanish all three years. Mercer International Middle School has expanded Mandarin to two periods all three years and Spanish has expanded at 8th grade. Hamilton International Middle School offers Spanish or Japanese Language Arts 1, 2, and 3 in 6th-8th grades, but no separate content class such as Social Studies. Both Denny and Mercer have 7-period schedules, which seems to be a critical factor. The Task Force encourages all three International middle schools to find a way to give all DLI continuation students access to two periods/day in the partner languages in future years.

Although high school models of DLI continuation programs are not as consistent nationally, Seattle has been able to support more than one period a day taught in Spanish at Chief Sealth International High School, thanks to visionary leadership by the principals and teachers at Chief Sealth and Denny International Middle School. They were able to expand DLI offerings taught in Spanish to World History, Global Leadership, and IB History of the Americas in 9th, 10th, and 11th grades, while also offering AP Spanish (in 9th grade) and IB Spanish 4/5/6 in 11th and 12th grades. Expanded opportunities to learn academic content in the partner language are extremely beneficial to the students' ultimate proficiency attainment and career options in the partner language.

The district will have a new opportunity to design the model(s) for high school DLI continuation beginning in 2019-2020 when Lincoln High School becomes the NW region's DLI high school pathway and an as-yet-unnamed high school becomes the DLI high school pathway in the SE region. The Task Force urges these new DLI high school pathways to follow the lead of Chief Sealth by offering two periods/day in the partner language in as many years as possible in high school.

Recommendation C2 Program Time Allocation Model Secondary: Fully implement the current recommended model at SPS for secondary level Dual Language Immersion continuation programs of two periods a day taught in the partner language.

Cost Implications of Program Model Recommendations:

Continuing the elementary DLI programs with a 50:50 time allocation model is no change, and, therefore, no incremental costs are associated with this recommendation. Expanding the secondary DLI programs to two periods a day should not be substantially more costly if students are already required to take that subject (such as Social Studies), unless class sizes are small. There are costs for

developing curriculum and preparing teachers to teach these subjects, but those can be shared across the three middle schools and, potentially, with DLI middle schools in neighboring districts, such as Highline and Bellevue.

Community Outreach Implications:

The parent community at each school with DLI programs should be informed of the Task Force’s recommendations and the impact on any instructional changes for their schools. However, at this time, those changes are minimal or only in exploratory stages, so no broad community outreach will be required. If the district decides to pursue the possibility of opening new elementary programs (or converting existing programs) to the 90:10 time model, extensive community outreach would be required.

At the secondary level, there will already be extensive community outreach as Lincoln High School becomes the DLI high school pathway in NW and a DLI high school pathway is designated in SE. This will be an excellent opportunity to engage with families, students, and the school communities around the desired goal to offer two periods/day in the partner language.

Number of Languages Taught per School

Nearly 20 years ago, the development of global perspective was one of the main goals of the International Schools in Seattle, so it was felt that offering more than one language in a school would cause both the students and the staff to have multiple opportunities every day to experience living and learning in a “global” environment. Currently, there are two International elementary schools with DLI programs in Spanish and Mandarin and two with DLI programs in Spanish and Japanese. The one school which began as a Spanish Dual Language program model focused on serving Spanish speaking students learning English (Concord), then later became designated International, is the only school that does not offer an additional partner language. Concord offers Spanish DLI in addition to its traditional all-day English strand.

While there are benefits to the multilingual learning environment, due to attrition in the upper grades (students who leave the program early), difficulties have arisen to staff classrooms in a manageable and equitable way. While split classes (e.g., grades 4/5) may be acceptable, albeit challenging, for English teachers, split languages (e.g., mixed Japanese/Spanish) are simply not feasible.

To address these staffing challenges, McDonald International School and John Stanford International School have proposed moving the entire Japanese program into one school, and Spanish into the other. Such a change could have a major impact on the international character of the schools and on families currently enrolled in the two schools.

Beacon Hill International also offers two partner languages, Spanish and Mandarin, as well as an all-day English strand since they are a Neighborhood school. They too have staffing and enrollment challenges, especially in the upper grades, due to attrition, but their diverse population has made offering both Spanish and an Asian language an essential choice for their school community. They were the first elementary in the district to launch a Mandarin Dual Language Immersion program and they are now a Confucius Classroom in the Asia Society Network of Confucius Classrooms. They also have a large Latino population in the neighborhood. Despite the challenges of maintaining two DLI strands (plus all-day English), the Beacon Hill school community has not put forward a request to move from two to one partner language.

