



The Seal of Biliteracy: Considering Equity and Access for English Learners

Amy J. Heineke

Loyola University Chicago

Kristin J. Davin

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

&

Amy Bedford

Loyola University Chicago
United States

Citation: Heineke, A. J., Davin, K. J., & Bedford, A. (2018). The Seal of Biliteracy: Considering equity and access for English learners. [Commentary]. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(99). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3825>

Abstract: The Seal of Biliteracy is a grass-roots language policy initiative that is sweeping across the United States. An award affixed to high school graduates' transcripts and diplomas, the overarching purpose of the policy is to promote and foster students' bilingualism and biliteracy in K-12 schools. Initiated in California in 2011, the policy has been modified significantly as stakeholders in 32 different states have drafted, passed, and enacted similar legislation in recent years. On its surface, the policy appears to hold promise in disrupting the monolingual norm prevalent in U.S. schools; however, with many states focusing efforts on world language education for English-dominant students, a critical analysis of the policy from the lens of the large and growing population of

English learners is warranted. This paper considers the 32 state policies from this lens, first exploring the policy purpose and logistics and then making policy recommendations to enhance equity and access for English learners. The recommendations target stakeholders across the United States who seek to either initiate or revise Seal of Biliteracy policies within their unique state contexts.

Keywords: English learners; biliteracy; heritage language

El Seal of Biliteracy: Considerando la equidad y el acceso para los alumnos de inglés

Resumen: El Seal of Biliteracy es una política de lenguaje que está ganando popularidad en todo Estados Unidos. Un premio fijado transcripciones y diplomas graduados de la secundaria, a propósito de la política es promover y fomentar el bilingüismo y biliteración en las K-12 escuelas. Iniciada en California en 2011, la política fue modificada de forma significativa a medida que las partes interesadas en 32 estados diferentes elaboraron, aprobaron y promulgar una legislación similar en los últimos años. En su superficie, la política parece ser muy prometedora en interrumpir el monolingüismo prevalente en los EE.UU. escuelas; sin embargo, con muchos estados interesados en la enseñanza de idiomas del mundo para los estudiantes inglés-dominantes, un análisis crítico de la política a partir de la lente de la población grande y creciente de los estudiantes inglés está garantizado. Este artículo considera las 32 políticas estatales a partir de esa lente, explorando primero la política y la logística y, a continuación, haciendo recomendaciones de políticas para aumentar la equidad y el acceso para los alumnos de inglés. Las recomendaciones apuntan a las partes interesadas en los Estados Unidos que buscan iniciar o revisar las políticas del Seal of Biliteracy dentro de sus contextos de estado únicos.

Palabras clave: alumnos de inglés; biliteração; idioma del patrimonio

O Seal of Biliteracy: Considerando a equidade e o acesso para os alunos de inglês

Resumo: O Seal of Biliteracy é uma política de linguagem que está ganhando popularidade em todo o Estados Unidos. Um prêmio afixada transcrições e diplomas graduados do ensino médio, a propósito da política é promover e fomentar o bilinguismo e biliteracy no K-12 escolas. Iniciada na Califórnia em 2011, a política foi modificada de forma significativa à medida que as partes interessadas em 32 estados diferentes elaboraram, aprovaram e promulgaram legislação semelhante nos últimos anos. Em sua superfície, a política parece ser muito promissora em interromper o monolingualism prevalente em EUA escolas; no entanto, com muitos estados interessados no ensino de idiomas do mundo para estudantes inglês-dominantes, uma análise crítica da política a partir da lente da população grande e crescente de alunos inglês está garantido. Este artigo considera as 32 políticas estaduais a partir dessa lente, explorando primeiro a política e a logística e, em seguida, fazendo recomendações de políticas para aumentar a equidade e o acesso para os alunos de inglês. As recomendações visam as partes interessadas nos Estados Unidos que buscam iniciar ou revisar as políticas do Seal of Biliteracy dentro de seus contextos de estado únicos.

