Intersectional Reculturing for All Students: Preparation and Practices for Educational Leaders

David A. Whitenack
San José State University

Andrea N. Golloher
San José State University

Rebeca Burciaga
San José State University

Abstract

Situated in the context of U.S. educational outcomes, education policy in California, and UNESCO's definition of inclusive education, we examine how schools have addressed student diversity. Methods of identifying students with disabilities are not adequately designed to identify English learners with disabilities. In part to address that problem, we introduce the concept of intersectional reculturing as an approach for educators to consider students' intersectional identities in order to address inequitable educational outcomes. We then present a theoretically grounded proposal for intersectionally recultured preparation of educational leaders, including use of a framework aligned with universal design for learning (UDL).

Keywords: educational leader preparation, inclusive education, intersectionality, reculturing

Shifts in educational policy at the U.S. federal and California state levels have serious implications for how public schools are expected to address the needs of all students. In light of the rapidly changing demographics of schools in California and elsewhere, we adopt UNESCO's (2015) definition of inclusive education, which declares:

> All people, irrespective of sex, age, race, colour, ethnicity, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property or birth, as well as persons with disabilities, migrants, indigenous peoples, and children and youth, especially those in vulnerable situations or other status, should have access to inclusive, equitable quality education and lifelong learning opportunities (p. 25).

This definition pushes educational leaders to consider the needs of many marginalized students, including recent immigrants, English learners, members of minoritized racial and ethnic groups, and those with special needs.

With equitable, inclusive education as our end-in-view (Dewey, 1938), we examine how schools have addressed diversity. As an alternative, we introduce the concept of intersectional reculturing, in which schools consider students' intersectional identities. We then present a theoretically grounded proposal for intersectionally recultured preparation of educational leaders. We begin with an overview of policy shifts and inequitable educational outcomes that highlight the importance of engaging in intersectional reculturing.

Policy Shifts in the United States and California

Echoing UNESCO's inclusive-education emphasis, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA; U.S. Department of Education, 2015) requires states to establish ambitious academic standards for all students, exempting only those with the most significant cognitive disabilities (Council for Chief State School Officers [CCSSO] & National Center for Systemic Improvement [NCSI], 2016). Even for exempted students, alternative standards and assessments must align with state standards and promote access to the general education curriculum.

Meanwhile, the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA) of 2004 reiterated the importance of providing special education services to students with disabilities that qualify for an individualized education program (IEP) in the least restrictive environment (LRE) possible. The LRE mandate aligns with research demonstrating the value of inclusive education for students with (and without) IEPs. Students frequently perform better on academic and behavioral measures when educated in well-supported inclusive settings compared to when they are pulled from general education classrooms to receive specialized services (Capp, 2017; Cosier, Causton-Theoharis, & Theoharis, 2013; de Graaf, van Hove, & Haveman, 2013; Kleinert et al., 2015; Sermier Dessemontet, Bless, & Morin, 2012; Szumski, Smogorzewska, & Karwowski, 2017; Tremblay, 2013). Despite the combined force of both policy and recommended practice for the inclusion of students with IEPs in general education, California lags behind the nation in implementing inclusive educational practices for students with identified learning needs (U.S. Department of Education, 2016).

The new California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs; Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2016) reflect California's intent to bolster educational opportunities for students with IEPs in general education classrooms. Threaded through the document is the expectation that general education teachers use Universal Design for Learning (UDL). General education teachers are also expected to be knowledgeable of and able to participate in ongoing progress monitoring systems associated with Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

Both of these approaches require the ongoing support of school administrators who guide progress-monitoring decisions.

Inequitable Educational Outcomes in the U.S.

While this policy and research context highlights the importance of educating all students, data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) suggest that current educational approaches in the U.S. leave many students underserved. Nationally, 36% of fourth graders and 37% of twelfth graders have reading composite scores at or above proficient. English learners (Latino and Asian) continue to trail white students in both mathematics and reading achievement on the NAEP (Carnoy & García, 2017), with 8% of fourth grade and 4% of twelfth grade English learners scoring at or above proficient (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). Among students with IEPs, 11% of fourth graders and 8% of twelfth graders score at or above proficient (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015), with similar disparities for other minority groups, such as students who identify as Black, Latino, or American Indian/Alaska Native and students eligible for free or reduced-price lunches. The most vulnerable group, however, are English learners who have disabilities, with 2% of fourth graders scoring at or above proficient. By twelfth grade, this percentage rounds to zero.

Taken alone, the NAEP data point to a need to consider intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989)—the full measure of each individual student's diversity—as the most vulnerable students were those identified as both English learners and students with disabilities. Accentuating the issue of intersectionality are data on the disproportionate representation of culturally and linguistically diverse students in special education (Artiles, Rueda, Salazar, & Higareda, 2005; Trent et al., 2014; Umansky, Thompson, & Díaz, 2017; Waitoller, Artiles, & Cheney, 2010). We must consider why different groups of students are over- (or under-) identified to receive special education services. The Office of Special Education Programs calculates the estimated risk ratio for identification to receive special education services in the U.S. by racial or ethnic group based on data that states are required to report (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). These data suggest that students who are identified as Alaskan Natives/American Indian, Black/African American, or Hawaiian/Pacific Islander are more likely to be designated as requiring special education services compared the rest of the population. Similar data are not available for English learners; such data reporting has not been federally mandated. However, state-level analyses indicate that English learners are more likely to be deemed eligible for special education services than students not designated as English learners, particularly in states requiring English-only instruction (Durán, 2008; Samson & Lasaux, 2009; Shifrer, Muller, & Callahan, 2009; Sullivan, 2011). More granular analyses examining how race and ethnicity co-vary with indicators of poverty, parental education, and language (Blanchett, 2006; Kramarczuk Voulgarides, Fergus, & Thorius, 2017; Shifrer et al., 2009) suggest that students from racial and ethnic minority groups are not simply more likely to be predisposed for such disabilities; instead, social factors, including the fact that "socioeconomic inequality is reproduced in schools," cause such disproportionate representation (Shifrer et al., 2009, p. 254). With our schools mirroring society, we also must draw explicit attention to a legacy of racism that has provided a troubling foundation for current schooling policies and practices in the U.S. (López & Burciaga, 2014).

