DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 877 FL 020 764

AUTHOR	Milk, Robert; And Others
TITLE	Re-Thinking the Education of Teachers of Language-Minority Children: Developing Reflective Teachers for Changing Schools. Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education. FOCUS Number 6.
INSTITUTION	National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	92
CONTRACT	T289004001
NOTE	21p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; Bilingual Teachers; Cooperation; Cross Cultural Training; Cultural Pluralism; Educational Environment; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Limited English Speaking; Mainstreaming; *Minority Groups; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Qualifications; Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS	*Language Minorities

ABSTRACT

Teacher training and development programs must adapt to shifting political, demographic, and program realities. This will require rigorous self-examination. Preparation of personnel to meet the needs of growing populations of language-minority students must include plans to address three distinct teacher audiences: bilingual educators; English-as-a-Second-Language teachers; and mainstream teachers. The primary goal of university-based teacher education programs is to help teachers create challenging learning environments. Emphasis should be on practice and assumptions underlying practice, not discrete skills. This calls for teacher training in reflection on classroom practice and its effect on students. Teacher education programs in colleges and universities should: institutionalize change in teaching practices; provide teachers with teaching techniques to promote student use of higher-order cognitive skills; aim at long-term, ongoing student language development throughout the curriculum; provide opportunities for teacher trainees to interact with minority language students; assess the extent to which their curricula address this group's needs; implement specific initiatives to train bilingual teachers; and increase faculty diversity. Inservice teacher education should focus on the following: reversing the teacher shortage; teaching instructional process over skills; promoting reflective practice; supporting communication between teachers; ensuring program quality; and providing ongoing technical assistance. A 49-item bibliography is included. (MSE)

Occasional
Papers
in
Bilingual
Education

Summer 1992
Number 6

Re-Thinking the Education of Teachers of Language Minority Children: Developing Reflective Teachers for Changing Schools

Robert Milk
Carmen Mercado
Alexander Sapiens

National Clearinghouse
for Bilingual Education

NCBE

Acknowledgments

We wish to acknowledge the insightful comments of Mary McGroarty and Barbara Merino in preparing the final draft of this paper, while maintaining full responsibility for any shortcomings or errors that may be present.

The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE) is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) and is operated under Contract No. T289004001 by The George Washington University's Center for the Study of Education and National Development, jointly with the Center for Applied Linguistics. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Education, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government. Readers are free to duplicate and use these materials in keeping with accepted publication standards. NCBE requests that proper credit be given in the event of reproduction.

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education
1118 22nd Street NW, Washington DC 20037

Director: Joel Gómez
Publications Coordinator: Lorraine Valdez Pierce

Re-Thinking the Education of Teachers of Language Minority Children: Developing Reflective Teachers for Changing Schools

Robert Milk
Carmen Mercado
Alexander Sapiens

Changing Contexts for Teacher Education

As teaching contexts change, so, too, must teacher training and staff development programs adapt to reflect shifting realities. Impetus for change in teacher education is particularly strong in today's environment and is currently being driven by three significant forces: political, demographic, and programmatic. Each of these forces is described below.

Political

The high profile of educational issues in current debates on national priorities is fostered by perceived shortcomings in the nation's ability to compete successfully within the international arena. In addition, hard economic times impose greater demands on limited resources and lead to increasing politicization of educational policy at all levels. This in turn creates an altered, more politically charged context for discussing strategies and goals for teacher education and staff development in the public schools.

Consensus is building around a vision of individual schools as "the center of change" for educational reform, yet beginning teachers are not "grounded in the knowledge and skills required to bring about meaningful change" (Goodlad, 1991, p. 4). Similar conclusions emerge if we examine in-service education: "The primary focus of district-driven staff development remains teachers' individual teaching competencies, not the capability of an entire staff to renew the school" (Goodlad, 1991, p. 4). Both pre service and in-service teacher training programs, therefore, need to undergo vigorous self-examination in order to ensure that they address the needs of teachers within a political climate that calls for change at the school site level rather than at the classroom level.

Demographic

Between 1980 and 1990 the ethnic profile of the United States changed significantly. According to U.S. Census figures, the number of Asian-Americans doubled and the Hispanic population grew by more than 50 percent (Armstrong, 1991). In California, 29 percent of all kindergarten students in 1991 were designated as limited English proficient (LEP), and in one year alone (1990 to 1991), a 14.5 percent increase in the number of these students (from 861,531 to 986,462) was reported (California Department of Education, 1992, p. 17). These dramatic increases in the number of English language learners exacerbate an already existing shortage in key teaching areas such as bilingual education. A national survey of teacher placement officers ranked bilingual education as the highest with regard to the "degree of teacher shortage" as well as being the teaching area with the highest demand (Association for School, College and University Staffing [ASCUS], 1990, p. 8). Severe shortages across the nation in this teaching area have led to a rethinking along a number of levels regarding the preparation of teachers for language minority students.[1]

[1] Following Wong Fillmore (1991, p.33), "language minority children" refers to children "from homes in which English is not the predominant language of communication between parents and children." Language profiles for these children vary substantially with respect to oral proficiency and literacy in both the home language and in English, and these profiles commonly change on a continuous basis. This term is more inclusive and more neutral than "limited English proficient" (LEP), a widely used label which is considered by many to be misleading and somewhat offensive in that it seems to imply that language deficiencies may exist.

