



A publication of the
New York State Association
for Bilingual Education

Journal of Multilingual Education Research

Volume 6 *Bilingual Special Education: Exploring
Pedagogical, Research, and Policy Implications*

Article 8

2015


Dual Language Program Meets Integrated Collaborative Teaching

Bethany Hatheway
Fordham University

Deborah Shea
Fordham University, deborahleeshea@gmail.com

Monica Winslow
Fordham University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://fordham.bepress.com/jmer>

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hatheway, Bethany; Shea, Deborah; and Winslow, Monica (2015) "Dual Language Program Meets Integrated Collaborative Teaching," *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*: Vol. 6, Article 8.
Available at: <http://fordham.bepress.com/jmer/vol6/iss1/8>

This Article on Practice is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalResearch@Fordham. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Multilingual Education Research by an authorized administrator of DigitalResearch@Fordham. For more information, please contact jwatson9@fordham.edu.



Dual Language Program Meets Integrated Collaborative Teaching

Bethany Hatheway, Deborah Shea, and Monica Winslow

Fordham University

This article proposes combining dual language programs with integrated collaborative teaching classrooms since both English language learners and special education students use many of the same teaching strategies and because there is a growing culturally and linguistically diverse population and shortage of bilingual special educators. Literature from peer reviewed journals and early childhood education publications support the idea with data from successful dual language programs. In addition, interviews conducted with teachers and principals in current dual language programs (DLP) and integrated collaborative teaching (ICT) classrooms give practical ideas and strategies for running such programs. We also explore how such a program can be implemented and question what changes and recommendations should be made.

Keywords: English language learners, dual language programs, overrepresentation, culturally and linguistically diverse, integrated cooperative teaching, biliterate

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES; 2012), recent statistics show that in the 2011-2012 school year, 9.1% or 4.4 million public school students were English language learners (ELLs) compared to 8.7% (4.1 million) in 2002-2003. Unfortunately, this population has not been properly identified or adequately served. As Harry (2008) argues, there are three main areas of concern. "First, children of African American, Latino, and Native American groups represent a disproportionately large group of certain disability categories and a disproportionately small percentage of gifted programs" (p. 372). Second, the nation's history of excluding and marginalizing culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) groups continues; and when children from such groups fall in the category of disability, it reinforces historically embedded prejudices. Third, and quite noteworthy, is that the concept and definition of disability varies across cultures, meaning the potential for miscommunication between service providers and families is very high. These concerns suggest that the education system is not sufficiently equipped to meet their needs, resulting in misplacement, overrepresentation, and high dropout rates.

The problem of overrepresentation in special education in the United States is widely documented (Trent et al., 2014). Leonard Baca and Hermes Cervantes (2004)

noted “It has been well established that bilingual children and minority children in general have historically been misplaced and thus overrepresented in special education” (p. 12). In 2007 the National Education Association (NEA) reported that approximately 13.5% of all students in K–12 schools receive special education services. The report also indicates that some subgroups of children, especially those from culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) populations, receive special education services at rates that are significantly higher or lower than 13.5%. Consequently, CLD students may be perceived as having three strikes against them, one of which is being categorized as special education, compounded by being a dual language learner, and thirdly most likely in a lower socio-economic group (NEA, 2007, p. 6).

Some misconceptions about ELLs are that (1) they should be immersed in English, (2) through immersion; ELLs will learn enough English within a year to survive academically, and (3) the less ELLs use their first language, the better (Artiles & Oriz, 2002; Baca & Cervantes, 2004; Brown & Sanford, 2011). On the contrary when ELLs learn in their first language, they can solidly transfer that knowledge to academic work in their second language. There are two types of language proficiency: basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP). Acquiring BICS takes two to three years and is insufficient for learning academic content and most ELLs need five to seven years to reach CALP in their second language. According to Cummins (1981) and Collier and Thomas (2004) they must continue to develop CALP to stay on grade level.

In this article we critically examine two issues: (1) the need for more effective bilingual programs and (2) the overrepresentation of minority CLD students in special education. Importantly, we also consider how two instructional programs, if implemented together, may ameliorate the negative impact of the practices described earlier. First, we consider the history of bilingual education in the United States. Second, we define and examine Dual Language Programs (DLPs) and Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT). Finally, we will propose combining the two types of educational programs, DLP and ICT, in order to create an inclusive general education model where bilingual and special educational needs of children can be met effectively in one classroom.