Approaches to Diversity in Education

Student diversity is frequently approached as a problem rather than as a natural outcome of demographic change (Florian, 2017). In contrast, we believe that educational leaders will best serve students from diverse groups, indeed all students, by using—and leading teachers and other staff to use—an intersectional (Crenshaw, 1989) lens to see and understand each student's multiple group memberships and embracing those identities as foundational to that student's learning. Too often, however, those charged with responding to diversity have attempted to separate students into one marginalized group or another.

Siloed Approaches to Educating Marginalized Students

Efforts to address the achievement gaps illustrated above often have relied upon single-axis frameworks, such as culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP; Ladson-Billings, 1995); English learner pedagogy (Goldenberg, 2013; Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008; Walqui, 2006); multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS; Sugai & Horner, 2009) including response to intervention (RTI; Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006; Vaughn & Fuchs, 2003) and positive behavior interventions and support (PBIS; Sugai & Horner, 2002); universal design for learning (UDL; Rose, 2000; Rose & Meyer, 2002); social emotional learning (SEL; Cohen, 2008); and more recently culturally sustaining pedagogy (CSP; Paris & Alim, 2017). While single-axis approaches can potentially facilitate learning for all students if applied inclusively, their application to only certain groups of students has created entrenched silos encompassing bilingual, special, and urban education, among others (Rueda & Stillman, 2012). These silos have been codified in educator preparation programs, state credentialing requirements (Blanton, Boveda, Munoz, & Pugach, 2017), and practices and programs in districts and schools, all of which apply to separate groups of students rather than inclusively to all students. Because of these silos, even frameworks that resist and reject the deficit model of education, such as Universal Design for Learning and Culturally Relevant Pedagogy, can result in systems that fail to recognize and build upon each student's strengths. Such silos fail to recognize that students' "*overlapping identities [are] fundamental to individuality*" (Florian, 2017, p. 12, emphasis original).

A compounding problem of the single-axis framework emerges in educational discourse through analyses determining whether an English learner *also* has a disability qualifying them for special education services (Guarino, Buddin, Pham, & Cho, 2010; Swanson, 2017; Wagner, Francis, & Morris, 2005). Given the manner in which support services are provided for English learners and students with disabilities, this discussion frequently rests upon a faulty premise that the needs of these students are best met in separate locations or programs—students with disabilities are best served by a special educator, while English learners are best served by an ELD teacher (Castro-Olivo, Preciado, Sanford, & Perry, 2011). The question inevitably becomes which of these locations will best address the student's needs. In this way, single-axis frameworks for understanding and addressing students' needs erase the needs of English learners with disabilities and problematize their presence in the school. This is not to say that the needs of English learners with disabilities are not unique and do not require individualized attention; instead, within this conversation we are suggesting that the very premise of this conversation be disrupted.

It is undeniable that current methods of identifying students with disabilities are not adequately designed to identify English learners with disabilities. Distinguishing between limited English proficiency and disability-related challenges to explain an English learner's

academic difficulties frequently flummoxes general education teachers (Ortiz et al., 2011). The chief issue in identification is the fact that the common developmental trajectories that English learners proceed through as they learn a new language include stages in which the student's behavior and performance is similar to that which is seen in students with a variety of disabilities (Klinger, Artiles, & Barletta, 2006; Wagner et al., 2005). Traditionally, schools have used the IQ-Achievement discrepancy model to identify students with learning disabilities. In this model, a discrepancy of two or more standard deviations between measured intelligence and measured achievement in a given area would be taken as indication that the student likely had an underlying learning disability (Wilkerson, Ortiz, Robertson, & Kushner, 2006). It is frequently unclear whether a student is performing poorly in a classroom due to a language barrier, an underlying disability, or another factor altogether (Abedi, 2002; Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006; Wilkerson et al., 2006). Even with the emergence of more sophisticated models to identify students with specific learning disabilities, such as Response to Intervation (RTI, Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006), challenges remain with providing appropriate instruction and assessment for culturally and linguistically diverse students (Klinger & Edwards, 2006).

Examination of strategies that have been developed within silos to meet specific student needs uncovers a significant level of overlap in strategies. Rather than focusing on specific and highly targeted educational strategies, there are now calls to develop "universal and loosely targeted education mechanisms aimed at supporting all underachieving students" (Public Policy and Management Institute [PPMI], 2013, p. 5). Educational leaders must therefore be prepared to support ongoing teacher development to implement such a pedagogy for all—truly inclusive education.

Intersectional Reculturing: A Whole-Student Approach

Mendoza-Reis and Flores (2014) designed a tri-level model for reculturing instructional leadership to address the academic learning needs of English learners (see Appendix A). We use intersectional theory to build on their model and introduce the concept of *intersectional reculturing*: the ongoing process through which administrators, teachers, and other educational service providers identify diverse student characteristics, including but not limited to race, and synthesize what they ascertain about each student to support their learning... Just as intersectional theory, analysis, and praxis emerged in Black feminist discourse to highlight the way anti-racist and feminist rhetoric had served to erase the needs of Black women from protection by anti-discrimination laws (Collins, 2015; Crenshaw, 1989), intersectional analysis (Cho, Crenshaw, & McCall, 2013; Collins, 2015; Covarrubias, 2011; Crenshaw, 1989) in education has emerged from the aforementioned single-axis efforts to address the needs of marginalized students. Students are too often are placed into an educational silo based solely on one of their characteristics (e.g., a pull-out English as a Second Language or special education program) that considers only one aspect of their learning needs. That siloing of students and the subsequent siloed application of pedagogical approaches to serve a single group of students has perpetuated the "myth of the normal child" (Baglieri, Bejoian, Broderick, Connor, & Valle, 2011, p. 2122). An intersectional approach perceives the diversity of students' characteristics and seeks to understand their funds of identity—their ways of being, knowing, and experiencing (Esteban-Guitart & Moll, 2014)— with the goal of improving learning outcomes for all students. It is important to underscore that confronting race is a vital component of intersectional reculturing

Since the educational reform era—touched off by the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) in the U.S.—reculturing has been recognized as a charge for educational leaders (Crockett, 1996). Mendoza-Reis and Flores's (2014) reculturing model includes the notion that principals at schools with English learners must be capable of instructional leadership that is informed in part by knowledge of the teaching and learning of English learners. Particularly in light of the current educational policy and trends in the U.S. and California described above, principals' instructional leadership also need to be informed by expertise in teaching students with disabilities and other marginalized students. While general and special education teachers alike need that expertise, without leadership from within schools and education agencies, individual teachers are less likely to be able to engage in meaningful attempts to dismantle silos and implement recommended practices for inclusive education on their own (Billingsley, 2004).