Programmatic

Given an environment within which there are insufficient personnel to adequately staff special programs for language minority students (such as bilingual education and English as a second language), mainstream teachers increasingly find ever greater numbers of these students in their classrooms. Teacher shortages lead to insufficient programs for meeting the needs of language minority students across all grade levels (K-12). These students (including those who start out in bilingual education) typically spend a much greater proportion of their time in school outside of bilingual education or ESL programs than within them. Consequently, in order for the needs of language minority children to be fully met within public schools, it is not sufficient to prepare only bilingual education and ESL teachers to work with them—mainstream teachers must also be prepared to address the special needs of this group. Therefore, ***the preparation of personnel to meet the needs of language minority students must include plans to address three distinct teacher audiences: (a) bilingual education, (b) English as a second language (ESL), and (c) mainstream teachers.***

What Skills/Knowledge Must Teachers of Language Minority Students Possess?

Recent research allows teacher educators to readily generate a list of teacher competencies (Anderson, 1991; Center for Applied Linguistics, 1976; Clark, 1990; Faltis, in press; Floden, 1991; Garcia, 1992; Moll et al., 1990; RMC Research Corporation, 1981; and Thonis, 1991). This list suggests a set of fundamental skills, knowledge, and attitudes that **all** teachers working with language minority students (including mainstream teachers) should possess:

1. an awareness of the kinds of special instructional services that second language learners experience at different stages of participation in bilingual and ESL programs (Faltis, in press);

2. the ability to work collaboratively in teams that include specialists and non-specialists in bilingual and ESL programs;

3. an understanding of how classroom settings (both social and physical) can be arranged to support a variety of instructional strategies (Faltis, in press);

4. an understanding of second language acquisition principles and how these can be incorporated into learning activities that require two-way communicative exchanges between teachers and students as well as between students (Faltis, in press);

5. an understanding of "how pupils use their existing knowledge to make sense of what is going on in their classroom . . . and aware[ness] of ways in which pupils might misunderstand content that seems clear (even obvious) to the teacher" (Floden, 1991, p. 201);

6. the ability to draw parents of bilingual learners into classroom-related activities and to tap into the "funds of knowledge" which parents and community members can contribute to enhancing the instruction of language minority children (Moll et al., 1990);

7. the ability to deliver an instructional program that provides "abundant and diverse opportunities for speaking, listening, reading, and writing along with scaffolding to help guide students through the learning process" (Garcia, 1992, pp. 79-80);

8. the ability "and disposition to create and to bring students into classroom dialogue" (Anderson, 1991, p. 216);

9. the ability to "assess dynamically the initial 'ability' of individuals and groups so

that instruction may be aimed above (but not too far above) that level" (Anderson, 1991, p. 216); and

10. a disposition "to be tolerant of responses that are divergent from the teacher's point of view" (Anderson, 1991, p. 216) and to incorporate the culture of language minority children into the curriculum.

Given current demographic trends, mainstream teachers, as well as ESL and bilingual teachers, need to be prepared to teach language minority students and to take a more active role in these students' education. Hamayan (1990) describes six major functions that mainstream teachers perform with regard to language minority students. These functions include: (1) mediator and facilitator of content learning; (2) facilitator of the acquisition of English as a second language (through multiple avenues, including integration of ESL instruction with content area subjects); (3) language model; (4) mediator of mainstream culture; (5) advocate for student empowerment; and (6) collaborator with administrators and other teachers to provide valuable information about language minority students in their classes and about the content of their classes. In addition, mainstream teachers increasingly need to be prepared to meet the challenge of how to address "the social, communicative, and educational needs of both native English-speaking and second language learners of English" within the same classroom (Faltis, in press, p. 4).

Creating Appropriate Learning Environments for Language Minority Students

Although many teacher training programs clearly specify expected outcomes, the general consensus among teacher educators today is that a statement of outcomes alone is not sufficient. Indeed, it is becoming increasingly evident that ***the emphasis on competencies in teacher education (both pre-service and in-service) may be too narrowly focused. This narrow view of teacher education often fails to lead to change*** in instructional practices and to emphasize the need to create the kind of classroom environment for language minority students that will facilitate both language development and content learning (Calderon, 1990; Mercado, 1992; Romero, 1990).

Conventional approaches to teacher training often begin with a list of expected outcomes (e.g., skills, knowledge, and attitudes) and proceed to use the most effective strategies possible for preparing teachers to achieve these outcomes. An alternative focus for professional development activities, however, might lead teachers-in-training to reflect in a more holistic fashion on two fundamental questions: What kind of learning environment would most successfully engage students in the learning process? What kind of learning environment would be most conducive to language development for learners who possess unique linguistic and cultural characteristics?