Palavras-chave: alunos de inglês; biliteração; idioma do patrimônio

The Seal of Biliteracy: Considering Equity and Access for English Learners

A nascent policy initiative in the United States, the Seal of Biliteracy (SoBL) is “an award made by a state department of education or local district to recognize a student who has attained proficiency in English and one or more other world languages by high school graduation” (ACTFL, NABE, NCSSFL, & TESOL, 2015, p. 2). In participating districts in states that have adopted the SoBL, students who demonstrate proficiency in both English and another language are eligible to earn a seal that is affixed to their high school diploma or transcript. This policy initiative began in California as a grassroots effort by educators and language advocates aiming to promote biliteracy despite restrictions on bilingual education for English learners (ELs). Since California’s successful legislation in 2011, 31 states and the District of Columbia (DC) have followed suit in enacting SoBL policies through various methods, including legislation via the state legislature, policy resolution by the state board of education, or program handbook drafted by state or district administrators (see Table 1).

Table 1
States with Seal of Biliteracy Policy (in order of policy enactment)

2011	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
California	Texas	New Mexico	North Carolina	New Jersey	Ohio	Michigan
	New York	Washington	Virginia	Florida	Colorado	Tennessee
	Illinois	Louisiana	Indiana	Oregon	Connecticut	
		Minnesota	Nevada	Maryland	Delaware	
		District of Columbia	Hawai‘i	Georgia	Missouri	
			Wisconsin	Arizona	Massachusetts	
			Utah	Kansas		
				Rhode Island		

Regardless of the state’s approach to the policy, students currently or formerly labeled as ELs can achieve the SoBL by demonstrating proficiency in English, as well as their home or other language. We contend that this policy initiative holds promise for the approximately 10 million students who speak a language other than English at home, including the 4.6 million students labeled as ELs in Kindergarten-through-grade-12 (K-12) public schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). When implemented in practice, the SoBL has the potential to provide ELs with opportunities to jointly develop home languages, particularly in secondary settings where ELs often receive subtractive, remedial, English-only instruction (Janzen, 2008; Menken, 2013; Menken & Kleyn, 2010; Reyes & Her, 2010; Wells, 2010). Nonetheless, we assert the need to critically evaluate the goals and logistics of states’ SoBL policies with a lens on equity and access for ELs.

Policy Goals

Across the country, SoBL policies have been drafted to emphasize the goal of promoting bilingualism and biliteracy with all students (Seal of Biliteracy, 2018). Yet, approximately two thirds of states did not explicitly mention ELs when framing the policy's purpose, including Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and Washington. Perhaps as a result, some states' SoBL policies prioritize elite bilingualism among English-dominant students. Other states left out ELs in the formal framing of the policy, but prioritized ELs during policy implementation. For example, Georgia stakeholders avoided explicit mention of ELs to successfully move the bill through the conservative legislature.

On the other hand, a cadre of states explicitly enacted the policy to promote the biliteracy of language-minoritized students. Approximately one third of participating states specifically mention ELs, heritage language learners, or linguistically diverse students in the overarching purpose of the policy, including California, Connecticut, Delaware, DC, Hawaii, Indiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. In Minnesota, for example, SoBL efforts stemmed from legislation aiming to close the EL achievement gap, which included emphasis on bolstering ELs' home language abilities. We see two trends among these states. First, four of these contexts (i.e., DC, Hawai'i, Michigan, Wisconsin) circumvented their state legislatures to instead go through the state board or department of education, thus requiring less political maneuvering to ensure passage. Second, four states enacted their policies recently—including Connecticut, Delaware, and Massachusetts in 2017, and Michigan in 2018—indicating a potential national trend returning to the original priority of the grass-roots movement initiated in California.

Policy Guidelines

States vary in the ways in which students demonstrate proficiency in other languages to receive the SoBL (Davin & Heineke, 2017). In a handful of states, including California, Colorado, Florida, Louisiana, North Carolina, and Texas, students can demonstrate proficiency by achieving a particular Grade Point Average (GPA) in a determined sequence of world language coursework, which is commonly referred to as *seat time*. Other states require scores on recognized assessments of world languages, including Hawaii, Indiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, Rhode Island, and Virginia. While providing more tangible evidence of language proficiency in contrast to seat time, this approach excludes languages that are less commonly taught in schools, including many home languages of ELs. More equitable forms of evidence used by some states include language portfolios or certification by indigenous groups. In addition to varying ways to demonstrate language proficiency, states vary by the minimum proficiency levels required to receive the award, or in some states, different tiers of the award (see Table 2). For example, students must demonstrate Intermediate Low in North Carolina versus Advanced Low in DC.

