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LEVERAGING HOME LANGUAGE FOR ACADEMIC SUCCESS

Abstract

This project seeks to support staff, educators and administrators working with Multilingual Learners (MLs) at Roosevelt Children’s Academy Charter School (RCA). Formerly hosting mostly African American students English native speakers, now RCA has a growing number of MLs whose potential is not fully explored. Their failure to succeed academically is greatly impacted by lack of integration of home language into classroom practices. Although the achievement gap between MLs and native-English speakers is also attributed to other factors such as income, state policies, access to resources, and community support, we will focus our attention on restrictive language practices in schools. Restrictive language practices lead to academic failure and school dropout, inability to form a positive cultural identity, isolation, and home language loss which leads to alienation from family and community. To solve this problem a schoolwide shift to a translanguaging pedagogy is suggested. This shift will begin with a schoolwide professional development that aims to educate teacher and staff on the latest research, theories, and classroom practices that incorporate translanguaging flexibly and purposefully, as a tool for social justice and academic success. Recommendations include continuous support and feedback for classroom teachers as they shift their practices, bi-weekly in-house faculty meeting (to further discuss research, classroom observations, challenges in applying a translanguaging mindset, successful stories, student work samples), and a new lesson plan to include translanguaging goals.

Keywords: Multilingual Learners, English Language Learners, translanguaging, heritage language, academic gap
Chapter 1: Introduction

Today, Mrs. Williams’ 5th grade remedial math class was learning about place value. The room was filled with chatter as the students worked together to sort the different number cards into 1’s, 10’s, and 100’s and then record their findings on a worksheet. Miguel and Daniel were working as partners when Mrs. Williams overheard Miguel ask Daniel a question in Spanish: "Miguel! Miguel!" she called, "We speak English in here and English only." Miguel softly smiled and looked down at his desk, and Mrs. Williams turned to help another student. (April 2, 2012)

The excerpt above is part of an audio-recorded classroom interaction, collected and analyzed by Fredricks and Warriner (2016). However, similar scenarios are very common in classrooms across United States. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES, 2020), Multilingual Learners (MLs) represented in average 10.0 percent of public-school students, with higher numbers in urbanized areas. Generally, there is a higher number of MLs in lower grades, data driven in part by students identified as they enter elementary school but exiting the program as they achieve language proficiency. There are over 350 languages other than English spoken in U.S. schools. Spanish is the most common, spoken by almost 3 quarters of all MLs, followed by Arabic, Chinese, Vietnamese, Somali, Russian, Creole, etc. (NCES, 2018). Although Multilingual Learners are the fastest-growing population in schools across United States (Carnock, 2017), these students’ academic and language development is restricted by a dominant, monolingual lens. A monolingual lens is a view according to which people who only speak one language (monolinguals), are the norm (Barratt, 2018). Multilingual and bilingual are exceptions. Their native language is not seen as an asset but rather as a challenge to overcome (Turner, 2022).

Restricting native-language use strongly affects MLs self-image (Bonner et al., 2018). Failure to reach set language and academic standards when restricted by a monolingual lens is due to a
complex system of biases, under which differences are seen as deficits (Zoch and He, 2022). Teachers admit to being challenged in moving beyond their own preconceived ideas in regard to culture and language diversity. Under this lens, “the other” is deemed for centuries innately inferior. Multilingual students internalize the idea that multilingualism is a proof of ignorance. Frederick’s interview (2016) with Felipe, a Spanish speaking student reveals how this mindset impacts the way the student perceives himself. The student just passes the AZELLA, an English Proficiency Arizona state test. He is now English proficient and ready to move into a mainstream class. However, he confesses that he is ‘not good at reading” (line 91) and resists remarks that attempt to position him as a good reader by shaking his head no and firmly stating, "No I'm not" (e.g., when complimented) (lines 92–93). When asked to elaborate, he revealed, "It's cause I speak a different language, like Spanish” (lines 95–96). This conversation demonstrates that Felipe submitted to the general view that language difference is a problem and his fluency in Spanish is worthless if his proficiency in English is limited.

Furthermore, schools continue imposing a monolingual policy, which implies that the dominant language-English is the only language considered a valuable resource. Proficiency in other languages is considered a secondary benefit at best or a problem at worst (Flores & Aneja, 2017, Piller & Gerber, 2018). This monolingual mindset in schools strongly affects family dynamics. Due to an imbalance of power and prestige between the minority languages and the dominant language, it has been proven that native language often gets lost. Sometimes by the second and in most cases by the third generation (Baker and Wright, 2017; Ming-Wai & Cheung, 2019). This creates a gap in communication within families, leaving family members feeling alienated and unsupported as they navigate a new life and try to find and redefine themselves.
Creagh (2017), points out a key problem in understanding multilingualism: is the monolingualism bias. Speakers of other languages are expected to achieve native-like proficiency as a “second monolingual way of being” (Creagh, 2017). In American homes this looks like ‘one parent, one language’ (OPOL)- a parent (usually mother) is responsible for solely using the minority language with the child or ‘minority language at home’-only the minority language is spoken at home (Schwartz and Verschik, 2013). These strategies view heritage language education as a family matter. In schools in which bilingualism is valuable, bilingual education programs structured as one day one language or one subject one language unintentionally reinforce the same monolingual belief (Piller & Gerber, 2018). Languages must be separated, and children must become equally proficient in both languages. This unattainable goal sets MLs for failure and places monolingualism as norm, superior to multilingualism.

As the ML population has shown constant increase (NCES, 2018), further research was performed (Lee & Wright, 2017; Menken & Sanchez, 2019; Rodriguez et al., 2020). This research dismantled racial bias and showed that minority students are not failing due to a lack of abilities. The system is rather failing them due to a lack of linguistic and cultural competency. Introducing culturally sustaining practices such as access to relevant content and ability to use the home language as a springboard for language and academic development will unravel a path towards equity and success.

As language lays at the foundation of culture Kekeya (2018) argues that leveraging home language as an asset for academic achievement will enable these students to realize their innate literacy potential. It is crucial that students’ needs as cultural and linguistic beings are not only acknowledged but their development is also supported. As demonstrated by NYS’ framework for
culturally responsive-sustaining practices developed in 2018, learning takes place when multiple expressions of diversity are allowed.

Language is also the vehicle to understanding cultural values, which leads to a better development of self. Multilingual practices can be used to decolonize and de-imperialize English as a New Language pedagogy through designing TESOL curricula that fits transnational educational spaces (Suraweera, 2022). Multilingual pedagogical approaches - which could simply begin with incorporating home languages in small-group or partner class discussion (Menken & Sanchez, 2019), empower students and facilitate their language learning by making use of their full language repertoire, validating diverse systems of knowledge, acknowledging their identities, and giving them a voice (Galante et. al., 2019; Hurst & Mona, 2017).

The purpose of this project is to persuade curriculum developers and educators to leverage home-language as an asset, and an essential part of language minority students’ development. This Capstone will review literature pertaining to using home language as an asset and will provide a strategy toolkit including best practices to support educators as they incorporate multiple linguistic abilities into their classroom.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter includes a review of literature that pertains to Multilingual Learners and their struggle to reach language and academic proficiency. When considering Multilingual Students’ achievement, it is essential to consider many dimensions of the individual, family, the school community, societal attitudes, and state policies regarding provisions for this population and their families. Only when we consider a multifaceted view of the context in which they find and redefine themselves as cultural beings, we can discuss their achievement. The literature discusses their language and academic needs, the support they receive, achievement gap between MLs and native English-speaking students, the struggle families face when debating if they should raise or not bilingual children, and teachers’ unpreparedness to address the needs of this growing population. Most importantly, it brings focus on new practices such as leveraging home language in schools for academic success which promises to bring equity and increase academic achievement.

