Doctor of Education Dissertations

College of Education

Fall 2021

A Program Evaluation: Implementing a Dual Language Immersion Program

Jennifer Hall
Gardner-Webb University, jhall21@gardner-webb.edu

A PROGRAM EVALUATION: IMPLEMENTING A DUAL LANGUAGE
IMMERSION PROGRAM

By
Jennifer H. Hall

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Gardner-Webb University School of Education
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

Gardner-Webb University
2021

Approval Page

The dissertation was submitted by Jennifer H. Hall under the direction of the persons listed below. It was submitted to the Gardner-Webb University College of Education and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Gardner-Webb University.

_____   _____
Stephen Laws, EdD   Date
Chairperson

_____   _____
Myra Cox, EdD   Date
Committee Member

_____   _____
Cynthia Altemuellar, EdD   Date
Committee Member

_____   _____
Mitch Porter, PhD   Date
Committee Member

_____   _____
Prince Bull, PhD   Date
Dean of the College of Education

for learning, innovation, and success are evident in her daily interactions with staff and teachers. I am where I am in my learning journey because of her unwavering support and belief in my work. Furthermore, I want to thank my chief academic officer. Her continual encouraging words, feedback, and patient clarity were essential as I worked toward completing my dissertation. I often say I want to be like these two power leaders when I grow up! Last, I want to thank my statistics professor who provided the necessary knowledge and support of research and statistics. I am truly thankful for the wisdom and support of all who participated on this invaluable team.

Finally, I want to thank my cohort. We have created, brainstormed, critiqued, discussed, and laughed much throughout the past 2 years. I am grateful to learn from such a passionate group of leaders and educators.

To all I have acknowledged, I love you. Thank you for assisting me along the way. Together, we completed this journey successfully. It is often said, "It takes a village"; all of you are truly my village. Thank you.

Abstract

A PROGRAM EVALUATION: IMPLEMENTING A DUAL LANGUAGE IMMERSION PROGRAM. Hall, Jennifer H., 2021. Dissertation, Gardner-Webb University.

The research study evaluated the implementation of a kindergarten Spanish dual language immersion program (DLI) using Stufflebeam's (2003) context, input, process, and product (CIPP) model of program evaluation. The study aimed to determine specific strategies to best implement a learning initiative not just in a stable year but also in a time of duress such as COVID-19. Interviews with the superintendent, chief academic officer, director of global studies, principal, teacher, and teacher assistant and head of household surveys informed the following research questions.

1. **Context:** What factors were considered when the district implemented the DLI program?

2. **Input:** What specific resources were needed to implement the DLI classroom?

3. **Process:** What strategies were employed to initiate the DLI with kindergarten students?

4. **Product:** How effective was the implementation of the DLI classroom during the initial year?

5. **Crisis Leadership**: How does a school district program implement change during a crisis?

District administration, teachers, and heads of households agreed that the implementation was successful. All stakeholders emphasized the goals for the program were met, which included student growth toward biliteracy, bilingualism, and cultural appreciation.

Stakeholder perceptions of the first year were positive, expressing an overall benefit for the students. District administration and teachers highlighted academic data growth. Implications for improvement include strengthening communication, monitoring and feedback, authentic resources, and professional learning.

Keywords: Spanish dual language immersion program, CIPP evaluation model, program evaluation, biliteracy, bilingualism, implementation, communication, monitoring, feedback, resources, professional learning

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction to Research Topic

School districts today are emphasizing the implementation of high-achieving academic programs that promote global learning for the benefit of student readiness when faced with rapidly evolving work in the 21st century. Currently, in the United States, only 20% of elementary, middle, and secondary schools provide second language instruction. The American Councils for International Education (2017) report on United States second language classrooms found that only "11 states have foreign language graduation requirements" (p. 6). These findings are different when looking at various countries throughout the world. Most of Europe has national requirements for studying second languages in schools, whereas the state or district decides the requirements in the United States. Specifically, in 2016 more than 73.3% of adults aged 25-34 of the European Union knew at least one foreign language (Eurostat, 2019). Students begin studying a required second language between the ages of 6 and 9 throughout Europe. Further, the study of a second language for at least 1 year is compulsory in 20 different European countries. Overall, 92% of students in Europe experience learning a second language in school (Fernando, 2018).

In recent years, school systems have incorporated dual language immersion (DLI) programs with the intention of developing skills authentically in two languages and improving overall academic success for English language learners (ELs) and students speaking English. There is much evidence for student achievement when developing and maintaining bilingual fluency and literacy (Lindholm-Leary, 2016). Further, schools recognize the importance of a dual language experience to promote procurement of

second language education and equip students with the requisite degree of bilingualism and biculturalism in which to accomplish advanced academic and professional work. In addition, bilingualism helps produce citizens successful in their "ability to understand, speak, read and write in world languages," proving crucial to achievement among innumerable professions, explorations, technological innovations, and geopolitics (American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 2017, p. viii). To support highly proficient and culturally aware students, schools must comprehend the need for providing instruction across disciplines to students in the primary as well as the second language. The intent of the DLI learning initiative is working bilingualism and biliteracy by middle school to effectively prepare for a global society (Fernando, 2018).

Lynch (2015) stated that students would benefit from the introduction of "a second-language as early as kindergarten" (para. 8). Today's students are growing up in an environment that promotes bilinguality. Foreign language has long been required for high school graduation, but a DLI classroom introduced at earlier grade levels supports the achievement of fluency for the majority of students. Research emphasizes many potential benefits from bilingual education including increased executive function, social benefit, overall school performance, and social awareness (Bialystok & Craik, 2010). Many school districts are executing DLI programs to strengthen overall student achievement, intentionally shaping young students' minds, and ultimately preparing students for the 21st century.

Neuroscience research reveals that actively learning a foreign language strengthens both brain density and cognitive dexterity, leading to improvements in working memory, attention, and problem-solving abilities. The results of brain imaging

studies completed by Bialystok and Craik (2010) showed that those who are bilingual most often have greater success than monolinguals when measuring executive function, which includes the skills of inhibition and task switching and the ability to switch without distraction. The brain imaging study provides related brain structure when comparing children who are bilingual from birth (Bialystok & Craik, 2010). Bilingualism asks individuals to switch attention quickly from one representation to another and is related to augmented learning competencies, two aspects that can enhance knowledge in various subject areas. Bilingual individuals are more adept at intentionally paying attention, inhibiting insignificant information, and maintaining the separation of two languages (Sorace, 2011). This increased cognitive flexibility, or the capacity to readily adjust to atypical or unanticipated situations, enhances student ability to quickly take notice of alterations in an environment and acclimate more easily when changes occur (Javor, 2016).

In regard to empathy and social benefits, bilingual students more easily adapt to social cues. Research highlights that younger bilingual students have greater "perspective-taking and theory of mind" (Javor, 2016, p. 144), both of which are rudimental social and emotional skills. These specific children, between the ages of 2 and 10, have increased social intelligence and can more easily solve social conflicts while recognizing a problem from multiple viewpoints (Javor, 2016).

In regard to school performance and engagement, the focus on dual language across multiple contents supports the development of language capacity at a much greater degree (Collier & Thomas, 2017). A 4-year research study provides the crucial information that students in a DLI classroom achieve greater academic success in English

and reading ability by at least 1 year of school learning by the completion of their middle school career. The study established that bilingual students have an earlier grasp of print meaning and symbolic function which promotes increased general knowledge, expanded vocabulary, fluent readers, and greater reading comprehension (Burkhauser et al., 2016). Further, all students who actively engage in an authentic DLI setting graduate proficient in the use of the languages, an advantage for their adult professional lives. Another key finding for bilingual students is the spontaneous understanding of language structure, providing for a more enhanced ability to learn new languages (Sorace, 2011). Based on standardized testing and teacher surveys, bilingual students are more intentional regarding learning. Longitudinal studies have found that these particular students have increased test scores, fewer behavioral problems, and greater attendance, and parent involvement is higher. Students are interested in school and portray higher levels of satisfaction and enjoyment (Collier & Thomas, 2017).

Umansky and Reardon (2014) revealed that native ELs who participate in a successful DLI experience in kindergarten will reach grade-level achievement in a projected 6 years rather than the standard 7-10 years. The study discovered that ELs engaging in a DLI class setting acquired English at a slower pace but achieved increased English proficiency by their senior year of high school. When specifically considering reading, ELs who experience literacy in a DLI classroom and continue consistent development of schoolwork throughout their career are consistently two to three grade levels ahead of other ELs in traditional classrooms. It is also essential to highlight that the research also established that ELs placed in a bilingual environment exhibited increased academic progress in English language arts than those in a traditional English setting

(Umansky & Reardon, 2014). Additionally, the research found that a DLI classroom supports working bilingualism which positively influences academic and social awareness progress (Lindholm-Leary, 2016).

Considering diversity and integration, DLI programs offer a setting where English speakers are deliberately placed with ELs, promoting a balanced social environment where all cultures and racial and ethnic identities are respected and celebrated. Classrooms are a principal source of transference for cultural competency and the development of personal and civic identities. Global interdependence is changing how we work, communicate, and live. Countries depend on each other for various resources, and schools must create environments where students engage and participate in effective global problem-solving locally, nationally, and globally. It is essential that schools prepare students for the future work climate and ever-changing demands. The DLI classroom emphasizes the opportunity for students to strengthen respect, comprehension, and celebration of diversity while becoming more socially cognizant of both their local and global communities. Ultimately, a bilingual learning environment will promote positive attitudes and respect towards different cultures while supporting the growth of global mindedness (Bellamy, 2019).

Although Spanish is not the only language implemented in a DLI setting, it is imperative to obtain knowledge of immigration trends to drive decisions when designing a two-way immersion setting. These programs consist of student populations that are made up of a combination of majority-language (English) and minority-language speakers, with as close to a 1:1 ratio as possible. For the purpose of this paper, the appellation "dual language" instruction is utilized to support proficiency in the native and

second languages, integrating both speakers in an academic environment. The learning initiative develops bilingualism and biliteracy while maintaining the native language (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2016). It is necessary to highlight that the paper emphasizes the 90:10 model of two-way immersion programs in which the bulk of the learning is administered in a second language. The kindergarten students will experience 90% of their learning in the second language (Spanish) and 10% in English.

Problem Statement

Multiple research studies are emphasizing the advantages of DLI classrooms for pupils, and many districts are implementing these programs to enhance and further student learning. Despite extensive research in this area, there is minor research on how to effectively implement an essential educational innovation during a global pandemic or similar crisis where resources are limited and need to be used strategically. Globally, we are experiencing potentially the greatest threat to education when considering student loss of learning, health, and overall well-being. The possibility of delaying the onset of the school year or multiple interruptions of the school calendar occurring throughout the year is very real. Further, kindergarten is a crucial year in which the fundamental skills of social interaction, reading, writing, and math, the necessary aspects for whole child development and future school and life success, are developed. Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate and identify the best strategies for the successful development of a DLI program during a crisis that calls for more intentional implementation and strategy.

Implementing a new program requires districts to "examine some of the successes, as well as challenges, identified in the research on dual language education programs, along with some of the implementation issues that are associated with high

quality programs that can impact student outcomes" (Lindholm-Leary, 2012, p. 257). It is

necessary to observe and evaluate how a district plans and implements a DLI initiative to

execute a similar program in a stable year, but especially during a global health and

educational crisis. The method of evaluation within this study will follow Stufflebeam's

(2003) evaluation model that includes context, input, process, and product (CIPP).

Replicating successful outcomes requires a clear understanding of all components,

especially when the goal is planning and implementing a new educational program that

directly impacts student learning and success during critical developmental years

(Lindholm-Leary, 2012).

Significance of Study

DLI programs continue to strengthen in positive approval throughout the United

States. For example, in North Carolina, there are over 200 programs in eight different

languages. Across all eight regions, there are 47 districts, six charter schools, and six

private schools that have implemented DLI programs (North Carolina Department of

Public Instruction [NCDPI], 2020). Although these programs are becoming increasingly

prominent, little research exists that informs an implementation of a successful DLI

program during a global pandemic or an equal time of crisis. This qualitative study

sought to evaluate the research to inform policymakers and educational leaders regarding

the planning and implementation process as they investigate educational methods and

strategies to serve students for a global workforce. Further, the results from the study will

provide valuable feedback to the district as to specific modifications necessary to address

the DLI implementation process and further strengthen the program. Planning and

implementing are the initial steps in understanding how to adopt a new educational

innovation. This evaluation is aimed to assist in providing a comprehensive understanding and guided reflection on the best practices for implementing a DLI program and what modifications may be needed for this district to sustain the program.

Relevance to Educational Leadership

This research relates to educational leadership as it focuses on the evaluation of strategies necessary to implement an educational program during a crisis specifically through the lens of a DLI program. Unfortunately, research is lacking in this area despite the need for strategies to best plan and implement a major innovation in a school setting during periods of resource limitation.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of the dissertation was to perform a CIPP model assessment of the facilitation of a kindergarten DLI program, examining the planning process and the initial year of implementation. This is the initial DLI program for the district, and it was implemented during a global health and education crisis. The mixed method evaluation captures the stories of district personnel, the principal, teachers, and parents involved throughout the stages of DLI planning and implementation. The larger goal is to inform school districts and educational practitioners who have an interest in implementing a 90:10 program. Compiled here will be a broad range of best strategies that can be applied to educational settings throughout the United States in times of duress, as this first-year program was implemented during the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic.

Research Questions

1. **Context:** What factors were considered when the district implemented the DLI program?

2. **Input:** What specific resources were needed to implement the DLI classroom?

3. **Process:** What strategies were employed to initiate the DLI with kindergarten students?

4. **Product:** How effective was the implementation of the DLI classroom during the initial year?

5. **Crisis Leadership:** How does a school district program implement change during a crisis?

Overview of Methodology

Program evaluation and monitoring are at the center of all innovations and are necessary to determine modifications for future success. Stufflebeam's program evaluation model, proposed in 1983, includes the four areas of context, input, process, and product (Stufflebeam, 2003). The context indicates the intent of a program. Inputs are the materials, time, and human resources that affect the work and success of the program. Process refers to teaching and learning development (Stufflebeam, 2003). This holistic evaluation approach utilizes formative and summative assessments that focus on the context of teaching, learning, and development processes. The product is the caliber of teaching and student growth and its ultimate usefulness in regard to a student's future potential (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007).

This program evaluation used a mixed method design and was completed through the study of the change theory. Fullan (2006a) explained that if a district aligns imperative measures and focuses on those with intentional influence and reinforcement, positive change will occur; however, without considering the conditions needed for continuous improvement and how best to change the culture, most initiatives are bound to

fail. Further, placing the most effective teachers in the classroom can successfully implement change (Fullan, 2006a). Fullan (2006a) wrote a change initiative must concurrently emphasize changing participants and the organization with which they participate.

Fullan (2001) highlighted the three components of the change theory that include initiation, implementation, and continuation. Fullan's (2001) change process provides educators with a framework that will support the successful implementation of necessary innovation. The change theory allows for the analysis of how best to plan, implement, and sustain change. Fullan (2001) wrote, "the main problem is not the absence of innovations but the presence of too many disconnected, episodic, piecemeal, superficially adorned projects" (p. 12). As educators, we tend to adopt improvement programs and initiatives that sap the strength and spirit of schools. Fullan (1982) wrote that "change is a journey not a blueprint: changes entail uncertainty with positive and negative forces of change" (p. 21).