Models of Bilingual Education Programs in the United States

The Bilingual Education Act in 1968 was signed by Lyndon B. Johnson. This legislation paved the way for federal funds to be used in local school districts for bilingual education. The landmark U. S. Supreme Court case of *Lau vs. Nichols* affirmed a student’s right to equal educational opportunity through special language programs in the United States, resulting in equality of outcomes for a broader range of students (Baca & Cervantes, 2004, p. 4).

Presently, there are three basic models of bilingual education: transitional, maintenance, and two-way enrichment. According to Baca and Cervantes (2004) *Transitional* programs are also known as “early-exit” models because as soon as students are deemed proficient in English language acquisition, which takes 2-3 years, they are exited. *Maintenance* typically provides native language instruction in the elementary years (k-6) and often the amount of native language instruction decreases

as English proficiency increases. Of the three bilingual models, dual language programs are having the most success for English Language Learners and Native English Speakers (NES) because, according to Baca and Cervantes, the goals of bilingual education are to accept and develop the native language and culture in the instructional process, whereas ELs instruction relies exclusively on English as the medium for teaching and learning (p. 27).

The dual language model is a two-way enrichment model. This model effectively educates ELLs in their native language and English while educating native English speaking students to become bilingual. In fact, “Research shows that dual language programs are an effective way to meet the needs of Latino ELLs and close the achievement gap” (López Estrada, Gómez, & Ruiz-Escalante, 2009, p. 54). Furthermore, scholars not only address how this model teaches ELLs to become literate in English, but places value on how to do so in a culturally responsive way. *Sage Handbook of Leadership* illustrates ways of teaching ELL students to become literate in English, “Dual language is considered an enrichment, or additive, model building on a student’s home language, with content being taught in both languages” (Wilson, 2011, p. 1). Dual language education is a type of bilingual education that is becoming more popular in the United States, specifically in places like California, Texas, and Utah. Maxwell writes that dual language classes are seeing growth in popularity and according to estimates from national experts, dual language immersion programs have been steadily on the rise in public schools over the past decade (Maxwell, 2012, p. 16).

There are currently around 2,500 DLPs across the United States (Maxwell, 2014) with “300 in New York State alone” (Wilson, 2011, p. 1). According to the New York City Department of Education, DLPs make up only 4.1% of the programs, 78.3% use the model of ESL, 15.2% transitional bilingual education, 1.7% have no program, and the remainder (0.7%) is unreported (New York City Department of Education, 2013a).

A long term dual language program study conducted by Virginia Collier and Wayne Thomas of George Mason University revealed, “After almost two decades of program evaluation research that we have conducted in 23 large and small school districts from 15 different states, representing all regions of the U.S. in urban, suburban, and rural contexts, we continue to be astonished at the power of this school reform model” (Collier & Thomas, 2004, p. 1). It seems clear that dual language programs are having success in a wide range of settings.

In light of this research, it appears that dual language programs are having more success than the abundant transitional and maintenance bilingual models. “Models for educating English-language learners have shifted since three U.S. states banned the use of transitional bilingual education (TBE) classes in the 1990s” (Wilson, 2011, p. 1). As the transitional models fade we see more promise for dual language.

“At a time when other types of bilingual education are on the decline and the B-word— bilingual—has been scrubbed from the U.S. Department of Education lexicon, dual language programs are showing promise in their mission to promote biliteracy and positive cross-cultural attitudes in our increasingly multilingual world” (Wilson, 2011, p. 1). If indeed we are living in an increasingly multilingual world, it doesn’t make sense to reduce cultures to a monochromatic way of life which requires the culturally diverse

to assimilate and students to become monolingual. Furthermore, it is argued that this country is better served by preserving the various cultures' contributions and in the long-term help linguistic minority children become more productive members of society in their adult life.

Language Ideologies

The bilingual practices that are implemented in the United States are guided by larger social relations of power. Historically, some people conceive of blackness and brownness as inferior while upholding the myth of whiteness as superior. Importantly, many multilingual speakers are not only seen as being inferior due to their physical features, but because of the language they speak (Pimental, 2011).

The discrimination of language is supported by a number of language ideologies as defined by Pimental. These ideologies are identified and described below.