In answering these questions, ***the challenge for teacher education shifts to how to prepare teachers (both beginning and experienced) to move from wherever they happen to be in their current approach to teaching toward becoming the kind of professionals who can create an optimal learning environment for language minority students.*** The nature of the challenge will vary with the kind of program in which a teacher is involved. In each case, the focus for teacher development shifts from "skills training" or "knowledge transmission" toward engaging teachers in a process which leads them to understand, at a deeper level, how learners learn language and subject matter. More specifically, teacher education programs would focus on how language minority students

learn, given their particular needs as second language learners from non-mainstream cultural backgrounds. The specific features of a program may be less important than the reflective nature of the process in which the teachers (or future teachers) are engaged (Faltis, in press; Flores et al., 1985; Freeman & Freeman, 1991; Merino & Faltis, 1985; Milk, 1990; Perez & Torres-Guzman, 1992; Torres-Guzman, 1992).

Preparing Teachers for Bilingual Education Contexts

In order for learners who are not yet fully proficient in English to progress academically, support systems must be created within the classroom to facilitate learning. Access to the native language provides one important element of support for comprehension and learning that is not available in all-English classroom settings. Setting up activities in ways that establish direct connections with existing knowledge that the learner brings to the task is another element of support (often culturally based) that bilingual teachers must provide. The motivational prerequisites for learning need to be relevant and directly evident to the learner, and the participant structures which serve to engage the learner in the task or activity must be appropriate for that learner, as well.

While certain aspects of good teaching undoubtedly cut across all learning contexts, teachers prepared to implement a bilingual program are distinct from mainstream teachers in at least three ways: (1) they are proficient in two languages and are able to use both to deliver effective instruction in all areas of the curriculum; (2) they are skilled in integrating "students' work at mixed levels of linguistic and conceptual complexity"; and (3) they "know the rules of appropriate behavior of at least two ethnic groups" and are able to "incorporate this knowledge into the teaching process" (Faltis & Merino, 1992, pp. 277-278). As bilingual teachers plan strategies for pursuing academic goals, they must invariably draw upon their knowledge of the child's language and culture to deliver an effective plan for attaining the desired outcomes.

In addition to developing strategies for the academic achievement of students, bilingual teachers must create optimal conditions for learners to acquire English as a second language. Based on our current state of knowledge, factors that can directly enhance this effort include: (a) providing opportunities for *interaction* in all phases of student learning in order to promote language development; (b) *contextualizing learning activities* (e.g., providing visual supports) in order to assist comprehension; (c) creating cooperative learning environments that *foster the development of social skills* needed to access knowledge from others and provide mutual assistance in pursuit of common goals; and (d) infusing higher-order cognitive skills into all aspects of classroom activity and directly *teaching metacognitive skills* at appropriate points in the curriculum (Hernandez & Donato, 1991). While there are many means to contextualize a lesson and multiple avenues for creating a highly interactive, language-rich environment, a key element appears to be teachers' conscious attention to these factors, in addition to an awareness of the kinds of classroom variables that can be successfully manipulated to generate a learning environment that promotes language acquisition.

In summary, a convergence of research and theory in the areas of bilingual education and second language acquisition has led to consensus among bilingual and second language specialists that language minority children are best served by instruction that is characterized by high levels of interaction framed within collaborative instructional modes. Such instruction appears to be attained by teachers who consciously and

deliberately push students beyond their current individual capabilities toward goals that focus on social-cognitive processes rather than on lockstep skills mastery. Despite this growing consensus, there is little evidence that practice is substantially changing to reflect these priorities. Indeed, it appears likely that a significant gap may exist between prevalent conceptions of effective instructional strategies for language minority children and actual practice (e.g., see Ramirez, et al., 1991).

Preparing Teachers for ESL Contexts

Many of the themes applicable to bilingual education settings are equally relevant in ESL contexts, except that within these contexts, native language support is not available as an element for facilitating comprehension and learning. Alternative strategies in ESL classrooms include sheltering instruction and/or integrating second language and content area instruction. Sheltered instruction consists of contextualizing academic language, promoting the active participation of students, and building on students' prior experiences (Hamayan & Perlman, 1990).

Modes of delivering ESL support for language minority students in mainstream classroom contexts vary widely. Depending on the program/school context, the needs of the student, and the kinds of resources available, arguments can be raised in support of different alternatives for delivering ESL services, but three key factors appear to be particularly important:

1. Whatever path is chosen, the key to success includes close *articulation* between different program components (cf. Richard-Amato, 1988);

2. *Integration* of ESL and content area instruction must be maximized wherever appropriate (cf. Crandall, 1987; and Rigg & Allen, 1989); and

3. Classroom procedures must *incorporate social aspects* that meet second language learners' needs, such as organizing classrooms in ways that facilitate student-student interaction (cf. Rigg & Enright, 1986) and using cooperative learning activities (cf. Kessler, 1992).