A Growing Population

Based on information released by the Census Bureau (2018, as cited by Zeigler and Camarota, 2019), 67.3 million residents in the United States speak a language other than English at home. In fact, ten states (Massachusetts, Arizona, Hawaii, Florida, Nevada, New York, New Jersey, New Mexico, Texas, and California) host approximately two thirds of all foreign-language speakers in the U.S. (ranging between 20 and 45 percent of the state’s population). The Center for Immigration Studies (2019), following data provided by the Census Bureau for people five years of age and older, reveals that although the number of speakers of other languages was high in 2010, in 2018 this number has since increased more than twice as fast as the number of monolingual English speakers. In 2018, about 31 percent of New York State’s population spoke a language
other than English at home (Zeigler and Camarota, 2019). In following this trends pace into the next few decades, the majority of the population will speak a language other than English at home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Foreign Language at home</th>
<th>English Only at home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>23.06 million</td>
<td>187.19 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>67.27 million</td>
<td>240.25 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>192%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 ‘Figures for 1980 are from the decennial census. Figures from 2018 are from the American Community Survey (ACS, 2018) data found at Data.census.gov. * Based on respondents’ self-assessment’ (Zeigler and Camarota, 2019)*

**ML Students and U.S. Schools**

Students in U. S. schools are mirroring immigrant demographic upsurge. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (2018), Multilingual Learners (MLs) represented nationally in 2018 an average of 10.0 percent public-school students. In 2021, in New York State, of the 2.6 million students, about 260,000 were classified as MLs. ML students are widespread, especially within city schools, and more likely living in impoverished areas (Cook, Perusse & Rojas, 2012). Approx. 16% of students enrolled in NYC schools are MLs. Number of MLs are higher in lower grades as students are identified as they enter elementary school, and some exit the program sometime before middle school or high school (NCES, 2022). For example, 2019 data provided by the National Center for Education Statistic reported about 15 percent ML students in kindergarten, 9.6 percent MLs in 6th grade, and 7.7 percent in 8th grade. By 12th grade, only 5.5 percent of students were identified as MLs.
Multilingual Programming

In the current outline, to support students with their linguistic needs, the following options and program descriptions are provided by the New York State Education Department (NYSED, 2022):

a. **Bilingual Education (BE)**

   - Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE)- same language students learn speaking, reading, and writing in English while acquiring content in their home language. The purpose is to use the HL as a bridge to cross between languages while students become proficient in English.

   - Dual Language Programs (DL) Students receive part of the instruction in HL and the other part in English. The goal is to reach a balance of 50/50, which would support the development of students’ biliterate, bicultural and bilingual identity. There are two kinds of DL programs: One-Way DL Program - students of the same background receive instructions in both English and HL simultaneously; Two-Way DL Program- native and non-native English speakers receive instructions in HL and English based on a model previously established in which languages are separated based on the day/subject (90%- 10%, 80%-20%), with a higher percentage of HL at start and the goal of reaching 50/50 over time (NYSED, 2022).

b. **English as a New Language (ENL)**

   This program places emphasis on English acquisition. Content and language arts instruction takes place in English, with the support of specialized teachers who use researched instructional strategies geared toward teaching content and developing English at the same time. Students of diverse backgrounds are served together using this program. While Heritage Language is sometimes permitted to help develop comprehension, English is enforced.

Aside from failing to address MLs linguistic and academic needs, an English focused programs contributes to subtractive bilingualism. Subtractive bilingualism implies that the acquisition of a
second language (English) has as a consequence the partial or total loss of the heritage language (Nguyen, 2022) due to an imbalanced use. This process and its impact on the individual and family will be developed further in this thesis. According to the NYC DOE, during the school year 2020-2021, most ML (80.14%) were served in ENL only programs, 9.91% in transitional Bilingual Education, and only 7.12% in Dual Language Bilingual Education.

**Addressing ML Students’ Language Needs**

High numbers of ML students, especially in New York City schools, would have justly benefited from enrollment into a bilingual program such as Dual language bilingual Education or Transitional Bilingual Education. Numerous studies including Miami School Readiness Project (MSRP) correlated bilingual rather than monolingual methods of instruction with faster English language acquisition and higher GPAs (Serafini, Rozell, & Winsler, 2022). However, about 80 percent of students who speak a home language other than English, are enrolled in English-focused ENL programs (Menken & Sanchez, 2019). This program is focused on acquiring English as soon as possible. MLs L1 is only permitted for direct translation of words encountered or directions to enhance comprehension. Students are discouraged from making use of their L1 during discussions or writing, under the assumption that the use of their L1 will decrease the need to learn English and will slow down the acquisition of the target language. Since this program is restricted by language constructs, it fail to satisfy MLs linguistic and academic needs.

CR-S 154 Framework supports an “asset-based pedagogies that recognize that cultural difference (including racial, ethnic, linguistic, gender, sexuality, and ability) should be treated as assets for teaching and learning” (NYS CR-S Ed Framework, 2018). Bilingual Education programs such as the above mentioned would support this view. However, there are many barriers to implementing BE. One reason cited often is bilingual teacher shortage (Gibney et. al. 2021).
Another barrier to implementing bilingual programs is accountability for English learning through high stake state tests which impact policies and practices in school. Lastly, the global push towards English leads parents and educators to dismiss the importance of developing L1 proficiency (Dorner & Cervantes-Soon, 2020).

**Achievement Gap**

There is a persistent achievement gap between MLs and native English-speaking students. This is supported by the data provided by the NYS Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages (OBEWL), which indicates that the current on time ML students’ graduation rate in only 26.6% comparing to 82.9% for native English-speaking student. The high school drop-out rate is also concerning, at 29.7% for MLs comparing to 5.2% non-MLs. There is a clear achievement gap between Latino/MLs (accounting for about 75 percent of all MLs) and native English-speaking students, which widens in an unbalanced manner. English-focused policies in the classroom fail to bring adequate academic and linguistic progress and detrimentally widen the achievement gap. The achievement data suggests that the ML population continues to lag behind their native English speakers. Although nationally there is an upward movement in MLs’ high school graduation from 57 to 68 percent, between the years of 2011 and 2018 (OELA, 2020), data collected by NCES (2020) for the school year 2017-2018 shows that there is still room for improvement (MLs 68 percent graduation rate vs. native English speakers’ 85 percent).

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP, 2019) showed that 72 percent of eighth graders and 79 percent of twelfth grade MLs scored below average level in reading assessments. The bar graph below also shows how there was little to no significant increase within the last 10 years in Hispanics science scores when compared to the scores of white, English native speakers.
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This data, along with high school dropout rates of almost 30 percent (27.5%, according to the NYS’ Demographics -at-a-Glance for the 2014-2018 cohort) indicate that common core standards and college and career readiness goals have not been reached. High school dropout students will most likely enter the work force within the low-income category, require financial support from the state, and/or become involved in illegal activities to make a living, which will lead to incarceration and further state expenses (NCES, 2017). Amongst the reasons often cited to account for MLs high dropout rates are limited language proficiency and different cultural background (Sheng, Sheng, & Anderson, 2011). Rodriguez et. al. (2020) states that even when students finally learn English the academic content gap is so high that it becomes impossible for MLs to catch up. They become frustrated, discouraged, and they drop out of school. Using students’ L1 as an asset would significantly lower high school dropout rates by increasing students’ content knowledge, participation, lowering frustration due to language barriers, and giving MLs a sense of belonging as they re-invent themselves as cultural beings. Leveraging home language as an asset in
classrooms is a matter of social justice. To avoid this perpetuating cycle, more attention must be given to the socio-emotional and linguistic needs of MLs.