- *Linguistic Conformity.* This ideology disseminates the idea that this nation must conform to one linguistic code in order to ensure national unity, social stability, and the preservation of democratic values.
- *Language as a Liability.* This ideology that constructs non-English languages as social impediments that prohibit students from learning the English language.
- *The Fear of Language.* This ideology emerges out of fear of Latinos taking over U.S. cities and resisting assimilation, thereby posing a direct challenge to existing power relations in this country that privilege Whites.
- *Language Elitism.* The English language is perceived as being superior, a language of intellect and enlightenment.
- *Language of Commodity.* This ideology perceives non-English language as commodities--assets that can create job opportunities and career advancements (Pimental, 2011).

These language ideologies, operating as part of the larger project of Whiteness, are often embedded in the language programs that are implemented in schools and thus shape how emergent bilinguals (EBs) are perceived within these programs. Unfortunately, these students risk never learning that their language is a valuable asset worthy of further development; their language serves as a foundation for learning material. Educators must take special care to ensure that students' minority languages are perceived as valuable academic resources and important cultural reflections of students' involvement in bilingual programs.

Minority languages should be viewed as a resource and not a hindrance. In the next section we look more in depth at successful dual language programs, how they've been implemented, what strategies work, and what future prospects may be in store for the bilingual/biliterate student and society.

Dual Language Programs

According to Estrada, Gómez, and Ruiz-Escalante (2009, p. 56), “In the past 10 years, many language experts have begun to advocate dual language programs”. In fact, the numbers of dual language immersion programs have been steadily growing over the past decade even in the face of English immersion being pushed in states like Arizona, Massachusetts, and California. “Spanish is by far the most prevalent language taught in dual programs, followed by Mandarin Chinese and French, according to national language experts” (p. 16).

In San Jose, California, Gardner Academy offers a two-way immersion program in which native learners of English and native learners of Spanish learn both languages in the same classroom. Maxwell (2012) writes that its goal is to establish skills in both languages during the early grades to produce fully bilingual and biliterate students by the end of elementary school. However, because of the state’s Proposition 227 law, parents must “opt” for their children to enroll in the two-way program.

“The goal isn’t to run away from one language or another, but to really educate the child in both and to use the native language as a resource and asset,” said Mr. Gómez (as quoted in Maxwell, 2012, p. 16). Looking at using native language as a resource is a far cry from terms such as “limited English proficiency” and “English Immersion”.

Furthermore, according to Maxwell (2012), leading the nation in dual language programs are Texas, Utah, and California. The Pharr-San Juan-Alamo Independent School District was likely to become the nation’s first to have dual language programs in all its schools including middle and high school. In fact, the fourth cohort of students who have been in dual language since kindergarten will graduate from the district’s four high schools (p. 17).

Maxwell (2012) further states that in Utah, a statewide dual language immersion program initiative funded by the legislature is now in its third year. He quotes Gregg Roberts, a specialist in world languages and dual-language immersion for the state office of education:

Utah is a small state and, for our future economic development and the national security of our country, we have to educate students who are multilingual. There is broad agreement in our state about that. It is not a red or blue issue here. (p. 17).

Rosa Molina, the executive director of Two-Way CABE, an advocacy group for dual language programs that is an affiliate of the California Association for Bilingual Education, said students benefit in multiple ways.

They preserve their primary language, they develop a broader worldview that they take into college and the work world, and they gain huge advantages in their cognitive development that translates into flexibility of their thinking and the ability to tackle really rigorous coursework (as quoted in Maxwell, 2012, p. 17).

In a Dallas dual language program, after five years, students in this program outperformed native English speakers on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge of Skills test in spring of 2010 in reading and math. Superintendent Michael Hinojosa said, “The chance for students to graduate bilingual and biliterate make them competitive in this

ever-widening global society” (Pascopella, 2011). He added that if students start the program in Kindergarten, they should be literate in two languages by fifth grade. Furthermore, Lindholm-Leary (2001), and Thomas and Collier (2002) support research which shows that that DLPs are an effective way to meet the needs of Latino ELLs and close the achievement gap.

Consultants with expertise in bilingual education and who have implemented enrichment bilingual programs throughout Texas claim, “We have observed that dual language models in which students perform academic work daily in both English and Spanish are the most effective way to educate Latino ELLs. We believe it’s crucial that schools all over the United States, particularly those serving Latino students go dual language” (Estrada et al., 2009, p. 55).