Dearborn Park International also offers Spanish and Mandarin DLI programs, but it is in a slightly different situation than Beacon Hill since the neighborhood where it is located has few Spanish or Mandarin home language students. However, there are many English Language Learner students representing other languages. In this diverse school setting, the global perspective reason for supporting two partner languages rather than identifying the school with one language (besides English) seems to make sense. Dearborn Park is also a Confucius Classroom in the Asia Society Network of Confucius Classrooms, so the commitment to Mandarin there is quite strong. At the same time, the school now hosts a City-sponsored Spanish Dual Language preschool, so it would not make sense to drop Spanish there. The current challenge at Dearborn Park is that the school introduced DLI in kindergarten in 2014 without including a traditional all-day English strand. As a Neighborhood

school, it is working through this challenge by reintroducing an all-day English strand for families who prefer that option.

Concord International School offers one language in its DLI program, Spanish, in addition to a traditional all-day English strand. The neighborhood is home to many Latino families, and so the school has focused on meeting their needs.

The Pros and Cons of offering single language schools were explored at the Task Force Community meeting held at Hamilton International Middle School on May 12, 2016. The Task Force Working Group also analyzed pros and cons of three options for number of languages taught per school, as shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Options for Number of languages taught per school:

Option	Pros	Cons
<p>1. Spanish Plus Other Partner Language at Some or Most International Schools Each elementary International School offers Spanish and a few schools offer an additional language (besides English either 50% or 100% of day)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status quo; no current programs would need to change • Allows more access to Spanish (most requested language and largest language of students who qualify for ELL services) • Allows SPS to offer “critical” languages such as Japanese and Mandarin • Supports most of the schools to offer a challenging global environment for learning for all 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools with two partner languages would still need to manage more materials and curricula and teachers from more languages • Still difficult to manage student class loads under smaller class-size guidelines with multiple languages
<p>2. Two Partner Language Strands per School Each elementary International School offers two partner languages (besides English either 50% or 100% of day)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the model that Seattle has used since 2001; current model for 4 of the 5 elementary schools • Fosters a challenging global environment for learning for all • Allows access to Spanish in every school (most requested language and largest language of students who qualify for ELL services) • Allows SPS to offer “critical” languages such as Japanese and Mandarin 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concord would need to add a language (likely Mandarin as pathway to Denny and Chief Sealth) • New elementary in SW would also add Spanish and Mandarin (or other language if that language could be supported by Denny/Chief Sealth) • Difficult to manage student class loads under new class-size guidelines • All schools need to manage more materials and curricula and teachers from more languages
<p>3. One Partner Language Strand per School Each elementary International School</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concord would not need to change • Easier to manage student class loads under smaller class-size guidelines if only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four current programs would need to change • Could have a big impact on assignment planning, esp. for

Option	Pros	Cons
offers at most one partner language (besides English either 50% or 100% of day)	one partner language per school <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each school would need to manage materials and curricula and teachers from just one partner language 	current families (if their language was moved to another school) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Might reduce access to Spanish (most requested language and largest language of students who qualify for ELL services) if at least two schools did not offer it • Might make it difficult for SPS to maintain “critical” languages such as Japanese and Mandarin if demand for them were less (and enrollment not full) • Might change ability for schools to offer a challenging global environment for learning for all

At this time, the Task Force was not prepared to recommend cutting languages from existing DLI programs at John Stanford, McDonald, Beacon Hill, or Dearborn Park, nor asking Concord to add an additional language. Option 1 above is still in effect. However, the Task Force felt that because they are Option schools located quite close to each other, John Stanford and McDonald could continue to explore the possibility of splitting the languages by school if they felt it would help reduce the need for mitigation (extra staffing to support the two languages) and if Enrollment Planning and Services agreed that it was feasible.

Recommendation C3 Number of Languages Taught Per School: Encourage John Stanford International and McDonald International to engage with their staff and parents and Enrollment Planning and Services to review the pros and cons of keeping the current model or splitting into separate language schools.

Cost Implications of Program Model Recommendations:

There is no specific cost for continuing the conversation at the two schools. However, there could be major cost implications for Enrollment Planning and Services if the decision were made to split the languages by school and redraw the GeoZones. Ultimately, the expectation would be that moving to one language per school would reduce the need for staffing mitigation.