To engage in intersectional reculturing, school-based educators and administrators first adopt an approach of identifying each student's diverse characteristics. They can then implement a whole-student approach in their practices and programs (Genessee, 1994; Rogers & Webb, 1991). Meanwhile, faculty preparing educational leaders must engage in the same intersectional reculturing reform of their programs, including curriculum and field experiences, to simultaneously foster candidates' adoption of a whole-child stance and prepare them to advocate for such a stance in the field.

We do not suggest that intersectional reculturing occurs simply by changing practices and programs (not that such changes are simple). Despite the years of work on addressing issues of race in education, U.S. schools still struggle to meet the needs of non-white students. Part of the difficulty with addressing race is that teachers and educational leaders, either consciously or unconsciously, adopt a colorblind stance (Bonilla-Silva, 2003) and ignore diversity among students, frequently because confronting issues of race is both overwhelming and uncomfortable. Therefore, a sustained focus on race is a vital component of intersectional reculturing.

Imagining Intersectional Reculturing in Educational Leader Preparation

To enable educational leaders and those charged with their preparation to understand and address the diverse needs of each and every learner (Florian, 2017), educators need to aggregate knowledge and experiences typically siloed in separate institutions, programs, and curricula. The California Statewide Task Force on Special Education (2015) has called for breaking barriers between general and special education in preparing classroom practitioners and moving toward a coherent educational system that meets all students' needs. We further call for dismantling silos that isolate educational leader, special educator, and teacher preparation, respectively.

While the need to deconstruct existing silos within teacher preparation (Florian, 2017; Whitenack & Lyon, 2015), between classroom practitioners (Beaton & Spratt, 2017), and between general and special teacher education (California Statewide Task Force on Special Education, 2015) has been noted, the separation between teacher preparation and educational leader preparation has received less attention. For example, the websites of the 22 of 23 California State University campuses that offer programs for general education (multiple and single subject), special education, and administrative credentials reveal that 8 offer some type of combined or concurrent program that allows candidates simultaneously to pursue either multiple or single-subject (general education) and education specialist (special

education) credentials. However, none of the administrative credential programs appear to be connected to the special education programs at their respective campuses.

Given the important role educational leaders play in setting the agenda within schools and districts, the push for inclusive education cannot move forward without them. Administrative and teacher leaders can safeguard equitable, enabling education of all students in their school community. To effectively enact that role, school leaders need the research-based knowledge and expertise necessary to critically select only those curricular programs and instructional innovations and approaches that can be adapted appropriately for each student. Additionally, school leaders can coordinate programming with stakeholders outside of and within their immediate school community. They can connect with policy makers at the district level and beyond; they also can unify students, families, teachers, other school personnel, and community partners at the site level. Others (Moore-Gumora, 2014) have noted the significance of the school community in addressing its needs through progressive program development, which again highlights the importance of the school leader's role as a coordinator of such efforts.

Administrators and practitioners can use an intersectional lens to foster positive learning outcomes for all students by engaging with teachers in a process of learning about their students and identifying their needs as whole children, not solely as English learners, students with disabilities, students from single-parent homes, and so forth. Administrators need to be prepared to lead intersectional reculturing at the school-site level, which includes supporting teachers in designing and delivering lessons to meet the widest range of student ability. As teachers learn about, master, and implement a set of research-based instructional practices recommended for use with all students in the general education classroom, administrators can facilitate and maximize the benefits of this intersectional reculturing by organizing professional development and providing ongoing support to teachers.

Confronting Bias in an Ongoing Way

Central to understanding and ultimately addressing inequities in education is the need to recognize that there is conscious and unconscious bias at play with respect to students' race, class, sexuality, gender, immigration status, and other characteristics for which they are marginalized. Despite the proliferation of social-justice-oriented teacher and educational leader preparation programs, a recent study by Sleeter (2017) revealed the importance of sustained discussions of bias--and explicitly race--beyond teacher preparation. Teachers in Sleeter's study were more likely to cite deficit ideologies to blame students' homes, families, communities, and poverty as factors for students' low achievement rather than reflect on their instructional practices. Sleeter asserted that what teachers learned about culturally responsive pedagogy "was not sufficiently potent to disrupt deficit theorizing about students, particularly in schools under pressure to raise student test scores" (p. 157), and maintained that in order to address inequities, sources of bias, such as race, must be confronted directly. This highlights the importance of repeatedly confronting all forms of bias during and after preparation.

Toward that end, educational leader preparation must enable its faculty and candidates to confront and address bias in themselves, their programs, and their practices. That includes preparing educational leaders to direct district- and school-level professional development and ongoing community discussions vital in facilitating teachers' confronting their biases and shifting their practice. Moreover, educational leaders must be prepared to uncover any deficit ideologies embedded in curriculum for struggling students when they are in a position to adopt or reject instructional materials. Furthermore, educational leaders need

to be prepared to recognize the pernicious effects of single-axis frameworks that allow stakeholders to slip from one set of deficit ideologies to another, such as by moving from a framework of poverty to explain low student performance to using a framework of disability to explain it. We argue for preparing educational leaders who instead will examine student performance by using an intersectional lens to interrogate institutional and classroom practices, including any biases therein.

Working Collaboratively Toward Intersectional Reculturing

As Ortiz and Robertson (2018) have called for special educators to collaborate with general education colleagues to meet the needs of English learners, we call for educational leader preparation faculty to collaborate with colleagues in both general and special education. These faculty can work across programs and departments to create new frameworks to prepare principals and others to view leadership through an intersectional lens while supporting teachers to use an intersectional approach when addressing the educational needs of their students. By bridging their programmatic boundaries, faculty can share their knowledge of effective instructional strategies to create a new curricular framework that prepares educational leader candidates to lead intersectional reculturing at the school-site level, which includes supporting teachers in designing and delivering lessons to meet the widest range of student ability.