A DLP model that Gómez and Gómez (1999) developed in the 1990’s, designed for mixed groups of elementary-age English and Spanish dominant speakers, uses bilingual pairs and groups. Content areas are taught in one language only. Language arts are taught in both languages, while math is taught in English only and science and social studies are taught in Spanish only. Teachers report that after they’ve used this model for even a short time, their ELLs show markedly higher levels of motivation and enthusiasm. In fact, some students who were quiet, shy and confused transformed into active, vocal, cooperative learners. An added bonus is that native English speakers benefit as well because as they become academically strong in English they transfer those skills conversationally to Spanish.

Thomas and Collier (2002) studied dual language enrichment programs in five sites across the United States and found that ELLs schooled in well-implemented dual language programs had greater long term academic success in English than did their native English-speaking peers in monolingual English programs (Estrada et al., 2009).

While the outcomes outlined in the above research demonstrate improvement in academics and promise for future opportunities, Alanis (2011), writes “Children’s daily classroom experiences influence their development of bilingualism and biliteracy and impact the way they feel about themselves as successful learners” (p. 21). This is most noteworthy because if children do not have positive, meaningful daily classroom learning experiences and see themselves as successful, they will not be able to develop language and meet academic achievement. This holds true for all students, including dual language learners and students with disabilities.

Within the above mentioned dual language programs that have proven to be effective, close the achievement gap, and show higher levels of motivation and enthusiasm, there are various teaching methods and strategies used that benefit both the dual language learner and the special education student. These are described below.

Instructional Methods and Strategies

One popular teaching model used in many school districts across the United States is the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP; Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2012). In the sheltered classroom, teachers use physical activities, visual aids, and the environment to teach vocabulary and concept development in mathematics,

science, social studies and other subjects. Visual aids are an essential strategy used in the special education classroom as are the use of physical prompts to teach necessary skills.

Other strategies used by the Kent, Washington School District are to use paraprofessionals and instructional assistants who speak the native language as well as tiered intervention framework or Response to Intervention (RTI), which is also used as a special education tool (Pascopella, 2011, p. 32). RTI allows student data to determine specific skill gaps or identify struggling students, which is important so that children don't get misplaced or misrepresented. In fact, the Vista Program in San Diego, was created in 1988 to train bilingual paraprofessionals to help students with learning disabilities and speech and language delays due to unavailable bilingual special education instructors (Charter, 1991, p. 3). There is still a shortage of certified teachers with the above mentioned specialty areas. In addition, according to Charter, one of the advantages of training paraprofessionals to work with bilingual special education students is that they can be a bridge to the family.

In our opinion, if students can be literate in two languages by fifth grade, students with disabilities and language delays may very well be able to use the same strategies to acquire language and improve communication. It is our belief that teachers, service providers, paraprofessionals, and families can also be useful resources to one another.

Skilled teachers of young children integrate culturally relevant material in the classroom and help children interact with one another to help them understand the world around them and make connections. This has been successfully done by grouping children in "bilingual pairs," which we discuss below.

Bilingual pairs will typically complete a project or do a hands-on activity and a teacher may select one student who is strong in English to work with another student who is strong in Spanish so they can support each other. This can also be done for students with disabilities in areas of development where they may be weak; they can partner with a peer who is strong in that area and vice versa (Carrasquillo & Rodríguez, 2002).

Some advantages and outcomes of bilingual pairs are that it creates community when children feel safe and connected, they are willing to take more risks as learners, and they are actively involved in their own learning and can express and exchange ideas as they build communication skills. Consequently, this cooperative learning increases children's social interactions and allows them to use their language skills to develop academic concepts. Children get to participate more fully this way and it works well in activities such as circle time. Working in pairs like this could be beneficial for children with special needs as well since children often learn from one another in a social context. Therefore, they don't feel singled out and experience peer support in a safe environment (Carrasquillo & Rodríguez, 2002; Christian, 2011). In such settings students can feel free to learn in a friendly environment and acquire new formal and informal language, develop social skills, and improve communication. Both dual language learners and students with disabilities need to acquire such skills.