In order for these factors to become incorporated as central elements within ESL programs, *collaborative frameworks must be developed that involve clear communication and mutual support among all the adults who determine the quality of education for language minority students* (Cazden, 1986), including teachers with administrators, teachers with teachers, and teachers with parents.

What skills, then, are needed by ESL teachers serving language minority students? *ESL specialists* must possess a thorough understanding of theory and research which allows them to become knowledgeable and informed advocates of language minority students within the school context. Among the critical instructional issues that they must be able to understand and apply in the classroom and illustrate to non-specialists are:

- how to use modified speech appropriately with second language learners;
- how to create multiple opportunities for "negotiation of meaning" within natural learning contexts;
- how to contextualize learning (such as by providing additional visual support and planned, meaningful redundancy); and
- how to use those variables related to second language development that are under their control to maximum advantage (for example, by creating opportunities for talking and turn-taking, selecting topics, and insuring bi-directionality of communication in the classroom) (Au & Kawakami, 1984).

Although this listing is incomplete and somewhat arbitrary, it serves to illustrate an important point: what is critical for ESL specialists is not merely to be able to *do* certain things in the classroom, but *to understand at a deeper level why certain conditions must exist in the classroom in order for the needs of second language learners to be met.*

Preparing Teachers in Mainstream Contexts

As schools become more diverse, *all* teachers must ultimately assume more responsibility for the English language and academic development of language minority students. Although it is becoming increasingly common for mainstream teachers to find themselves teaching language minority students, most of these teachers have not been trained to address the particular learning needs of these students (Rigg & Allen, 1989). Both pre-service and in-service training programs should begin to incorporate into their long-term plans appropriate goals and strategies for addressing the needs of this audience. For an example of a contemporary attempt to address the specific needs of mainstream teachers assigned to all-English classrooms with language minority students, see Faltis (in press).

Preparing Teachers for Pluralistic Classrooms: Process Frameworks

It is remarkable to consider the advances we have made in approaches to the preparation of teachers in recent years. In less than two decades, we have moved from identifying and disseminating information on effective instructional practices (through workshops and other training activities) to implementing collaborative process approaches in which teachers work alongside teacher educators and researchers to create and test out innovative practices for language minority students.

In this section, three major frameworks representative of significant trends in teacher preparation will be briefly reviewed. These include: (1) the effective practices framework, (2) the coaching framework, and (3) the collaborative research framework. Each framework has its merits as well as its limitations; no single framework meets the needs of all teacher education programs.

The Effective Practices Framework

The period between 1980 and 1990 marked the beginning of efforts to examine what actually occurs in bilingual/ESL classrooms as a means of identifying the practices that make a difference by promoting improved participation and achievement among second language learners. This was the intent of the Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study (SBIF) early in the decade (Tikunoff, 1985). It was also the intent of the recently completed descriptive study, Significant Features of Exemplary Special Alternative Instructional Programs (SAIP) (Tikunoff et al., 1991), as well as of the ongoing descriptive study of content-ESL practices ("Descriptive Study," 1991). Drawing upon what actually occurs in successful settings, these studies have identified practices that, in principle, may be replicated elsewhere. Typically, these effective practices were identified on the basis of a school/program nomination process, but they were also determined on the basis of student performance on standardized measures of academic achievement.

The recently completed SAIP study of alternatives to bilingual education programs goes beyond the classroom to examine the administrative- and program-level features of these exemplary instructional

programs (Tikunoff et al., 1991). In documenting the characteristics of nine such programs nationwide, this study yields important information for the improvement of instruction for English language learners from diverse, low-incidence native language backgrounds—a growing population. Four key findings from this study merit attention. These are:

- The school leadership plays a critical role in providing instruction that responds to the needs of language minority students;

- Intensive staff development is essential in responding to the changing concerns of even the most expert teachers facing a changing student population;

- Exemplary programs extend students' educational experiences beyond school hours; and

- The native language of students continues to play an important role in learning, even in settings where English is the primary language of instruction.

In effect, this study suggests that creating effective learning environments for language minority students is the responsibility of *all* members of the school/program community, not just of the classroom teacher. It also suggests that, in light of the changing demographics that characterize schooling in the United States, professional development must become a life-long process.

The Coaching Framework

Within bilingual education over the course of the past decade, the coaching approach has been used successfully by Calderon (1990) and her colleagues in the Southwest. Coaching typically involves presenting teachers with information for implementing an instructional innovation in the classroom and pairing them to provide non-threatening feedback to each other regarding their effectiveness in applying this knowledge in the classroom setting (Garmston, 1987; Showers, 1984; Showers et al., 1987). Its greatest strengths lie in acknowledging the need for in-classroom support and encouraging teachers to create their own adaptations of instructional practices that are responsive to the academic and social needs of their language minority students. In combining what is known about applying instructional innovations to the classroom with research on effective practices for language minority students, the coaching framework adds a significant new dimension to the professional development of teachers working with this student population.