Inclusive Pedagogies

Consistent with the intersectional approach that we propose, Ohito and Oyler (2017) offer goals for supporting teachers' inclusive counter-hegemonic pedagogies, including designing accessible instruction through Universal Design for Learning (UDL). Villegas, Ciotoli, and Lucas (2017) also suggest UDL as an effective approach used by inclusive teachers. Importantly, they add that inclusive teaching goes beyond simply applying appropriate instructional strategies. It must include the knowledge, skills, and dispositions underlying educators' (a) sociocultural consciousness, (b) affirming views of diversity, (c) commitment to acting as change agents, (d) understanding how learners construct knowledge, (e) knowing about their students' lives, and (f) using these insights to support learning. Those six characteristics of inclusive educators are consistent with our proposed intersectional approach and are infused throughout the instructional framework described below.

Tier 1 Framework

The Tier 1 framework (Whitenack & Golloher, 2017a, 2017b) for instructional practices is one tool to support intersectional reculturing to improve learning outcomes for all students, particularly English learners, students with disabilities, and other marginalized students (see Appendix B).[1] The Tier 1 framework builds upon previous work of the Teacher Education and English Learners (TEEL) research group (Stoddart et al., 2015), which distilled a set of instructional practices supported by a substantial body of research demonstrating the value of integrating subject-matter teaching with language and literacy development to enhance learning for English learners (Cummins, 1981; Genesee, 1987; Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Met, 1994) and building on the work of the Center for Research on

---

[1] A PDF of the Tier 1 framework is available at http://bit.ly/tier1framework

Education, Diversity & Excellence (Doherty, Hilberg, Epaloose, & Tharp, 2002). To prepare teacher candidates to teach students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms, rather than create a separate framework focusing on the needs of that student group, the Tier 1 framework aligns practices developed by the TEEL group with the UDL framework (National Center on Universal Design for Learning, 2014)[2]. Many of the practices correspond with Checkpoints of the UDL Guidelines (CAST, 2018).

We have begun to use the Tier 1 framework across programmatic curriculum in general education teacher preparation, and we propose its use in preparing educational leaders and in K-12 professional development. Dismantling programmatic silos in which general education, special education, and educational leader preparation tend to operate in universities and barriers between universities and K-12 schools could at once enable and be enhanced by implementation of the Tier 1 framework across programs and institutions. Such shared implementation could foster a shared vision among teacher and administrative candidates, practitioners, and educational leaders that all students participate inclusively—together—in learning activities (Florian, 2017).

Preparing Educational Leaders and Leading Schools with the Tier 1 Framework

The curriculum of educational leader preparation programs typically includes leadership, management, human resources, legal issues, and other such courses, and not ones related directly to curriculum and instruction (Whitenack, 2015). In light of the policies described above, however, Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (ASC) programs need to explicitly address the effective teaching and learning of English learners, students with disabilities, and other marginalized students so that ASC program graduates are prepared to lead the teachers at their sites in addressing the needs of all students. While some veteran teachers may have developed instructional expertise in teaching English learners or students with disabilities through extensive professional development, courses, or degree work, this is rare. Therefore, to be an inclusive instructional leader in most schools, principals need at least a modicum of expertise related to effectively educating English learners, students with disabilities, and struggling students. That many aspiring principals lack that level of content knowledge and instructional expertise highlights the importance of intersectionally reculturing ASC programs both to include curriculum focused on the needs of marginalized students and to develop in aspiring administrators the mindset of seeing the totality of each student rather than assigning them to a silo that matches their predominant characteristic, if any. The Tier 1 framework could be used in educational leadership preparation to support intersectional reculturing, for example, as an observation guide for candidates' analysis of instructional video or live teaching; in planning lessons related to coaching cycles conducted with teachers; or to consider how they would begin intersectional reculturing at specific schools, including considering what choices they would make as a leader, how they structure professional development, what they look for when hiring teachers, and even their expectations for how special education will operate on their campuses.

---

[2] The Tier 1 Framework referred to herein is neither derived from nor intentionally related to Tier 1 Supports as defined by Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (OSEP Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, 2017).

Dismantling the K-12/Higher Education Silo: School-University Partnerships

In order to intersectionally reculture educator preparation programs for general and special education teachers and educational leaders, candidates need field placements where existing educators use an intersectional lens to deliver inclusive instruction to all students. If educator preparation programs are unable to find a sufficient number of intersectionally recultured schools for field placements, they could collaborate with school communities to simultaneously engage in intersectional reculturing while increasing the supply of inclusive placements. To forge such collaborations focused on intersectional reculturing, silos in which higher and K-12 education typically operate need to be removed, potentially by forming school-university partnerships (SUPs; Clark, 1999; Miller, 2015; Sirotnik and Goodlad, 1988), such as Professional Development Schools (PDSs; Darling-Hammond, 1994; Teitel, 2003) or via partnerships with other members of the communities in which schools are located, including community-based organizations (CBOs; Richmond, 2017). In partnering with CBOs, those led by and for members of marginalized groups could be pivotal to efforts at intersectional reculturing. Even with CBO participation, PDSs, SUPs, and other partnerships will not automatically become intersectionally recultured. Members from the K-12, higher education, and any other institutions in a particular partnership need to agree to pursue intersectional reculturing as a partnership goal. We maintain that any SUP or PDS seeking to engage in intersectional reculturing needs to include among its core values that education is an inclusive activity, one in which all students collectively participate, and that to educate all students it is necessary to understand the diversity within each student. Educational leaders would be pivotal in securing such partnership agreements.

Community-based Intersectional Reculturing

While the Tier 1 framework can be a useful part of intersectionally reculturing educator preparation and K-12 practices as described above, it is neither the sole nor is it the foundational component of such efforts. Instead, we conceive of the Tier 1 framework as one part of the inclusive counter-hegemonic pedagogies (Ohito & Oyler, 2017) included in intersectional reculturing, central to which is challenging deficit ideologies about diverse students. Yosso's (2005) community cultural wealth approach reframes traditional notions of cultural capital to focus on and learn from the array of contributions students bring to educational settings.