Community Outreach Implications:

A change to the number of languages taught in each International School would require a tremendous amount of community outreach, depending on how it was implemented. If the change were phased in beginning with kindergarten, it would be less impactful on current families in the schools, but it would also not provide any cost savings that would be envisioned by the change for a number of years. In addition, families with new kindergarteners and siblings in upper grades might find themselves split between schools based on which language was offered at which school. If the change were phased in all at one time, that could be a hardship for families who have to move to a new school.

Content Taught in the Partner Language

When the first International School was launched in 2000 with Spanish immersion in kindergarten and first grade, the decision was made to teach math and science content in the partner language. As new grades were added and new languages (Japanese and a few years later, Mandarin), that content allocation model continued, but evolved.

For many years in Seattle, decisions about which content areas to teach in the partner languages have been mainly up to the discretion of the individual schools/programs and principals and teachers. This has led to a patchwork of choices and lack of clarity in the program model. As elementary school students transition into middle school, this can create problems for articulation (i.e. transition) into 6th grade if the 5th graders from two different elementary programs have different language skills and knowledge because students have learned different content areas in the partner language.

It also becomes difficult to provide appropriate professional development (training and education) and resources to programs when student needs are very different. For example, some schools might need professional development for teaching math in the partner language, while some might need science and/or social studies. In any case, all of the programs need literacy materials, but what the students have capacity to read could be different from school to school based on the content areas taught.

When comparing high leverage practices around the country, Dual Language Immersion programs in other states and school districts also focus on the percentage of the day in which the language is taught, along with the minutes allocated for the subject content being taught in the partner language. For example, in large DLI school districts with partial immersion 50:50 time allocation programs, there is a commitment to ensuring that language arts, as well as other content areas including math, science, and social studies, are taught in the partner language. (See Utah's models, for example, <http://www.utahdli.org/instructionalmodel.html>.)

School districts with a 50:50 time model vary in the subject content that is taught in the partner languages. Increasingly, more programs around the country are creating thematic units with an interdisciplinary curricular focus. In this way, there is often less restriction on what part of the day DLI teachers are devoting to certain subject content, as long as there is intentionality during the unit planning stage that distributes content focus and second language acquisition time equitably.

The issue of DLI curriculum and materials was clearly articulated in the DLI Fidelity Checklist (see Appendix B) developed as part of the International Schools/Dual Language Immersion Program Review carried out in Seattle Public Schools in 2017. From the teacher survey, the research team found that only 33% of teachers responding to the survey agreed that “DLI curriculum and materials are... Intentionally planned across grades for each content area taught in the partner language and English.” While this relates to *how* content is taught as much as *which content areas* are taught in the partner language, it highlights that lack of consistency in identifying content to be taught in the partner language impacts the schools' abilities to plan curriculum and acquire materials intentionally.

The Seattle Public Schools Immersion Guidelines, first adapted from the Fairfax County Public Schools Guidelines for Dual Immersion Schools presented by Regla Armengol in August, 2000, and

updated each year during the summer “Dual Language Immersion Boot Camp,” offer the following recommendations:

Here are some specific guidelines for achieving in the content areas:

1. Introduce the partner language in kindergarten in specific content areas (Math, Science, and/or Social Studies). Continue the Dual Immersion program into the next grade each year (i.e. 1st grade, 2nd grade, then 3rd grade, and so on).
2. Emphasize concrete, hands-on activities in teaching content. Use language that is simple and direct.
3. Ensure that all children in the Dual Immersion program have an opportunity to also practice content vocabulary and language structures in English – at home, through outside activities at school, or in the English language classroom.
4. If children seem to be struggling with concepts in the content areas, be sure to assess whether it is a language problem or a conceptual problem. You can have an English-speaking teacher, classroom aide, or volunteer assess them in English on those concepts. If they are still struggling, then offer them additional help in the content area – in English and/or the partner language. If they understand the concepts in English, but not in the partner language, then offer them additional practice in the partner language.
5. Transition the content focus from about 3rd or 4th grade to provide more instruction in partner language literacy.

Generally, the model in Seattle has been to teach math and science in the partner languages beginning in kindergarten. Some programs have introduced more social studies content starting in about 4th grade while moving some of the math and science instruction to the English side. However, some programs have moved math completely over to the English side by 4th grade. There are no right or wrong answers regarding which content areas to teach through the partner language. However, inconsistency from year to year can have an impact on sustainability of the programs. The International Schools/Dual Language Immersion Program Review carried out in Seattle Public Schools in 2017 cited principal concerns about program models, differences among the DLI programs, and alignment to national best practices.

After much discussion, the Task Force members felt it was important for the district to develop a coherent program model across the schools and a process for considering modifications to the model that might be needed and appropriate within a given school setting.