**Teachers’ Lack of Preparedness to Teach Multilingual Learners**

In a study performed by Okhremtchouk and Sellu (2019) in Arizona, 444 educators stated that they do not feel confident in their skills and knowledge on language acquisition and assessment of ML students. This is problematic as teachers who lack preparedness in working with this population lower MLs learning opportunities (Villegas, 2018). More so, teachers who lack preparedness to teach MLs are guided by common misconceptions such as: more exposure to English equals faster language acquisition so reading, writing, and class discussions must remain in English. It ignores CR-S Framework and research associated with it according to which students’ L1 supports content and language development.

Cummins Linguistic Interdependence Theory (1978) presented sufficient evidence that MLs language skills and knowledge in L1 transfer to support the acquisition of language and content in L2. The idea of interdependence lays the foundation of Dual Language Education. However, the potential of this theory has been considered irrelevant in general education classrooms. Teachers assume that they must be bilingual to be able to support their ML students in their language. To dismantle this misconception, various leaders in the field took initiative. One of these initiatives is CUNY-NYSIEB web series titled *How to Teach Bilinguals (Even if You Are Not One)*. These web series provide teachers with exemplars of applying a translanguaging stance in the classroom. More access to resources and professional development will enable educators to better understand, apply, and address the linguistic needs of diverse students.
Teachers’ Lack of Understanding of How to be Culturally Responsive

The NYS Culturally Responsive-Sustaining Framework (2018) demonstrates that the state strives to meet the needs of diverse students. However, there are barriers in implementing ‘systems and structures that facilitate the scale of culturally responsive-sustaining practices and hold each other accountable to short-and long-term goals (NYSCR-S, 2019).

Research unveils that teachers continue to have challenges implementing efficient instructional strategies to address the needs of ML students. They state that they feel unprepared to address their cultural, linguistic, and academic diversity. In a study performed by Bostad, Cwikla, & Kienzle (2015), 41 out of 53 teachers rated their confidence in understanding MLs cultural backgrounds and linguistical needs 1 to 3 on a scale of 1 to 5. A similar rating was given regarding confidence in approaching and building relationships with ML students’ families.

All teaching is inherently cultural. Teachers’ beliefs and attitudes towards MLs are an important predictor of their behavior, practices, and instructions, which affect the value of education MLs receive (Kim, 2021). For example, a teacher who might disagree with NYS CR-154 is less likely to implement with fidelity its framework. (Janety, 2020). This teacher might commonly persuade MLs to use English only in the classroom guided by the common belief that if you are in America, you must learn English.

Following the same mindset lacking cultural awareness, this e-mail shared by Malsbary (2014) in an article based on her study of an ENL high-school program, spotlights the major discourse surrounding MLs. A staff member, frustrated over the administrator:

“Look, you’ve taught these students, you know how little support at home they are getting…I would say that only 10% couldn’t communicate in English, the others were too lazy to care. I’m
not going to slow down my teaching for these kids…most of these students shouldn’t be getting extra attention or be rewarded for their lack of giving a rat’s a***” (p.378)”.

The same study shared another teacher’s reflection on a ML student who recently dropped out of high school. In the days leading to her drop out, Anna showed signs of struggle in her ESL 2 class. She shared with her aid that her accent will never allow her to succeed, and she would rather be placed back into ESL 1 class. However, the teacher’s account differs from that of the aid. She attributes Anna’s ‘drop out’ most likely to her emotional instability, her sexual orientation-possibly gay, and lack of motivation (Malsbary, 2014). Belittling Ana’s anxiety points out the way in which the teacher denies personal accountability for Anna’s lack of progress and submits to general views in which MLs are inherently uninterested in education.

These quotes are important because they show that despite great efforts in many states to promote professional development and implement teaching methods that are effective and equitable guided by the NYS CR-S practices, there are still many educators who have little to no understanding of MLs. It does not suggest that the view is equally shared by all educators. In fact, in a study performed by Walker, Shafer, and Liam (2004), surveying 426 teachers across K-12 indicated that most teachers do not begin their career with a negative attitude towards MLs. This rather develops in time as a result of frustration, mostly for teachers unprepared and unsupported to work with ML students. However, the key point is that MLs are often described as challenging, frustrating, and overwhelmingly lacking motivation.

When cultural competence is not achieved, unwillingly, educators bring into the classroom their own bias perpetuating racial stereotypes. Most MLs are supported by monolingual native English-speaking teachers, with values, beliefs, and practices different than their own. In order to promote equity, teachers must first see themselves as cultural beings, and acknowledge that
potential preconceived ideas can shape or have influence on their stance. Doing this exercise will enable them to develop an appreciation for the cultures of ELs; to view cultural diversity as a strength and resource, rather than a deficit or challenge.

**Effects of Restrictive Language Policies on MLs and Their Families**

According to the New York States OBEWL, the term Heritage Language (HL) is used to refer to the language first taught, the language used within the family during childhood, and the language in which the speaker is most fluent or is most comfortable using. Although there are other terms in research, such as Mother Tongue, Native Language, Primary Language, and Home Language, in this study we will adopt the terms Heritage/Home Language

Regardless of recent research supporting the effectiveness of a socio-cultural approach to teaching, many U. S. schools remain largely guided by a subtractive bilingual pedagogical approach. This process signifies that the acquisition of a second language has as a consequence the partial or total loss of the heritage language (Nguyen, 2022). English focused policies lead to a gradual loss of the use of students HL, which negatively impacts family dynamics and identity formation, obliterating cultural identity (Tao, 2019). Upon partially or fully losing their HL, students become alienated from their family and/or community. Without their cultural identity formed, nor fully accepted as natives, they remain stuck somewhere in the middle trying to reinvent themselves as cultural beings.

Aggressive rhetoric by influential political leaders surrounding immigrants also affect minority language status, and as a consequence, willingness to persuade new generations to take pride in heritage language. An ideal example is analyzed by Nacos, Shapiro, and Bloch-Elkon (2020). Donald Trump’s linguistic toolbox who repeatedly referred to unwelcomed immigrants as ‘animals’ who are ‘coming into the country or trying to’, discourse echoed by supporters, inflicted
psychological harm. Minority language status dropped further, and people-especially Latinos-were demonized for using their heritage language in public spaces (Nachos et al. 2020). These events shattered heritage pride, affecting parents’ decision to submit to general belief that an L1 different than English will not only hinder their children’s opportunity to be successful academically but also to be accepted socially.

Conflicts and discourses of proficiency within the community arise. The responsibility of passing on the HL is placed on families, but with no community or school support not all families succeed in doing so. Failure to pass the heritage language brings shame to both the children and their family.

Tseng (2020) examines the Hispanic community’s language attitude towards later generation heritage speakers. Upon analyzing the informal conversation with 22 first and second-generation Latinos, findings show the positive attitudes Latino communities’ manifest in maintaining their HL. The language use is associated with social identity, which is formed through social interaction, and based on individual beliefs regarding languages and speakers (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). However, here MLs are ostracized and misunderstood. Under the community lens Latinos must be able to become ‘two monolinguals in one’. The speaker is accepted or rejected as a community member based on his/her ability to master the HL. ‘If you are Latino but don’t have the cultural connection or speak the language (…) You don’t get the discount. Without the language, you lack the credentials, therefore you will not be accepted by the group’ (Tseng, 2021).