This specific study sought to evaluate the first-year implementation of a kindergarten DLI classroom. Specifically, I sought to identify the best strategies for implementing an educational initiative; therefore, I targeted the initiation and implementation phases of the Fullan (2001) change process theory.

The program evaluation also utilized Schoenberg's (2004) crisis leadership model. Schoenberg wrote that crisis leadership includes four phases that include gathering information, preparing, using past experience, and listening to one's conscience. The model is centered on communication and fortified through authenticity and influence. Trust is necessary when convincing stakeholders of leaders' beliefs and

their ability to communicate honestly, creating trust and credibility. Trust is earned

through authentic and positive guidance from a leader during a crisis. Without these, a

leader will lack the support necessary to implement necessary change and reform. The

model indicates that leaders should consider specifically the people they lead, the goals

they wish to achieve, and how their actions will impact the situation (Schoenberg, 2004).

Setting of Study

The elementary school identified for the study is located within a small rural city

school system in the western piedmont of North Carolina. The Title I prekindergarten

through Grade 6 is the only elementary school and consists of 643 students. It is

important to highlight that 45.3% of students receive free or reduced lunch. The school

comprises 45 licensed teachers, 20 support staff, and two administrators. Of those

teachers, 32.6% have advanced degrees, and 12 have obtained their National Board

certification with 74.4% of instructors having 10 or more years of experience. The school

lacks ethnic diversity with 68.9% White, 22.6% Hispanic, and 4.1% two or more races.

The school, built in 1967, is positioned in the center of the small township and houses the

location of all classes and enhancements on the campus. The elementary school is

consistently strong academically, maintaining a B performance grade and meeting or

exceeding growth for the last 6 years.

This was the initial year of implementation for the 90:10 DLI program. The

district hired a native-speaking teacher from Colombia and a native-speaking assistant

from Puerto Rico during the summer prior to initiating the kindergarten classroom. The

Spanish DLI program is actively hiring a first-grade native-speaking teacher and assistant

for the upcoming school year and will continue to add until the program reaches the fifth

grade.

The classroom was composed of 25 students, 13 females and 12 males. It is important to highlight that 70% of the class recognized themselves as White, while 30% of the students identified as Hispanic. The classroom was divided into two separate settings spaced 6 feet apart per North Carolina Department of Health requirements for the pandemic year of learning. The teacher created a rigorous schedule where she and the assistant work between both classrooms throughout the day.

Role of Researcher

The role of the researcher for the study is the assistant principal of the elementary school. At the time of writing the dissertation, I acted as the assistant principal for 2 years and was formerly the success coach and first-grade teacher at the school. Throughout the 20 years with the school and community, I had many opportunities to engage with students and families within the school environment. I maintain a trusting and positive relationship with staff, administrators, parents, and community members.

For this study, my responsibility was to provide a comfortable setting for participants to openly share their experiences. I created an interview setting that promoted open conversations to identify specific areas for success of the initial year of implementation and opportunities for growth. Once the CIPP evaluation was completed, I communicated the findings with the district.

Definition of Terms

Bilingual Education

Learning that employs two languages for instruction (Acquino, 2020).

Bilingualism

The capacity in which individuals speak multiple languages and the ability to use the languages effectively (Acquino, 2020).

Biliteracy

Refers to an individual who can read, speak, write, and listen in more than one vernacular (Bellamy, 2019).

DLI Program

Coined as a two-way, bilingual, and Spanish immersion. Students are provided guidance in two languages and the aim is for students to be bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural (Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, 2020).

Globalization

Refers to a process in which people, ideas, and resources spread throughout the world, supporting interaction and integration between cultures, governments, and economies (Bellamy, 2019).

Two-Way Immersion Program

This educational learning environment represents an even distribution of native English and second language speakers. The educational program offers incorporated instruction to both cohorts of students as they represent the language representation and learner at various settings (Howard et al., 2018).

One-Way Immersion Program

This educational setting provides learning of instruction in one target language (Howard et al., 2018).

90/10

Ninety percent of teaching is presented in the target language, and 10% is presented in a second vernacular (Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, 2020).

50/50

An equivalent method of teaching that supports learning in both the minority language 50% of the day and another language 50% (Acquino, 2020).

EL

A student who, according to a national assessment, has not yet acquired the necessary proficiency in reading, writing, speaking, and listening in English (Acquino, 2020).

L1. First Language

The student's native language (Acquino, 2020).

L2. Second Language

A student's additional language (Acquino, 2020).

Language Acquisition

A subconscious act that people undergo when learning their native language (Acquino, 2020).

Language Immersion

A teaching method for second language instruction in which the curriculum is conducted in a foreign language (Acquino, 2020).

Minority Language

The language other than the one utilized by most in a specific area (Center for

Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, 2020).

Majority Language

The language used by most in a domain (Center for Advanced Research on

Language Acquisition, 2020).

Monolingual Classrooms

Instruction that is received only in the English language (Acquino, 2020).

Partner Language

Term used to define the second language that is utilized for teaching (Acquino,

2020).

Target Language

Term used to define the language that is being taught.

Translanguaging

Refers to a student who incorporates two languages to communicate effectively

(Hammon, 2018).

Assumptions

It was assumed that the district leaders, teachers, and parents were honest and

openly expressed their views in the interviews and surveys. Multiple perspectives were

presented, and triangulation of information was necessary to verify the information. It

was assumed that participants had a genuine interest in participating and that the

observations were accomplished in an unbiased manner.

The study asked participants about their experiences and perceptions of the first-

year implementation of a DLI program. The study assumed that responses to the

interview questions would compare previous experiences in monolingual classrooms and

schools. All participants have been a part of the DLI program for only 1 year. Participants in the study were first-year teachers and administrators of the program.

Summary

Although there are significant studies on effective strategies for implementing a DLI program and the many advantages of language immersion, this study sought to evaluate, using the CIPP model, the implementation of a program during a global health and education crisis. Specifically, this study sought to evaluate, identify, and report on effective initiation and implementation strategies that lead to a successful DLI program. This program evaluation is conducted through the lens of Fullan's (2001) change theory and utilized the CIPP model for program evaluation.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

According to a 2016-2017 report, "thirty-five states and the District of Columbia reported having a dual language program" (Office of English Language Acquisition, 2019, p. 1). These programs differ in composition but incorporate three similar objectives: (a) support bilingualism and biliteracy, (b) attain educational success in both languages, and (c) advance discernment and value of various cultures. Spanish is most commonly used as a partner language in the programs with the next being Chinese/ Mandarin, then French, German, and Vietnamese (Office of English Language Acquisition, 2019).

As school districts increasingly add these valuable DLI programs, it is essential to define successful practices and strategies for initiation and implementation that lead to a successful DLI program that supports highly proficient and culturally aware students who are both functional as bilinguals and bilateral. With this as the focus, the literature review is categorized into four sections: (a) summarizing the transformation of DLI education, (b) distinguishing the benefits of a DLI initiative, (c) identifying successful practices for implementing a DLI program, and (d) evaluating a DLI program.

DLI Programs

Mora et al. (2001) wrote that bilingual immersion is intended to support all students and includes programs for two-way bilingual learning and dual immersion. Dual language refers to the incorporation of reading and writing, educational programming, and teaching in two languages in a learning environment where students acquire 50% of their instruction in a second language. Integrating curriculum content, language, and

culture prepares students for opportunities and challenges in a global society. The goal of

DLI is competency in two languages. One of these languages is the one most widely used

in the school's context and location, while the second is the minority or partner language,

for instance, Spanish. The programs usually last for 7 years, beginning in kindergarten.

The instruction comprises accredited bilingual teachers and students who speak a

corresponding language (Mora et al., 2001).

There are different types of DLI programming. Collier and Thomas (2004)

defined the one-way program, also coined a "foreign language immersion," primarily for

native-speaking students which delivers content instruction in two languages.

Specifically, one language is taught through two languages. Curricular determinations are

made centered on the needs of the one, identified student population. This specific

program necessitates that elements include at least 6 years of bilingual education,

separation of the two languages, attention to core standards and goals, high expectations,

and collaborative learning. The one-way immersion program cannot provide genuine

collaboration between students of the partner language; thus, it is possible for students to

take 1 or 2 years longer to become comfortable speaking a second language (Collier &

Thomas, 2004).

Further, Collier and Thomas (2004) wrote that the two-way program includes a

proportionate number of majority English and native students of the target language

present in a heterogeneous classroom. Students learn content in both English, or other

national languages, and the second/partner language. The objective of the educational

initiative is to promote competence in both languages for students utilizing Language 1

(L1) and Language 2 (L2). Collier and Thomas (2004) considered the two-way DLI or

90:10 model to be successful in reducing the learning gap for ELs.

Other DLI programs have proven to achieve initial gains for ELs, but as these students proceed into high school, the disparity reoccurs (Collier & Thomas, 2004). Native speakers are taught in the DLI classroom in at least a 50% balance of each language. This educational setting is advantageous because the students interact with native speakers of both languages, providing more accurate fluency in an accelerated setting. This instructional program supports a far greater number of students including ELs and students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds and ultimately aids in bridging cultural and social divides (Genesee, 1999).

Genesee (1999) wrote that transitional bilingual instructional settings provide support to ELs as the settings strengthen English competency in literacy. This learning environment provides learning in the students' first language and simultaneously in English. As pupils proceed through school, the proportion of the primary language, which might be Spanish, instruction decreases. The goal of the transitional classroom is to support student mastery of grade-level academic skills and to accelerate the learning of English (Genesee, 1999).

Some transitional settings withdraw students from the programs in as little as 2 years, while others continue learning for longer depending on the specific demands of the student. It is important to highlight that the transitional program does not prepare students for full bilingualism. Transitional refers to the students moving from instruction primarily in the partner language, such as Spanish, to instruction in English (Genesee, 1999). Additionally, a significant distinction between a transitional and DLI program is that the transitional program does not include the objective of protecting the student's native

language (Seidlitz et al., 2014).

History of DLI Programs

The United States has a lengthy history of bilingual education. Bilingual education refers to the capacity to speak multiple languages and also the capacity to utilize numerous dialects of a language (Mora et al., 2001). Ovando (2003) highlighted that in the 18th and 19th centuries, bilingualism was respected, appreciated, and widespread with multiple languages used in instruction throughout the United States, especially in European immigrant communities. Bilingualism was advantageous in business, schooling, and religion. Intellectual and political leaders encouraged the study of non-English languages. Individuals arriving to the continent viewed bilingualism as sustaining their birthright and personal privilege. German was a minority language spoken by the largest population in the United States with at least 600,000 children receiving a portion or all of schooling in German in public schools. Ovando wrote that by the middle of the 19th century, multiple states provided minority language instruction in German, Spanish, Swedish, Italian, and French. Additionally, the continental congress supported non-English speakers with many official publications written in German and French which specifically included the Articles of Confederation. Soon after the purchase of Louisiana, all federal laws referring to that specific area were published in French and English (Ovando, 2003).

Ovando (2003) wrote that in the 20th century, there was an elimination of minority language instruction and the implementation of an English-only policy in school curriculum. The English-only policy and campaign intensified and was associated with patriotism, establishing monolingual English as the norm throughout the states.

Generations accepted English as their primary language, releasing their native language and acclimating to life in North America. Ovando pointed out that the English immersion was the dominant practice of instruction for language-minority students with very little additional support. The minority student would continue in the same grade until adequate English was acquired. This crippling manner began to change amidst World War II and the Cold War when the United States recognized the importance of the knowledge of foreign languages as a vital resource to compete in global interests such as military and international relations. Ovando noted that the government began to understand the value of bilingual education as a strategy and resource to promote and accelerate the nation's economy and security for the nation.

Bybee et al. (2014) wrote that President Lyndon B. Johnson supported the bilingual educational movement when he encouraged the federal government to accept Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1968. ESEA assisted in promoting, evaluating, and monitoring EL education. The act provided school districts federal funding to support educational programs that would train teachers in developing instructional strategies and materials and further encourage parental involvement. ESEA additionally funded early programs that used student native languages in grade-level curriculum. Bybee et al. highlighted that this act acknowledged a major shift in support for bilingual education; however, it did not specifically make bilingual education in schools a requirement. The act did focus upon supporting different languages and cultures, weakening the English-only instruction laws enacted in prior years (Ovando, 2003).

The first DLI initiative was implemented in Miami at Coral Way Elementary

School in 1962 as a response to the abundant arrival of Cuban refugees. The educational

initiative was established to sustain their primary language and support academic

proficiency in English (Lindholm-Leary, 2013). The essential objective of the initiative

was to support children of Cuban refugees in becoming proficient in two languages. The

DLI programming proved successful, initiating a bilingual movement that led to

accessible bilingual education in 56 programs in over 13 states by 1968 (Ovando, 2003).

Ovando (2003) wrote that the Supreme Court conclusion of 1974 for *Lau v.*

Nichols is considered paramount for language-minority individuals and their civil rights.

The case was filed by 1,800 Chinese-American students who believed they did not

receive adequate educational support because of their lack of understanding of English.

They considered themselves discriminated against based on their ethnicity. Ovando

pointed out that the school district argued that they offered equal instructional learning to

all students no matter national origin and thus did not discriminate. The Supreme Court

agreed with the Chinese Americans and found that the students were denied "equal

educational opportunity" (U.S. Legal, 2020, para. 3). Justice William O. Douglas stated,

"there is not equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities,

textbooks, teachers and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are

effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education" (U.S. Legal, 2020, para. 2).

This vital case had a significant effect on educational programming that served

language-minority students. The act modified learning from a choice to a requirement for

language-minority students (Bybee et al., 2014). The justices arrived at the judgment that

equal instruction for English students and individuals of a different language did not

equate to an equal learning environment. The act had a substantial impact on the

expansion and success of bilingual instruction throughout the United States. Further, DLI became a favored strategy for observing the court's finding and provided language-minority students' foundational academic curriculum in their native language (Ovando, 2003). This historical decision prompted DLI programs to strengthen and gain greater acceptance with English-speaking students. The programs provided an educational setting that included both minority and majority language students, teaching both clusters simultaneously (Ovando 2003). DLI settings provide an equitable education as well as develop bilingualism for all students (Bybee et al., 2014).

Interest in the learning innovation was accelerated in the 1980s by the U.S. Department of Education as the department promoted successful instructional practices for ELs who were struggling with English proficiency. The government supported more effective language programs for these ELs or underachieving native English-speaking students. During the 1980s and 1990s, several million dollars were provided by the U.S. Department of Education to design, implement, and assess the progress of DLI programming (Lindholm-Leary, 2013).

Since then, bilingual education has found favor, and other times, not. The revitalization of ESEA in 1993 and then termed the No Child Left Behind Act, established that second language education was not included in federal funding. President George Bush renamed the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs to the Office of English Language Acquisition (Ovando, 2003).