Again, it is important to remember that school districts nationwide report more than 400 languages spoken. While dual language programs have grown and become more popular over the last decade, there has also been a “steady undertow of resistance to bilingualism and bilingual education” according to T. G. Wiley and W. E. Wright as quoted by Varghese and Park (2010, p. 73). Lindholm-Leary (2001) argued that DLP programs provide a solution to this resistance, eradicating any negative status because they combine maintenance bilingual and immersion education models in an integrated classroom with the goal of full bilingualism and biliteracy for both language majority and language minority students.

With all the positive aspects of dual language education, there is one missing component. Dual language education should address the needs of students with disabilities. Combining DLP with ICT could alleviate that issue. The following sections describe this idea further and propose ways it can be implemented in schools, but first we will discuss the ICT model.

Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) Model

During the 2012-13 school year, 159,824 ELLs were enrolled in NYC public schools and 35,787 (22.4%) of them were identified as having a disability and eligible for special education services (New York City Department of Education, 2013b). Given the frequency of special education placements, we will address the issue of ELLs with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs), which we believe is best accommodated in the Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) model.

Through our studies in early childhood special education we have come to understand that ICT is an inclusive model for teaching special education students mixed with general education students in the same classroom. ICT classes have two teachers, one general education and one special education teacher. The ratio of students is generally 40% with IEPs and 60% general education students. This model is more expensive than a typical general education classroom (New York City Department of Education, 2013). However, ICT is more supportive and inclusive and educates students with special needs in a general education environment.

Teacher collaboration is a necessary component for a successful ICT program. With this model, the ESL, special education, general education, and bilingual teachers can work together to plan and differentiate instruction insuring the best outcomes for all students. In this model, teachers are able to share responsibilities, as well as lead, allowing them to use their talents and areas of expertise.

Collaboration between Bilingual and Special Education Teachers

The ICT model has two teachers whereas DLP has one, but a hybrid of the two types of classroom, DLP/ICT, would need two teachers, one teacher would need a special education license and both teachers would need bilingual extensions to their teaching licenses. In the DLP/ICT model, students with special needs would be active participants in the class, rather than being pulled out for services and missing classroom instruction. This model is inclusive and would meet all the children’s needs in the classroom.

In New York City the DLP/ICT model already exists. According to the 2012-2013 Demographic Report by the New York City Office of English Language Learners there are 11 DLP/ICT classes out of 141 DLP classes. Ten of these classes are Spanish/English and one is Mandarin/English. Furthermore, during the 2012-13 school year, ELLs in New York City spoke 166 languages other than English. This report also indicates that in particular 62.4% speak Spanish at home, followed by 14.1% who speak Chinese. Given the percentage of Spanish speaking ELLs in New York City, the DLP/ICT model seems like it would be a favorable investment in the future and save money in the long run (New York City Department of Education, 2013a).

In our opinion, it could reduce overrepresentation in New York City public schools and create an inclusive model for Spanish speaking students with IEPs. This model has key components respectful of each student's language, culture and learning needs. It would foster a supportive atmosphere for both students and teachers. Lastly, since 71% of teachers are white females, it would behoove schools to combine DLP with ICT classes to promote diversity, share knowledge, and most importantly to be culturally responsive to student needs as 78% are second language learners (Rodríguez, 2014).

How Can Schools Implement DLP and ICT?

A wide variety of strategies may be pursued to implement DLP/ICT classrooms in schools. It may be advisable to have a consultation assistance team for the whole school in order to implement this model. According to Leonard Baca and Hermes Cervantes (2004), team members may be selected across grades and include specialists representing the skills and interests of the entire school. One benefit of forming such a group is that many times members volunteer to be on the team. Consequently, the team's purpose is valued and promoted by its members. The main strategy in both DLP and ICT is to use co-teaching teams with a variety of individuals, such as general and special educators, bilingual and English as a second language educators, as well as speech and language therapists.

In regards to policy development, the National School Board Association (2002, as cited in Baca & Cervantes, 2004, p. 394) provides resources and guidance and offers the following 12-step procedure that could be helpful in developing and implementing a bilingual special education policy.

1. Define the issue or problem.
2. Gather necessary information on the issue.
3. Secure recommendations from the superintendent.
4. Discuss and debate at the board level.
5. Draft policy.
6. Hold first reading.
7. Make revisions.
8. Hold second reading.
9. Adopt the policy.
10. Distribute to the public.