Calderon (1990) has sought to help teachers incorporate cooperative learning in their classrooms. First, teachers learn about cooperative learning through formal presentations and workshops. Next, they receive assistance through peer coaching in applying what they have learned to their individual teaching situations. It is the peer coaching component that assures the transfer of training, a previously neglected aspect of professional development.

The Collaborative Research Framework

Collaborative research approaches are those in which teachers work as equal partners with teacher educators and researchers to create challenging learning environments for students. These approaches are exemplified by the work of the Innovative Approaches Research Project (IARP) funded in 1987. The IARP project included four separate studies. The process followed in each study was complex and involved a number of phases, precisely because of its need to be inclusive of teachers, as Rivera (1991) suggests:

> . . . the implementation of each project was a collaborative effort involving researchers, administrators, and teachers who worked

> together in classrooms and in schools and who jointly shaped the refinements in the processes and procedures of the individual models. For this reason, the research and demonstration phase of the project was particularly informative and led to important insights about effective instructional approaches for language minority students.
>
> By working as equal partners in this effort, teacher collaborators gained increased understanding of the importance of the organization of schooling, the value of teaching and learning approaches that restructure the traditional teacher/student relationship, and the importance of presenting language minority students with challenging content that is relevant to their experiences and needs. (p. iv)

Another example of the collaborative research approach is reflected in the work currently being conducted by Mercado (1988, 1992). Mercado's approach is undergirded by two key elements:

- a belief that, in order to change instructional practice in schools, teacher trainers must "practice what they preach" and teachers must experience what it is like to be a language minority student; and

- an inquiry-based stance oriented toward the creation of new knowledge grounded in the actual classroom experience of practitioners.

Mercado has tested her approach in a study which examines a methods course organized around the development of thematic units and student portfolios. Units are developed in a process wherein all participants jointly plan, try out, and assess activities appropriate for achieving the desired goals. The course emphasizes submission of "works-in-progress," with substantial interaction focused on constructive evaluation of these works throughout the semester.

The principles of professional development which the study exemplifies parallel those described in the literature on effective classroom practices for language minority students. That is, professional development is characterized by: (1) *authentic dialogue over relevant content*; (2) *learning by doing*; (3) *ongoing collaboration*; and (4) *collective reflection over practice*. Teachers experience the kind of instruction that they are being encouraged to practice.

It is important to note that professional development cannot be imposed from the outside; the need and desire for change must grow from within each individual. The notion that knowledge comes from action and reflection on that action is central to this pedagogical approach. Reflecting on shared experiences is essential to deepening our understanding of ideas and of individual interpretations, to confronting our beliefs as well as our biases, to making learning explicit, but also to creating new interests and awareness of new needs.

Preliminary findings of Mercado's study seem to suggest the power of direct experience to alter perceptions of the way teaching and learning may be organized to accommodate cultural and linguistic diversity in classrooms. Graduate students of varied backgrounds and experiences—pre-service and in-service teachers, novice and veteran teachers, bilingual, ESL, and mainstream teachers—who came together by chance in this course, collaborated to create a student-centered learning environment that supported them while challenging them to accomplish projects many believed were beyond their individual capabilities. Participants cooperated to create a community of learners in which all received assistance and encouragement, despite differences in backgrounds and experiences. As a key member of this community, the instructor took a lead in identifying and tapping the unique resources each student brought to

enrich the group, but over time, other students took on this leadership role as well.

Out of this experience, most students expressed pride in their own accomplishments and those of their peers when thematic units and portfolios were displayed during the final two sessions. One of the most important outcomes of these efforts is that students learned to value and engage in reflection as they saw how reflection followed action in practice. Although much has been written about the characteristics of training activities for classroom teachers, relatively little is known about what occurs within university/college-based courses in teacher education. ***There is a need to examine instructional practice in university-based teacher training programs, much the way that instructional practices have been examined in school settings.***

Re-Thinking the Education of Teachers of Language Minority Children: Developing Reflective Teachers for Changing Schools

A number of key themes have emerged with regard to reforming teacher education. First, in order for innovations to be fully implemented and for sustained educational change to occur, "support systems . . . must be established and sustained" in schools which will facilitate interactive, collaborative approaches to instructional issues that are inclusive of teachers, supervisors, and administrators (Calderon, 1990, p. 1). Teacher education programs need to include within their goals appropriate strategies for *fostering team-based approaches* to resolving instructional challenges.

Second, teacher education programs need to provide sufficient *modeling through direct experience* of what is involved in creating interactive, language-rich classroom environments. A number of successful programs have been documented that simulate the bilingual learner's classroom experience within the context of a university teacher education course (Freeman, 1992; Mercado, 1992; Merino & Faltis, 1985; Milk, 1990). These programs model an ideal classroom environment designed to meet the needs of language minority students through cooperative learning and hands-on, problem-solving, interactive activities.