Specifically, Proposition 227, created in 1998 in California, "English for the Children," was enacted because of the continually decreasing achievement of the nation's many non-English-speaking students (Goldenberg & Wagner, 2015). The proposition

limited the time students spent in a classroom setting with non-English instruction for 1 year in an attempt to ensure students received the proper amount of English instruction. However, after 5 years of facilitation, only 30% of the language English proficient students were successfully comprehending instruction from English texts at grade level (Freeman et al., 2005). Collier (1995) found that ELs who receive no instruction in their primary language will demand between 7 or more years to successfully gain English language capability. However, positively, with the enactment of the proposition, parents were allowed to sign a waiver for bilingual programming and various successful programs have thrived since the enactment (Jones, 1998).

The state of North Carolina Board of Education has recently included bilingual education growth as part of its 5-year strategic plan. A specific goal of the plan includes introducing at least one k-12 DLI program to each of the state's 115 school districts (NCDPI, 2020). This plan is in direct response to the fact that schools across the state have seen a dramatic demographic shift over the last 20 years. The Hispanic population has steadily increased with 997,000 in 2018. Specifically, between 2010 and 2018, the Census Bureau estimated that the Hispanic population in North Carolina increased by 197,000, which results in a growth of 24.6%. This finding reveals a growth that is faster than the nationwide population of 18.6%. Additionally, considering North Carolina, 9.6% of the population is identified as Hispanic or Latino; and looking broader at the U.S., the population is 18.3% (Tippett, 2019).

Benefits of a DLI Program

Lindholm-Leary (2013) noted that bilingual instruction is not only crucial for a global society but is effective in improving a student's overall capabilities. Native

English speakers and ELs who actively receive instruction in a DLI classroom succeed at measures that are proportionate and often higher than students enrolled in monolingual instruction (Genesee, 1999). Research supports that native English speakers and ELs who are bilingual usually score greater on standardized math, reading, and English-language ability assessments. However, academic outcomes are not observed until the end of elementary school, especially those students identified as "educationally at risk" (Lindholm-Leary, 2013, para. 10). This is because proficiency requires additional learning for students to demonstrate efficient abilities in the two languages (Lindholm-Leary, 2013). An additional benefit of bilingualism and biliteracy is that bilingual students will most likely graduate from high school and participate in higher-level math courses. Further, individuals who participate in a DLI setting most often achieve average or above in reading when contrasting students in a traditional learning environment (Collier & Thomas, 2017). These crucial findings apply to all students from varying ethnic and socioeconomic environments as well as those identified with diverse learning capabilities (Lindholm-Leary, 2013). Specifically, ELs, Black or African American students, and low socioeconomic status students who participate in dual language education most often outperform students who participate in traditional reading and math settings (Collier & Thomas, 2017).

Thomas and Collier have collected data for the past 30 years through longitudinal research in 35 districts with more than 42,000 students. Collier and Thomas (2017) determined that DLI learning environments have the capacity to decrease the learning disparity for ELs. The value of bilingualism and biliteracy promotes the long-term acquisition of language and literacy capability in the target language with English

speakers. Students are expected to sustain and grow first language capabilities while supporting second language capabilities as well (Howard et al., 2018). The integrated educational settings serve as a native language model where students develop proficiency in both languages without abandoning achievement of the foundational instruction (Howard et al., 2018). Additionally, DLI programs support the advancement of the target language for the English-speaking students without detriment to the academic achievement of first language development (Genesee, 1999).

Research highlights the concept that dual language education provides increased educational productivity, offering full achievement gap closure. Considering standardized assessments in oral language, literacy, and academic performance, it can be expected that the achievement disparity for ELs will close each year by approximately one-fifth to one-sixth (Collier & Thomas, 2017). A 5-year research study found that bilingual students outperform monolingual students in all content areas after participating in 4-7 years of bilingual instruction (Thomas & Collier, 2002). These bilingual students sustain this academic success and outperform monolingual students in the upper grades (Collier, 1995). Specifically, the 90:10 and 50:50 one-way and two-way DLI support students in reaching the 50th percentile in all academic content and maintaining that extent of accelerated knowledge or attaining even greater achievement by the termination of high school (Collier & Thomas, 2017).

Research supports that language instruction is most compelling for all when it is the focused method of instruction rather than the exclusive. Students learn the second language when integrated with the academic content. It is important to note that individuals who are well developed in their initial language have greater success in

learning the second language (Collier & Thomas, 2017). Academics, literacy growth, and

learning strategies intentionally taught in the primary language will easily transition to

the second. As students attain oral, vocabulary, and written abilities in the second

language, they can easily exhibit the learning that was acquired in the initial language.

Additionally, students must attain a required level in their first language to ensure no

difficulties in the second (Collier, 1995).

Bilingual education studies further reveal that instructional knowledge and skills

attained in one language provide for easier acquisition related to that knowledge and

abilities in the second language. This vital learning occurs when instruction through the

primary language is taught with balanced second language support. Bilingual individuals

display an even greater ability in learning additional languages when compared with

monolingual individuals. Further, acquisition of a second language earlier in a student's

career will most likely promote "greater metalinguistic and metacognitive abilities"

(Adesope et al., 2010, p. 229).

Specifically, Serafini et al. (2020) supported this historical evidence that a DLI

classroom promotes academic growth. The study used English and a target language at

50% and found that ELs acquired English at a faster rate than those attending a

monolingual classroom. Further, the study revealed that these students had greater test

results and grade averages in both math and reading. Additionally, ELs in this DLI setting

exited the EL program earlier than their counterparts in other educational settings.

Furthermore, the study found that the DLI classroom promotes learning English faster

because it creates an easier pathway for students to achieve academically. This study also

emphasized that the results occurred for those students who lived in Spanish-speaking

communities as well (Serafini et al., 2020).

Bialystok (2011) wrote that when considering the positive cognitive effects of DLI programs, research proves that bilingualism greatly affects the brain of a bilingual speaker. Bilingual individuals actively process registers, collocation, and synonyms. A bilingual individual is required to select between two languages, which demands the practice of executive control. Bialystok (2011) wrote that executive control is commonly referred to as "language switching," an accustomed aspect of a bilingual's interaction. Executive control is significant when a bilingual is actively language processing. Bilingual individuals must process and then determine the accurate language from two alternatives determined by the social context. Bialystok (2011) highlighted that this enhanced performance of task switching is found at all stages and across lifespans and is used to govern attention to the primary language.

Pliatskias et al. (2020) found that the structure of the brain is affected in students identified as bilingual. These individuals have increased gray matter which controls daily functions, motor skills, and memory. The increased gray matter is also associated with language and learning. Traditionally, the gray matter continues to grow until adolescence. Studies reveal that the structure of the brain begins to age in younger bilinguals than that of a monolingual child. Studies show that this gray matter has been proven to decrease the aging of the brain and further confirms the connection between bilingualism and Alzheimer's (Pliatsikas et al., 2020). Additionally, this increased gray matter also supports stroke sufferers. The study found that bilingual individuals' cognitive impairment was less severe, and the percent of bilingual patients with intact cognitive function was much higher than compared with monolinguals (Alladi et al., 2015).

Bialystok (2011) further found that bilingual individuals can more easily manage their attention while participating in linguistic and nonverbal activities as compared to monolinguals. The use of two languages demands that bilinguals manage their attention and determine the primary language. Bialystok's (2011) research showed that the capability to manage two languages explains the improved achievement on tasks with conflicting or distracting information and requires greater attentional control. Further, results of meta-analysis research demonstrate that bilingualism is related to various cognitive benefits. Bialystok's (2011) studies revealed that bilinguals perform greater than monolinguals on metalinguistic and metacognitive assessments which measure abstract and figurative depiction, divergent thinking, and creative problem-solving. Fully proficient bilinguals at an earlier age can solve problems with conflicting or misleading cues and decipher more quickly than monolinguals of the same age. Bialystok (2011) wrote that learning two languages and controlling them while inhibiting one without interference affords a bilingual to strengthen these vital abilities.

Research highlights that bilinguals have greater working memory capacity than monolinguals. At all phases of development, individuals who engage in more than one language reveal significant differences from individuals who speak one language in brain organization and cognitive work (Bialystok, 2011). Specifically, they exhibit greater cognition, strengthened creativity, and better analytical thinking ability (Thomas & Collier, 2003).

Struggling learners also benefit from a DLI setting. These students strengthen their ability to focus, problem solve, and think critically and creatively. Additionally, research has proven that bilingualism can reduce the emergence of age-related conditions

such as dementia and Alzheimer's. Specifically, the time frame is longer by 5-8 years than monolingual individuals (Bialystok, 2017).

According to Vygotsky (1978), learning occurs through social collaboration with a teacher and peers. Vygotsky wrote that while a student is in the zone of proximal development for a specific learning target, collaboration with a teacher or peer can assist in providing direction to fully ensure the student ultimately learns the standard. Vygotsky found that the interval connecting a student's actual developmental level of independent problem-solving and the level of potential development with problem-solving was a positive force when using adult facilitation, or collaborating with peers. Purposeful integration of new English speakers and native speakers of another language not only accelerates learning of the second language but promotes a setting of authentic interchange among students of the two languages (Genesee, 1999). Howard (2002) noted that the DLI setting offered an authentic opportunity to interact with diverse cultures. Howard further wrote that this learning setting provides a hands-on exploration of student cultures.

Considering socioculturally, bilingualism provides a blended, comprehensive, and homogeneous educational setting for all students. A DLI classroom promotes inclusiveness and supports the cultural demands of minorities while providing vital opportunities to explore the world with nonminority students. A DLI classroom provides knowledge and appreciation for customs and experiences of peers in the classroom environment (Thomas & Collier, 2003). Students have the opportunity to explore different cultures and strengthen friendships across those cultures, interacting in a culturally appropriate and sensitive manner. Research highlights that these students

exhibit more respectful attitudes towards peers and school and positive attitudes toward

acquiring two languages (Thomas & Collier, 2012). DLI promotes global competence,

providing skills that assist in producing members of a community and the world with the

ability to communicate across cultures, critically exchanging ideas and alternatives to

problems. DLI students are aware of similarities and differences among cultures,

promoting and strengthening their curiosity and empathy (Thomas & Collier, 2003).

Further, bilingualism provides an ability to communicate with individuals from

various language and cultural circumstances in an open and inclusive educational setting.

These educational initiatives support "integrated, inclusive, and unifying educational

experiences for their students, in contrast to the segregated, exclusive, and decisive

education characteristics of many traditional English-only and transitional bilingual

programs" (Thomas & Collier, 2003, p. 64). Students are provided knowledge and

respect of other languages; and later, this ability will encourage global travel. The

opportunity to experience a DLI classroom provides students with respectful interactions

in which to experience other societies and cultures in an authentic and integrated setting

while expanding their worldview, promoting the desire to visit the cultures of interaction

(Thomas & Collier, 2012).

In regard to economics, bilingualism opens up employment possibilities. Today,

multiple employers demand participation in a global economy that includes international

businesses, tourism, communications, and diplomatic institutions. Various employment

opportunities require competence in numerous languages. In the United States, bilingual

skills are progressively essential to security, economics, the medical field, and law

enforcement (Jackson & Malone, 2009). Bilingualism provides the ability to earn 5% to

20% more than an individual who speaks only one language. It is a benefit in employment where today, 31% of administrators speak two or more languages. Ultimately, bilingualism greater prepares an individual for an ever-growing global workplace (Callahan & Gandara, 2014). Governor Hunt stated, "If we have a well-educated workforce that knows the languages…that can be one of the most powerful advantages of a state, of a community and America" (Hunt, 2005, as cited in Lindholm-Leary, 2013, para. 13).

Implementation

The implementation of a DLI model is only successful if the teacher truly believes in the model and understands the developmental stages of L1 and L2 used in an educational setting (Mora et al., 2001). There are seven essential factors when implementing a successful DLI program, including "program structure, curriculum, instruction, assessment and accountability, staff quality and professional development, family and community, support and resources" (Howard et al., 2018, p. 5).

Program Structure

The district's program structure is an essential strategy for implementation and includes the vision and goals, clear commitment, positive school environment, and justice for all children (Howard et al., 2018). A school district should ensure all students have the ability to receive a second language at no loss to the first (Cloud et al., 2000). Effective implementation is dependent on the comfortability between classroom procedures, teachers, learning tools, and the intentional use of the languages as a method of teaching. To obtain success, the program must have communicated goals and objectives that are aligned with the school and district objectives and mission (Howard et

al., 2007). The vision and goals should be centered on "bilingualism, biliteracy, and sociocultural competence" (Howard et al., 2018, p. 10). Effective schools with successful outcomes are centered on sound understanding and best practices and enhanced with augmented instruction. Research has repeatedly found that the stronger the implementation of the DLI program, the greater the outcomes for the ELs over just English-only instruction. It is necessary to emphasize that a school must maintain a consistent sustained program in Grades K-12 of DLI to ensure student understanding and learning (Howard et al., 2018).

When considering the structure of the learning initiative, the school environment should promote equality for each student, ensuring "justice and fairness" (Howard et al., 2018, p. 11) for participants. Equity is a necessary characteristic of a DLI classroom. It is essential that the school be cognizant of each cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic diversity and include intentional integration of multicultural instruction. To effectively ensure equity, districts must support teacher professional learning in sociocultural understanding, use of cultural materials, integrating cultural values and ideas, and promoting activities of social justice and the belief all can learn (Howard et al., 2018).

Additionally, when considering program structure, Thomas and Collier (2012) found that the DLI program must implement effective strategies that include no less than 50% of the partner language used during an instructional day. Many schools initiate a program of total immersion or a 90:10 model where the native and non-native students of English are provided instruction of literacy in the minority language until third grade when English literacy is then taught. Thomas and Collier (2012) recommended that the DLI program begin in kindergarten and build sequentially throughout the next 6 years.

Specifically, their research pointed out that school districts commit the DLI program to at least 6 to 8 years of language immersion instruction to ensure successful students. In this particular model, the kindergarten class receives learning in the target language for 90% of the academic schedule, and the remainder is presented in English. In first grade, students acquire 80% of learning in the target language, while the remainder is in English. This educational sequence continues through fifth grade where language distribution is then 50:50. Thomas and Collier (2012) found that students educated in the 90:10 model will most likely become proficient bilinguals, while students experiencing 50:50 of instruction with the partner language and English have proven to be less effective. Thomas and Collier (2012) noted that it takes students longer to realize proficiency, with 8 years as compared to 6 in the 90:10 dual language model.

Further research considering program structure recommended that students experience a distinct division of the school day between the two languages to ensure successful understanding and language use (Thomas & Collier, 2012). This practice further supports that administration and teachers ensure the demands for the percentage of each language are met (Thomas & Collier, 2012).

Recent studies have highlighted the incorporation of translanguaging as an instructional strategy in bilingual education. Translanguaging refers to the bilingual tool of integrating different languages to communicate effectively (Hammon, 2018). Collier and Thomas (2017) wrote that there should be a clear division or separation of language by teacher, time, and subject to protect the minority language. However, Hammon (2018) found after studying a second-grade DLI classroom that translanguaging is an authentic method bilingual individuals utilize when communicating. Garcia and Wei (2014)

supported this finding and wrote that language is autonomous to each other. Garcia and Wei supported that translanguaging should be used to scaffold instruction and carry out school tasks, enhancing the knowledge gained in an authentic environment where students interact and construct meaning comfortably and fluidly. Hammon wrote that translanguaging is an effective pedagogical tool, and teachers should provide a flexible translanguaging space for social and academic interaction. This intentional effort will ensure all students use language as a resource to communicate most effectively (Hammon, 2018).