The excerpt below is part of the informal interview with Celia, a first-generation Latina who shares her U.S. born children’s struggle:

‘But when we are in an all-Hispanic setting, they feel embarrassed. Because they-because the Hispanics aren’t very- they’re like, ‘¡Que’ barbaridad! ¿No, no me entiendes el español? ~ ’ [(hh)]
‘How awful! You don’t, don’t understand me in Spanish?’… And, my sons turn red and they’re like, ‘Sí’, entiendo.’… ‘Pero no hablo.’. (Yes, I understand. But I can’t speak.) (Tseng, 2021).

External factors, such as immigration influx affect as well how immigrant are perceived. The table below will provide data supporting that a high immigration influx directly and negatively affected general views and state policies, hence the provisions for ML student population.

The table below collected data between the years 1990 and 2010, a period of significant growth in immigration (Migration Policy Institute, 2020). Callahan et al. (2020), demonstrates how a growing number of U.S. immigrants stirred unrest and gave birth to a xenophobic wave of English-only policies as well as regulations aiming to cut or restrict services and support for immigrants. Public’s response to these measures varied.

While most research focused on how districts, schools, and educators are prepared and determined to satisfy the language and educational needs of ML students, in Figure 2 bellow, Callahan et al. (2020) demonstrate that attitudes towards ML students, educational and language policies, are simply a reflection of state’s immigration policies context (Callahan et al. 2020).

Findings revealed that states within Quadrants One (1) and Quadrant Two (2) that experienced a lower immigration growth within the time frame measured, were approaching or reached the inclusive or equitable status based on a series of measures established by Callahan et al. (2020). These measures included but were not limited to the access to resources in the community, community and stake holder’s involvement and power of decision in school’s policies, compliance and implementation of measures according to Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), and federally funded access to Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) for immigrant students. The other eight states part of the research (in Quadrant Three (3) and Quadrant Four (4)), all experiencing a higher influx of immigrant population within the time frame measured (1990- 2010), scored mostly either
inequitable or departing inequity, demonstrating that general views and state policies based on immigration influx directly and negatively affected school measures, expectations, and provisions for ML student population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Immigrant Growth Rate 1990-2010 (US Average=0.2%)</th>
<th>Low &lt;12%</th>
<th>High &gt;12%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUADRANT ONE (1)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, Massachusetts</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of US EL Student Total</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-2010 Immigrant Growth Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUADRANT TWO (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of US EL Student Total</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-2010 Immigrant Growth Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUADRANT THREE (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>208%</td>
<td>445%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of US EL Student Total</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-2010 Immigrant Growth Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUADRANT FOUR (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>219%</td>
<td>312%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of US EL Student Total</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-2010 Immigrant Growth Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>525%</td>
<td>172%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of US EL Student Total</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-2010 Immigrant Growth Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EL- English Learners

Overall, the data presented showed a direct relationship between attitudes towards immigrant population and ML educational equity. States that showed explicit support for immigrants and undocumented also mirrored this attitude in schools through rigorous curriculum and high but
realistic expectations for MLs. States with restrictive policies towards immigrants had no provisions in place for MLs and set the academic and language bar low along with unrealistic expectations for ML students (Callahan et al. 2020).

**Leveraging Home Language for Academic Achievement and Equity**

Within the last decades, scholars, researchers, sociolinguists, and TESOL/bilingual educators shifted their pedagogical mindset from classic bilingualism - the idea according to which a bilingual person masters equally two language repertoires while maintaining completely separated (Menken & Sanchez, 2019)- to what May (2013, as cited by Menken & Sanchez, 2019) calls multilingual turn. The multilingual turn suggests moving away from set language construct to adopting a translanguaging stance. The translanguaging stance has been thoroughly researched, having its origins in Welsh bilingual education of 1980s (Lewis et al. 2012). It can be defined as a planned cross-curricular strategy that allows for systematic use of two languages within the same lesson (Conteh, 2018). Cummins (2001), whose theory on language acquisition had a great influence on education practices highlighted that a well-developed L1 positively affected the acquisition of L2. His theory was setting the stage for language transfer and potentially opening spaces for multilingual oral interaction. It also brought awareness of the pedagogical potential of leveraging the home language for academic achievement.

A translanguaging stance challenges the very notion of fixed language. It suggests fluidity and plurality. Alternating languages give ML students a voice. It enables them to leverage their full language repertoire as a resource, flexibly and strategically for academic and linguistic progress, and for social justice.

The literature based on research on translanguaging, is slowly making its way into education practices (Block, 2018). Findings using this theoretical and practical approach are promising.
Initially, the research in the field has been focused on MLs as they entered the school system until graduating high school (Garcia et. al., 2017). In a recent CUNY study titled New York State Initiative on Emergent Bilinguals (CUNY-NYSIBE), upon qualitative research conducted in eight English-focused public schools located in New York City, Menken & Sanchez (2019) concluded that a disruption of monolingual policies and practices created ripples, initiating not only academic and linguistical strides, but also an “ideological shift as educators adopted a translanguaging stance that has proven transformative to the school as a whole”. Teachers who confessed to acting as ‘English police’, because they believed that MLs need to talk and hear English ONLY to learn English (Menken & Sanchez, 2019), are now ‘seeing for themselves that when you use students’ home language, they learn the content better and they are actually learning more English’ (Menken & Sanchez, 2019). By adopting a translanguaging pedagogy, educators experienced a broader shift in ideology from a monolingual way of being to a multilingual orientation.

While studies within grades P-12 continue, research interests have now shifted towards higher education levels (Andrei et al., 2020; Musanti & Cavazos, 2021; Tian et al., 2020; Van Viegen & Zappa-Hollman, 2020). The research in higher education institutions have shown similar positive outcomes. When two higher education instructors, from different content areas designed their curriculum & instructional decisions reflecting the HL of their large Hispanic student population in Texas, bilingualism and biliteracy were supported and leveraged for academic achievement. The ML students’ engagement with the content increased and positive traction gained in scholastic efforts where achieved (Musanti & Cavazos, 2021).

The seriousness with which the multilingual turn is approached has been clearly stated by the New York State Department of Education. It shows appreciation for diverse ways of knowing including demonstrating knowledge through a language other than English. ‘This system of
inequity — which routinely confers advantage and disadvantage based on linguistic background, gender, skin color, and other characteristics — must be clearly understood, directly challenged, and fundamentally transformed’ (NYSDE-CRS, 2018). We are witnessing a historical shift in education. New York State takes on the responsibility not only of preventing the omission of those groups historically erased from textbooks, but also commits to valuing diverse ways of knowing by promoting and sustaining multiple cultures and languages, ostracized in education due to social, political, and economical views.