Third, effective teacher education involves a *sustained reflective process* which the teacher either initiates or enters into willingly as part of a *collaborative enterprise*. Teachers learn to do new things not solely because they "now have new information" but because they have become engaged in an active, introspective process through which they are, in some manner, transformed. As a result of this transformation, teachers are better able to sustain the willingness and ability to effect change in their classrooms.

Conclusions and Recommendations

In this paper, we have presented three central propositions:

1. Teacher training and staff development programs must adapt to reflect shifting political, demographic, and programmatic realities. In order to properly respond to changing needs, these programs need to undergo vigorous self-examination;

2. Preparation of personnel to meet the needs of language minority students must include plans to address three distinct teacher audiences: (a) bilingual education, (b) English as a second language (ESL), and (c) mainstream teachers. Mainstream teachers must be prepared to meet the challenge of how to address the social, communicative, and educational needs of both native English speak-

ers and second language learners within the same class; and

3. The primary goal of university-based teacher education programs is to help teachers learn to create challenging learning environments for language minority students. Emphasis should be on practice and assumptions underlying that practice, not on discrete skills. This calls for programs that promote teachers who reflect on what they do in the classroom and on how this affects language minority students and second language learners.

In addition to these central propositions, a number of recommendations can be offered based on the current literature on teacher education and staff development.

Recommendations for Teacher Education Programs in Colleges and Universities

1. Meaningful change in teaching practices rarely takes hold over the long term unless *support systems* for change are created within the context of an entire school setting. It appears critically important that efforts for improving practice with respect to language minority children be addressed at the level of whole-school plans and that efforts not be limited merely to the needs of individual practitioners within their isolated classrooms (Leithwood, 1990).

2. Teacher education programs must prepare teachers to deliver instruction which moves second language learners away from conventional procedures grounded in basic, low-level, passive skills instruction toward engaging them in "learning processes which *foster higher-order cognitive and social skills* that take their sociocultural and linguistic knowledge into consideration" (Hernandez & Donato, 1991, p. 20, emphasis added).

3. Teacher education programs must prepare teachers in a manner that enables them to *experience directly through their training* the extent to which successful academic learning for these students is grounded in rich language experiences and interactive communicative processes. These processes must be aimed at sustained, on-going language development through all phases of the curriculum.

4. Teacher education programs must provide prospective teachers with multiple opportunities to interact with language minority students and their parents during the training phase. Institutions of higher education (IHEs) located in suburban or rural areas must resist pressures to send teachers-in-training to convenient nearby schools or districts for field experiences and should create linkages with schools having significant language minority student populations. This ensures that teachers are adequately prepared to function effectively in *multicultural environments*.

5. Teacher education programs should examine *curricula* for teacher training courses to ensure that all teachers are provided with the requisite knowledge and skills to address the needs of language minority students. In addition, a foreign language requirement should be instituted for all prospective teachers in order to create a stronger awareness of second language learners' needs and experiences.

6. Universities and colleges must be proactive in addressing the severe *national shortage of bilingual teachers* and implement specific initiatives, such as recruiting more minorities into teacher preparation programs and seeking out "partnerships with school districts to establish programs for language minority junior high and senior high youths to prepare them for entering teacher preparation programs" (Quezada, 1992, p. 24). Institutions of higher education should also "provide support mechanisms for

language minority teachers beyond the certification level, e.g., new teacher assistance programs" (Quezada, 1992, p. 24).

7. Universities and colleges should increase the *diversity of faculty members* in teacher preparation programs in order to "bring a variety of background perspectives to the teacher education program" (Quezada, 1992, p. 25).

Recommendations for Staff Development

1. Staff development at the school district level should address the teacher shortage through a *coordinated effort* which includes collaboration among school districts, state and county educational service centers, universities and colleges, professional organizations, and state credentialing boards (Gold, 1992). Innovative programs, such as *fully developed* alternate routes to certification or career ladder programs for paraprofessionals through community colleges and four-year institutions should be designed and implemented. Short-cut routes which produce ill-prepared classroom teachers should be avoided as the long-term consequences for language minority students can be extremely damaging.

2. Staff development must involve more than addressing a discrete set of competencies. It means *engaging teachers in a process* wherein they see themselves as learners involved in discovering how their students learn and reflecting on how they can create optimal environments for all of their students in the classroom. In order to accomplish this, we must "say goodbye to quick-fix workshops and hello to staff development that provides intellectual stimulation and opportunities to develop new knowledge and skills" (Goldenberg & Gallimore, 1991, p. 69).

3. Change will only occur if teachers themselves change what they are doing in the classroom. For this cycle of change to be initiated, practitioners need to become engaged in a process of "reflective practice." This can occur through formation of "problem-solving teams" or teachers' "learning communities" that *generate change* among fellow teachers, not just at a given grade level, but within an entire school campus and, eventually, beyond the school site (Lucas, 1992).

4. Local districts should "offer *mainstream classroom teachers* a wide array of staff development activities which revolve around the education of PEP (potentially English proficient) students" (Hamayan, 1990, p. 18). Specific strategies must be created to break down artificial barriers between bilingual/ESL and mainstream teachers that work against developing a whole-school response to meeting the needs of language minority students.