Recommendation C4 Content Taught in the Partner Language: Develop a consistent SPS DLI Program Model K-5 across all schools with DLI programs. Schools that would like to depart from the standard model should consult with other DLI programs and district leadership, as well as families and community members, to explain and gain consensus for the alteration. All programs should provide explicit time for developing biliteracy, i.e. strong literacy skills in both English and the partner language.

Cost Implications of Content Taught Recommendations:

There is no specific cost for providing district-level support and guidance for decisions about the DLI program model regarding content taught in the partner language. If anything, making the models more consistent across schools and programs should reduce costs to the individual schools (and

teachers) in the long run. For example, rather than each individual 3rd grade Spanish DLI teacher translating or creating exit tickets for Math in Spanish, all of the teachers from the five elementary schools could share what they've created and fill in missing pieces by working together. The International Schools/Dual Language Immersion Program Review showed that teachers perceive that collaboration and sharing of materials and model curriculum units is currently happening to a very limited extent.

Community Outreach Implications:

It is important to engage with community about the decision-making process for selection of content areas to be taught in the partner language, especially where there will be changes. The exact needs for community outreach will vary from school to school based on what the schools are currently doing and how they might shift. The common message should be focused on the “three pillars” of Dual Language Immersion education:

- **Pillar One:** Bilingualism and Biliteracy
- **Pillar Two:** Grade Level Academic Achievement
- **Pillar Three:** Cross-Cultural Competency

<http://www.cal.org/cal-susa/online/dle-intro/> (retrieved 3/17/2018)

These have always been part of the district's vision for International Schools and Dual Language Immersion programs and they need to be reemphasized to all stakeholders.

Language of Initial Literacy

The 2009 [presentation](#)¹ by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), “Program Models and the Language of Initial Literacy in Two-Way Immersion Programs,” provides a succinct analysis of three logical options for initial literacy and the pros and cons of each. The CAL study begins with some assumptions about the two-way models, where about half the students are native speakers of English and half are native speakers of the partner language (see Appendix A for more definitions), including:

- (1) At least 50% of instruction is provided in Spanish at the elementary grade levels to all students
- (2) The program extends at least five years, preferably K-12
- (3) Both literacy and content are taught in both the partner language and English over the course of the program
- (4) Instruction is delivered in one language at a time without translation

The CAL study outlines considerations for 90:10 time models, which begin in kindergarten with almost exclusive (90%) use of the partner language during the instructional day. The other major time model is 50:50, where English and the partner language (in this case Spanish) are used equally (more or less) throughout the program.

The CAL study indicates that how children are taught to read and write for the first time (initial literacy) can be approached in three ways:

- All students learn to read in the partner language first
- All students learn to read in both languages simultaneously
- All students learn to read in their native language first

Partner language first is typical for 90:10 or 80:20 time models, as is native language first. Since all of Seattle’s Dual Language Immersion programs are 50:50 time model, we’ll focus on the analysis CAL offers on that model. Generally, in 50:50 time model programs, literacy is introduced in both languages simultaneously. Therefore, native English speakers and native Spanish (or Japanese or Mandarin) speakers are integrated for instruction throughout the day. While teachers maintain separation of languages for instruction (and do not use translation), they do use flexible groupings and differentiation to help them meet the needs of both groups of students.

Some of the benefits of both languages for everyone are that students get the literacy support that they need to be successful in the content areas (such as math, science, and social studies) in both languages, and all of the students have a chance to develop stronger academic language to meet the demands in the upper grades.

¹ “Program Models and the Language of Initial Literacy in Two-Way Immersion Programs,” authored by Elizabeth R. Howard, University of Connecticut, and Julie Sugarman, Center for Applied Linguistics, with the invaluable contributions of David Rogers and Natalie Olague of Dual Language Education of New Mexico (www.dlenm.org). accessed 9/15/2017

The CAL study notes that there are issues whenever programs decide to change models or approach to literacy instruction, including professional development of teachers and procurement of materials and assessments, as well as communications to parents, staff, and community. There are also many potential questions for future research.

Seattle's Situation with Two-Way DLI

For the most part, the two-way model assumptions outlined above in the CAL study do apply to the two programs in Seattle (Concord and Beacon Hill) that currently operate Spanish two-way Dual Language Immersion programs where at least 50% of the students come from Spanish-speaking homes and could be considered native or heritage speakers of Spanish. The exception is that at Concord in kindergarten this year (and previously in grades K-1), students on the non-Spanish home language side have been getting about 30% of their instruction daily in Spanish, rather than 50%.