Table 2
World Language Proficiency Requirements per State Policy

Proficiency	State Policy
Intermediate Low	Illinois (Level 1: Commendation); North Carolina
Intermediate Mid	Arizona; Colorado; Connecticut; Delaware (Level 1: Gold); Florida (Level 1: Silver); Hawaii; Kansas (Level 1: Gold); Massachusetts (Level 1: Silver); Missouri (Level 1); New Jersey; Rhode Island (Level 1; Silver); Tennessee; Virginia; Utah; Washington
Intermediate High	Georgia; Illinois (Level 2: Gold); Indiana; Maryland; Massachusetts (Level 2: Gold); Michigan; Minnesota (Level 1: Gold); Nevada; New Mexico; New York; Ohio; Oregon; Texas; Wisconsin (Level 1: Seal of Biliteracy)
Advanced Low	Delaware (Level 2: Diamond); D.C.; Florida (Level 2: Gold); Kansas (Level 2: Platinum) Louisiana; Massachusetts (Level 3: Platinum); Minnesota (Level 2: Platinum); Missouri (Level 2: Distinguished); Rhode Island (Level 2: Gold)
Advanced Mid	Wisconsin (Level 2: Distinguished Seal of Biliteracy)
n/a	California (does not specify ACTFL proficiency level)

States also have varying requirements for students to demonstrate English language proficiency (Davin & Heineke, 2017). GPA is the primary measure in many states, including GPA in English language arts courses in Arizona, California, Georgia, Kansas, Nevada, Texas, and Utah and overall GPA in Hawai'i. Another cadre of states (i.e., Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oregon, Virginia, Washington) infers students' English proficiency if they meet graduation requirements. In other states, students must pass end-of-course exams, which come in 10th grade in Florida, Indiana, Maryland, and Massachusetts and 11th grade in California and Rhode Island. In this particular approach, ELs are put at a disadvantage in that they must demonstrate proficiency in their second language (i.e., English) early on in their high school careers, whereas English-dominant students typically have through their senior year to do the same in a world language.

Some states have additional requirements for ELs to receive the award, requiring students to demonstrate English proficiency beyond the above-described measures. In California, Nevada, and Texas, ELs must pass the state-level English proficiency assessment, subsequently demonstrating advanced proficiency and formally exiting EL services. In North Carolina and Wisconsin, ELs do not need to pass the proficiency exam and shed the EL label, but they need to achieve particular scores to indicate biliteracy abilities. Not only does this approach require additional testing for ELs, it sets more rigorous English proficiency requirements for ELs than world language requirements

for English-dominant students. For example, in Texas, second language proficiency is set at intermediate high for English-dominant students, but advanced high for ELs.

Policy Recommendations

We recommend that stakeholders probe the equity of requirements for students to achieve the Seal of Biliteracy in their state, including any additional testing requirements for ELs, earlier deadlines to demonstrate English proficiency, and more rigorous requirements for English versus other languages. First, ELs should not be subjected to double testing requirements to receive the award, as English proficiency can be gleaned on the English-specific measures already determined by the state. Second, students should have the same amount of time to demonstrate biliteracy; if English-dominant students can demonstrate world language proficiency through 12th grade, then ELs should not be expected to demonstrate English proficiency in 10th or 11th grade. Third, if biliteracy for all is truly the goal of the policy, then students should be held to similar expectations of language proficiency; for example, students might achieve the SoBL for demonstrating advanced proficiency in their home language and intermediate proficiency in a second language, whether that be English or another language.

Issues of access must also be considered, specifically evaluating what languages are able to be recognized via the SoBL. In many states offering the award, students can only demonstrate proficiency in another language on approved exams. This results in particular languages being prioritized, such as those taught in high school world language coursework, such as Spanish, French, and German. But students in U.S. schools come from homes using over 300 languages (American Community Survey, 2015), including a diverse array of immigrant (e.g., Hmong, Malayalam) and indigenous languages (e.g., Dakota, Navajo). When the award is limited to particular languages, specifically prioritizing world languages formally taught in schools, it becomes exclusionary in nature—denying access to ELs with proficiency in their home language. We recommend flexibility in assessing proficiency in less common languages, such as certification by indigenous tribes in New Mexico or portfolio assessments in Illinois.