Furthermore, considering student demographics and program structure, it is recommended to consistently provide a learning setting where instruction and language support an environment of educational and linguistic equity to support equitable reciprocity between English and new English speakers. The most advantageous proportion is 50% English and 50% target language speakers (Howard et al., 2018). There should be no more than one third of one language and two thirds of the other to ensure effective interaction between learners (Howard et al., 2018).

Considering the structure of a DLI classroom and a student identified as Specific Language Impairment, Autism Spectrum Disorder, Developmentally Delayed, or Down Syndrome, a study found that children can successfully participate in these programs (Kay-Raining Bird et al., 2016). Specifically, the study showed that the communication skills of bilinguals match those of monolinguals identifying as Developmentally Delayed as similar for all students when considering the predominant language or either language (Kay-Raining Bird et al., 2016). The study highlighted that teachers should intentionally increase the frequency of the experience to develop the weaker language in bilinguals

identifying as Developmentally Delayed. The study further found a positive transfer from L1 to L2. The study argued that when implementing full inclusion policies, the school should provide full access of service providers to DLI programs for the special needs students. The study found that a DLI program does not affect child development any more so than a monolingual classroom with students having the same disabilities. The study further found that bilingual performance is equivalent or better and did not put children at risk. The study supports that at-risk students can thrive in a DLI classroom (Kay-Raining Bird et al., 2016).

It is important to highlight that individual students who exhibit serious language processing in their native language should be carefully considered before being included in a DLI environment (Howard et al., 2018). Research revealed that when considering a student's impairment in verbal induction and fluency, phonological awareness, or phonological working memory, there is slower development for a student in a DLI setting than in a monolingual environment (Howard et al., 2018). Further, the confirmation of a language deficiency in a DLI classroom can prove to be complicated by language capability. The diagnosis can differ in the two languages, and it is necessary to assess in both languages to indicate an impairment (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2017).

Effective leadership is key when considering program structure. The principal is a main advocate for the program but requires support from an assistant principal, program director, or collaborative leadership team. The three main roles of this leader or team are "program advocate and liaison; supervisor of model development, planning, and coordination; and facilitator of staff cohesion, collegiality, and development" (Howard et

al., 2018, p. 21). Further, a 2016 study of specific skills and characteristics of principals with DLI programs found five effective factors which include that of an "immersion guru, immersion proponent, immersion overseer, cultural unifier, and agent of change" (Rocque et al., 2016, p. 11).

The principal or lead learner must have extensive mastery of and dedication to the DLI program in order to support, train, and lead teachers. Principals should know the curriculum and instruction and effective classroom practices to best oversee a successful DLI program (Rocque et al., 2016). They should be well versed in research surrounding bilingual development, DLI education principles, and instructional strategies (Howard et al., 2018).

The principal is the champion or proponent of the program. They serve as the vital role of point person for the initiative within the school, board of education, parents, and finally community (Howard et al., 2018). They should continually communicate to all stakeholders the vision and goals for the DLI program (Rocque et al., 2016).

The principal is the immersion overseer, developing faculty cohesion and supporting collaboration and collegiality to promote achievement for all students. These overseer leaders consistently monitor for drops in enrollment (Rocque et al., 2016). They are fully aware of curriculum and instruction and resources. They oversee and are involved in professional development to ensure full alignment to the goals of the program. This leader is highly visible, monitoring and selecting staff and hiring as needed (Howard et al., 2018).

The principal is the cultural unifier. They are consistently monitoring faculty cohesion. They create a sense of belonging for families and the community. They learn

the needs of parents, soliciting questions and concerns ensuring that all believe in the program. Finally, a principal as a cultural unifier is well informed, remaining ahead of problems as they arise (Rocque et al., 2016).

Finally, the principal is the agent of change. They oversee scheduling, time management, and successful input of programs (Rocque et al., 2016). Kotter (2012) observed leaders over 4 decades and identified eight steps for leading change. These include establishing urgency, creating an alliance, designing a vision, conveying the objectives, delegating activity, planning reachable goals, reinforcing gains and creating change, and ultimately sustaining the innovation (Kotter, 2012).

Another crucial strategy with program structure is first providing instruction in literacy in the target language. Thus, succeeding in strengthening foundational reading abilities in the partner language, students then later receive literacy in English (Thomas & Collier, 2012). This is a critical recommendation because studies reveal that ELs benefit from acquiring reading and writing direction in their predominant vernacular before receiving reading in English. Also, language majority students score as great or greater than English speakers in a monolingual setting on literacy assessments by third or fourth grade utilizing this particular approach. Further research has found that teaching literacy first in the partner language provides a greater tendency to read for pleasure and then accelerates the development of literacy skills and with greater depth (Howard et al., 2018).

Continuous and ongoing planning is necessary to ensure an effective program structure. Program articulation should be vertical across grades and include scope, sequence, and alignment with specific processes and indicated competency levels based

on formative and summative assessments. The program should be flexible with ongoing self-reflection to support continual improvement (Howard et al., 2018).

Curriculum

The curriculum for the DLI program should be aligned with local standards and assessments. Language objectives are blended into the curriculum and should include effective and engaging technology. Pedagogically planned instruction that aligns with the development of the child and the demographic climate will ensure the ultimate achievement of each student (Howard et al., 2007). Literacy is integrated within the curriculum to support all students' improvement of academic language associated with the curriculum. Further, the curriculum should articulate measurable learning outcomes (Howard et al., 2018).

It is necessary to highlight that most educational programs and assessments are not specifically planned for DLI classrooms. Districts must adapt the curriculum and create alignment for reading and writing progress in the primary language to address literacy abilities in the second language rather than "mirroring the teaching of English literacy" (Howard et al., 2018, p. 33). This should include biliteracy development.

A district should develop a detailed "vertical and horizontal alignment" across grade levels in order for the learning to align with support services for students identified as at risk, special education, and gifted and talented. Research noted that English students receiving instruction in two languages should experience intentional literacy content in the first language and targeted to foundational reading skills (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2017).

Further, the curriculum should include social-emotional learning to develop

positive attitudes. "There is broad agreement that today's schools must offer more than academic instruction to prepare students for life and work" (National Research Council, 2012, p. 3). This necessary learning develops cultural knowledge and a true sense of identity in an environment of multicultural and multilingual students from diverse backgrounds. The curriculum should reflect these diverse students' languages and cultures. Skills included in the curriculum should comprise social and self-awareness, self-regulation, interconnection tools, and authentic decision-making. Books and materials in both languages are necessary to ensure bilingualism and biliteracy. Additionally, multicultural literature will strengthen positive social interactions and acceptance of different perspectives and viewpoints (Howard et al., 2018).

Technology is also necessary as an integrated tool to support the curriculum. Technology supports individualized learning. It promotes greater engagement, retention of knowledge, and collaboration with peers. Effective technology enhances students' life skills. These valuable resources are beneficial for teachers. There are numerous technology resources to support student learning of the partner language (Howard et al., 2018).

Instruction

Echevarria et al. (2016) found that the early stage of second language acquisition calls for slow, intentional, and repetitive speech. It further requires strong contextualized language and gestures. Comprehension checks are necessary for understanding. Scaffolding of communication is necessary for meaning and interpretation. This is made available through the use of sheltered content and the Sheltered Instructional Observation Protocol (SIOP) providing planning and delivery for language learners. The techniques

include visual aids, modeling, students acting as mentors, alternative assessments,

scaffolding, and various presentation strategies (Echevarria et al., 2016). Echevarria et al.

found that ELs need sheltered instruction with the SIOP model. The study highlighted

that students score much higher and make greater gains compared to ELs who do not

receive instruction using SIOP (Echevarria et al., 2016).

Effective instruction should include explicit instruction that utilizes intentionally

reviewing previously learned concepts. The students and teachers focus on step by step,

practicing a task, then demonstrating and modeling. Craik and Lockhart (1972)

introduced the level of processing model which emphasizes that information should be

processed in multiple ways. This affects the ability to retrieve and comprehend the

information. It is the degree to which information is modeled affects how well the

information is learned. Stoel et al. (2017) found that explicit teaching is necessary for

supporting true student understanding. The study also highlighted that open-ended

activities, social engagement, and relevance were essential to support student learning.

Further, Stoel et al. pointed out that explicit instruction "allows students to acquire

intended domain-specific, deep-level strategies and appears to stimulate individual

interest" (p. 333).

Research has found that grouping homogeneously by language proficiency needs

is essential in a DLI classroom. This strategy provides second language learning activities

in a group setting promoting interaction between students (Hamayan et al., 2013).

Integrating this style of grouping encourages students to collaborate and share

information thus constructing knowledge from their peers. Teachers should group

students by academic levels homogeneously to ensure student growth and simultaneously

improve their social skills (Wyman & Watson, 2020).

Instruction should be equitable and engaging and include cooperative learning. The dual language teacher monitors language input and adjusts as needed to the comprehension levels of the learner. The classroom instruction should be interesting and provide sufficient quantity and challenges (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). The teacher should emphasize problem-solving and exploratory learning through the use of thematic lessons. The collaborative environment should promote social interactions where natural language acquisition can take place (Collier, 1995).

The DLI classroom environment requires high academic expectations, encouraging family and community involvement and demonstrating the promotion of bilingual and multicultural experience. Teaching strategies should support the growth of language, collaboration, and achievement in instructional topics using interactive collaboration, kinesthetic activities, thematic units, language separation, SIOP strategies, and separation of languages (Thomas & Collier, 2012). Instruction is adjusted to the learner based on assessment data. It should be interesting and authentic but also challenging (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). Highlighting the primary instructional standards is always a must in a DLI setting incorporating high-quality literacy instruction in both languages. Cooperative learning techniques are a necessary instructional practice as students interact across native language groups. Teachers should integrate sheltered instruction that includes visual aids and modeling (Howard et al., 2007). These visual and graphic displays include repetition and rephrasing for the necessary practice of comprehension (Genesee, 1999).

Assessment and Accountability

Assessment and accountability provide guidance on student progress and drive curriculum decisions. Language and instruction must be consistently assessed using formative and summative evaluations. These assessments provide accountability and gauge needs for improvement (Howard et al., 2007). The school and DLI program must identify the means for evaluating and then schedule ongoing assessments to ensure successful implementation and sustainability. This is an ongoing practice of assessment, adjustments, and refinement to ensure a successful DLI program (Mora et al., 2001). The assessments must be aligned to the school vision and objectives and further support the content and standards (Howard et al., 2018).

Formative and summative assessment tools provide reliable and valid means to identify and monitor students' individual needs for reading and math for both L1 and L2 students. Further, consistent use of assessments is essential for measuring the progress of L1 and L2 students' language skills. These effective tools provide context for the level of performance and evaluate the success of the instructional procedure of L1 and L2 students' current objectives. Schools should provide numerous measures in both languages to evaluate the progression of bilingualism and biliteracy objectives as well as curriculum and instruction associated with the goals of oral language and literacy capabilities in the target language (Howard et al., 2018). Specifically, intentional and structured questions elicit student understanding and support the interpretation of student ideas. These formative assessments are administered regularly to provide the necessary feedback to contribute essential evidence of student learning (Furtak et al., 2016).

Staff Quality and Professional Development

Teacher quality is essential for student success. Highly effective schools found certification to work with DLI students, partner language proficiency, assessment data knowledge, familiarity with standards and alignment to instruction, collegial attitude, familiarity with the school community, and excitement for teachers as critical characteristics for successful DLI implementation (Howard & Sugarman, 2007).

An additional strategy for DLI implementation includes an educator who is fluent and proficient in the language they teach. They should understand the bilingual theory and second language development. The highly skilled teacher is aware of and provides strategies that promote second language development. Further, the teacher should have training in multicultural and equity skills (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). The native or native-like ability provides the cognitive stimulating teaching necessary and ultimately promotes greater language proficiency achievement. It is also necessary to highlight that a native teacher responds more appropriately to students of different cultures and languages (Howard et al., 2007).

The shortage of quality bilingual teachers is recognized as a problem with implementing DLI programs. Kennedy (2013) suggested that in recruiting bilingual staff, it is necessary to articulate and implement a recruiting plan relying on various sources that include international recruits and partnerships with universities. Further, the recruiting process should include a collaboration of school staff and district leaders to support positive strategies for screening and outreach. Alternative pathways for certification are also needed to increase the number of bilingual teachers. Further, teacher collaboration and resources are essential when considering the retention of high-quality

bilingual teachers.

Preservice programs for teachers should focus on strengthening linguistically and culturally competent teachers who support equity, plan collaboratively, develop relationships with student's language and literacy. Further, teachers should be able to use assessment to drive instruction and monitor student growth and implement planning incorporating language and content. Research suggests that DLI program leaders work with universities and provide internships. This preservice training will enable beginning teachers to have a greater comprehension of theories and philosophies centered on bilingual proficiency, biliteracy, and sociocultural appreciation (Howard et al., 2018). An increase in high-quality preparation service programs for bilingual teachers is necessary for strengthening the quality of teacher candidates for school districts. Further alignment between district and bilingual instruction and preparation programs is imperative to support high-quality bilingual teachers. This alignment across schools will also support training and eventual retention success of bilingual staff (Kennedy, 2013).

Professional learning is a necessary implementation resource to continually advance the knowledge, strategies, and resources to ensure student achievement. The continued growth of diverse classrooms accentuates the need for professional learning that strengthens culturally adept teachers. The professional development should support teachers working with dual language students to ensure equitable instruction for all students (Ramírez et al., 2018). This particular study reveals that teachers with more training have significantly higher scores in academic development. The research further highlighted that experience has no significant factor. The study found that teaching background is remunerative but is not a requirement for successful growth. Ongoing and

intensive professional learning supports effective teachers who display a greater positive

cultural understanding and better teaching practices and foster a strengthened

development of language (Ramírez et al., 2018). Professional learning should be data-

driven, personalized, and designed around the needs of teachers, staff, and administration.

Quality professional learning should include training in promoting biliteracy

development and developmentally appropriate pedagogy resources and strategies that

align with the objectives and demands of a district's DLI program (Howard et al., 2007).

The learning should support "educational pedagogy, equity pedagogy, standards-based

teaching, literacy instruction, sheltered instruction, high standards for all students, and

parental and community involvement" (Howard et al., 2018, p. 93). Professional learning

should also include critical assessment and self-reflection. Finally, it is suggested to

utilize veteran teachers as trainers for other teachers (Howard et al., 2018).

Family and Community

An additional strategy for a successful DLI program is strong community support

for the educational setting. Parental support from the community is essential in ensuring

that all parent groups are equally valued. This vital aspect also includes family and

community involvement in the decision-making processes throughout the school

environment. When the school supports family and community, it communicates a

welcoming environment that values bilingualism and biliteracy and consistently fosters

belonging and strengthens trust (Howard et al., 2007).

Effective programs utilize various strategies to strengthen relationships between

the family and school. These strategies should include providing a welcoming

environment that implements cultural and linguistic services that provide adult education

programs. Resources for families should include directions to navigate school processes and technology use, translated materials for all languages spoken, and flexibly scheduled meetings that share family cultures and support student development. Further, schools should utilize technology that supports the language development of students in their home language (Jacob et al., 2016).