To successfully realize intersectional reculturing at the school-site level and beyond, educational leaders need to be prepared to engage their constituencies (i.e., teachers, parents, and fellow administrators) in an educational process to increase their understanding of the concepts of inclusive education and work collaboratively across their siloes to achieve more equitable outcomes for all students. In developing a plan to engage constituencies, it is common for school and district leaders to rely solely on consultants from outside of their districts for professional development. To reclaim agency, we recommend cultivating the expertise already within the school community, which includes educators, activists, parents, and alumni who are experts in navigating school politics and policies. Listening to their experiences is an important step in understanding students' needs. This approach requires facilitation by leaders who are reflective, humble, and purposefully committed to all their students.

Implications and Closing Thoughts

Practices, programs, and policies related to inclusive education and intersectional reculturing will need to be studied to determine their impact in improving educational outcomes for all students, particularly those who have been marginalized and inequitably served by existing educational institutions. Although the various linkages along the chain from programmatic practices to student outcomes have been challenging to connect (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Desimone, Smith, & Phillips, 2013; Mullens, Leighton, Laguarda, & O'Brien, 1996), inquiry with such a comprehensive scope would greatly inform future efforts. When such a broad view is resource prohibitive or otherwise not possible, richly detailed accounts of practices and programs also could inform others engaging in similar efforts.

While progress has been made within educator preparation silos in California to address the needs of all students, there remains a lack of vision to work across programs toward that end. The California Administrative Services Credential Program Standards defines all students as including:

> a wide range of learning and behavioral characteristics, as well as disabilities, dyslexia, intellectual or academic advancement, and differences based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, language, religion, and/or geographic origin. (Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2018a, p. 42)

The state's program standards for the Education Specialist (Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2018b) and Multiple and Single Subject (Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2017) credentials are comparably inclusive. While we believe that it is necessary for the policy documents emanating respectively from administrative, teacher, and specialist education to articulate the importance of educating all students, as they do, we urge educators and those who prepare them to transcend their silos and work collaboratively toward that shared goal.

DAVID A. WHITENACK is a Professor at San José State Univsersity, Department of Teacher Education, 1 Washington Square, San Jose, CA 95192. Email: david.whitenack@sjsu.edu

ANDREA N. GOLLOHER is an Assistant Professor at San José State Univsersity, Department of Special Education, 1 Washington Square, San Jose, CA 95192. Email: andrea.golloher@sjsu.edu

REBECA BURCIAGA is an Associate Professor at San José State Univsersity, Department of Educational Leadership and Department of Chicana and Chicano Studies, 1 Washington Square, San Jose, CA 95192. Email: rebeca.burciaga@sjsu.edu

References

Abedi, J. (2002). Standardized achievement tests and English language learners: Psychometrics issues. *Educational Assessment, 8,* 231-257. https://doi.org/10.1.1.455.5565

Artiles, A. J. (2011). Toward an interdisciplinary understanding of educational equity and difference: The case of the racialization of ability. *Educational Researcher, 40*(9), 431–445. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X11429391

Artiles, A. J., Rueda, R., Salazar, J. J., & Higareda, I. (2005). Within-group diveristy in minotiry disproportionate representation: English language learners in urban school districts. *Exceptional Children, 71*(3), 283-300.

Baglieri, S., Bejoian, L. M., Broderick, A. A., Connor, D. J., & Valle, J. (2011). Inviting interdisciplinary alliances around inclusive educational reform: Introduction to the special issue on disability studies in education**.** *Teachers College Record, 113*(10), 2115-2121. Retrieved from http://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=16428

Beaton, M. C., & Spratt, J. (2017). Professional Learning to Support the Development of Inclusive Curricula in Scotland. In L. Florian & N. Pantić (Eds.), *Inclusive Teaching and Educational Equity: Vol 2. Teacher education for the changing demographics of schooling* (pp. 167-182). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Press.

Billingsley, B. S. (2004). Special education teacher retention and attrition: A critical analysis of the research literature. *The Journal of Special Education, 38,* 39-55. https://doi.org/10.1177/00224669040380010401

Blanchett, W. J. (2006). Disproportionate representation of African American students in special education: Acknowledging the role of white privilege and racism. *Educational Researcher, 35*(6), 24-28. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X035006024

Blanton, L. P., & Pugach, M. C. (2017). A dynamic model for the next generation of research on teacher education for inclusion. In L. Florian & N. Pantić (Eds.), *Inclusive Teaching and Educational Equity: Vol 2. Teacher education for the changing demographics of schooling* (pp. 215-228). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Press.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America*. Lanham, M.D.: Rowman & Littlefield.

California Statewide Task Force on Special Education. (2015). *One system: Reforming education to serve all students. Report of California's Statewide Task Force on Special Education.* Retrieved from http://www.smcoe.org/assets/files/about-smcoe/superintendents-office/statewide-special-education-task-force/Task Force Report5.18.15.pdf

Capp, M. J. (2017). The effectiveness of universal design for learning: A meta-analysis of literature between 2013 and 2016. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 21,* 791-807. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1325074

Carnoy, M., & García, E. (2017). Five key trends in U.S. student performance: Progress by blacks and Hispanics, the takeoff of Asians, the stall of non-English speakers, the persistence of socioeconomic gaps, and the damaging effect of highly segregated schools. Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved from http://www.epi.org/files/pdf/113217.pdf

CAST (2018). Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 2.2. Retrieved from http://udlguidelines.cast.org

Castro-Olivo, S. M., Preciado, J. A., Sanford, A. K., & Perry, V. (2011). The academic and social-emotional needs of secondary Latino English learners: Implications for screening, identification, and instructional planning. *Exceptionality, 19,* 160-174. https://doi.org/10.1080/09362835.2011.579846

Cho, S., Crenshaw, K. W., & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a field of intersectionality studies: Theory, application, and praxis. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 38,* 785-810. https://doi.org/10.1086/669608

Clark, R. W. (1999). School-University Partnerships and Professional Development Schools. *Peabody Journal of Education, 74*(3/4), 164-177.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. M. (Eds.) (2005). Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cohen, J. (2008). Social, emotional, ethical, and academic education: Creating a climate for learning, participation, democracy, and well-being. *Harvard Educational Review, 76,* 201-237.

