DUAL LANGUAGE PROGRAM, 2012–2013
PROGRAM FIDELITY

Department of
Research and
Evaluation

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

RESEARCH BRIEF

Background. In 2012–2013, Austin Independent School District (AISD) offered dual language (DL) instruction for prekindergarten (pre-K) through 2nd-grade students at elementary schools with a bilingual education (BE) program. In addition to these one-way DL Spanish program, 25 AISD campuses offered a two-way program (i.e., classrooms with English language learners [ELLs] and non-ELLs) and one school offered a one-way program in Vietnamese. Nine pilot campuses offered 3rd-grade DL instruction.

Gómez and Gómez 50/50 dual-language enrichment (DLE) model (1999). AISD's DL program adopts the Gómez and Gómez DLE model. The DLE model for both one-way and two-way programs provides 50% instruction time in English and 50% instruction time in Spanish. The Gómez & Gómez DLE model is unique compared with other 50/50 DL models in that it has the following characteristics:

- The language of instruction (LOI) is consistently divided by subject areas, with the promotion of content-area biliteracy.

- Conceptual refinement (CR) activities are provided at the end of lessons to support students in their second language (L2) rather than their native language (L1).

- Scaffolding of students based on language ability (i.e., bilingual pairs or groups) is used for all classroom learning activities.

- Bilingual learning centers (pre-K through 2nd grade) and bilingual resource centers (3rd through 5th grade) are incorporated in students' daily routines.

- Non-instructional school language is promoted throughout the day by all students, parents, and school staff, based on the alternating language of the day (LOD).

Training for the model is provided through the Dual Language Training Institute (DLTI). In October 2012, DLTI staff conducted classroom observations of 440 teachers who were trained by the Institute. [1] DLTI provided the district with campus summary reports and teacher-level reports of those observations completed at 59 AISD

Terminology. The term English language learner (ELL) is most commonly used to describe students who are not yet proficient in English. An ELL for state accountability purposes is a student whose dominant language is other than English and who has been tested and determined to be of limited English language proficiency.
Bilingual refers to the ability to speak fluently in two languages.
Biliterate refers to the ability to read and write in two languages.
Bicultural pertains to the presence of two cultures in one setting.
Dual language (DL) is a type of bilingual education (BE) program in which instruction is provided in both English and a second language. AISD offered DL in English and Spanish and English and Vietnamese in the 2012–2013 school year.

---

[1] Not all implementing classrooms were observed because DLTI was contracted to observe only 440 classrooms.

campuses. This report summarizes the campus data provided by DLTI on program fidelity. The appendix provides a list of DL campuses that were observed by DLTI in Fall 2012.

Ninty-three percent (*n* = 55) of campuses observed by DLTI had an *emerging proficient* (i.e., average) or higher implementation level (two more campuses than in the 2011–2012 year). Four of the 59 campuses were *below expectations* or lower, according to DLTI reports. Thirty-five teachers were cited as exemplary, 11 more teachers than were cited in 2011–2012 (*n* = 24). Table 1 provides the district's average implementation ratings in each area evaluated by DLTI.

Table 1. Gómez and Gómez Dual Language (DL) Model Implementation Ratings, 2012–2013