All of Seattle's non Two-Way Dual Language Immersion programs have taken the approach to developing literacy in both languages simultaneously. The two-way programs have been taking opposite approaches (although the situation is changing now with the new district adoption of a common English Language Arts curriculum from the Center for the Collaborative Classroom). Beacon Hill took the partner language first approach, where all students in the K-1 Spanish two-way DLI program were explicitly taught literacy skills in Spanish, but not in English (until 2nd grade). Concord, on the other hand, implemented native language first literacy (at least for the Spanish speakers) by providing Spanish literacy to Spanish home language students K-1 and English literacy to all the other students in the program (including non-Spanish ELLs), then offering literacy in both languages by 2nd grade.

During Working Group meetings of the International Schools/Dual Language Immersion Task Force in summer 2016, the Task Force Members reviewed the CAL study in detail and articulated several questions:

- Is there any evidence that doing concurrent literacy instruction in English harms literacy development in L1 (first language) for the students receiving ELL services or harms later learning outcomes?
- Is there any evidence that this might differ by partner language (e.g., might English literacy instruction interfere with Spanish literacy instruction because of shared/similar writing systems in a way that it wouldn't interfere with Japanese/Chinese literacy instruction?)
- What concerns would the staff and communities at Beacon Hill and Concord have around moving to concurrent initial literacy instruction?

Since 2009 when the CAL study was published, there has been a growing body of research in the area of Teaching for Biliteracy. This work strongly favors introducing literacy skills in both languages to children who are emerging bilingual/biliterate users of English and another language. In particular, Collier and Thomas² have stated: "In a 50:50 two-way program, both language groups, taught

² Collier, V.P. & Thomas, W. P. (2012). *Dual Language Education for a Transformed World*. Albuquerque, NM: Dual Language Education of New Mexico-Fuente Press.

together, benefit from formal language arts instruction provided for their language. ... Therefore, **we recommend that the groups not be separated for initial reading instruction in their native language, because this lowers test scores both in English and in the partner language in the long term.**" (emphasis theirs)

As we continue to explore answers to the questions posed above, based on the strong recommendation from Collier and Thomas, the Task Force Working Group recommended that all of the Seattle DLI programs move to concurrent or simultaneous initial literacy instruction, and that support should be provided to Concord and Beacon Hill to make the transition.

Recommendation C5 Language of Initial Literacy: Provide initial literacy instruction in both English and the partner language starting in kindergarten, with a focus on teaching for biliteracy and careful consideration of the language development needs of both heritage speakers and second language learners of the partner languages (Spanish, Japanese, and Mandarin).

Cost Implications of Language of Initial Literacy Recommendations:

The cost implications of this recommendation are influenced by the fact that the district this year adopted a new K-5 English Language Arts curriculum, Center for the Collaborative Classroom. Therefore, the costs for the English-side of literacy development have already been accounted for. The costs for supporting implementation of literacy in the partner languages, Spanish, Japanese, and Chinese, would be present whether or not there was a change in the literacy model. All of the DLI programs were teaching partner language literacy by kindergarten to either all of the DLI students or to at least the Spanish home language students (as in the case of Concord). Therefore, some effort had already been made to provide partner language literacy instruction and materials from K-5 in all of the programs. However, what was being done was not enough.

The new K-5 ELA adoption has prompted the schools to take a much closer look at what is needed to develop biliteracy in all of their students. There will be increased costs for books, online reading accounts, and professional development for teachers in teaching for biliteracy and in teaching literacy skills in their specific languages (Spanish, Japanese, and Chinese). The specifics will be outlined in Intl/DLI Task Force Recommendations Part 3: Sustainability.

Community Outreach Implications:

For most of the programs, teaching initial literacy concurrently is not a change. At Beacon Hill, the shift is already in progress. At Concord, the shift to sharing literacy instruction across English and Spanish will require much more community outreach and concrete information about why teaching for biliteracy can work long-term to the advantage of the Spanish home (i.e. "mother tongue") language students.

Next Steps for the Task Force

The strongest message from the community meetings held in spring 2016 was that the district needs to ensure that the **current International Schools are both sustainable and equitable**. This view was also echoed by principals and other stakeholders in the International Schools/Dual Language Immersion Program Review in 2017.