5. Staff development should intensify program coordination and monitoring activities at the school and district level to *ensure quality* (e.g., adequate spending for materials and retention of good teachers in programs designed for language minority students), and to *increase the level of implementation* (i.e., to decrease the gap between what is publicly proclaimed to be happening and what actually occurs) for bilingual programs (Quezada, 1992, p. 26).

6. State education agencies can contribute greatly by *providing on-going technical assistance* and maintaining thorough, sustained compliance efforts.

The challenge for teacher educators is clear: we must practice what we preach in university teacher education and district staff development programs. Beyond the classroom, we must model the creation of meaningful, interlocking support networks, not only within institutional systems, but also across artificial barriers (such as school/university or school/community) in order for the dramatic changes so badly needed in our schools to become reality.

References

Anderson, A. (1991). Teaching children: What teachers should know. In M. Kennedy (Ed.), *Teaching academic subjects to diverse learners*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Armstrong, L. (1991, March 1). Census confirms remarkable shifts in ethnic make-up. *Education Week*, p. 1.

Association for School, College and University Staffing, Inc. (ASCUS). (1990). *Teacher supply/demand: An annual report based upon an opinion survey of teacher placement officers*. Evanston, IL: Author.

Au, K., & Kawakami, A. (1984). Vygotskian perspectives on discussion processes in small-group reading lessons. In P. Peterson, L. Wilkinson, & M. Hallinan (Eds.), *The social context of instruction: Group organization and group processes*. New York: Academic Press.

Calderon, M. (1990, April). *Training and coaching teachers of language minority students for cooperative learning*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

California Department of Education. (1992). *BEOutreach: A news magazine from the Bilingual Education Office*, 3(1). Sacramento, CA: Bilingual Education Office.

Cazden, C. (1986). ESL teachers as language advocates for children. In P. Rigg & S. Enright (Eds.), *Children and ESL: Integrating perspectives* (pp. 9-21). Washington, DC: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Center for Applied Linguistics. (1976). Guidelines for the preparation and certification of teachers of bilingual/bicultural education. In J. Alatis & K. Twaddell (Eds.), *English as a second language in bilingual education* (pp. 345-349). Washington, DC: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Clark, E. (1990). The state of the art in research on teacher training models with special reference to bilingual education teachers. In *Proceedings of the First Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Students' Issues* (pp. 361-391). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs.

Crandall, J. (Ed.) (1987). ESL through content-area instruction: Mathematics, science, social studies. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Descriptive study of content-English as a second language (ESL) practices. (1991). *NCBE* [National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education] *Forum, 14*(6), 3.

Faltis, C. (in press). *Joinfostering: Adapting teaching strategies for the multilingual classroom*. New York: Merrill/Macmillan Publishing Company.

Faltis, C., & Merino, B. (1992). Toward a definition of exemplary teachers in bilingual multicultural school settings. In R. Padilla & A. Benavides (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on bilingual education research*. Tempe, AZ: Bilingual Press/Editorial Bilingüe.

Floden, R. (1991). What teachers need to know about learning. In M. Kennedy (Ed.), *Teaching academic subjects to diverse learners*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Flores, B., Garcia, E., Gonzales, S., Hidalgo, G., Kaczmarek, K., & Romero, T. (1985). *Bilingual holistic instructional strategies*. Chandler, AZ: Exito.

Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (1991). Practicing what we preach: Whole language with teachers of bilingual learners. In K. Goodman & Y. Goodman (Eds.), *Occasional papers: Program in language and literacy.* Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona.

Freeman, Y. (1992). *Teachers learn what it's like to be a second language learner.* Unpublished manuscript. Fresno Pacific College.

Garcia, E. (1992). Linguistically and culturally diverse children: Effective instructional practices and related policy issues. In H. Waxman, J. Walker de Felix, J. Anderson, & H. Baptiste (Eds.), *Students at risk in at-risk schools: Improving environments for learning.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Garmston, R.J. (1987). How administrators support peer coaching. *Educational Leadership, 44*(5), 18-26.

Gold, N. (1992, April). *Solving the shortage of bilingual teachers: Policy implications of California's staffing initiative for LEP students.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Goldenberg, C., & Gallimore, R. (1991). Changing teaching takes more than a one-shot workshop. *Educational Leadership, 49*(3), 69-72.

Goodlad, J. (1991). Why we need a complete redesign of teacher education. *Educational Leadership, 49*(3), 4-10.

Hamayan, E.V. (1990). Preparing mainstream classroom teachers to teach potentially English proficient students. In *Proceedings of the First Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Students' Issues* (pp. 1-21). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs.