A Fundamental Change in Teaching Pedagogies

Clearly ignoring ML students’ home language while they acquire English affects their cultural identity formation, relationships within family and community, as well as academic achievement. I propose to fix this approach to teaching MLs immediately by leveraging home language as an asset in the classroom. But simply suggesting a pedagogical approach through a one-time professional development would not be sufficient to support educators who are willing to move from a basic conversational stance of translanguaging -talking about- to a thorough translanguaging pedagogy-applying (Catalano, Traore Moundiba, & Pir, 2019). Garcia et al. (2017) state that once teachers are set in their ways regarding their content area and language and professional identities, they are not easily willing to shift their ideology. In order to do so, they must have a strong grasp of the replacement; once set in their beliefs and teaching pedagogies, educators filter all new information through this lens. This makes them resistant to acknowledging and supporting new theories that would transform their teaching. To help educators become comfortable using the new pedagogy, my proposal enables multiple opportunities to observe, discuss, and have hands-on practice prior to being required to fully implement the new approach.
Guided by Garcia et al. (as cited by Catalano, Traore Moundiba, & Pir, 2019) my professional development provides actual examples – like a strategy toolbox – that offers a clear picture of what translanguaging would look like when applied in the classroom. Furthermore, Catalano et al. (2019) stresses the importance of quality education programs for inservice/preservice teachers which increase critical consciousness and promote the growth of teacher’s agency. In order to accomplish this goal within our district, in-service teachers will be given plentiful opportunities to take the place of their learners and experience these pedagogies as students. Through dialogues and introspective moments, this measure will remove any preconceived ideas or misinformation that does nothing but limit their horizon.
Chapter 3: Description of the Product and Tools

In this chapter I will present a professional development and its reasoning. It aims to educate administration and staff regarding the benefits of leveraging the Multilingual Learners’ home language in the classroom as a mean to promote equity and academic achievement. It support teachers by providing resources and strategies to implement this fairly new pedagogical approach. This method has the purpose of acknowledging and leveraging different ways of knowing, supporting teachers as they close educational gaps between MLs and English-native speakers. Menken & Sanchez (2019) offered empirical evidence that learning about translanguaging strategies as well as practicing these strategies in the classroom results in many cases in a translanguaging stance. A translanguaging stance is the foundation of the shift to a complete translanguaging pedagogy. It is an ideological change that impacts how teachers approach and engage multilingual students (Seltzer, 2021).

Working in different roles in multiple districts- both affluent and diverse low SES over the last ten years, it became apparent to me that there is one subject in particular that is like the elephant in the room that everyone seems to avoid, just acknowledge at best, or simply deny its existence at worst: that is ML students home language. Within a couple of schools, the use of HL was limited to a language buddy translating teacher’s directions to a newcomer or interaction with the school nurse if needed. There was no use of HL within ENL programs, teachers imposing only English to be used. In my current school, with a population of 70 percent African American and 30 percent Latino MLs, while diversity is acknowledged through flags, posters and cultural celebrations, there is no discussion on using the home language as an asset. Throughout my academic career, as a ML student myself, I have reviewed this issue as well as the literature pertaining to the topic. I chose to share relevant research as well as methods that
can be implemented immediately, methods aimed to change school’s culture from a monolingual to a translinguaging stance.

The following presentation will pose the problem, which is neglecting the potential of MLs home language in the classrooms at Roosevelt Children’s Academy Charter School as well as a solution. It will begin with an outline of the professional development plan. A strategy tool kit that allows translinguaging therefor opening up room for intentional HL use will be provided and the tools will be described. Other items for discussion will include videos, intentional language and academic goal as well as purposeful space for translinguaging, biweekly professional development, and weekly push in support to model the use of the new strategies as well as to offer constructive feedback.

**Description of the Professional Development**

The 2 hours professional development plan will be shared during our Roosevelt Children’s Academy Charter School PD week on August 24th, 2022, in the gymnasium where all teachers and administration will be present. Schools’ ENL teachers as well as instructional coaches will also be present to share input where appropriate.

The professional development titled *Adopting a Translanguaging Stance in RCACS - From Theory to Practice* is shared as a power point (Appendix A, H). It will include videos and handout materials, highlight research and theories supporting our stance, common misconceptions about English, speakers, learners, multilingualism, and teaching English (Seltzer & Garcia, 2020), the translinguaging definition and essential components, a toolkit including ways to incorporate a multilingual approach to teaching, and plans for ongoing professional development. It aims to obtain a major transformation of the school environment as well as of the practices adopted in classroom and throughout our ENL program.
The elements of this PD will be discussed individually in the following section which will include a description, rationale behind choosing that particular material/strategy, how it contributes to the shift in pedagogical approach from a monolingual to a translanguaging stance at Roosevelt Children’s Academy Charter School, and how is it relating to current research and literature review.

Common Misconceptions

This PD was designed to include various formats. Learner’s engagement with true-false statements when compared to correct statements rereading, has been proven to be an effective learning tool that increased retention of material when feedback was provided (Under, Tekin, & Roediger, 2022).

This section is an engaging True/False Kahoot game (Appendix B), challenging participant in the PD to respond with either or to questions. These questions include common misconceptions that monolinguals often associate with MLs such as:

- bilinguals speak two separated languages English and another language (Grosjean, 1989).
- Their translanguaging practices demonstrate that they don’t fully master either or.
- They are used to switch between the two (L1 and L2) as needed.
- Communication practices used at home are not to be used in completing literacy tasks in school.

It also includes facts supported by insiders, citizens of a ML society. These facts are:

- all languages are social practices.
- They are not nouns but verbs, a dynamic DO and BE, through language.
The persistence of terms such as native/non-native are a colonialism and racism invention that must be eradicated.

Engagement with these statements will increase teachers’ metacognitive awareness; It will make them think about their thinking and possible preconceived ideas. More so, since RCA is a diverse school, teachers with a diverse background will confirm those statements that support a social justice position. Discussions and feedback at the end of the PD will contribute to changing school’s culture from a monolingual to a translanguaging stance.

Video 1 and 2

Seltzer (2020) defines translanguaging as interrelated language practices of bilingual people; Translanguaging is seen as a sophisticated composition and disposition towards language, and MLs social justice stance through a refuse to submit to the monolingual norms. The first video shared in the P.D. accessed through the social media Tik Tok, (Gegethejing, 2021, Appendix C) records the phone conversation of a young adult with her mom. Throughout this conversation she leverages her multilingual repertoire using interchangeably both English and Chinese. It is evident from the conversation that both speakers can communicate in English and the second language. However, using a bilingual repertoire allows them to do it more efficiently.

The second video accessed through Twitter (geo_vinny, 2022, Appendix C), is that of a toddler from a multilingual family who uses two languages as part of one linguistic repertoire. The child is spoken to in both English and Spanish within the same conversation and she responds accordingly supporting her point of view with a convincing argument.

The rationale behind using these two short videos is to bring light on translanguaging practices. They will be discussed and contrasted with the common practices in schools, which continue to be guided by a monolingual mindset (Flores and Aneja, 2017, Garcia & Sanchez,
2018). ML learners in both general education as well as bilingual education continue to be expected to achieve equal proficiency in two completely different languages, while maintaining their repertoire separated most of the time. This expectation ignores the reality of the globalized world in which we live, placing MLs as deficient, or not fully proficient in either language (Seltzer, 2020).

**Cummins’s Linguistic Interdependence Theory**

Students who are not yet proficient in L2, can benefit when L1 is used purposefully to increase students’ comprehension, engagement, and L2 language and content learning (Yuen, 2015). Farbman (2015) looked at multiple studies, highlighting how students in bilingual programs outperformed those in English-only programs in academic English proficiency. These results were allocated to a focus on supporting the development of L1 as a tool to increase engagement and development of L2. Other studies followed ML students throughout their academic years and demonstrated that MLs who had a higher proficiency in their HL at the beginning of the school journey, typically outperformed academically and in English proficiency students with a lower L1 development (Proctor et al., 2017).