Sustainability includes the issue of funding. We need a clearer picture of which budget items are “must haves” because the school is an International School with a Dual Language Immersion Program and which items are “desirable,” but not absolutely necessary. This information will help the district produce a clearer picture of what “sustainable” means. But sustainability is not just about funding. It also relates to program structures, leadership, hiring, and professional development of teachers and staff, all in the context of the district’s long-term vision, mission, and intermediate objectives for International Schools/Dual Language Immersion programs.

Regarding equity, the Task Force heard compelling words from parents and community members whose first language is not English about the importance of offering Dual Language Immersion as an effective gap-elimination strategy. This was also a clear message from principals and teachers in the International Schools/Dual Language Immersion Program Review. This would suggest that the district should be considering expanding opportunities for Dual Language Immersion beyond the current 10 International Schools. But until we have a clear picture of what a “sustainable” International School/Dual Language Immersion program model looks like, expansion does not seem realistic, even if it would offer more equitable educational opportunities to students who would benefit most.

The Task Force will address Issue D Sustainability in its final set of recommendations.

Appendix A: Models for Dual Language Immersion Programs

(This section was originally part of the Background information in Recommendations Part 1.)

One of the unique characteristics of Seattle’s International Schools is the commitment to helping students develop a high level of proficiency in a language other than English by providing a K-12 sequence of language study beginning in Seattle’s international elementary schools. As stated in the Seattle School Board Policy # 2177 International Education,

The District is committed to teaching world languages in an immersion setting for grades K-5 in addition to world language classes and immersion language classes offered at District middle and high schools.

The goals of world language programs are for students to:

- Communicate in languages other than English;
- Gain knowledge and understanding of other cultures;
- Connect with other disciplines and acquire information;
- Develop insight into the nature of language and culture; and
- Participate in multilingual communities at home and around the world

In addition, an International Education offers Heritage speakers opportunities to enhance literacy and academic skills in their native language.

The result of participation in a dual immersion program from kindergarten through grade 12 should be advanced level proficiency at the end of high school in two languages.

School Board Policy No 2177 [International Education](#) accessed 8/13/2017

The policy refers to “teaching world languages in an **immersion** setting,” but what does that mean? The terminology around these types of programs has evolved over the past 20 years. At the time that Seattle launched its first International School with this type of language program, it was common to refer to the program as “language immersion” or “partial language immersion” since the students are “immersed” in the immersion language about 50% of the day. (Some schools in other districts offer “full immersion” or 80:20 time model, where 80% of the day is taught in the immersion language and 20% in English.)

Over the past decade, the term “dual language” or “dual language immersion” has become more common, especially if there are English Language Learners included in the program who are native or heritage speakers of the immersion language.

A Dual Immersion or Dual Language program is an instructional model that provides content-based instruction to students in two languages where the goal is for the students, over a number of years of participation in the program, to become proficient and literate in both languages, while also meeting high academic standards in all subject areas. Other terminology that is commonly used for one of the variations of this type of program model is Dual Language, Two-way Dual Language, One-way Dual Language, Partial Immersion, Full Immersion, etc. Typically, programs begin at kindergarten or 1st grade and continue through elementary school, and, if possible, into middle and high school.

<http://www.k12.wa.us/WorldLanguages/DualImmersion.aspx> accessed 8/9/2016

Based on the student population, a Dual Immersion program can be a:

- **Two-way model** – A balanced group of approximately 50% native/heritage speakers and 50% English speakers. This program model has been demonstrated in research (see Appendix I) to be the most successful in eliminating the achievement gap between the general student population and English Language Learners who participate in the program, regardless of whether or not they already speak the target language.

Examples in Seattle: Spanish – Concord International School, Denny International Middle School, and Chief Sealth International High School; Beacon Hill International School and Mercer International Middle School

- **One-way model** – Generally, a homogeneous group of native speakers of one of the two languages (could be all Spanish speakers learning in Spanish and English or, for example, all English native speakers learning in Japanese, Mandarin, or Spanish and English).

Examples in Seattle: Spanish – Some Spanish heritage language classes at Denny International Middle School and Chief Sealth International High School that were started before students from the Two-Way Dual Language program (which includes English native speakers) came up from Concord

- **“Mixed” model** – In Seattle’s urban schools, it is unlikely that any of the Dual Language Immersion programs would have a truly homogeneous group of native English speakers learning a second language. In most cases, there are at least a few native speakers of the target immersion language (but not enough to qualify as a “two-way model”), as well as students whose native language is neither English nor the immersion language.