Resources

Resources are a final strategy for successful implementation. Necessary resources are allocated for DLI and are seen as enriching and equitable. Bilingual teaching materials include textbooks, computer software, and hands-on materials that are necessary for student learning and achievement (Howard et al., 2007). An essential factor of successful implementation of a DLI program is to furnish effective resources (Howard et al., 2018).

Further, a recent study found that mentors are a valuable resource to support administration and teachers to strengthen adeptness and provide essential feedback to support self-monitoring and assessment practice. Furthermore, mentors support administrators in sustaining the DLI program. Effective mentors facilitate regular, ongoing conversations for planning, and implementing, and knowledge building (Anderson, 2019).

Fullan's Change Theory

This qualitative program evaluation is anchored with Fullan's (2006a) change theory. During the past year, the elementary school implemented a DLI kindergarten classroom, and it is essential to note that the learning innovation was introduced during the middle of a global health and education crisis. The evaluation analyzed the

perceptions of district personnel, the principal, teachers, and parents directly involved in Fullan's (2006a) three stages of implementation centered on a DLI kindergarten classroom. The larger goal was to inform school districts and educational practitioners who have an interest in implementing a 90:10 DLI program. I compiled a broad range of effective strategies that school districts throughout the United States can apply to educational settings in times of duress, as this first-year program was implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic.

"Education is entirely about change-about drawing things out of people and creating the generations of the future" (Fullan, 2014, p. 5). Sustainability is not simply defined as "whether something will last. It addresses how particular initiatives can be developed without compromising the development of others in the surrounding environment now and in the future" (Hargreaves & Fink, 2006, p. 30). Change is imperative for schools and students to continually improve and grow. A change initiative is defined as an improvement or initiative that is implemented to modify the culture of the schools and ultimately refine learning and achievement (Kruse & Louis, 2009). An administrator must constantly advocate for change to facilitate positive improvements. They then become a change agent, one who affects innovations for positive improvements (Fullan, 2001).

Researchers have proposed several revised models that support change initiatives. Fullan utilized various components of Ely's (1999) and Ellsworth's (2000) change initiative theories to develop and create his change model. He has intently studied both the correlation of the implementation of change and the success of the system changed (Fullan, 2015).

Ely's (1999) change theory emphasizes environmental conditions that bolster change and ultimately aids the success of an innovation. Ely's (1999) theory requires a clear definition of what the stakeholders wish to achieve and how the improvement will affect the organization. These must be in place for the change agents within the school to fully embrace the change. Without effective implementation, success is a challenge. Ely noted that teachers will grapple to launch, administer, and then maintain the research-based improvement and actions.

Ely (1999) identified eight conditions that must exist to have a successful innovation. The conditions will affect the implementation of the change process and define if adoption is easy or will experience complications (Ely, 1999). These conditions include resources, guidance, time, stimulus, responsibility, engagement, knowledge, and ability. Ely wrote that the eight conditions must exist during the implementation stage for the likelihood of change agents to implement successfully. Ely maintained that without these eight necessary conditions, the adoption of the innovation will be severely impeded or eventually fail.

Ellsworth (2000) stated that the change agent must disseminate the innovation to the adopters. The change process moves through the changing environment, and some stakeholders may resist the transition which disrupts the process and/or appearance. Ellsworth highlighted that to ensure successful implementation, a district must be aware and have strategies readily in place to improve or foresee any impediments that occur along the way.

Change Agents

Fullan's (2015) change theory highlights the roles and strategies of the change

agents. His change theory specifically centers on the idea that achievement of any improvement relies on the complete community of change agents which includes teachers, principals, students, district administrators, parents, and community members (Fullan, 2001). Fullan's (2015) view of change is a systematic approach where a district identifies a necessary project and the specific policies necessary to produce success. The change theory then centers on these policies to initiate the reform, identify the strategies needed for implementation, and finally define the specifics of the transformation when the reform is sustained (Fullan, 2015).

Fullan and Steigelbauer (1991) noted that the teacher is the first change agent. Fullan and Steigelbauer maintained that if a teacher resists the innovation or implements the program incorrectly, the innovation will not be successful. A district must provide open and clear communication necessary for full understanding and buy-in. According to Fullan and Steigelbauer, a teacher needs consistent administrative support in the form of colleague collaboration and instructional resources which will continually strengthen teacher capacity, ensuring student and school success. A district must keep in mind that as change agents, teachers have the greatest significance on the achievement of an educational change initiative (Hattie, 2009).

The principal is the second change agent. They become the buffer between the district, government policies, and staff. Fullan (2002) wrote that principals will experience a greater impact on an organization and "comprehensive leadership if their focus extends beyond maintaining high standards" (para. 5). The "cultural change principal" (Fullan, 2002, para. 5) will transform a school effectively using the staff and PLCs. He wrote there are five vital traits of a change leader: integrity, knowledge of

change process, ability to build and sustain relationships, provide professional learning, and communicator (Fullan, 2002).

The first characteristic of a change principal is their integrity, the "social responsibility to others and the environment" (Fullan, 2002, para. 6). Effective principals consistently look for strategies to support positive change for their students. They are committed to ending the learning disparity between high-achieving and low-achieving students and strengthening growth for all. Fullan (2002) wrote that their focus is systematic, using data to drive decision-making and monitoring growth. The cultural change principal works to develop capacity in staff to support the sustainment of reform even after a principal leaves. Principals need to empower and utilize distributive leadership to avoid micromanagement. An effective leader understands the value of developing an environment of innovation that will be measured "by the leaders he or she leaves behind" (Fullan, 2002, para. 22).

A principal must understand change. The goal is "innovating selectively with coherence" (Fullan, 2002, para. 9). Fullan (2002) wrote that effective principals utilize critical resistance to improve, addressing concerns and concretely listening. These cultural change principals invite staff to research, question, and dissent, expecting problems throughout the implementation process. Fullan (2002) maintained that principals should intentionally create processes that enhance ownership and commitment, promoting quality relationships that strengthen based on critics and the energy of skeptics. They must transform the culture, changing what the staff values and working together to accomplish what is necessary for lasting change (Fullan, 2003).

Fullan (2002) claimed that a principal intentionally seeks to improve relationships

while inspiring the staff. Fullan (2002) maintained that it is necessary to be an emotionally intelligent leader who is empathetic towards the staff. Fullan (2002) recognized that this emotional intelligence is anxiety-provoking but stressed that motivating and energizing teachers, even disconnected teachers, can produce profound changes in the school climate.

A principal must create and share knowledge through collaborative communities, fostering "knowledge giving as knowledge seeking" (Fullan, 2002, para. 13). Fullan (2002) wrote that a principal encourages and models practicing, studying, and refining teaching strategies, modeling lifelong learning by sharing research, books, and research. Fullan (2002) stressed that schools have more autonomy when they build these collaborative environments where teachers, staff, and administration participate in a learning network within and even outside the district to strengthen knowledge, creativity, and innovation.

Fullan (2002) further stated that individualism and collectivism are equal. Successful change requires a "two way relationship of pressure, support and continuous negotiation" (Fullan, 1993, p. 38). Fullan (2002) noted that transitions require a combination of individuals intentionally collaborating to achieve quality learning for each individual student. This deliberate connection within oneself and one's organization is vital for change to be sustained. Fullan and Steigelbauer (1991) wrote that chaos brings about greater change. Fullan and Steigelbauer reminded principals that collaborative environments are chaotic at times and that as cultural change agents, they should accept the chaos, attack the incoherence, and understand there is not a single solution. Fullan (2015) pointed out the necessary relationship between autonomy and collaboration and

coined the term "connected autonomy" (p. 53). This specific environment promotes

collaboration where teachers focus on improving from each other, testing new ideas, and

contributing to the whole, and ultimately students succeed. "Integrating human and social

capital is the answer, as people in turn develop their decision-making expertise relative to

problems they need to solve" (Fullan, 2015, p. 54). This critical social cohesion

concentrates efforts to solve problems, close learning gaps, and build commitment for

sustained action (Fullan, 2003).

The final characteristic of a change principal is coherence making. They do not

seek "external innovations and take on too many projects" (Fullan 2002, para. 16).

Principals must remain focused on the educational essentials that include curriculum and

instruction, communication, vision, alliances, and "talking with teachers, planning,

helping teachers get together, and being knowledgeable about what is happening" (Fullan

& Steigelbauer 1991, p. 168). A positive change principal emphasizes student learning as

the objective of an initiative and seeks strategies and resources that further that idea. This

principal remains focused on the short- and long-term goals, measuring teacher energy

levels, promoting positive collaboration, and encouraging full engagement with

colleagues (Fullan, 2006b).

The student is the third change agent. It is imperative that students actively

participate in authentic learning that is individualized to fit the student. A school must

ensure the effective introduction of innovation and provide the necessary strategies to

strengthen competency and promote student achievement (Fullan & Steigelbauer,1991).

Fullan and Steigelbauer (1991) wrote that the district administrator is an

additional change agent. This impactive leader helps schools identify the change needed.

They assist in successfully coordinating multiple innovations over the district simultaneously. Additionally, the district director empowers others while focusing on the goals and mission of the school district. Fullan and Steigelbauer noted that they provide necessary resources, training, and professional learning that meets the needs of the innovation, fostering effective actions that focus on improving instruction and teaching. They rely on data to inform decisions and provide and seek feedback as needed to improve and change for successful implementation of the innovation.

Fullan (2006b) explained that if a district aligns primary objectives and emphasizes those with continual pressure and support, positive change will occur. However, without considering the conditions needed for continuous improvement and how best to change the culture, most initiatives are bound to fail. Fullan (2006b) further contributed that recruitment is key, ensuring the best possible people are in the classrooms and schools will successfully implement change. Fullan (2006b) stated that "any strategy of change must simultaneously focus on changing individuals and the culture or system with which they work" (p. 7).

The final change agent is parents and community (Fullan & Steigelbauer, 1991). Parents greatly influence the implementation of an innovation and ultimate success of students and the school. Schools that work closely with families and the community to support learning help to ensure that students attend school consistently and ultimately exhibit academic success. An innovative school communicates daily with parents and helps them monitor their child's social and behavioral development, lessons, filling in gaps as needed. A school must foster these vital family and community relationships, promoting true family participation where family and school relationships are consistent

and be able to comprehend and respond to multiple cultural backgrounds. The community and school faculty share accountability and provide what is essential for students, families, and communities (Head Start, 2014). The school is key in connecting staff and families to necessary community resources and developing and sustaining an essential partnership through open two-way communication (Stefanski et al., 2016). Additionally, communicating openly with the community will ensure full support and additional resources for ongoing and future innovations. This ongoing exercise of strengthening key family and community relationships will ensure the collective trust of the program and shared decision-making that will sustain a successful innovation (Fullan & Steigelbauer, 1991).

Phases of Change Theory

Fullan's (2015) change theory occurs in three phases over time. These phases are defined as initiation, implementation, and sustainability (Fullan, 1991). The goal of change is sustainability, and a change will not ensue if the reform has not been successfully initiated or fully implemented. It is important to highlight that each phase is dependent on the prior phases' success (Fullan, 2015).

Phase 1. Phase 1 is the *initiation*, the process that leads change agents to gauge whether to initiate or proceed with a change. The standard for and approach to an initiative and the espousal from the district administration and teachers is necessary for initiation. These factors include implications of change for an organization, a plan of how to promote the change, and a definition of stakeholders' action for promoting the change to address needs and priorities (Fullan, 1991).

Fullan (2015) wrote of the initiation phase as the phase in which decisions are

made, where a school district chooses a reform initiative, understanding what drives that change while capturing the trust of change agents involved in the reform. There are seven factors that Fullan (2015) identified with the initiation phase. The first is defining the innovation and the quality of the specific innovation. Next, Fullan (2015) listed access to information and emphasized the relevance of transparency. Fullan (2015) then explained the role of district and school leaders, teachers, and the community as proponents of the innovation. Fullan (2015) concluded with the significance that external change agents and economic resources have on outcomes.

Phase 2. Phase 2 is the *implementation,* which occurs during the first 2 or 3 years following the adoption of an initiative and involves putting an initiative into practice. The implementation aspect is composed of three main categorizations consisting of the characteristics of change, local characteristics, and external factors. This particular phase includes the perceptions of the stakeholder experiences with facilitation of the initiative (Fullan, 2015).

Fullan (2015) identified the characteristics that determine how successful stakeholders can effectively change their practices and beliefs through the application of the initiative. When implementing a program, Fullan (2015) identified nine factors, organized into three categories that ensure successful initiation:

    A. Characteristics of Change

        1. Necessity

        2. Coherence

        3. Intricacy

        4. Standard/Feasibility

B. Local Characteristics

    1. Principal

    2. Teacher

    3. Family

    4. District

C. External Characteristics

    1. State Departments of Education

Fullan (2015) also established three areas of necessary change within this phase of implementation that include (a) curriculum and materials, (b) teaching practices, and (c) sound knowledge of instruction and learning practices. These factors are critical for successful implementation (Fullan, 2015).

Fullan (2015) pointed out that an implementation dip will occur at the beginning of the change process and will initially hinder implementers. This may occur because implementers are not sufficiently skilled or do not fully understand the innovation. During this dip, rewards are distant, and dissent will occur. Change agents should recognize this dip and take action by communicating, providing knowledge building, and continually strengthening capacity. They act with the understanding that the future is unpredictable, and people crave certainty. Change leaders must act with confidence (Fullan & Scott, 2016).

The first characteristic that affects implementation is the characteristics of change. This includes identifying the need for the change. A school district must clarify the goals and the quality of the program. Communication is key to successful implementation (Fullan, 2003).

The second characteristic is the local stakeholders, including the teachers, administration, parents, and school board. Local autonomy is essential, providing full engagement and commitment of students and teachers. High expectations and precision are communicated and opportunities for learning and improvement are incorporated for those who struggle as well as those who seek better understanding. Internal responsibility is based on "the notion that individuals and the group in which they work can transparently help themselves responsible for their performance" (Fullan, 2015, p. 107). This collective environment promotes a "strong allegiance to the cause and to each other" (Fullan, 2015, p. 112).

"Leadership from the middle" (Hargreaves & Braun, 2010, p. 15) is necessary. Hargreaves and Braun (2010) wrote that districts must understand that top-down management does not work. They cannot control from the top but rather should focus on engaging an entire system in the change, highlighting goals, capacity building, monitoring, and intervening as needed. Hargreaves and Braun pointed out that a district must increase its capacity to sustain innovation. When a district intentionally strengthens the support in the middle, it ensures greater cohesion and supports the work vertically and horizontally. Fullan (2015) maintained that a school district should concentrate on bringing all staff, parents, and public partners together to work skillfully and effectively for a common cause which will ensure commitment and ultimate sustainability.

Finally, the third is the external characteristics that include the government mandates (Fullan, 1991). A district must align policy, curriculum, assessment, and teacher learning to ensure clarity. Transparent communication concerning the growth and necessary improvements is necessary to implement a program successfully (Fullan,

2003). A district should focus on building internal accountability, resulting in less external accountability needing to be accomplished. This includes setting the goals for implementation, expectations, data-driven strategies, and continual examination of progress. A district must establish the necessary policies that provide direction for employees and leaders that include hiring and developing staff, mentoring, and professional learning support. Fullan (2003) maintained that districts should invest in fostering others.

Phase 3. Phase 3 is *continuation* and refers to the decision to continue the innovation based on reactions to the change and whether or not it is embedded into the structure. For continuation to occur, the change must generate a commitment to the established procedures.