11. Oversee policy implementation.
12. Engage in policy evaluation and revision or modification.

Without access to a combined DLP/ICT program we used the following personal interviews to collect information and identify some of the practical issues that impact school implementing separate models of DLP and ICT. We will explore two different schools' experiences, one with the implementation of a DLP and the other's direct experience with teaching in an ICT classroom.

Interviews Conducted In Two Different Schools

First we will share information from an interview from December 2014 which provides a principal's explanation of how an urban school in the Northeast region implemented a DLP. This is followed by the findings from interviews conducted with teachers in an ICT program.

According to Principal A, in order to start a dual language program a school must first organize a group of "stakeholders". Stakeholders are a group of parents and staff. In urban School A the primary stakeholders consisted of Principal A, Teacher A and a small group of parents. Together they developed a proposal or plan of how they envisioned getting their French dual language program started. This proposal was submitted to the Office of English Language Learners in the Department of Education. Once it was accepted, the program had initial funding; however, Principal A said that it was not enough funding. She said in order to be successful you need to find a secondary source of funding. Principal A and the other primary stakeholders approached the French Embassy with another proposal for additional funding. That proposal was granted as well. The French Embassy provided monetary and general support, which included funding for all of the French books and materials used in the program. The French Embassy paid for teacher planning and limited professional development in France, as well as provided a support network of teachers and schools. Embassies can provide invaluable supports for dual language programs.

Principal A suggested rolling out a new DLP very slowly, one class/grade per year. In this way potential community problems and bumps can be minimized according to Principal A. There must also be available space in a school for a dual language program to get started. A new class on the next grade is added each year so there must be more than one free classroom available. Principals must also have a good source of fully certified bilingual and bicultural teachers if they need to hire a new teacher(s). This school built a partnership with two universities to hire new teachers. It is currently trying to build two more partnerships with additional universities (K. DelloStritto, personal interview, December 2014).

As far as starting a combined DLP/ICT program, there must be a need for the ICT component. In order to start an ICT classroom, at least 40% of students should have an IEP (United Federation of Teachers, 2015). With each IEP student comes funding for a second teacher in the DLP/ICT classroom. According to Principal A the real challenge comes with identifying teachers that have the proper certification. Teachers in the DLP/ICT classroom must have an early childhood or childhood education license with a bilingual extension or ESL license and one of the teachers needs a special education

license as well. A principal must be able to find and hire teachers with all of this certification to start a DLP/ICT program. (K. DelloStritto, personal interview, December 2014).

In a different urban Northeast school, three teachers in the ICT program were asked, "How can schools implement a DLP/ ICT Program?" They provided the following suggestions, strategies and recommendations, which coincide with the information provided above by Principal A. Teacher A is a special education teacher who works in an ICT classroom with a general education bilingual teacher. Teacher A stated:

The DLP/ICT model would be great if it was implemented when students with disabilities enter Pre-Kindergarten. Teacher A mentioned two challenges in implementing the DLP/ICT model: ensuring classes have a balanced student population; and staffing bilingual teachers. Most of the urban schools have ESL programs because it's easier to find certified ESL teachers. (P. Narcano, personal interview, December 12, 2014).

Teacher B is a second grade bilingual general education teacher. She works in the second grade classroom with Teacher A. Teacher B stated:

The DLP/ICT model would be quite beneficial to the school community... The majority of the students and families are descendants from the Dominican Republic. They do not speak the English language at all. The DLP/ICT model would piggyback the ESL program. The ELLs would be able to acquire the English language faster (L. Kantoine, personal interview, December 12, 2014).

Teacher C is a special education teacher that works in a K-1 ICT classroom. Teacher C stated:

The biggest misconception of ICT programs is that there are two teachers in the classroom; therefore, it's easier to work with the students. Unfortunately, that's not true. In this class, there are 18 students. Most of the students are ELLs and some have behavioral issues. This is a combined class, so we have two curriculums to implement. We have to differentiate instruction to meet the students' range of capabilities. The DLP/ICT model would be beneficial to our students, especially if implemented in the beginning of the school year. It would also benefit our parents who primarily speak Spanish (S. Henry, personal interview, December 12, 2014).

Teacher A's recommendations are:

Make sure the personalities of the teachers mesh (teaching styles, beliefs, communication, philosophy). This is the most important component of an ICT program. Consider how the teachers would be licensed. Would each of the teachers have to be certified in special education? Bilingual education? Would there be separate licenses to obtain or one to cover all these components of certification (P. Narcano, personal interview, December 2014,).