Collins, P. H. (2015). Intersectionality's definitional dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology, 41*(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112142

Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2016). *California Teaching Performance Expectations.* Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/adopted-tpes-2016.pdf?sfvrsn=8cb2c410_0

Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2017). *Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Program Standards.* Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/prelimmsstandard.doc?sfvrsn=2

Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2018a). *Administrative Services Credential Program Standards.* Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/asc-admin-handbook-2018ff8b3d731dff6ddbb37cff0000940c19.docx?sfvrsn=2

Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2018b). *Preliminary Education Specialist Teaching Credential Program Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations.* Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/education-specialist-program-standards.docx?sfvrsn=6

Cosier, M., Causton-Theoharis, J., & Theoharis, G. (2013). Does access matter? Time in general education and achievement for students with disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education, 34*, 323-332. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932513485448

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2016). *Major provisions of Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) relate to the education of English learners.* Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2016/ESSA/CCSSOResourceonESSAELLs02.23.2016.pdf

Council of Chief State School Officers & National Center for Systemic Improvement. (2016). *ESSA: Key provisions and implications for students with disabilities.* Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2016/ESSA/ESSA_Key_Provisions_Implications_for_SWD.pdf

Covarrubias, A. (2011). Quantitative intersectionality: A critical race analysis of the Chicana/o educational pipeline. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *10*(2), 86-105. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2011.556519

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989,* 139-167.

Crockett, M. (1996). Reculturing American education: the emerging task of leadership. *The Clearing House, 69*(3), 183-187.

Cummins, J. (1981). *Bilingualism and minority-language children*. Toronto: OISE Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (Ed.) (1994). P*rofessional development schools: Schools for developing a profession*. New York: Teachers College Press.

de Graaf, van Hove, & Haveman, M. (2013). More academics in regular schools? The effect of regular versus special school placement on academic skills in Dutch primary school students with Down syndrome. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 57,* 21-38. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2011.01512.x

Desimone, L., Smith, T. M., & Phillips, K. J. R. (2013). Linking student achievement growth to professional development participation and changes in instruction: A longitudinal study of elementary students and teachers in Title I schools. *Teachers College Record, 115*(5), 050308.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.

Doherty, R. W., Hilberg, R. S., Epaloose, G., & Tharp, R. G. (2002). Standards performance continuum: development and validation of a measure of effective pedagogy. *The Journal of Educational Research,* 96(2), 78-89. DOI: 10.1080/00220670209598795

Durán, R. P. (2008). Assessing English-language learners' achievement. *Review of Research in Education, 32,* 292-327. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X07309372

ELLISA Project. (2013). English Language and Literacy Integration in Subject Areas. University of California, Santa Cruz: Regents of the University of California. https://education.ucsc.edu/ellisa/

Esteban-Guitart, M. & Moll, L. C. (2014). Funds of identity: a new concept based on the Funds of Knowledge approach. *Culture & Psychology, 20*(1), 31-48.

Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, P.L. 114-95 § Stat. 1177 (2015-2016)

Florian, L. (2017). Teacher education for the changing demographics of schooling: Inclusive education for each and every learner. In L. Florian & N. Pantić (Eds.), *Inclusive Teaching and Educational Equity: Vol 2. Teacher education for the changing demographics of schooling* (pp. 9-20). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Press.

Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (2006). Introduction to response to intervention: What, why, and how valid is it? *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*, 93-99. https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.41.1.4

Garcia, S. B., & Ortiz, A. A. (2013). Intersectionality as a framework for transformative research in special education. *Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Learners, 13*, 32-47.

Genessee, F. (1994). *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Genesee, F. (1987). Considering two-way bilingual programs. *Equity and Choice, 3*(3), 3-7.

Goldenberg, C. (2013, Summer). Unlocking the research on English learners: What we know--and don't yet know--about effective instruction. *American Educator, 37*(2), 4–11.

Guarino, C. M. Buddin, R., Pham, C., & Cho, M. (2010). Demographic factors associated with the early identification of children with special needs. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 30,* 162-175. https://doi.org/10.1177/0271121409349273

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. §1400 *et seq.* (2004).

Kleinert, H., Towles-Reeves, E., Quenemoen, R., Thurlow, M., Fluegge, L., Weseman, L., & Kerbel, A. (2015). Where students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are taught: Implications for general curriculum access. *Exceptional Children, 81,* 312-328. https://doi.org/10.1177/0014402914563697

Klinger, J. K., Artiles, A. J., & Barletta, L. M. (2006). English language learners who struggle with reading: Language acquisition or LD? *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 39,* 108-128. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222194060390020101

Klinger, J. K., & Edwards, P. A. (2006). Cultural considerations with response to intervention models. *Reading Research Quarterly, 41,* 108-117. https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.41.1.6

Kramarczuk Voulgarides, C., Fergus, E., & Thorius, K. A. K. (2017). Pursuing equity: Disproportionality in special education and the reframing of technical solutions to address systemic inequities. *Review of Research in Education, 41,* 61-87. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X16686947

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32,* 465-491.

Lambert, W. E., & Tucker, G. R. (1972). *Bilingual education of children: St. Lambert experiment*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

López, G. R., & Burciaga, R. (2014). The troublesome legacy of Brown v. Board of Education. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *50*(5), 796-811.

Lucas, T., Villegas, A. M., & Freedson-Gonzalez, M. (2008). Linguistically responsive teacher education: Preparing classroom teachers to teach English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59,* 361-373. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108322110

Mendoza-Reis, N., & Flores, B. (2014). Changing the pedagogical culture of schools with Latino English learners: Re-culturing instructional leadership. In Portes, P. & Salas, S. (Eds), *U.S. Latinos and education policy: Research based directions for change.* Routledge Press: Taylor & Francis.

Mendoza-Reis, N., Flores, B., & Quintanar, R. (2009). *Webinar: Re-culturing instructional leadership using a sociocultural lens.* Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Met, M. (1994). Teaching content through a second language. In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community* (pp. 159-182). Oakleigh: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, L. (2015). School-University Partnerships and teacher leadership: Doing it right. *The Educational Forum, 79*(1), 24-29. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2015.972810

Moore-Gumora, C. (2014). A Study of Students on the Autism Spectrum Transformation in a High School Transition Program. *CLEARvoz Journal, 1*(1), 36-48.

Mullens, J. E., Leighton, M. S., Laguarda, K. G., & O'Brien, E. (1996). Student learning, teaching quality, and professional development: theoretical linkages, current measurement, and recommendations for future data collection. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics.