ELs are a large and growing sub-group in U.S. schools. An estimated 20% of the student population in K-12 schools speak languages other than English, with half of those considered as ELs (NCES, 2016). In a policy that aims to build the bilingualism and biliteracy of all students, this sub-group of learners must be considered and prioritized. They bring rich linguistic backgrounds and abilities into classrooms and schools, which should be encouraged, honored, and celebrated in equitable ways in comparison to English-dominant students learning another language. We contend that the issues of equity and access described above should be approached consistently across the country, with all participating states equitably and authentically including ELs in policy goals and logistics to achieve the award. In this way, whether drafting new policy or revising current policy, state-level stakeholders should critically consider and prioritize these issues of equity and access for ELs. While these formal policy decisions are made at the macro-level, teachers and administrators should recognize these issues with the current approach and advocate for ELs' equitable access to achieve the Seal of Biliteracy.

References

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, National Association for Bilingual Education, National Council of State Supervisors for Languages, & Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages International Association. (2015). Guidelines for implementing

- the Seal of Bilingual Literacy. Joint report. Retrieved March 21, 2018, from http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/SealofBilingualLiteracyGuidelines_0.pdf
- American Community Survey. (2015). Detailed languages spoken at home and ability to speak English for the population 5 years and over for United States: 2009 to 2013. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Davin, K. J., & Heineke, A. J. (2017). The Seal of Bilingual Literacy: Variations in policy and outcomes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 50, 486-499. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12279>
- Janzen, J. (2008). Teaching English language learners in the content areas. *Review of Educational Research*, 78, 1010-1038. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308325580>
- Menken, K. (2013). Emergent bilingual students in secondary school: Along the academic language and literacy continuum. *Language Teaching: Surveys and Studies*, 46, 438-476. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444813000281>
- Menken, K., & Kleyn, T. (2010). The long-term impact of subtractive schooling in the educational experiences of secondary English language learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism*, 13, 399-417. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050903370143>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). EDFacts file 141, Data Group 678; Common Core of Data, "State Nonfiscal Survey of Public Elementary and Secondary Education." Table 204.27.
- Reyes, R., & Her, L. N. (2010). Creating powerful high schools for immigrant and English language learning populations. *Yearbook Of The National Society For The Study Of Education*, 109, 527-547.
- Seal of Bilingual Literacy. (2018). State laws regarding the Seal of Bilingual Literacy. Retrieved February 18, 2018, from www.sealofbilingual.org
- Wells, R. (2010). Children of immigrants and educational expectations: The role of school composition. *Teachers College Record*, 112, 1679-1704.

About the Authors

Amy J. Heineke

Loyola University Chicago

aheineke@luc.edu

<http://www.orcid.org/0000-0002-4219-3600>

Amy Heineke is Associate Professor of Bilingual/Bicultural Education at Loyola University Chicago. Her research focuses on language policy and teacher preparation for students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Her scholarship is informed by her prior work as a classroom teacher of English learners in Phoenix, Arizona.

Kristin J. Davin

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

kdavin@uncc.edu

<http://www.orcid.org/0000-0003-3590-7086>

Kristin Davin is Assistant Professor of Foreign Language Education at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. Her research focuses on second language teacher preparation, language assessment, and the Seal of Biliteracy. Her scholarship is informed by her prior work as an elementary Spanish teacher in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Amy Bedford

Loyola University Chicago

abedford@luc.edu

Amy Bedford is a doctoral student and adjunct instructor at Loyola University Chicago. Her research focuses on science-focused afterschool programs for underserved youth and immigrant students. Her scholarship is informed by her prior work as an elementary teacher and volunteer in West Palm Beach, Florida, and Chicago, Illinois.

education policy analysis archives

Volume 26 Number 99

August 6, 2018

ISSN 1068-2341



Readers are free to copy, display, and distribute this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and **Education Policy Analysis Archives**, it is distributed for non-commercial purposes only, and no alteration or transformation is made in the work. More details of this Creative Commons license are available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>. All other uses must be approved by the author(s) or **EPAA**. **EPAA** is published by the Mary Lou Fulton Institute and Graduate School of Education at Arizona State University. Articles are indexed in CIRC (Clasificación Integrada de Revistas Científicas, Spain), DIALNET (Spain), [Directory of Open Access Journals](#), EBSCO Education Research Complete, ERIC, Education Full Text (H.W. Wilson), QUALIS A1 (Brazil), SCImago Journal Rank; SCOPUS, Socolar (China).