Teacher B's recommendations are:

Teachers involved in the DLP/ICT model would have to be experienced certified bilingual teachers, having worked three to five years in special education. As of now, Integrated Co-teachers have a lot to juggle when working with these

students such as common core standards and the bilingual component (ESL program). The DLP/ICT model would need to provide clear, precise roles for teachers and establish how the day would flow. Would half of the day be dedicated to English instruction and the other half of the day be the second language instruction?

In addition, schools should provide:

- professional development for teachers to implement the DLP/ICT model;
- hands-on materials and visual aids to help bilingual students; and
- a school-wide tuition reimbursement incentive for all teachers in order to obtain certification in bilingual education. (L. Kantoine, personal interview, December 12, 2014).

Teacher C's recommendations are:

Consider these two questions: What would happen to the ESL programs? How do parents feel about a DLP/ICT program? (S. Henry, personal interview, December 12, 2014).

In light of those personal accounts and expert commentaries, the future of integrated co-teaching may be dependent on increasing the quantity and quality of research on it and placing co-teaching in the larger context of school reform and improvement. This may foster a transition from a dual system of education to a more blended and contemporary educational practice. Three groups of educators are directly affected. First, special educators must understand how their knowledge and skills facilitate learning in co-teaching. Second, it is equally important to prepare general education, bilingual, and ESL teachers to understand and implement their skills. Third, principals and other site administrators cannot be expected to lead staff members through this fundamental change or to integrate it with other school improvement efforts without increasing their understanding" (Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, & Shamberger, 2010).

Conclusion and Implications for Further Research

In summary, our article addresses the need for more effective bilingual programs, defines both dual language programs and the ICT model, and proposes combining these two models. The DLP and ICT models use many of the same strategies to help students reach their optimum level of learning. The numbers of ELLs in public schools and the projection that they will increase by 2030, along with overrepresentation of misplaced ELLs in special education, justify resources needed to provide equal educational opportunities to CLD students in special education.

Research discussed in the article argues that DLP is a promising educational program in teaching ELLs. However, there is a gap between the number of DLPs compared to the number of ESL programs and even a higher deficit in the small number of DLP/ICT hybrid programs that exist. We agree with Foote, Press, and Rinaldo (2010) in that:

to measure and improve inclusion in today's general education we must provide answers to these questions: How much special education training classes do general education teachers need? What is the optimal inclusion class size? How many students with severe disabilities can be accommodated within a single class? How much and what kind of personnel support will make the class successful?" (p. 44).

In addition, we question, how can we expedite the certification process for bilingual teachers and bilingual special education teachers in order to keep up with the growing population and demand for quality bilingual instruction? These are questions not to be left unanswered.

Interviews with teachers and principals provide answers and information for starting such a program. They discuss strategies, obstacles, and possible solutions prior to embarking on such an endeavor. Baca and Cervantes support what one teacher recommends above, that personalities and philosophies should mesh when forming co-teaching teams and that "interpersonal communication is the cornerstone of a co-teaching relationship" (2004, p. 342) to meet the diverse need of dual language learners and those with IEPs.

A major obstacle according to Ochoa, Brandon, Kaplan, and Ramirez (2014), is that less than 2% of special education teachers in California are certified in both special and bilingual education disciplines and 1 in 4 students are identified as ELLs. Therefore, a teacher preparation program was created to incorporate key standards for special education and bilingual teacher education candidates to develop critical knowledge and skills required to address the growing linguistic diversity (p. 79). We recommend more programs such as this to meet the needs of teachers and students in order to bridge bilingual and special education classrooms.

Finally, we found there is a need for more current literature on the topic of bilingual special education. Therefore we recommend that future research be conducted in the DLP/ ICT models that exist today thus helping them and their culturally diverse learners to grow and succeed academically.