In this section of the PD, teachers are learning the role of L1 in L2 development and acquisition through discussing Cummins’s (1978) linguistic interdependence hypothesis. This hypothesis argues that L1 knowledge transfers to L2. More so, a well-developed L1 supports the acquisition of L2. This theory has been cited and used as a foundation for Dual Language Education Programs. Discussing Cummins’ theory removes the misconception of speakers of a language other than English (LOTE) as language deficient, supporting the argument of this PD which is that L1 should be seen as an asset and be used for further development of L2.
Furthermore, I choose to add this section within my PD because teachers’ familiarity with this theory is essential in understanding NYS CR -154. This subpart regulates instruction of L1 in bilingual programs while also demanding L1’s use as a scaffolding strategy for students that classify as entering, according to their last NYS assessment.

From Theory to Practice- Taking a Translanguaging Stance in the Classroom

In Seven Elements of Effective Professional Development, Morgan and Bates (2018) argue that effective PDs “showcase models of effective practice” through various means such as videos, demos, peer observation, case studies, etc. PD developers are persuaded to show not tell. This method in combination with teachers’ opportunities to analyze multiple students’ work increase teachers’ understanding of new teaching strategies. Collaborative discussions as teachers study multiple students’ work samples are important as well to solidify understanding that no two students reach the destination following the exact path (Morgan & Bates, 2018).

To model a translanguaging stance in the classroom I selected two short videos, part of the CUNY- NYSIEB’s webseries “Teaching Bilinguals (Even If You’re Not One).” Both videos showcase teachers’ translanguaging stance while they build relationships; create a classroom environment in which diverse languages are welcomed, seen, and valued; assess content knowledge and native language skills through leveraging home language as an asset, creating scaffolds, and setting clear content and language objectives. This videos also showcase students’ work samples, which will confer the opportunity for teachers to observe, analyze, and discuss the artifacts.

These videos are valuable resources because they help educators visualize the “how” part in “How am I going to apply what I have learned into my classroom?” They give teachers a vision
of what they are striving to accomplish within their own classrooms and enables them to set clear objectives to turn that vision into reality. They offer strong examples to solidify teachers’ understanding of leveraging students’ home language as an asset, which lead to them applying this learning for students’ academic success and equity.

Continuous Professional Development

Studies suggest that a “one-shot, sit-and-get approach” to PD (Morgan & Bates, 2018), regardless of how engaging, is not enough to provide teachers with meaningful professional learning. Sadly, most PDs are limited to a few hours (Wei et. al, 2010), which is not sufficient time to approach content, apply new practices in the classroom, and meet again to discuss classroom experiences. Continuous PD give teachers sufficient time to apply new teaching methods/materials, find possible problems, and work together with other professionals to find solutions (Morgan & Bates, 2018).

Guided by this knowledge, my plan includes continuous PD geared towards cementing a translanguaging pedagogy school wide. One-hour meetings will take place biweekly on Thursdays in the gymnasium (Appendix F). The goal of each meeting will be established by the Monday before the meeting by the meeting leaders and communicated. to give others the opportunity to reflect or maybe prepare questions related to the topic. The purpose of allowing flexibility regarding the scope and sequence is to enable leaders to approach translanguaging with issues as they arise, unrestricted by a structured schedule. Each grade level will take the lead through rotation and can prepare for the meeting using a platform of their choice. Teacher leaders can choose to investigate issues that occurred or barriers to implementing translanguaging strategies in the classroom, review new research related to the topic, discuss successful stories, bring students work samples, present slides, and share videos and lesson
plans. However, each grade level will be required to engage in discussion. A designated scribe within the group is responsible of adding the notes of the meeting in a common shared document for later review.

This segment of my plan considers the importance of collaboration as an essential factor for social learning (Vygotsky, 1979). Ongoing PD allows for small and whole group collaboration with the goal of developing knowledge, solidifies relationships between educators built on trust, and enables teachers to learn from one another through classroom environment and teacher-student interaction discussions.

Ongoing collaboration will affect the desired change. Collaboration leads to problem-solving, which leads to action, which in turn ensures continuous engagement to validate different ways of knowing and further support ML students as they develop their identity as cultural beings through leveraging their multilingual repertoire.

Support and Feedback

My agenda also involves weekly push-in sessions with literacy coaches (Appendix G). Informal observation will permit opportunity for personalized feedback addressing teacher’s strengths and weaknesses and opening-up a space for individualized modeling that fits each teacher’s instructional style. A standard form will be created to focus coaches’ classroom observation. This will include two sections: incorporating home languages in class discussions and incorporating multilingual literacy practices (multilingual books and material, use of full linguistic repertoire in writing, visual displays of students’ home languages). A brief coaching session to discuss observations can take place at the end of the day as students prepare for dismissal.
Literacy coaches or other instructional leaders can create rich, individualized feedback through one-on-one in-class coaching (Morgan & Bates, 2018). Personalized coaching is more likely to identify problems in practice and address them on the spot. Many teachers complain that upon participating in PDs, there is no opportunity for feedback, for further support, or experts to answer questions that may occur who can help them make changes to their instructional practices (Darling-Hammond, Hyler, & Gardner, 2017).

The decision to add this element to my PD will affect the teacher’s ability to shift to a translanguaging pedagogy, bringing the change that I strive into the classroom. When teachers possess the knowledge, make a commitment, are supported in implementing the change, receive individualized feedback, and engage in ongoing in-class support, are less likely to become frustrated or disregard new research by continuing with previously established practices, such as those known to neglect the potential that ML students’ L1 has for academic achievement and English development.

Adopting a Translanguaging Stance in RCACS- From Theory to Practice- Goals

This professional development idea has been created and will be shared with one main goal in mind: to disrupt monolingual approaches of teaching ML students, and to initiate a philosophical shift in pedagogy as educators adopt a translanguaging stance in Roosevelt Children’s Academy Charter School. Initially, it will make available new, valuable information and research pertaining to language learning, which will support school’s staff and administration in making more educated decisions regarding school’s practices and policies. Secondly, participants in the PD will have the opportunity to engage in conversation regarding ML students and their needs while all staff members are present. This will solidify the idea that MLs achievement is everyone’s responsibility rather than the common misconception that ENL teachers only- are
responsible for their language and academic progress. Furthermore, it enables ongoing conversation through push-in support, feedback, and biweekly meetings dedicated to enforcing translanguaging pedagogies. These measures will have further outreach. ML students (but not only) will begin to feel that their language, which lays foundation for their cultural identity, is valued in school. Translanguaging practices will remove barriers in communication, supporting staff/staff and staff/students’ relationships while contributing to an overall sense of integration and belonging (Wall & Musetti, 2018). Also, as ML students begin to experience success across multiple areas through leveraging their L1, teachers will become less resistant towards implementing translanguaging practices in their class. Overtime, success and equity for a growing body of ML students will finally be achieved.
Chapter 4: Conclusion

This capstone project has focused on the failure to capitalize on Multilingual students’ linguistic abilities in many U.S. schools, including Roosevelt Children’s Academy Charter School. It argues that adopting translanguaging practices flexibly and strategically in all classrooms increases MLs academic achievement and leads to the disruption of the monolingual mindset (Menken & Sanchez, 2019). The deficit mindset towards ML speakers manifested through commonly adopted practices such as English-focused schooling, and disregards how MLs multilingual repertoire impacts their language and academic achievement and their ability to integrate culturally as citizens of a multilingual world. To fully investigate MLs and language related common school practices, it is necessary to analyze the relationship between immigration patterns, state policies, in-school programs available for MLs, and local support and attitudes towards immigrants. These elements combine often in research and lead to questions such as: How much of an impact do state policies have on the services provided for ML students in U.S. schools? How prepared are educators to cater to the cultural and linguistic needs ML students have? What is the impact of English-focused practices adopted in schools? How would translanguaging pedagogies foster cultural sustainability and English language development, and increase academic success?