Please send errata notes to Audrey Amrein-Beardsley at audrey.beardsley@asu.edu

Join **EPAA's Facebook community** at <https://www.facebook.com/EPAAAPE> and **Twitter feed** @epaa_aape.

education policy analysis archives
editorial board

Lead Editor: **Audrey Amrein-Beardsley** (Arizona State University)

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Associate Editors: **David Carlson, Lauren Harris, Eugene Judson, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Scott Marley, Molly Ott, Iveta Silova**, (Arizona State University)

Cristina Alfaro San Diego State University

Gary Anderson New York University

Michael W. Apple University of Wisconsin, Madison

Jeff Bale OISE, University of Toronto, Canada

Aaron Bevanot SUNY Albany

David C. Berliner Arizona State University

Henry Braun Boston College

Casey Cobb University of Connecticut

Arnold Danzig San Jose State University

Linda Darling-Hammond Stanford University

Elizabeth H. DeBray University of Georgia

Chad d'Entremont Rennie Center for Education Research & Policy

John Diamond University of Wisconsin, Madison

Matthew Di Carlo Albert Shanker Institute

Sherman Dorn Arizona State University

Michael J. Dumas University of California, Berkeley

Kathy Escamilla University of Colorado, Boulder

Yariv Feniger Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Melissa Lynn Freeman Adams State College

Rachael Gabriel University of Connecticut

Amy Garrett Dikkers University of North Carolina, Wilmington

Gene V Glass Arizona State University

Ronald Glass University of California, Santa Cruz

Jacob P. K. Gross University of Louisville

Eric M. Haas WestEd

Julian Vasquez Heilig California State University, Sacramento

Kimberly Kappler Hewitt University of North Carolina Greensboro

Aimee Howley Ohio University

Steve Klees University of Maryland
Jackyung Lee SUNY Buffalo

Jessica Nina Lester Indiana University

Amanda E. Lewis University of Illinois, Chicago

Chad R. Lochmiller Indiana University

Christopher Lubienski Indiana University

Sarah Lubienski Indiana University

William J. Mathis University of Colorado, Boulder

Michele S. Moses University of Colorado, Boulder

Julianne Moss Deakin University, Australia

Sharon Nichols University of Texas, San Antonio

Eric Parsons University of Missouri-Columbia

Amanda U. Potterton University of Kentucky

Susan L. Robertson Bristol University

Gloria M. Rodriguez University of California, Davis

R. Anthony Rolle University of Houston

A. G. Rud Washington State University

Patricia Sánchez University of University of Texas, San Antonio

Janelle Scott University of California, Berkeley

Jack Schneider University of Massachusetts Lowell

Noah Sobe Loyola University

Nelly P. Stromquist University of Maryland

Benjamin Superfine University of Illinois, Chicago

Adai Tefera Virginia Commonwealth University

Tina Trujillo University of California, Berkeley

Federico R. Waitoller University of Illinois, Chicago

Larisa Warhol University of Connecticut

John Weathers University of Colorado, Colorado Springs

Kevin Welner University of Colorado, Boulder

Terrence G. Wiley Center for Applied Linguistics

John Willinsky Stanford University

Jennifer R. Wolgemuth University of South Florida

Kyo Yamashiro Claremont Graduate University

archivos analíticos de políticas educativas
consejo editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editores Asociados: **Armando Alcántara Santuario** (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México), **Jason Beech**, (Universidad de San Andrés), **Angelica Buendía**, (Metropolitan Autonomous University), **Ezequiel Gomez Caride**, (Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina), **Antonio Luzon**, (Universidad de Granada), **José Luis Ramírez**, Universidad de Sonora), **Paula Razquin** (Universidad de San Andrés)