National Center for Education Statistics (2015). *The Nation's Report Card: 2015 Mathematics and Reading*. National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_math_2015/

National Center on Universal Design for Learning. (2014). *What is UDL?* Retrieved from http://www.udlcenter.org/aboutudl/whatisudl

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: the imperative for educational reform: a report to the Nation and the Secretary of Education, United States Department of Education. Washington, D.C.: The Commission.

Ohito, E. O., & Oyler, C. (2017). Feeling our way toward inclusive counter-hegemonic pedagogies in teacher education. In L. Florian & N. Pantić (Eds.), *Inclusive Teaching and Educational Equity: Vol 2. Teacher education for the changing demographics of schooling* (pp. 183-198). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Press.

Ortiz, A. A., Robertson, P. M. (2018). Preparing teachers to serve English learners with language- and/or literacy-related difficulties and disabilities. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 41*(3) 176–187. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406418757

Ortiz, A. A., Robertson, P. M., Wilkinson, C. Y., Liu, Y., McGhee, B. D., & Kushner, M. I. (2011). The role of bilingual education teachers in preventing inappropriate referrals of ELLs to special education: implications for Response to Intervention. *Bilingual Research Journal, 34*, 316–333. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2011.628608

OSEP Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (2017). Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports Tier 1 supports. Retrieved from https://www.pbis.org/school/tier1supports.

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (Eds.). (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: teaching and learning for justice in a changing world.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Public Policy and Management Institute (PPMI). (2013, January). *Study on educational support for newly arrived migrant children.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Retrieved from http://cdn.basw.co.uk/upload/basw_23245-7.pdf

Richmond, G. (2017). The power of community partnership in the preparation of teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 68*(1), 6-8.

Rogers, D., & Webb, J. (1991). The ethic of caring in Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 42*(3), 173-181.

Rose, D. (2000). Universal design for learning. *Journal of Special Education Technology, 15,* 47-51.

Rose, D. H., & Meyer, A. (2002). *Teaching every student in the digital age: Universal design for learning.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Rueda, R., & Stillman, J. (2012). The 21st century teacher: a cultural perspective. *Journal of Teacher Education, 63*(4), 245-253. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487112446511

Samson, J. F., & Lesaux, N. K. (2009). Language-minority learners in special education. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 42,* 148-162. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219408326221

Sermier Dessemontet, R., Bless, G., & Morin, D. (2012). Effects of inclusion on the academic achievement and adaptive behaviour of children with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 56*, 579-587. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2011.01497.x

Shifrer, D., Muller, C., & Callahan, R. (2011). Disproportionality and learning disabilities: Parsing apart race, socioeconomic status, and language. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 44,* 246-257. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219410374236

Sirotnik, K. A., & Goodlad, J. I. (Eds.). (1988). *School university partnerships in action.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Sleeter, C. E. (2017). Critical race theory and the Whiteness of teacher education. *Urban Education*, *52*(2), 155-169. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916668957

Stoddart, T., Bravo, M., Lyon, E., Mosqueda, E., Shaw, J., Solís, J., Tolbert, S., & Whitenack, D. (2015, March). The Teacher Education and English Learners (TEEL) Project. Presented at the California Council on Teacher Education (CCTE) Quest for Teacher Education Research Institute, San Jose, Cal.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (2002). The evolution of discipline practices: School-wide positive behavior supports. *Child & Family Behavior Therapy, 24,* 23-50.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (2009). Responsiveness-to-intervention and school-wide positive behavior supports: Integration of multi-tiered system approaches. *Exceptionality: A Special Education Journal, 17,* 223-237.

Sullivan, A. L. (2011). Disproportionality in special education identification and placement of English language learners. *Exceptional Children, 77,* 317-334. https://doi.org/10.1177/001440291107700304

Swanson, H. L. (2017). A latent transition analysis of English learners with reading disabilities: Do measures of cognition add to predictions of late emerging risk status? *Topics in Language Disorders, 37,* 114-135. https://doi.org/10.1097/TLD.0000000000000117

Szumski, G., Smogorzewska, J., & Karwowski, M. (2017). Academic achievement of students without special educational needs in inclusive classrooms: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review, 21,* 33-54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2017.02.004

Teitel, L. (2003). *The professional development schools handbook: Starting, sustaining, and assessing partnerships that improve student learning.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Tremblay, P. (2013). Comparative outcomes of two instructional models for students with learning disabilities: Inclusion with co-teaching and solo-taught special education. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 13,* 251-258. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2012.01270.x

Trent, S. C., Driver, M. K., Rodriguez, D., Oh, K., Stewart, S., Kea, C., … 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.

Umansky, I. M., Thompson, K. D., & Díaz, G. (2017). Using an ever-English learner framework to examine disproportionality in special education. *Exceptional Children, 84*(1), 76-96. https://doi.org/10.1177/0014402917707470

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2015). *Education 2030: Incheon declaration framework for action for the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all.* Retrieved from http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/education-2030-incheon-framework-for-action-implementation-of-sdg4-2016-en_2.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2015). *Every Student Succeeds Act.* Retrieved from https://www.ed.gov/ESSA

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs. (2016). *38th Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2016.* Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved from

https://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/osep/2016/parts-b-c/38th-arc-for-idea.pdf

Vaughn, S., & Fuchs, L. S. (2003). Redefining learning disabilities as inadequate response to instruction: The promise and potential problems. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 18,* 137-146. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5826.00070

Villegas, A. M., Ciotoli, F., & Lucas, T. (2017). A framework for preparing teachers for classrooms that are inclusive of all students. In L. Florian & N. Pantić (Eds.), *Inclusive Teaching and Educational Equity: Vol 2. Teacher education for the changing demographics of schooling* (pp. 133-148). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Press.

Waitoller, F. R., Artiles, A. J., & Cheney, D. A. (2010). The miner's canary: a review of overrepresentation research and explanations. *The Journal of Special Education, 44*(1), 29-49. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466908329226

Walqui, A. (2006). Scaffolding instruction for English language learners: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9*(2), 159-180. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050608668639

Whitenack, D. A. (2015). Equitable education of English Learners in the Common Core age: Implications for principal leadership. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development,* 26, 67-73. Retrieved from http://www.ncpeapublications.org/attachments/article/20/CAPEA,%20Volume%202 6,%20March%202015.pdf

Whitenack, D. A. & Golloher, A. N. (2017a). Tier 1 Strategies for Integrating Language and Literacy in Subject-Area Instruction. San José State University, California, U.S.A. Retrieved from http://bit.ly/Tier1framework.