In this chapter, I will begin by summarizing the literature, I will discuss the impact the findings have on teaching ML students, and end with proposals for further research.

Summary

The literature reviewed includes journals and case studies that seek to explain the persistent achievement gap between MLs and native-English speaking students and the benefits of leveraging MLs L1 as an avenue for social justice and academic success. It begins with immigration trends
that are believed to affect state and federal measures as well as English native speakers’ attitudes towards immigrant (Census Bureau, 2018; The Center for Immigration Studies, 2019; Zeigler & Camarota, 2019; NCES, 2018). It continues with an outline of program options set in place by NYSED to support schools in addressing the language and academic needs of ML students that mirror the demographic upsurge (NCES, 2018; NCES, 2022); reviews research on bilingual programs associated with higher GPA and faster English language acquisition (Serafini, Rozell, & Winsler, 2019); barrier to implementing bilingual education programs (Gibney et. al. 2021; Sanchez, Menken, & Pappas, 2021; Nachos, Shapiro, and Bloch-Elchon, 2020); subtractive bilingualism or loss of the heritage language (Menken & Sanchez, 2019; Nguyen, 2022); effects of subtractive bilingualism on family dynamics and community integration (Tseng, 2020); and lastly, teachers’ unpreparedness to support culturally and linguistically ML students (Bostad, Cwikla, & Kienzle, 2015; So Lim, 2021; Janety, 2020; Malsbary, 2014; Walker, Shafer, and Liam, 2004).

Research and practice show compelling evidence that ignoring ML students’ cultural and linguistic diversity has a detrimental impact on their academic and linguistic development, their sense of belonging within their family and community, their socio-economic situation, and consequently on the future of the society as a whole. ML students’ home language is an underused asset that has been correlated positively with academic achievement and a higher sense of belonging for MLs. Schools must act immediately by providing staff with access and time to discuss the newest research in the ESOL field, highlight tools and skills to apply in the classroom, and provide continuous support and feedback, which will ensure their effectiveness and the success of their students.
Overall, this project concludes that although we can blame the country, the government, the state, the community and its leaders, and each individual school for the achievement gap between MLs and native English-speakers, there are measures schools can take to solve the problem and bring social justice to this underserved population.

These ideas lead us to the professional development plan created which brings forward both the classic and the newest research in the ESOL field, discusses common practices in multilingual families with support from popular media platforms, and shows the striking contrast between home practices and school expectations. It offers an alternative approach to teaching MLs, which recommends adopting a translanguaging pedagogy. This pedagogy is based on using ML students’ L1 as an asset in schools to support content learning and foster L2 development. Examples are shared to support teachers in visualizing how this would look and how it can impact their classroom. The PD also includes a scheduled support system for teachers as they adjust their methods to fit the new pedagogy. Feedback and modeling from school’s experts is provided within their classroom. Lastly, the plan includes continuous PD which would take place biweekly under the leadership of each grade level on a rotating schedule.

**Implications for Learning**

A professional development plan focused on supporting home language that improves teachers’ understanding of ML students and helps them develop their craft to better address MLs cultural and linguistic needs will directly benefit student learning. A translanguaging approach will remove barriers in communication. It will support students’ acquisition of content in their L1 while they develop English. It will give them a voice in the classroom in which the language barrier silenced them. This state of mind along with leveraging their L1 will help them experience success, which
will significantly decrease ML students high school dropout rate, will narrow and in time eliminate the achievement gap and bring social justice.

**Implications for Teaching**

Adopting a translanguaging stance, and honoring home language has great benefits for classroom and content teachers, ENL teachers, and administrators for many reasons. The information presented during the PD expands everyone’s knowledge and understanding of language practices in multilingual families. It helps them dismantle the deficit view associated with non-English speakers and builds empathy. It opens up a space for collaborative discussion on current research in the field and better practices. This new learning carries into the classrooms, where they are supported by school’s experts. Continuous support as they adopt translanguaging practices increases effectiveness. Experiencing success decreases frustration which leads to less teachers leaving the field of education due to feeling overwhelmed and unprepared to address the needs of their students.

**Implication for Families**

Advocating for a translanguaging pedagogy lowers the pressure placed solely on families to use and develop the native language. The presence of students’ L1 in schools will help them develop their language skills in L1 and contribute to their heritage pride, integration, and sense of belonging in this multicultural world. A pride in their heritage will foster positive family and community dynamics; It will increase students’ willingness to use and develop their native language outside of school, which will encourage communication within and outside the family. More so heritage pride and opportunity to use and develop further the native language will delay (or hopefully avoid) language loss which appears to lead to distress within families and communities. Furthermore, as
students experience academic success, they are more likely to enroll in higher education, have a career, and move up on the social ladder, which often extends to benefit the family financially and morally by creating a feeling of accomplishment and a positive example for future generations to follow.

**Recommendations**

The PD is intended to support teachers and administrators at Roosevelt Children’s Academy Charter School (RCACS) as they implement a translanguaging pedagogy schoolwide. The hope is that a positive outcome in this location will have further outreach and embrace the other locations under the same leadership. However, upon analyzing the research in the field, it became clear that lack of teachers’ preparedness and valuing MLs home language practices are not the only major elements affecting MLs learning and leading to alarming high school dropout rates. Other barriers spring from low socio-economic status. This correlates to poor living conditions, lack of access to educational resources and enriching experiences, and family anxiety growing from political measures and societal attitudes towards “the other”. I consider that there is not enough research on the impact socio-economic status has on MLs achievement. More research and plans to address these issues are needed. Teachers must advocate at the community, district, and state levels to support their students and their families. Each problem can be chosen for future PD, researched, and tackled with concrete plans. These could be as simple as facilitating families access to information regarding food and resources available, medical and mental health assistance, providing transportation for families and students to school events and after-school activities, having translation services that would facilitate school-family communication, but most of all creating an environment in which each and every student and their families feel welcome.
Final Thoughts

Leveraging multilingual students’ home language in schools is crucial for their academic success and equity. Although there are currently many barriers to adopting a translanguaging pedagogy such as teachers and administrators’ views, expectations, and preparedness, and high-stake state tests in English that are mandated and keep schools accountable for students learning, creating a PD on translanguaging and a plan for continuous support and learning will have transformative effects. These effects will be felt not only in the classroom environment. As stated by Menken & Sanchez (2019), a translanguaging pedagogy will initiate a broader ideological shift that will transform the school. It will change the way teachers, administrators, and other student view their multilingual peers and their practices and has the potential to improve MLs learning outcomes at all grade levels.
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APPENDIXES

APENDIX A

Link to PD Presentation

Professional Development

Florentina Celis Professional Development.pptx
APENDIX B
KAHOOT TRUE/FALSE

Kahoot Link

https://create.kahoot.it/details/80f11458-e106-443e-ac3c-16e41e037e52
APPENDIX C

Video Links

Slide 4
TikTok via YouTube *Tell Me You’re Bilingual Without Telling Me You’re Bilingual*

https://www.youtube.com/shorts/TBo3TX3immI

Twitter Little Samantha

GM on Twitter: "If you’re having a bad day, enjoy this video of my little cousin fighting with her dad https://t.co/cQR6t93qZF" / Twitter