Claudio Almonacid

Universidad Metropolitana de
Ciencias de la Educación, Chile

Miguel Ángel Arias Ortega

Universidad Autónoma de la
Ciudad de México

Xavier Besalú Costa

Universitat de Girona, España

Xavier Bonal Sarro Universidad
Autónoma de Barcelona, España

Antonio Bolívar Boitia

Universidad de Granada, España

José Joaquín Brunner Universidad
Diego Portales, Chile

Damián Canales Sánchez

Instituto Nacional para la
Evaluación de la Educación, México

Gabriela de la Cruz Flores

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de
México

Marco Antonio Delgado Fuentes

Universidad Iberoamericana,
México

Inés Dussel, DIE-CINVESTAV,
México

Pedro Flores Crespo Universidad
Iberoamericana, México

Ana María García de Fanelli

Centro de Estudios de Estado y
Sociedad (CEDES) CONICET,
Argentina

Juan Carlos González Faraco

Universidad de Huelva, España

María Clemente Linuesa

Universidad de Salamanca, España

Jaume Martínez Bonafé

Universitat de València, España

Alejandro Márquez Jiménez

Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la
Universidad y la Educación, UNAM,
México

María Guadalupe Olivier Tellez,

Universidad Pedagógica Nacional,
México

Miguel Pereyra Universidad de

Granada, España

Mónica Pini Universidad Nacional
de San Martín, Argentina

Omar Orlando Pulido Chaves

Instituto para la Investigación
Educativa y el Desarrollo Pedagógico
(IDEP)

José Ignacio Rivas Flores

Universidad de Málaga, España

Miriam Rodríguez Vargas

Universidad Autónoma de
Tamaulipas, México

José Gregorio Rodríguez

Universidad Nacional de Colombia,
Colombia

Mario Rueda Beltrán Instituto de
Investigaciones sobre la Universidad
y la Educación, UNAM, México

José Luis San Fabián Maroto

Universidad de Oviedo,
España

Jurjo Torres Santomé, Universidad
de la Coruña, España

Yengny Marisol Silva Laya

Universidad Iberoamericana, México

Ernesto Treviño Ronzón

Universidad Veracruzana, México

Ernesto Treviño Villarreal

Universidad Diego Portales Santiago,
Chile

Antoni Verger Planells Universidad

Autónoma de Barcelona, España

Catalina Wainerman

Universidad de San Andrés,
Argentina

Juan Carlos Yáñez Velazco

Universidad de Colima, México

arquivos analíticos de políticas educativas
conselho editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editoras Associadas: **Kaizo Iwakami Beltrao**, (Brazilian School of Public and Private Management - EBAPE/FGV, Brazil), **Geovana Mendonça Lunardi Mendes** (Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina), **Gilberto José Miranda**, (Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Brazil), **Marcia Pletsch, Sandra Regina Sales** (Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro)

Almerindo Afonso

Universidade do Minho
Portugal

Alexandre Fernandez Vaz

Universidade Federal de Santa
Catarina, Brasil

José Augusto Pacheco

Universidade do Minho, Portugal

Rosanna Maria Barros Sá

Universidade do Algarve
Portugal

Regina Célia Linhares Hostins

Universidade do Vale do Itajaí,
Brasil

Jane Paiva

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Maria Helena Bonilla

Universidade Federal da Bahia
Brasil

Alfredo Macedo Gomes

Universidade Federal de Pernambuco
Brasil

Paulo Alberto Santos Vieira

Universidade do Estado de Mato
Grosso, Brasil

Rosa Maria Bueno Fischer

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Sul, Brasil

Jefferson Mainardes

Universidade Estadual de Ponta
Grossa, Brasil

Fabiany de Cássia Tavares Silva

Universidade Federal do Mato
Grosso do Sul, Brasil

Alice Casimiro Lopes

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Jader Janer Moreira Lopes

Universidade Federal Fluminense e
Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora,
Brasil

António Teodoro

Universidade Lusófona
Portugal

Suzana Feldens Schwertner

Centro Universitário Univates
Brasil

Debora Nunes

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Norte, Brasil

Lílian do Valle

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Flávia Miller Naethe Motta

Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Alda Junqueira Marin

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de
São Paulo, Brasil

Alfredo Veiga-Neto

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Sul, Brasil

Dalila Andrade Oliveira

Universidade Federal de Minas
Gerais, Brasil