Fullan (2015) wrote that the initiative must be integrated into the school district's structure, including skilled employees who are committed to the initiative. Further, processes must be established that will ensure continued success, particularly for new staff and administration. During the continuation, Fullan (2015) wrote that the change results should have the essential outcome of improvement for the students, including but not limited to individual learning and attitude, followed by a positive change in teacher attitudes, capabilities, and contentment. Fullan (2015) also noted requisite structural reform, such as collaborative problem-solving, for a successful outcome.

The third is the sustainability phase which is what takes place to ensure the initiative continues to meet the expectations set forth in the reform. Consistent and continual feedback is vital and the "key interacting simplifier for individuals and groups wanting to change" (Fullan, 2015, p. 69). Fullan (2015) maintained that transparent data

and progress provided with intentional purpose are necessary. The continual feedback should be specific, not vague. Specificity identifies needs for improvement, monitors results and strategies, and promotes a culture of transparency. Fullan wrote that interventions and explicit feedback are crucial to improved organizations (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2000). A school must encourage teachers to work with others including parents and the public. "The goal is not to create high quality mentor programs as ends in themselves but rather to incorporate mentoring as part of transforming teaching into a true learning profession" (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2000, p. 6). This intentionality will foster conceptual thinking systems and ultimately ensure sustainability (Fullan, 2006a).

A school and district can learn much from the change process (Fullan, 1991). This includes that a district cannot plan for what matters. The planning is derived as the program continually develops. Further, Fullan (1993) wrote, "Change is a journey, not a blueprint" (p. 15). Fullan (2003) highlighted that a district's vision and strategic planning will develop as the program grows, expands, and changes. Fullan (2003) reminded us that the shared vision takes time. Patience is required as faculty and staff learn more deeply about innovation through true interactions; then deep ownership and buy-in will develop which comes from the active engagement in solving problems along the way (Fullan, 1993). Fullan (1993) went on to explain that problems will come and should be expected; "problems are our friends" (p. 25), and this growth is a path to ultimately more significant change. Schools and districts should recognize and appreciate that problems will arise and that conflict will ultimately bring collaboration and change. Fullan (2006a) wrote that schools must work as a team to problem solve, and communicating is key to challenges that arise.

Fullan (2002) encouraged schools to remember that this authentic learning in context is essential. While schools and districts examine real problems, they learn while attacking with solutions. Fullan (2002) was determined that this strategy has the greatest potential for true improvements in organizations.

Learning in context establishes conditions conducive to continual development, including opportunities to learn from others on the job, the daily fostering of current and future leaders, the selective retention of good ideas and best practices, and the explicit monitoring of performance. (Fullan, 2002, para. 21)

Crisis Leadership

"If we wait for a pandemic to appear, it will be too late to prepare" (Bush, 2005, para. 43). In March 2020, no schools were prepared for school closings, and almost none had considered what the implications for instruction and learning would be in an occurrence of such an impactful pandemic, which forced the closing of school doors for several crucial months. Effective school leadership must have competencies and preparation in place for any crisis that can and will occur (Wooten & James, 2008).

There have been several less widespread pandemics over the past century, not all reaching the pandemic level as COVID-19. Other pandemics included Spanish Flu in 1918-1919, Hong Kong Flu in 1968-1970, HIV/AIDS virus 1981-present, severe acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS-CoV-1) in 2003, Swine Flu in 2009-2010, and Ebola virus during the years of 2014-2016 (Gonzalez et al., 2020).

Christensen and Alexander (2020) wrote that schools must ensure that learning continues and innovations are at the forefront to ensure high achievement gains for all in the case of preparing for a crisis such as a pandemic. Teachers and staff must continue to

provide authentic learning and assessment. Christensen and Alexander pointed out that

moving forward, schools need to ensure that teachers have the essential technology skills

in place to support and provide the feedback necessary for continued learning and

growth. They must continue to provide engaging lessons that use knowledge-building

tools and provide necessary access to teach from a distance. Christensen and Alexander

noted that teacher preparedness in developing skills to provide quality learning in virtual

or hybrid sessions is essential with one-on-one sessions, team teaching, and online

lessons, supporting individual student levels. Teachers must continue to collaborate with

peers, providing for accountability and commitment to student learning.

Crisis Leadership Model

Crises will occur in schools, and it is imperative leaders are ready to act

positively, quickly, and efficiently, focusing on developing leadership and

communication skills. This dissertation focused on Schoenberg's (2004) crisis leadership

model which included external conscience, information, preparation, and experience.

Crises range from occurrences that directly or indirectly affect students and even an

entire community and can occur on or off a school campus. "A crisis is a situation where

schools could be faced with inadequate information, not enough time, and insufficient

resources, but in which leaders must make one or many crucial decisions" (U.S.

Department of Education, 2007, p. 1). School leaders must share responsibility for the

crisis with a team promoting various opinions and the ability to define characteristics of

crises that could occur in a school. This team will reflect on many aspects such as the

capability to work calmly during a circumstance with tools available and its experience in

the past. Types of crises may include extreme weather, natural disasters, fires, school

shootings, bomb threats, terrorism, and eruption of disease (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). Crisis leaders must consider the people they lead, the goals for accomplishment, and the specific actions that promote the greatest impact on circumstances. The objective of an emergency figurehead "is to build and sustain an organization's trust and credibility among employees, communities, customers, partners, suppliers, investors, and others that rely on the individual and his/her organization through two-way communication" (Schoenberg, 2004, p. 15).

The first factor of the crisis model is information. Leaders must "have ongoing, two-way access to information, in order to assess the situation and make informed decisions for the benefit of the organization and its stakeholders that will move a situation into a more positive direction" (Schoenberg, 2004, p. 16). This information should be continual, and the leader should be ready to take the information and act accordingly (Schoenberg, 2004).

The second aspect is external conscience and includes an individual outside the school district or organization. It is recommended that the crisis leader use a neutral advisor who provides an open channel for two-way communication. This individual acts as a sounding board for decision-making and ongoing discussions (Schoenberg, 2004).

Schoenberg (2004) wrote that the third aspect is experience. This includes the crisis preparation and prior experience a leader brings to an organization. A crisis leader must have the necessary training or experience with how best to deal with both the media and stakeholders. Schoenberg noted that the leader is in command and is the outlet for one-way knowledge and needs to know how best to share critical and continual information. The crisis leader must have the ability to take charge of a situation during a

time of crisis and to draw on past events and knowledge for help. Schoenberg pointed out

that leaders should have the necessary skills and expertise to organize and lead

organizations, working with both people's needs and organizational goals without

dividing a school district or school. Crisis leaders are competent and have thorough

experience in all aspects of the work across an organization, understanding all aspects of

a school or district (Wooten & James, 2008). With experience comes the comfortability

to use creativity in planning and brainstorming for quick solutions and actions and

making essential decisions under pressure (Wooten & James, 2008). Learning and

development are the foundation of crisis leadership. Leaders must recognize the crucial

skills and actions that are essential during a crisis, the knowledge essential to work

through these, and the ability to execute strategies needed. An essential strategy for crisis

leaders is the comprehension of the "4Cs of crisis management: (a) cause, (b)

consequences, (c) cautionary measures for prevention, and (d) coping mechanisms for

responding" (Wooten & James, 2008, p. 353).

The crisis leadership model has two pillars that include authenticity and influence.

A crisis leader's responses and actions should be aligned with their daily works and

actions. These should be meaningful and intentional. Authentic actions and a core set of

values are communicated in an honest manner and provide direction of communication to

influence and motivate an organization (Schoenberg, 2004). During a crisis, it is

imperative to ensure the well-being of those affected by the crisis. The ability to

understand and empathize is important to effectively respond to an organization and

ensure that actions are completed with integrity (Wooten & James, 2008).

The influence pillar includes the attempts to manipulate the vital messages

positively. Influence includes controlling the communications that are shared with staff and families. These controlled messages affect outcomes of situations, and a positive influence will result in more desired reactions and responses. Positive influences assist in managing the control of a crisis. These positive communications should be shared often to ensure transparency. The key for effective crisis leaders to remember is that influence involves a leader's mind and heart. The information a leader should share with their community includes research, media, data assessments, and decisions providing a two-way ongoing communication (Schoenberg, 2004). "Sense making" (Wooten & James, 2008, p. 12) is essential to organizing information to effectively lead to action. The ability to be persuasive and influential to provide effective direction is necessary (Wooten & James, 2008).

The foundation of the crisis leadership model is consistent communication from the crisis leader. They must be able to deliver good and bad news consistently and in a straightforward positive manner. A crisis leader must "clearly communicate the vision, allay internal fears and reassure outside participants and onlookers" (Schoenberg, 2004, p. 11). It is necessary to provide a swift reaction to an event and changes in events while providing attention to detail. These leaders must connect emotionally and psychologically with an audience, attempting to restore calm and provide the essential reassurance. At times, a crisis leader must be "persuasive, confident, or empathic in their messaging" (Wooten & James, 2008, p. 368).

When these pillars are intentionally in place, trust is earned and sustained and then leaders can effectively lead no matter the environment. A leader must remember that when trust is elevated, performance is multiplied (Covey, 2006). Trust allows an

organization to function normally prior to and after the crisis and ultimately sustain its reputation during and after the crisis. Trust cannot be earned, and authenticity and influence must be in place. Leaders who lack true "authenticity and influence" (Schoenberg, 2004, p. 15) which are the foundation of crisis leadership, or exhibit only one of the two pillars, most likely will eventually fail. A crisis leader must exhibit both pillars to succeed during, before, and after the crisis. Authenticity requires leaders' actions to be aligned with their spoken words which must be meaningful and ethical to alleviate conflict (Schoenberg, 2004). It is imperative to restore and uphold trust when working during a crisis (Wooten & James, 2008). Further, leaders need to observe a crisis as a source of opportunity for learning to create new practices and actions that will significantly alter an organization positively. These effective leaders are continually reflective following a crisis, promoting innovation and problem-solving (Wooten & James, 2008).

The crisis model illustrates the behaviors, actions, and results of effective crisis leaders. Qualities and skills leaders possess include nine personal attributes of "integrity, intelligence, passion, charisma, vision, courage, organization, analytical personal attributes/values, and communication skills" (Schoenberg, 2004, p. 15). The purpose of the model is to ensure positive and consistent communication. Effective leaders take command, learn much, and communicate positively to support maintaining that essential trust with their stakeholders (Schoenberg, 2004). Crisis leadership entails speed of decision-making and action-taking and the scrutiny and publicity that occurs. It is important to remember that crisis leadership demands competency which "ultimately requires leaders to gain or enhance their human and social capital through education,

training, practice, experience, or natural ability" (Wooten & James, 2008, p. 375).

Summary

According to the Eurostat (2019) report, the United States is not adequately preparing students for a global workforce when compared with European countries' consistent support of the acquisition of a second language. The literature review examines studies that reveal the requisite benefits of the DLI program that include the advancement of students' academic, cognitive, social, and global skills to better prepare for a rapidly changing world. Because of these compulsory benefits, along with the importance of equipping students for an increasingly global world, districts must implement and successfully sustain a DLI program.

The literature review examines and defines the necessary characteristics that must be established for success and the ultimate acceleration of student achievement and growth. These attributes include "program structure, curriculum, instruction, assessment and accountability, staff quality and professional development, family and community, support and resources" (Howard et al., 2018, p. 5).

The review focuses on Fullan's (2001) change theory which highlights that for successful change, a district must focus on the positions and actions of its change agents. His change theory specifically centers on the idea that achievement of any innovation is contingent on the complete community which includes teachers, principals, students, district administrators, parents, and community members (Fullan, 2001). Fullan's (2001) view of change is a systematic approach where a district identifies a necessary project (DLI) and the specific policies necessary to produce success. The change then centers on these policies in order to initiate the reform, identify the strategies needed for

implementation, and finally define the specifics of the transformation when the reform is sustained (Fullan, 2015).

Last, the literature review examines how best to utilize Schoenberg's (2004) Crisis Leadership Model to further assist in identifying how best to implement a learning program successfully during a time of crisis such as the COVID-19 global pandemic. The crisis model cites the necessary behaviors, actions, and results of effective crisis leaders. These necessary qualities and skills that effective leaders possess include the personal attributes of "integrity, intelligence, passion, charisma, vision, courage, organization, analytical personal attributes/values, and communication skills" (Schoenberg, 2004, p. 15). The purpose of the model is to ensure positive and consistent communication. It is imperative that successful leaders take command, learn much, and communicate positively during times of crisis to support building that essential trust with their stakeholders (Schoenberg, 2004).

Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

The study assessed the implementation year of a kindergarten Spanish DLI program. The study examined the planning procedures and the initial year of the DLI program which was facilitated during a global health and education crisis. The mixed method evaluation captured the perceptions of district personnel, principal, teachers, parents, and guardians involved throughout the DLI planning and implementation. The larger goal of the study informed educational practitioners who have an interest in implementing a 90:10 program, providing specific steps for a successful first year. Compiled here is a broad range of best strategies that can be applied to educational settings throughout the United States in times of duress, as this first-year program was implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic.

As districts work to offer programs to benefit and provide success for all students, DLI programs and the obtainment of a second language offer multiple benefits. These student benefits include biliteracy, biculturalism, student achievement, and cultural awareness. Further, a sustained program of 5 or more years also supports 21st century citizens prepared for a global economy, having a global advantage in the future job market (Howard et al., 2018).

A DLI program offers an academic setting where English speakers and ELs work and learn from each other, promoting academic and social benefits. Studies reveal that students in a dual language environment will score better in reading, math, science, and history as compared to the scores of their peers in a monolingual classroom. Further, bilinguality sharpens focus, boosts working memory, and supports educational equity

(Howard et al., 2018).

CIPP Program Evaluation

A program evaluation is imperative in the education field to guide the success of an educational initiative. The major focus for evaluation is to inform decisions carried out by stakeholders such as principals, department heads, program staff, and program consumers for decision-making, program and organizational improvement, and strengthening knowledge (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011). This dissertation research utilized Stufflebeam's (2005) program evaluation cycle which focuses on improving rather than proving if the program is effective. The evaluation process is designed to assist change agents in improving aspects of their work. An evaluation guides "delineating, obtaining, reporting, and applying descriptive and judgmental information about some objects' merit, worth, probity, and significance to guide decision making, support accountability, disseminate effective practices, and increase understanding of the involved phenomena" (Stufflebeam, 2005, p. 61). When applied, the CIPP will provide formative and summative feedback and consistently monitor resources (Aziz et al., 2018). The formative and summative information is used for improvement to instruction and projects and determines if processes are successful (Aziz et al., 2018).

A school or district will incorporate ongoing evaluation of educational programming using one or more phases of the CIPP that include the four concepts of context, input, process, and product assessment to gauge direction and success. Plans, actions, and outcomes of a program can then be examined and modified as needed**.** A district should center these evaluative interactions around school personnel and other vital stakeholders (Stufflebeam, 2003, p. 31).