Examples in Seattle: Spanish, Japanese, Mandarin – John Stanford International School (Spanish and Japanese), McDonald International School (Spanish and Japanese), Beacon Hill International School (Mandarin), Dearborn Park International School (Spanish and Mandarin), Hamilton International Middle School (Spanish and Japanese), Mercer International Middle School (Mandarin)

In addition, a two-way model may shift over time as attendance patterns change. In that case, the 50% balance of native speakers of the two languages may change to be a larger percentage of native/heritage Spanish speakers of the immersion (or “partner”) language or a larger percentage of native English (or other languages).

At the middle and high school levels, students from the elementary Dual Language Immersion programs may have the opportunity to participate in Dual Language Immersion Continuation programs. These are language programs geared to students who have completed a number of years in an immersion setting or are, perhaps, heritage speakers of the language. The programs incorporate language topics (including grammar) that would be covered in a typical world language classroom in middle or high school, but also provide continued experience in content-based instruction and project-based learning. The goal would be to offer **two periods a day** in the language, but at least one that is taught immersion style (90% or more in the target language with content-based instruction).

There are currently three International Middle Schools in Seattle serving Dual Language Immersion students. Each school has developed its program within certain constraints, such as availability of qualified teachers, number of periods per school day (6 vs. 7, for example), and number of students in the cohort coming from elementary school.

- **Hamilton International Middle School (NW)** offers Dual Language Immersion Continuation language courses in Spanish and Japanese Language Arts (**1 period per day**) taught by experienced world language teachers geared to preparing students for traditional high school world language classes. The Spanish classes have been able to attract a number of heritage Spanish students who joined the program in middle school.
- **Denny International Middle School (SW)** offers Dual Language Immersion Continuation language and Social Studies courses (**2 periods per day**) taught in Spanish geared to preparing students to be bilingual and biliterate in Spanish and English and able to continue to take academic courses in Social Studies in Spanish in high school.
- **Mercer International Middle School (SE)** offers Dual Language Immersion Continuation language and Social Studies courses taught in Spanish or Mandarin geared to prepare students to be bilingual and biliterate in Spanish or Mandarin and English and able to continue to take academic courses in Spanish or Mandarin in high school. Initially, Mercer was able to offer **1 period per day** of Social Studies in Spanish or Mandarin but in Fall 2016, they expect to offer **2 periods per day** (Language and Social Studies classes) at least in Mandarin. The school also offers after school programs to further supplement language and literacy development.

The high school Immersion Continuation program models are still in development:

- **Ingraham International High School (NW)** offers International Baccalaureate (IB) level language courses for 11th and 12th graders. In 9th and 10th grade, Immersion Continuation students have been taking traditional Spanish and Japanese courses at Level 2 or Level 3 (**1 period per day**) typically. There have not been any content-based courses offered in Spanish or Japanese.
- **Chief Sealth International High School (SW)** developed its Dual Language Immersion Continuation program for heritage speakers of Spanish who had participated in Denny International Middle School's program from grades 6-8. Now, in Fall 2016, the first group of students who started in Dual Language Immersion in Spanish at Concord International School will be entering 9th grade at Chief Sealth, and they will have the opportunity to take both World History in Spanish and AP Spanish as a language course. In 10th through 12th grades, they will continue to have opportunities for language study (through IB) as well as Social Studies or other similar classes in Spanish (**2 periods per day**).
- **Future International High Schools (not designated yet)** should aim to offer at least 1 period/day in 9th grade, preferably an AP level language course, as is the plan at Chief Sealth. It would also be desirable to offer World History in the immersion language, but that might not be realistic during the first year with a limited size cohort of students.

Appendix B: DLI Fidelity Checklist

(This section was originally part of the Appendix of the Intl/DLI Program Review.)

Background

As part of the 2017 Program Review of International and Dual Language Immersion programs in Seattle Public Schools, a team from Seattle Public Schools and the University of Washington reviewed a variety of nationally available guidelines for Dual Language Immersion Programs to prepare a Fidelity Checklist. The intention is for this Fidelity Checklist to be useful now and in the future as a tool for continuous improvement of Seattle's Dual Language Immersion Programs.

The two Checklists that follow represent essential elements from the master list of guidelines that would be most relevant for Seattle's schools: a Fidelity Checklist for District Survey and a Fidelity Checklist for Teacher and School Survey. These were extracted from the full working documents [SPS-Intl-DLI-Fidelity Checklist](#) and [SPS-Intl-DLI-Fidelity-Checklist-Details](#).