References

- Alanis, I. (2011). Learning from each other: Bilingual pairs in dual-language classrooms. *Dimensions of Early Childhood*, 31(1), 21-28.
- Artiles, A. J., & Ortiz, A. (Eds.). (2002). *English Language Learners with special needs: Identification, placement, and instruction*. Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Baca, L. M., & Cervantes, H. T. (2004). *The bilingual special education interface* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Brown, J.E., & Sanford, A. (2011). *RTI for English language learners: Appropriately using screening and progress monitoring tools to improve instructional outcomes*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, National Center on Response to Intervention. Retrieved from <http://www.rti4success.org/images/stories/pdfs/rtiforells.pdf>

- Carrasquillo, A., & Rodríguez, V. (2002). *Language minority students in the mainstream classroom* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Charter, P. F. (1991). Who will teach our children?...Use of bilingual paraprofessionals in special education. ERIC document ED336896. Available from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED336896.pdf>
- Christian, D. (2011). Dual language education. In Hinkel, E. (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning Vol. 2* (pp 3-20). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Collier, V. P. & Thomas, W. P. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 1(2), 1-20. Retrieved from http://www.hillcrest.waoisd.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_345/File/Publications/ELL/Dual%20language%20survey.pdf
- Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In D.P. Dolton (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3-49). Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissertation, and Assessment Center.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. J. (2008). Making content comprehensible for English language learners: The SIOP model (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Estrada, V. L., Gómez, L., & Ruiz-Escalante, J. (2009). Let's make dual language the norm. *Educational Leadership*, 66(7), 54-58.
- Foote, C. J., Press, K. L., & Rinaldo, V. J. (2010). Inclusion classrooms and teachers: A survey of current practices. *International Journal of Special Education*, 25(3), 43-56.
- Friend, M., Cook, L., Hurley-Chamberlain, D., & Shamberger, C. (2010). Co-teaching: An illustration of the complexity of collaboration in special education. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 20(1), 9-27. doi: 10.1080/10474410903535380 Available from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/10474410903535380>
- Gómez, R., & Gómez, L. (1999). Supporting dual CALP development among second language learners: The two way model revisited. *Educational Considerations Journal*, 26(2), 29-33.
- Harry, B. (2008). Collaboration with culturally and linguistically diverse families: Ideal versus reality. *Council for Exceptional Children*, 74(3), 372-388.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2001). *Dual language education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Maxwell, L. A. (2012). 'Dual' classes see growth in popularity. *Education Week*, 31(26), 15-17.
- Maxwell, L. A. (2014). Schools successes inspire N.C. push for dual language. *Education Week*, 34(8), 1, 14-15. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2014/10/15/08dual.h34.html>
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2012). English language learners. In NCES, *The Condition of Education* (Chapter 2, 1-3). Washington, DC: Author
- National Education Association of the United States & National Association of School Psychologists. (2007). Truth in labeling: Disproportionality in special education. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from: <http://www.nea.org/books>
- New York City Department of Education, Office of English Language Learners. (2013a). 2013 *Demographic Report*. Available from http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/FD5EB945-5C27-44F8-BE4B-E4C65D7176F8/0/2013DemographicReport_june2013_revised.pdf

- New York City Department of Education, Office of English Language Learners. (2013b). *Special education English language learners (ELLs)*. New York City, NY: Author.
- Ochoa, A., Brandon, R., Kaplan, K., & Ramírez, P. (2014). Bridging bilingual and special education: Opportunities for transformative change in teacher preparation programs. *Association of Mexican-American Educators*, 8(1), 72-82.
- Pascopella, A. (2011). Successful strategies for English language learners. *District Administration*. Retrieved from <http://www.districtadministration.com/article/successful-strategies-english-language-learners>
- Pimental, C. (2011). The color of language: The racialized educational trajectory of an emerging bilingual student. *Journal of Latinos and Educators*, 10(4), 342-343.
- Trent, S. C., Driver, M. K., Rodríguez, D., Oh, K., Stewart, S., Kea, C., Artiles, A., & Hull, M. (2014). Beyond Brown: Empirical research on diverse learners with or at-risk for specific learning disabilities from 1994-2012. *Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Learners*, 14(2), 12-29.
- United Federation of Teachers. (2015). *Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT)*. Retrieved from <http://www.uft.org/teaching/integrated-co-teaching-ict>
- Varghese, M. & Park, C. (2010). Going global: can dual-language programs save bilingual education? *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 9(1), 72-80.
- Wilson, D. M. (2011). Dual language programs on the rise. *Harvard Education Letter*, 27(2), 1-2. Retrieved from http://www.hepg.org/hel-home/issues/27_2/helarticle/dual-language-programs-on-the-rise