The CIPP evaluation process provides timely and relevant information from which to make informed decisions. It further provides a detailed framework from which to review components of a program. The CIPP ultimately assists school districts to evaluate and improve projects accurately and efficiently, ensuring accountability. It is important to highlight that the CIPP emphasizes learning to indicate opportunities for programming. The CIPP is utilized "not to prove, but to improve" (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007, p. 331). As districts utilize the CIPP for evaluating, they promote decision-making and quality assurance, allowing faculty members to continually reframe projects based on merit and worth (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). The CIPP model recommends involving all stakeholders in the process of questioning, clarifying criteria, contributing information, and making decisions (Stufflebeam, 2005). The evaluation model is decision-oriented and cyclical, providing a continual information loop for stakeholders to improve and refine programming (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011).

The review further examines Stufflebeam's (2005) CIPP model as a necessary tool for evaluating the DLI program for success and opportunities for growth. The research examines Stufflebeam's (2005) CIPP model as a program evaluation cycle, which emphasizes improvement rather than proving if the program is effective. The research urges districts to utilize the CIPP for evaluating, promoting decision-making and quality assurance, and allowing faculty members to continually reframe projects based on merit and worth. The evaluation process is designed to assist change agents in the improvement of specific aspects of their work (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). This study presents a CIPP evaluation to define necessary changes in the DLI program for the upcoming year.

Context Phase

The CIPP begins with the context assessment which centers upon a needs assessment to identify resources in place and further identify opportunities for growth within the school learning environment. The context phase can assist in identifying a district's learning and community needs. The context evaluation intentionally assesses problems, assets, and opportunities (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). This aspect of the assessment model can define the relevant context and identify targets of a population. The context further identifies the most relevant methods and strategies for evaluation. These include analyses, surveys, case studies, paperwork review, and interviews. Continual dialogue must be provided throughout the process with the district to provide transparency and open communication.

The context phase is the initiation of broad planning and includes the goals, intentions, and background of the school (Aziz et al., 2018). Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007) wrote that it clarifies what needs to be accomplished, assessing the needs and opportunities for growth. This is the area of the evaluation where a district is provided the big picture and begins to identify various possible program implementations while evaluating the fit of the programming. Stufflebeam and Shinkfield noted that objectives include defining, identifying, and addressing the needs of the school environment; then a district can assess specific objectives of a prescribed program that will effectively respond to the identified needed changes.

Specifically, the formative evaluation piece of the context phase includes the guidance for identifying necessary interventions and ranking those for identification. The summative aspect of the context phase includes comparing the goals and priorities to the

needs, problems, and opportunities (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011).

Stufflebeam (2005) pointed out that evaluators should follow general guidelines for the context evaluation; and he included identifying the level of decision-making, projecting decision-making situations, defining criteria for decision-making, and defining the policies for evaluator operations.

Input Phase

The second phase of the CIPP assessment process is the input phase where the problem is specifically defined to determine resources used to ensure success (Aziz et al., 2018). Input can help define receptive projects that best meet the specific opportunities of a district as identified in the context phase (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007).

The multiple needs are clearly outlined in the context phase including detailed data with a list of possible responsive programs for improvement (Aziz et al., 2018). During the input evaluation, a district begins the work of structuring that includes budget, research, plans, stakeholders, scheduling, and strategies to implement. These specific resources are imperative to achieve goals defined in the first phase (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007).

Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007) wrote that a plan is formulated and information is compiled in alignment with the mission, objectives, and plans of an initiative, along with methods to execute. In the input phase of the evaluation, the district inventories and analyzes available human and material resources, creates proposed budgets, and schedules with key input to evaluate criteria for relevance and feasibility. Stufflebeam and Shinkfield highlighted that the overall purpose is to identify an appropriate strategy for implementation to resolve a problem found in the context phase.

A district assesses possible programs, analyzing the strategies and merits of the work plan against research. The administrative team then refers back to their organizations' needs and compares alternative actions utilized in similar programs.

Specifically, the formative evaluation of the input evaluation includes guidance for choosing a program or strategy and examining the work plan. The summative evaluation includes the comparison of the organization's plan and money allocated to similar programs and the needs of recipients (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011).

Process Phase

The third aspect of the CIPP is the process evaluation where implementation occurs. Inputs are used effectively to attain the intended objectives of the initiative (Aziz et al., 2018). Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007) noted this is where the program is fully developed and executed. A district revisits the program multiple times to review development and ensure the meeting of expectations. Stufflebeam and Shinkfield highlighted that this is where the execution of the processes is examined for refinements, examining how well the context and inputs are operating. A district investigates the implementation of program activities, consistently monitoring, documenting, and assessing. Feedback is gathered and processed and then communicated to the key stakeholders to provide transparency and buy-in. Stufflebeam and Shinkfield stated that this aspect of the evaluation will gauge whether intended strategies are implemented and whether alterations are needed and will evaluate the scope to which members of the organization implement their roles effectively. It further identifies any specific needs and additional information for correcting programming.

The implementation phase of the process evaluation is especially valuable for

providing information for onsite adjustments and fostering relationships between evaluators and stakeholders. The process is reused often to gauge whether a program is working effectively and meeting expectations and seeking refinements. A primary objective of the process phase is providing concrete observations regarding the range in which strategies are implemented (Stufflebeam, 2003). Additionally, this phase identifies participant success in specific roles and helps determine termination, continuation, or modification (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007).

The formative evaluation aspect includes guidance for implementing the plan. The summative includes a complete documented account of the initiative and monies utilized, plus a differentiation of the design and confirmed work (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011).

Product Phase

The final aspect of the assessment cycle is the product evaluation. The product phase examines the innovation's process and prospective procedural impediments and quality of student learning, "not grades but skills attitudes, knowledge, and abilities" (Aziz et al., 2018, p. 194). It is the review aspect of the cycle. It defines the project alterations. The product evaluation is the review phase where intended goals are assessed as to whether or not they are met. Product assessment appraises, expounds, determines initiative outcomes, and clarifies quality, benefit, and importance (Aziz et al., 2018). It identifies if the program achieved outcome goals if any are necessary improvements and if any changes must be made. It evaluates the productive and negative aspects of the initiative toward the intended audience and assesses the short- and long-term outcomes (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007).

Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007) wrote that stakeholder actions and decisions

are analyzed. The product phase identifies if the project has achieved its purpose. Stufflebeam and Shinkfield noted that the objective of this assessment is to measure, interpret, and evaluate projects' outcomes by measuring their value and significance. It helps to ascertain if the program is meeting the goals and objectives defined by the district. Stufflebeam and Shinkfield identified logs, diaries of outcomes, interviews of stakeholders, focus groups, document/records retrieval, and analysis as strategies used to measure this aspect of the evaluation.

The formative evaluation used with the product phase includes the direction for continuing, altering, or concluding the work after analyzing the data. The summative evaluation role is the comparison of outcomes to the needs identified with the purpose of the program. It includes the data of results against the context, input, and processes (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011).

It is imperative to highlight that providing feedback is important during all phases of a project including the conclusion to provide feedback to stakeholders. Communication is essential and requires meaningful and appropriate involvement throughout the entire evaluation cycle (Stufflebeam, 2003).

Stufflebeam (2003) further highlighted that organizations should follow specific steps when collecting information in each evaluation phase. Stufflebeam (2003) defined these as specifying the source of information, identifying the instruments and methods for collecting data, designating the sampling procedure, and scheduling the data collection. Stufflebeam (2003) also framed the guidelines for the analysis of information during each evaluation phase and identified these as selecting the analytical procedures and designating the means for performing the analysis.

Research Questions

The purpose of the study was to assess and analyze the initial year of a

kindergarten DLI program. The four evaluation phases of the CIPP include context,

input, process, and product. The study examined each of the phases to address

improvement and accountability of the DLI kindergarten classroom during the 2020-2021

academic year. I examined the implementation and effectiveness using the following five

research questions.

1. **Context:** What factors were considered when the district implemented the

   DLI program?

2. **Input:** What specific resources were needed to implement the DLI classroom?

3. **Process:** What strategies were employed to initiate the DLI with kindergarten

   students?

4. **Product:** How effective was the implementation of the DLI classroom during

   the initial year?

5. **Crisis Leadership:** How does a school district program implement change

   during a crisis?

Program Participants/Selection of Sample

One DLI program was selected for participation in this program evaluation. The

evaluation included the superintendent, chief academic officer (CAO), director of global

studies, elementary school principal, kindergarten teacher, and kindergarten teacher

assistant. These school and district personnel were interviewed. Additionally, the study

included the heads of households who had a child participating in the Spanish DLI

program for the 2020-2021 academic year. These heads of households were asked to take

part in an electronic survey.

  The school district selected for the study is a small rural district with one elementary, middle, and secondary school and is positioned in the foothills of North Carolina. The district serves 1,244 students in grades prekindergarten through 12. The subject classroom is a kindergarten Spanish DLI classroom located at the elementary school which serves 660 students in grades prekindergarten through 6. The initiating kindergarten DLI classroom served 24 students identifying as native English speakers and native Spanish speakers. I asked each head of household to take part in the survey.

Nature of the Study/Rationale

  The program evaluation used a mixed methods design. Creswell and Creswell (2018) defined this approach as "inquiry involving collecting both quantitative and qualitative data, integrating the two forms of data, and using district designs that involve philosophical assumptions and theoretical frameworks" (p. 4). Additionally, Creswell and Creswell wrote that a mixed method data approach will support a more thorough comprehension of the data found.

  The electronic survey represented the quantitative component of the evaluation. Descriptive statistics analyzed the quantifiable data necessary to achieve survey objectives. I used frequency analysis to interpret the data.

  The qualitative portion of the evaluation used interviews. This approach is most effective when measuring a participant's perceptions. Specifically, qualitative methods provide insight that quantitative methods cannot support alone. A qualitative approach is utilized to support authentic responses from the audience and a more in-depth understanding of the program aspects (Gill & Baillie, 2018).

Methodology

I conducted a survey with parents of students in a kindergarten DLI classroom. The survey was available in both English and Spanish. The survey polled parents in order to support a thorough investigation of their perceptions of the initial academic year of implementation of the DLI program in regard to their level of satisfaction related to the classroom experience. I was particularly interested in learning the parents' perceptions regarding the kindergarten experience as well as their concerns around the first year. I disseminated surveys in early June 2021 with the expectancy of a 2-week turnaround.

I conducted interviews with the district administration including the superintendent, CAO, principal of the elementary school, teacher, and teacher assistant. The motivation for the interviews was to expand on perceptions of the initial year of implementation of the DLI program using the four aspects of assessment based on the CIPP model. The questions were open-ended and conducted by me.

Prior to conducting any research, I sent a formal email to the superintendent in order to receive permission from the school district. I explained the purpose of the study and shared the dissertation for further explanation. After the approval was granted, the CAO, director of global studies, and principal received a formal email with a detailed account of the study of the first year of implementation. I anticipated the district being cooperative and supportive of the evaluation and did not anticipate any issues related to those involved with the study or the distribution of materials associated with the evaluation.

The surveys were distributed along with a letter in Spanish and English detailing the purpose of the survey and related aspects to all parents or guardians of students in the

kindergarten DLI classroom. The surveys are included in the Appendix for review.

Creswell and Creswell (2018) wrote that follow-up steps are necessary to ensure maximum participation. These items included

1. Short reminder letter sent to all participants;

2. Actual survey resent if necessary;

3. Email and phone call of reminder to complete the survey; and

4. Personal letter to all participants who do not complete the survey.

Additionally, the informed consent was documented and approved by the IRB. A consent form was provided to each head of household electronically before taking the online survey. These signed informed consent forms will be maintained for 3 years in agreement with the IRB. The informed consent procedure includes the subsequent steps:

1. Presentation of information to participants to understand and voluntarily choose whether or not to participate;

2. Documentation of consent signed by the participant;

3. Response to questions or concerns offered during the study; and

4. Preparation for any new outcomes that might affect inclination to pursue.

Instrumentation

Survey Tool

I used a survey adapted from a survey originally designed by Xinming Ren, a doctoral student at St. Cloud State University in Minnesota. The survey was originally used in Ren's (2017) study, "Parents' Perceptions of Chinese Immersion Programs in Minnesota." The survey involved 256 parents in Minnesota who had children enrolled in Chinese DLI programs. I communicated with Dr. Ren and secured permission to apply

her survey to this specific study.

 The survey was field-tested by three separate groups before Ren applied it to the DLI participants. These included two doctoral cohorts of educational administration and leadership at the university. An additional group of guardians with students in a Chinese immersion classroom was also utilized. Following these three initial experiences, Ren formulated additional changes for coherence and merged them to shorten the survey. Ren then surveyed 256 parents and guardians and positively received 246 responses, providing 96% participation. It is important to note that 10 surveys were not completed (Ren, 2017).

 Ren (2017) designed a survey that comprised 17 forced option items to establish valid data. After revising for a Spanish immersion program, I omitted the original Questions 2, 3, 4, and 20, resulting in a 15-question survey. Ren originally used these specific items to gauge parent perceptions, experiences, and demographics of multiple immersion classrooms rather than one kindergarten setting. Seven of the 15 items included rating scale subquestions asking heads of households to select their level of satisfaction or concerns with components associated with the kindergarten Spanish immersion program. The final two items were open-ended to extract more detailed direction from the heads of households. Ten of the 20 items provided parents the option to offer supplemental information or experiences concerning their students' engagement in the Spanish kindergarten DLI classroom. This additional information provided an essential understanding of parent perceptions concerning the Spanish immersion setting.

Interview Data

 To conduct the CIPP evaluations, I collected qualitative data in the structure of

semi-structured interview data. Interviews are a process where the researcher asks questions to and records participant responses (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). For the intention of the CIPP evaluation, I interviewed the superintendent, CAO, director of global studies, kindergarten teacher, and teacher assistant. I collected data to inform the CIPP model in a semi-structured manner to ask probing questions and build off participant responses.

Data Collection and Analysis

The instruments, as viewed in Table 1, were used to collect quantitative and qualitative data and explain how they are aligned to the research questions, participants involved, and how the data were analyzed. The qualitative data were collected using personal interviews. I collected quantitative data while conducting a parent survey.

Table 1

Alignment Table

CIPP evaluation	Research question	Tools/ instruments	Method of analysis
Context	What factors were considered when the district implemented the DLI program?	Interviews Parent survey	Thematic analysis Descriptive statistics
Input	What specific resources were needed to implement the DLI classroom?	Interview Parent survey	Thematic analysis Descriptive statistics
Process	What strategies were employed to initiate the DLI with kindergarten students?	Interview Parent survey	Thematic analysis Descriptive statistics
Product	How effective was the implementation of the DLI classroom during the initial year?	Interview Parent survey	Thematic analysis Descriptive statistics
Crisis leadership	How does a school district program implement change during a crisis?	Interview	Thematic analysis Descriptive statistics

I used quantitative and qualitative measures to evaluate the implementation of a kindergarten DLI classroom. Qualitative interview data were analyzed for common themes within the context, input, process, and product of the CIPP evaluation assessment.

Interview Questions

Presented below is the list of questions prepared for the administrative interviews.

Context

1. What are the goals of the DLI program?

2. What is your perception of the need and purpose of the DLI program?

Input

3. What plans, strategies, training were put into place before and during

implementation?

4. Describe the people and roles of each person involved in the DLI program.

Process

5. How does learning look in the DLI classroom?

6. How is the program monitored? And feedback given?

7. What specific strategies were implemented in the DLI classroom?

Product

8. What are the strengths of the DLI classroom?

9. What are the areas for improvement?

10. How effective is the DLI program?

Crisis Leadership

11. How did COVID-19 affect the rollout of the DLI program?

12. What were key strategies implemented to address the challenges

accompanying a crisis such as the pandemic?