Slide 10

Teaching Bilingual Students (Even if You Are Not One) Episode 4

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1lwiSQNemw&t=2s

Teaching Bilingual Students (Even if You Are Not One) Episode 3

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aP7NILgtVa8
## APENDIX D

Lesson Plan to Include Purposeful Translanguaging

New Format Lesson Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Essentia Question:</strong></th>
<th>•</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.C.S.S.</strong></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Objective(s)</strong></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Objective (s)</strong></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translanguaging Objective (s)</strong></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment/ Culminating Activity</strong></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX E

**Translanguaging to Success - Biweekly PD**

Translanguaging to Success Continuous Biweekly PD Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY/DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>LEADERS</th>
<th>FOCUS CHosen/ Resources/Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/16</td>
<td>GYMNASIUM</td>
<td>4PM-5PM</td>
<td>LITERACY COACHES</td>
<td>Based on classroom observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30</td>
<td>GYMNASIUM</td>
<td>4PM-5PM</td>
<td>4th grade team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14</td>
<td>GYMNASIUM</td>
<td>4PM-5PM</td>
<td>3rd grade team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28</td>
<td>GYMNASIUM</td>
<td>4PM-5PM</td>
<td>2nd grade team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11</td>
<td>GYMNASIUM</td>
<td>4PM-5PM</td>
<td>1st grade team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/25</td>
<td>GYMNASIUM</td>
<td>4PM-5PM</td>
<td>KINDERGARTEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

Biweekly PD Notes

Biweekly PD Notes

Date: ____________________  Completed by: ____________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________
# APPENDIX G

Translanguaging Classroom Observation Form

Translanguaging Observation Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher_____________________</th>
<th>Coach__________________________</th>
<th>Explained/Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incorporating home languages in class discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• incorporating multilingual literacy practices (multilingual books and material, use of full linguistic repertoire in writing, visual displays of students’ home languages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H
Professional Development Presentation Slides

Slide 1

ADOPTING A
TRANSLANGUAGING
STANCE - FROM THEORY TO
PRACTICE
By Florentina Celis

Slide 2

Agenda

• Introductions
• T/F Common Misconceptions-Break the Ice
• Video 1 and Video 2
  • Translanguageing – multiple languages, one language repertoire
  • Common Practices in Schools
Cummins Linguistic Interdependence Theory
  • Teaching Bilinguals (Even If You’re Not One) Webseries
  • Translanguageing Pedagogy- stance/ design/ shift
Continuous PD
Support and Feedback
• Wrap Up
LEVERAGING HOME LANGUAGE FOR ACADEMIC SUCCESS

Slide 3

Ice breaker true/false
https://create.kahoot.it/details/80f11455-e106-443e-ac3c-16e41e037e52

Slide 4

Tell Me You're Bilingual Without Telling Me You're Bilingual

GM on Twitter: "If you’re having a bad day, enjoy this video of my little cousin fighting with her dad https://t.co/so39F3aZT" / Twitter
https://www.youtube.com/shorts/f8o31X3iimm
Multilingual Families and Common Practices

- Common communicative practices in multilingual families
- Expression using ONE full linguistic repertoire
- Effective communicators

Let’s Discuss- What did we witness?

SAMANTHA GOES TO SCHOOL

- She has incomplete language skills in both English and Spanish
- Her limited English vocabulary will not allow her to fully participate in class discussions
- She must be exposed to as much English as possible so she can catch-up linguistically with her monolingual native English-speakers or else she will not reach set language and academic standards

- Samantha loses confidence and grows frustrated-unable to use her full linguistic repertoire. She must only use English in class, which does not allow her to be an effective communicator
- She learns that her family’s linguistic practices are undesirable, which makes her in time avoidant in using them even when within her community or family
- Speaking another language makes you somehow LESS...she must learn to suppress her language repertoire if she wants to be accepted

- on-time ML students’ graduation rate 26.6% comparing to 82.9% for native English-speaking student
- high school drop-out rate is also concerning, at 29.7% for MLs comparing to 5.2% non-MLs (NYS OBEWL, 2021)
Slide 7

Samantha joined your classroom?

How would you feel?

What steps would you take to help her succeed?

---

Slide 8

Four Key Models for English Learners

Common Practices in Schools

During the school year 2020-2021

- 80.14% were served in ENL (ESL) programs,
- 9.91% in transitional Bilingual Education
- 7.12% in Dual Language Bilingual Education

(NYC-DOE, 2022)
**Cummins Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis or Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP)**

*Thoughts that accompany talking, reading, writing, and listening come from the same engine.*

*Information processing skills and knowledge can be achieved through one language or multiple, as they all feed the same central processor.*

*Language skills and knowledge obtained through L1 support the development of L2.*

[Baker & Wright, 2017]

---

**Teaching Bilinguals (Even if You Are Not One)**

Observe your students’ expression and behavior.

Allow students to show what they know using home language practices.

Provide resources in HL for students who you know will benefit from it.

Use multilingual and cultural relevant mentor texts.

Incorporate HL in class discussion (small group, partner talk).

(CUNY: NYSIEB Webseries)
### Slide 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANCE</th>
<th>DESIGN</th>
<th>SHIFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s approach to teaching ML students, based on his/her ideology</td>
<td>Creating the physical space, instructions, and assessments that develop from a translanguage stance and invites HL use</td>
<td>Change plans within the design based on students linguistic and academic needs and interests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(Seitz, 2020)**

*Translanguageing*

*Suggest introduced by Welsh scholar in 1994*

- Pedagogical approach to teaching that allows students to alternate between languages for a specific purpose in their learning process
- Discursive practices in which bilingual/ML engage to make sense of their bilingual worlds


### Slide 12

**Support and Feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What you did well</th>
<th>How you can improve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Our literacy experts are committed to your success and that of your students.
- Support through modeling, informal observation, and feedback will be provided beginning with the second week of school.
- Literacy coaches or other instructional leaders can create rich, individualized feedback through one-on-one in-class coaching. Personalized coaching is more likely to identify problems in practice and address them on the spot.

*Morgan & Battis, 2018*
Continuous Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY/DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>LEADERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/26</td>
<td>OTHERS/SEE</td>
<td>1PM-3PM</td>
<td>LITERACY COACHES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/28</td>
<td>OTHERS/SEE</td>
<td>1PM-3PM</td>
<td>4th grade team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>OTHERS/SEE</td>
<td>1PM-3PM</td>
<td>5th grade team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28</td>
<td>OTHERS/SEE</td>
<td>1PM-3PM</td>
<td>2nd grade team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>OTHERS/SEE</td>
<td>1PM-3PM</td>
<td>2nd grade team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/25</td>
<td>OTHERS/SEE</td>
<td>1PM-3PM</td>
<td>KINDERGARTEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leaders might choose one or more of the following for discussion:
- Observation
- MLs in your class
- Share new research
- Investigate issues that arise in the classrooms
- Successful stories
- Students’ work samples

All staff is required to participate.

Let’s Review

Translanguage Your Way to Equity and Academic Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>HOW</th>
<th>WHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implies leveraging multiple languages to process content</td>
<td>MLs collaborate with peers using their HL</td>
<td>Supports comprehension when target language is not fully developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages expression using multiple languages in the same sentence—focus on communicative aspect of language, comprehension, and content acquisition</td>
<td>MLs read/view resources in their HL—multilingual books/materials are made available—create word walls, cognate walls, false cognate walls in English and students’ L1</td>
<td>Encourages participation and gives MLs a voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families are invited to share stories in their HL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotes bilingualism through practice &amp; building heritage pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML is made visible within the classroom next to English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Results in academic achievement and English acquisition and lowers high-school dropout rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank You
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