Whitenack, D. A. & Golloher, A. N. (2017b, March 31). *Moving toward one coherent system to prepare general education teachers for all students: Creation and implementation of a Tier 1 observation guide.* Paper presented at the fall meeting of the California Council for Teacher Education, Sacramento, CA.

Whitenack, D. A., & Lyon, E. G. (2015, March). *Teacher education and English Learners (TEEL).* Paper presented at the California Council on Teacher Education Quest for Teacher Education Research Institute, San José, CA.

Wilkinson, C. Y., Ortiz, A. A., Robertson, P. M., & Kushner, M. (2006). English language learners with reading related LD: Linking data from multiple sources to make eligibility determinations. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 39,* 129-141. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222194060390020201

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race ethnicity and education*, *8*(1), 69-91. https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000341006

50

Appendix A
Reculturing Instructional Leadership (Mendoza-Reis & Flores, 2014)

Institutional Level	Pedagogical Level	Personal Level
Identifying and addressing institutional inadequacies by identifying structural barriers to student achievement and taking an "advocacy stance" as leaders	Instructional leadership that defines content knowledge necessary for leading schools with ELs: Pedagogical Knowledge Sociocultural Knowledge Culturally Relevant Pedagogy L1/L2 Language and Literacy Acquisition and Development	Exhibiting ideological clarity by self-examination and transformation of deficit assumptions, beliefs, and attitudes about ELs; and naming, interrogating, and transforming deficit assumptions, beliefs, and attitudes about ELs with teachers

A conceptual model adapted from Mendoza-Reis, Flores, and Quintanar (2009).

Used with permission.

Appendix B
Tier 1 Strategies for Integrating Language
and Literacy in Subject-Area Instruction

Contextualize Learning (CONTEXTUALIZATION)
Engage in Dynamic Instruction
- Activate or supply students' prior knowledge and thinking about the lesson topic (UDL Checkpoint, hereafter UDLC 3.1)
- Connect the lesson topic to local physical, geographic, economic, ecological, political, social, or other conditions (UDLC 7.2)
- Link the lesson topic to issues and challenges faced personally, locally, statewide, and/or nationally (UDLC 7.2)
- Plan for and maximize transfer and generalization of content by explicitly connecting topics across domains, subjects, etc. (UDLC 3.4)

Stimulate Active Student Learning
- Anticipate and elicit students' home, community, or other out-of-school experiences related to the topic being studied
- Engage students in problem- and project-based learning tasks and assignment

Encourage Self-reflection and Monitoring (GROWTH MINDSET)
Engage in Dynamic Instruction
- Guide appropriate goal setting through modeling planning, embedding opportunities for strategy development, promoting the use of planning tools, discussing what constitutes excellence, etc. (UDLCs 6.1, 6.2, 8.1)
- Create an accepting and supportive classroom that minimizes threats and distractions (UDLC 7.3)
- Promote expectations and beliefs that optimize motivation, focus on self-regulatory goals, and encourage self-reflection (UDLC 9.1)
- Employ differentiated, mastery-oriented feedback. Feedback should identify areas of strength and patterns of errors and provide strategies for success (UDLCs 5.3, 8.4)

Stimulate Active Student Learning
- Optimize individual choice and autonomy (UDLC 7.1)
- Enhance capacity for self-monitoring and self-assessment (UDLCs 6.4, 9.3)
- Facilitate personal coping skills and strategies (UDLC 9.2)

Scaffold Language and Content (SCAFFOLDING)
Engage in Dynamic Instruction
- Modify talk (repetition, wait time, enunciation, rate of speech, rephrasing, L1 use, gesturing) that facilitates student understanding of instruction
- Pay explicit attention to language issues that might be confusing or difficult and promote understanding across languages (UDLC 2.4)
- Illustrate concepts and organize information through multiple media, including by providing supports such as sentence frames, word walls, graphic organizers, outlines, and reading guides (UDLCs 2.5, 5.1, 6.3)
- Highlight patterns, critical features, and big ideas to guide information processing, visualization, and manipulation to maximize transfer and generalization of content (UDLCs 3.2, 3.3)

Stimulate Active Student Learning
- Embed multiple means for students to interact with a concept through the use of visual representations, physical manipulatives, models and realia, offering alternatives for visual or auditory information (e.g., textual descriptions of pictures, transcriptions of audio content) (UDLCs 1.2, 1.3, 2.3)
- Allow students to differentiate how they interact with the lesson by allowing learners to customize the display of information, varying the allowed methods of response, varying demands and resources to optimize challenge, and optimizing access to tools and assistive technology (UDLCs 1.1, 1.3, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2)

Promote Academic Discourse (DISCOURSE)
Engage in Dynamic Instruction
- Model discourse patterns such as recounting, hypothesizing, and explaining
- Re-voice or restate student contributions using subject-area-specific discourse patterns
- Provide students with feedback on their use of academic language

Stimulate Active Student Learning
- Ask students to communicate their ideas and thinking about concepts, especially claims, evidence, and reasoning
- Ask students to restate, affirm, critique, and/or respond directly to each other's assertions, claims, evidence, and/or reasoning
- Foster collaboration and communication through the creation of cooperative learning groups and opportunities for peer interactions (UDLC 8.3)
- Allow multiple media for communication that allows students to demonstrate competence with the material (UDLC 5.1)

Support Literacy Development (LITERACY)
Engage in Dynamic Instruction
- Explain expectations of literacy tasks and provide clear instruction about how to successfully accomplish the tasks
- Clarify vocabulary and symbols (UDLC 2.1)
- Clarify syntax and structure, including highlighting structural relations, making connections to previously learned structures, and making relationships between elements explicit (UDLC 2.2)
- Use key subject-area-specific terms throughout the lesson

Stimulate Active Student Learning
- Assign tasks that involve subject-area-specific literacy skills (e.g., expository writing, measuring, using instruments and tools, recording observations, making tables and charts, interpreting or drawing diagrams, reading primary-source documents, etc.)
- Give students opportunities to use key words in writing or talk