Hamayan, E.V., & Perlman, R. (1990). *Helping language minority students after they exit from bilingual/ESL programs.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Hernandez, J., & Donato, R. (1991, April). *Metacognition as an equity issue for Mexican American language minority students.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Kessler, C. (Ed.). (1992). *Cooperative language learning: A teacher's resource book.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Leithwood, K. (1990). The principal's role in teacher development. In B. Joyce (Ed.), *Changing school culture through staff development* (pp. 71-90). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lucas, T. (1992, April). *Twenty success stories: Overview of the case study phase of the national study of Title VII capacity building.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Mercado, C. (1988). *An ethnographic study of academic help with language minority centers.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University at Lincoln Center, New York.

Mercado, C. (1992, January). *Reciprocal teaching and learning in a bilingual reading course: Educational reform begins in the college classroom.* Paper presented at the National Association for Bilingual Education, Albuquerque, NM.

Merino, B., & Faltis, C. (1985). Spanish for special purposes: Communication strategies for bilingual teachers. *Foreign Language Annals, 18,* 43-56.

Milk, R. (1990). Preparing ESL and bilingual teachers for changing roles: Immersion for teachers of LEP children. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*(3), 407-426.

Moll, L., Velez-Ibañez, C., Greenberg, J., & Rivera, C. (1990). *Community knowledge and classroom practice: Combining resources for literacy instruction* (Handbook for teachers and planners from the Innovative Approaches Research Project). Arlington, VA: Development Associates, Inc.

Perez, B., & Torres-Guzman, M. (1992). *Learning in two worlds: An integrated Spanish/English biliteracy approach.* New York: Longman.

Quezada, M. (1992, April). *District remedies to eliminate the shortage of qualified teachers of limited English proficient students in selected districts in California.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Ramirez, J.D., Yuen, S.D., & Ramey, D.R. (1991). *Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit bilingual education programs for language minority students. Final Report.* San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.

Richard-Amato, P.A. (1988). *Making it happen: Interaction in the second language classroom.* New York: Longman.

Rigg, P., & Allen, V. (1989). *When they don't all speak English: Integrating the ESL student into the regular classroom.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Rigg, P., & Enright, S. (1986). *Children and ESL: Integrating Perspectives.* Washington, DC: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Rivera, C. (1991). Preface. In B. Warren, A. Rosebery, F. Conant, J. Hudicourt-Barnes, & C. Rivera, *Cheche Konnen: Collaborative scientific inquiry in language minority classrooms.* (Handbook for teachers and planners from the Innovative Approaches Research Project). Arlington, VA: Development Associates, Inc.

RMC Research Corporation. (1981). *Framework of competencies for aides, teachers, and teacher trainers in bilingual education.* (RMC Report UR-474). Mountain View, CA: Author.

Romero, M. (1990). Discussant response to E. Riojas Clark, "The state of the art in research on teacher training models with special reference to bilingual education teachers." In *Proceedings of the First Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Students' Issues* (pp. 487-498). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs.

Showers, B. (1984). *Peer coaching: A strategy for facilitating transfer of training.* Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Showers, B., Joyce, B., & Bennett, B. (1987). Synthesis of research on staff development: A framework for future study and a state-of-the-art analysis. *Educational Leadership, 45*(3), 77-87.

Thonis, E. (1991). Competencies for teachers of language minority students. In M. McGroarty & C. Faltis (Eds.), *Languages in school and society: Policy and pedagogy.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tikunoff, W.J. (1985). *Applying significant bilingual instructional features in the classroom.* Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Tikunoff, W.J., Ward, B., van Broekhuizen, L., Romero, M., Castañeda, L., Lucas, T., & Katz, A. (1991). *Executive summary: A descriptive study of significant features of exemplary special alternative instructional programs.* Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Torres-Guzman, M. (1992). *Bringing it closer to home: An analysis of culturally relevant instruction.* Unpublished manuscript. Teachers College, Columbia University.

Wong Fillmore, L. (1991). Language and cultural issues in the early education of language minority children. In S. Kagan (Ed.), *The care and education of America's young children: Obstacles and opportunities. Ninetieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I* (pp. 30-49). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

About the Authors

Robert D. Milk is Professor and Director of the Division of Bicultural-Bilingual Studies at the University of Texas in San Antonio. He has taught ESL and Spanish at the secondary level and directed a number of Title VII teacher training projects. His latest publication is "Preparing Teachers for Effective Bilingual Instruction."

Carmen Mercado is Assistant Professor of Education at Hunter College/City University of New York (CUNY). She has served as Coordinator of a Title VII program providing training and technical assistance to schools and districts in New York State, as a curriculum specialist, and as an elementary school teacher. Her latest publication is "Researching research: A student-teacher-researcher collaborative project at Hunter College of CUNY."

Alexander Sapiens is Associate Professor at San Jose State University in California. He has worked as a secondary school science teacher and a bilingual teacher and has directed Title VII teacher training projects. His latest publication (with A. G. Ramirez and R. D. Milk) is "Intragroup Differences and Attitudes toward Varieties of Spanish among Bilingual Pupils from California and Texas."

The George Washington University
WASHINGTON DC

CAL
Center for Applied Linguistics