The team that worked on the Fidelity Checklist included:

- Dr. Michele Anciaux Aoki, International Education Administrator, Seattle Public Schools
- Dr. Chan Lu, Assistant Professor of Asian Languages & Literature, University of Washington
- Ms. Fenglan Nancy Yi-Cline, Graduate Student, UW College of Education
- Ms. Erica Marlene Ramos-Bailey, Graduate Student, UW College of Education

In addition, Dr. Jessica Beaver, Senior Researcher, Seattle Public Schools, reviewed the draft Fidelity Checklists and identified items to be used in the Teacher Survey as part of the Program Review. Members of the International Schools Leadership Team (teacher leaders from the ten International Schools in Seattle) and the International Schools/Dual Language Immersion Task Force also had an opportunity to review and prioritize items from the full draft Fidelity Checklist.

Sources Reviewed

From Seattle Public Schools: Dual Language Immersion Guidelines, adapted from Fairfax County, Virginia in 2002, and updated each year in Seattle. Download from [SPS International Education](#).

From the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL): Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., Christian, D., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Rogers, D. (2007). Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. Download at [CAL TWI Guiding Principles](#).

From the Asia Society Chinese Early Language Immersion Network (CELIN): Key Features of Chinese Language Programs: A CELIN Checklist (presented at the April 2017 National Chinese Language Conference). To be posted at [CELIN](#).

From the State of Utah: [DLI Assurances Grades 1-6](#)

From Houston Independent SD: [Handbook for Dual Language](#)

From Collier and Thomas: Non-Negotiables in [Dual Language Education White Paper](#)

From CASLS Portland Study: [Chinese Immersion Research](#)

From Asia Society Ed Week blog: [Ten Lessons for Language Immersion Programs](#)

The key elements were compared and grouped by category

- Program Design
- Curriculum
- Instruction
- Assessment and Accountability
- Staff Quality and PD
- K-16 Commitment
- District Support
- Materials
- Parents/Community Support
- Recruitment and Retention

While all of the categories are relevant and the individual items important, the excerpted Checklists below include the items which seemed most focused and pertinent to the Program Review process for Seattle.

Fidelity Checklist for District Survey

Program Design

1. The program design is research-based and uses a process of continual program planning, implementation, and evaluation.

Curriculum

2. Language learning targets are described clearly, based on the ACTFL language proficiency scale and encompassing all modes of communication.

Assessment and Accountability

3. The program collects a variety of data, using multiple measures, that are used for program accountability and evaluation.
4. The program communicates with appropriate stakeholders about program outcomes.

Staff Quality and Professional Development

5. The program recruits and retains high quality dual language staff; HR has an active role and clear understanding of the unique needs of a Dual Language Immersion program.
6. A system is in place for observing classroom instruction and providing feedback, mentoring, coaching, and evaluation with a specific and measurable focus on Dual Language Immersion instruction.
7. The district provides teachers with ongoing professional development through professional learning communities that work toward aligning content and language curriculum horizontally across disciplines and vertically across grade levels.

District Support

8. The program is supported by all program and school staff, as well as strong, knowledgeable, and effective district staff.

Parents/Community Support

9. Parents know what the intended outcomes are of their children's participation at different levels.

Recruitment and Retention

10. Enrollment in dual language immersion is open to all students of varying backgrounds and ability levels using a clear and equitable process.
11. Enrollment procedures are clearly communicated to parents and community members.

Fidelity Checklist for Teacher and School Survey

Curriculum

1. The curriculum is aligned to Washington State Learning Standards, including Common Core State Standards and the World Readiness-Standards for Learning Languages.
2. The curriculum is intentionally planned across grades for each content area taught in the partner language and English.
3. The curriculum promotes the development of bilingual, bicultural, biliterate, and multicultural competencies for all students.
4. The district and schools provide opportunities to teachers to share model curricular units and high-leverage strategies across schools, grades, and content areas.

Materials

5. Materials are age appropriate and engaging for students of intended language proficiency levels.

Instruction

6. Teachers provide students access to both structured and unstructured learning activities, giving them opportunities to develop formal and informal language in English and the partner language.
7. Teachers plan for collaboration time for reinforcement of content taught in the partner language in the English classrooms.

Assessment and Accountability

8. Teachers use both formative and summative classroom-based assessments of student proficiency in both the partner language and English that are administered in an effective and timely fashion.
9. Teachers analyze and use data from student language assessments for student placement, interventions, and to guide instruction and report progress to families on students' growing proficiency in the partner language and English.

Staff Quality and Professional Development

10. The district and schools provide meaningful and targeted professional development for teachers throughout the school year on both teaching academic content and teaching for biliteracy.