		n		Mean	SD
Campus-wide implementation					
Evidence of primary learning materials in LOI		59	🔵	4.3	.69
Evidence of supplementary learning materials accessible/ equitable in both languages		59	🟢	3.8	.67
Signage across campus reflects a bilingual/biliterate atmosphere		58	🟡	3.4	.91
LOD implemented across campus by other campus staff		57	🟡	3.2	.73
Evidence of the development of Dual Language Library		58	🟢	3.6	.68
Evidence of the establishment of a Dual Language Campus Committee		57	🟢	3.6	.93
Computer software in LOI (PK-2nd grade)		54	🟢	3.5	.49
Classroom environment and classroom instruction					
Classrooms have print-rich environment in both languages		59	🟢	3.8	.70
Classrooms have student-generated alphabets in both languages		59	🟢	3.8	.68
Evidence of student-generated work displayed in both languages		58	🟢	3.6	.70
Use of bilingual learning centers (PK–2) with academic-based activities		58	🟡	3.2	.56
Use of bilingual research centers (3–5) for project-based learning *		9	🔴	2.5	.79
LOD activities used for vocabulary development throughout the day		50	🟡	3.0	.58
Consistent use of LOI (no translation); all DLE components listed in daily schedule		56	🟢	3.6	1.0
Lessons are cooperative, hands-on, meaningful, relevant, authentic		57	🟡	3.4	.58
Effective use of bilingual pairs/groups; students learning together		59	🟡	3.1	.60
Evidence of extensive student writing across subjects in both languages		58	🔴	2.9	.71
Lessons are challenging, at grade level or higher; students engaged in HOT		55	🟡	3.0	.54
Evidence of implementation of CR strategy (PK–5)		57	🟡	3.1	.73
Weekly implementation of SVE activities (3–5)*		9	🔴	2.5	.81

Source. Dual Language Training Institute, October 2012
* Only included pilot campuses. Ratings were as follows: *1 = unsatisfactory; 2 = below expectations; 3 = emerging proficient; 4 = proficient; 5 = exemplary.* Spotlights are as follows: red, average rating < 3; yellow, 3 ≤ average rating < 3.5; green, 3.5 ≤ average rating < 4; blue, average rating ≥ 4. "*n*" is number of observed dual language schools. DLE = dual language enrichment. HOT = higher-order thinking. LOD = language of the day. LOI = language of instruction. CR = conceptual refinement. SVE = specialized vocabulary enrichment activities. PK = prekindergarten.

According to DLTI, on average, DL programs were *proficient* in having primary learning materials in the LOI. On average, the district was *emerging proficient* in 16 of the 20 areas rated. The district should continue to provide support to teachers in the areas of providing challenging lessons (3.0), using the LOD to develop vocabulary throughout the day (3.0), implementation of CR strategies (3.1), use of bilingual pairs (3.1), and use of the bilingual centers for academic-based activities (3.2). The three areas in which the district average was below expectations were use of bilingual research centers (2.5), implementation of SVE activities (2.5), and students' ability to write extensively in both languages across subjects (2.9). Two of the three low DLTI item ratings were associated with the 3rd-grade DL program, which began implementation in Fall 2012 at pilot campuses.

The areas with the most inconsistent[2] level of implementation across the district were the consistent use of LOI and DL components in the daily schedule, schools having a DL campus committee, and having signage across the campus to provide a bilingual/biliterate atmosphere.

References

Gómez, L., & Gómez, R. (1999). *Dual language enrichment education*. Edinburg, TX: Dual Language Training Institute.

Appendix

Pilot DL campuses. Becker, Blazier, Dawson, Ortega, Perez, Pickle, Ridgetop, Sanchez, Winn, and Wooten

Other DL campuses. Allan, Allison, Andrews, Barrington, Blanton, Brentwood, Brooke, Brown, Campbell, Casey, Cook, Cunningham, Galindo, Govalle, Harris, Hart, Houston, Jordan, Joslin, Kocurek, Langford, Linder, Maplewood, McBee, Menchaca, Metz, Oak Hill, Oak Springs, Odom, Overton, Palm, Pecan Springs, Pillow, Pleasant Hill, Read, Reilly, Rodriguez, Sims, St. Elmo, Summitt, Sunset Valley, Travis Heights, Walnut Creek, Widen, Williams, Woodridge, Zavala, and Zilker. Schools observed in 2011–2012, but not in 2012–2013: Baldwin, Baranoff, Blackshear, Graham, Kiker, and Norman.

Please contact the author for permission to reproduce portions of this report if it is not used in its entirety.

---

[2] This is based on the standard deviation (*SD*). The larger the *SD,* the larger the variation in ratings.