Presented below are the interview questions for classroom personnel.

Context

1. What was your role in the district implementation of the DLI classroom?

2. What is the goal of the DLI program?

Input

3. What plans, strategies, training did you experience prior to and during

implementation?

4. Describe your experience with implementation.

5. What is your perception of implementation?

Process

6. How does learning look in the DLI classroom?

7. How is the program monitored? And feedback given?

8. What specific strategies were implemented in the DLI classroom?

Product

9. Describe how DLI has impacted the academic achievement of students.

10. What are the areas for improvement?

11. How effective is the DLI?

Survey Items

I analyzed the survey data to evaluate and delineate each research question. Descriptive statistical analysis was utilized for the mixed quantitative and qualitative work. Each section is displayed with a detailed account of the results for the five research questions. The survey questions and alignment to the research questions are included below.

1. **Context:** What factors were considered when the district implemented the DLI program?

   Q2: Which languages are spoken in your home? (Check all that apply)

   Q6: What was your understanding of the Spanish immersion program before you enrolled your child in the program?

   Q7: What has been your level of understanding of the Spanish immersion

program since you enrolled your child in the program?

2. **Input:** What specific resources were needed to implement the DLI classroom?

   Q8: Please select the top three reasons you used for enrolling your child in the

   Spanish immersion program?

3. **Process:** What strategies were employed to initiate the DLI with kindergarten

   students?

   Q10: Please rate your level of concern (or worry) related to your child's

   progress in the Spanish immersion program.

   Q11: How much does your child like learning Spanish?

   Q12: How often do you help your child with Spanish learning?

   Q13: How often do you help your child with Spanish school assignments?

   Q14: How often do you help your child with English reading and writing in

   general?

4. **Product:** How effective was the implementation of the DLI classroom during

   the initial year?

   Q4: Please select the three most important strengths of the Spanish Immersion

   Program. (Select only three)

   Q5: Please select the areas that require improvement in the Spanish immersion

   program (Select all that apply)

   Q9: How much growth in the following areas have you observed in your child

   since they have been enrolled in the Spanish immersion program?

   Q15: For the following questions, please rate your level of satisfaction with

   your child's growth.

Q16: Please share any additional comments or feedback about your child's

participation in the Spanish immersion program below.

Summary

This chapter presented the purpose, participants, methodology, instrumentation, data collection, and analysis approach. I conducted a mixed quantitative and qualitative method program evaluation of the implementation of a Spanish DLI classroom. I sought to determine the success of the program using the CIPP model for evaluation. Data were acquired using interviews and parent surveys to discover themes and success. The data collected evaluated the context, input, process, and product of the DLI program. Data results will provide the district with information that can inform improvement and ultimate sustainability of the Spanish DLI program.

Chapter 4: Results

Purpose

The mixed method study was facilitated in order to evaluate the first year of implementation of a Spanish DLI kindergarten classroom using Stufflebeam's (2003) CIPP model of program evaluation. This was achieved through examining a quantitative survey of kindergarten heads of households along with a qualitative interview of district and school administration and the perceptions of the kindergarten teacher and assistant of the first year of implementation. This chapter provides the results of the data analysis of the five research questions.

1. **Context:** What factors were considered when the district implemented the DLI program?

2. **Input:** What specific resources were needed to implement the DLI classroom?

3. **Process:** What strategies were employed to initiate the DLI with kindergarten students?

4. **Product:** How effective was the implementation of the DLI classroom during the initial year?

5. **Crisis Leadership:** How does a school district program implement change during a crisis?

The data and analysis from the surveys and interviews are provided. Surveys provide information on the success of the implementation of the DLI kindergarten program from the viewpoint of the heads of households, while the interview data provide the perceptions of administration and teachers. This mixed method approach will support a more detailed understanding of the success of the implementation of the Spanish DLI

kindergarten classroom. The chapter is divided into five sections: (a) context, (b) input, (c) process, (d) product, and (f) summary.

Interviews

Interviews were facilitated with the superintendent, CAO, director of global studies, principal, teacher, and teacher assistant at the elementary school. Each administrator and teacher was interviewed separately. The interviewees were asked to respond to open-ended questions that were designed around the CIPP evaluation model: context, input, process, and product.

Context

When considering context, Research Question 1 asked, "What factors were considered when the district implemented the DLI program?" This question intended to identify the reasoning for designing and implementing the DLI program. The interview questions provided background information for why the district chose to implement the program. I asked questions to facilitate understanding. The questions for the administrative team were as follows:

1. What are the goals of the DLI program?

2. What is your perception of need and purpose of the DLI program?

Interview With the Superintendent

The superintendent responded that the first goal of the DLI program was to provide an environment for kindergarten-level students to experience foundational learning skills in Spanish. "The initial goal of the program was to provide a place and space for kindergarten level students to learn their kindergarten curriculum in a second language, which we chose to be Spanish." The second goal was to continue the dual

language experience each year, adding additional classrooms so that by fifth grade, the district has a population of students who are bilingual and biliterate. The third goal was to extend the program into middle and high school, offering "the options of taking High School Spanish or an alternate language."

When reflecting on the superintendent's perception of the need and purpose of the DLI program, the superintendent spoke of the need for "interested and invested parents who understand the program and desire to place their students in a DLI classroom 90% of their learning day from kindergarten through fifth grade." Further, the superintendent indicated that parents should understand and ultimately trust the process and fully support bilingual learning for their student's elementary learning experience. The superintendent reflected on the broader purpose of the DLI experience of students who are "fully bilingual and biliterate by middle school and high school and are prepared to speak a second language fluently, offering multiple academic and economic opportunities for their futures." "The purpose is far reaching, [to] continue through their educational career and be equipped to find desirable employment opportunities in the students' future."

Interview With the CAO

Reflecting on the goals of the DLI program, the CAO responded that the first goal is to "provide a kindergarten environment where students learn and interact in Spanish 90% of the day." She emphasized that the educational space should look similar to a traditional kindergarten but follow the DLI model and "learn in Spanish." She also emphasized the goal of learning and appreciating different cultures.

Concerning need and purpose, the CAO reflected on the DLI classroom as "supporting bilingual and biliterate students." She also emphasized that the DLI program

would provide authentic academic opportunities and prepare the students for economic futures in the 21st century. Further, she stated the purpose was that "students not only understand the language, but also the various cultures that accompany the second language."

Interview With Director of Global Studies

The director stated that the goals of the DLI program are to "produce biliterate students who can read, write, and speak in two languages." She emphasized this would be accomplished by the time "they enter high school."

Concerning the need and purpose of the program, she indicated the acceptance and appreciation of various cultures. She reflected on the growth of the Hispanic population over the past few years in the school district and the necessity of supporting their academics so they have the choice for higher education and obtain future employment success. She felt the DLI program "fosters a deeper appreciation and kindles that love of the two languages." The director indicated European countries' support of bilinguality for a majority of students. "I've traveled to European countries where everyone is bilingual or even trilingual. It's so commonplace, and I think it is important for our community to see the importance of that skill." She also highlighted academic and "job opportunities" in the future, providing a necessary skill set for the 21st century.

Interview With Principal

The principal noted that the goals of the DLI program are students who are biliterate and bilingual. "They will be able to speak, listen, and read in English and Spanish when they leave high school."

In regard to the need and purpose of the Spanish immersion program, the

principal highlighted global awareness. She stated that the need of the program is "the strategic goal of global awareness and providing our students the opportunity to be globally competitive citizens when they graduate from high school."

Interviews With Teacher and Teacher Assistant

I also interviewed the teacher and teacher assistant of the kindergarten DLI classroom to further gain understanding of the first year of implementation. Context evaluation questions for the teacher and assistant interviews are as follows:

1. What was your role in the district implementation of the DLI classroom?

2. What is the goal of the DLI program?

Reflecting on the first question pertaining to her role in implementation, the teacher noted her first priority was providing "daily instruction for the kindergartners." She further indicated her role of planning, pacing, note-taking, and reflection. She pointed out that she was confident with creating the initial kindergarten scope and sequence for the acquisition of Spanish. She stated that she was comfortable with designing the student's learning timeline for most effectively teaching and learning Spanish.

The teacher assistant referred to her role as a support with copies, hands-on activities, tutoring, and facilitating small groups. She reflected on the beginning of the year, struggling with structure and COVID-19. Due to restrictions, the class of 24 was split into two classrooms, and she was given responsibility for half the class. Throughout the day, the teacher and assistant would switch to teach and support the kindergarten students' learning. She noted for the first 4 months, she actually "took part in delivering instruction." During the second half of the year, she indicated she was a "support for the

teacher and tutor for small groups and one-on-one settings."

Reflecting on the second question of the goal of the DLI program, the teacher responded with the common themes highlighted in the administrative interviews of "biliterate and bilingual students by the time they enter high school." However, she also emphasized the easy transition for "Heritage Speakers." She reflected that these students did not speak fluent Spanish at the beginning of the year. They understood what was spoken in their home; nonetheless, they did not actively or fluently speak the language. However, by the third month of the kindergarten program, they were "comfortably communicating with their parents." She indicated that the students were proud to hear everything spoken in their native language and this motivated their learning. The teacher noted that soon all students reflected this pride in learning which motivated English-speaking students' learning also. "If you make an inviting classroom where everyone feels comfortable, then they want to share and are very proud of their learning." She highlighted their willingness to share with those who visited the classroom and parents at home. "They were so proud to show what they know." She emphasized, "for me, that's the ultimate goal of a DLI program."

When asked the second question concerning the goal of the program, the teacher assistant responded with supporting "bilingual and biliterate students." She reflected on the importance of fluency and the understanding of the language. She also emphasized the appreciation and understanding of different cultures. "It's called immersion for a reason. It helps the children find the balance between their culture and their native language of English, finding common interests, where they can bridge together."

Head of Household Survey

I surveyed the heads of households of the kindergarten DLI classroom to gain understanding of their perceptions of the first year of implementation. It is important to note that 14 responded, 58% of the heads of households, of the 24 students in the DLI classroom. Context questions for the survey are as follows:

1. Which languages are spoken in your home?

2. What was your understanding of the Spanish immersion program before you enrolled your child in the program?

3. What has been your level of understanding of the Spanish immersion program since you enrolled your child in the program?

Concerning the first question as to which languages are spoken in the home, nine heads of households responded English. Six responded that Spanish was spoken in the home, while one spoke German.

The second question, concerning understanding of the Spanish immersion program before enrolling their child in the program, only 11 heads of households chose to respond. Table 2 provides the responses for each participant.

Table 2

Head of Household Survey Responses Understanding Before Enrolling

Responses	Frequencies	Percentage
I/we had limited information about the program	3	21.4
I/we had only general information about the program	3	21.4
I/we had learned enough details to help me understand how the program works	3	21.4
I/we had learned enough details to help me make a decision to enroll my child in the immersion program	2	14.3

Regarding the understanding of heads of households before enrolling, the response was split with 21.4% responding they had limited information concerning the program, while 21.4% answered they had general information about the program, and 21.4% agreed they had learned enough to help understand how the program works. It is important to note that only 14.3% of heads of households stated they had enough details to make an informed decision to enroll in the DLI program.

Finally, the third question concerned the level of understanding of the Spanish immersion since enrolling in the program. Table 3 provides the responses of 11 of the heads of households.

Table 3

Head of Household Survey Responses Understanding of the Spanish Immersion Since

Enrolling

Responses	Frequency	Percent
I/we have received limited information about the program	1	7.1
I/we have received only general information about the program	2	14.3
I/we have learned enough details to help me understand how the program works	3	21.4
I/we have learned enough details to help me make a decision to keep my child in the immersion program	5	35.7

Analyzing the responses to the understanding since enrolling in the program,

35.7% of heads of households stated that they had learned enough details to help make an

informed decision concerning keeping their child in the immersion program, while 21.4%

stated they have learned enough details to help understand how the program works. It is

important to emphasize that 14.3% stated they have received only general information

about the program.

Input

When considering the input aspect of the program evaluation, Research Question

2 asked, "What specific resources were needed to implement the DLI classroom?" This

question was included to discover what particular strategies and resources were used

prior to and during the implementation process. This question was answered with two

administrative interview questions which included the following:

3. What plans, resources, training were put into place prior to and during

implementation?

4.   Describe the people and roles of each person involved in the DLI program?

Interview With Superintendent

When asked to respond to the plans, strategies, and trainings, the superintendent spoke of meeting with the district's educational foundation several times, answering questions concerning teachers, and identifying benefits, resources, and financial aspects. She emphasized how instrumental these initial meetings were in the implementation process as this foundation would be the

> sole investor in the hiring for the program for the subsequent years of
> kindergarten through fifth grade. They have promised to invest in the program for
> the subsequent years beyond kindergarten to allow the dual language immersion
> program sustainability through fifth or sixth grade.

She further indicated the importance of researching, hiring, locating necessary materials, identifying learning companies, and calculating costs for a DLI program, Grades K-5. The superintendent spoke of visiting neighboring districts with "proven successful dual immersion programs" and ultimately establishing beneficial relationships for future work. She noted the facilitation of interviews and the subsequent hiring of a native speaker teacher from Colombia through the support of an educational company. Additionally, she spoke of hiring a director of global studies who would actively "facilitate the implementation and sustaining of the program." She talked of collaborating with the CAO and the director to advertise the program using "billboards, radio, social media to garner parental and community interest in the program." She reflected on the work with the CAO to investigate and eventually obtain a mentor from a school district who had years of DLI experience. She emphasized the value of this relationship between the

mentor and teacher and how it would prove invaluable in successful implementation and strengthening of the program throughout the year. The superintendent noted that the mentor provided weekly instructional assistance for the teacher and classroom support. "The colleague was very experienced in DLI programs. She offered to help us build and strengthen our program, to get it kicked off on a solid start." This crucial relationship supported intentional professional learning geared to the needs of the beginning teacher.

Reflecting on the roles of individuals involved with implementing the program, the superintendent identified the native-speaking teacher of record for the kindergarten classroom along with the heritage-speaking teacher assistant. "These teachers were hired to fully implement a 90/10 dual immersion kindergarten classroom while teaching kindergarten foundational skills in Spanish." She indicated these teachers provided the state indicated "curriculum and instruction in Spanish and assessed student progress, reporting learning outcomes with local and district administrators and parents throughout the year." She noted the immersion of different cultures in the classroom and the acquisition of Spanish. The superintendent also identified the principal and assistant principal as important roles for the DLI classroom, supporting the teachers, providing resources, and observing and coaching. Further, she identified the CAO as ensuring the classroom and teachers had the "necessary resources and learning as she was responsible for funding." Additionally, the superintendent identified the role of the director of global studies as one who secured resources and materials and consulted directly with the mentor. Finally, the superintendent identified herself as a facilitator of the process, providing that "listening ear and eliminating barriers…that was my role this year."

Interview With CAO

Responding to the strategies and training necessary for implementation, the CAO reflected on hiring the director of global studies who is responsible for the DLI classroom and working with the Educational Partnership Initiative who assisted in locating the native-speaking teacher. She indicated hiring the native-speaking teacher and heritage-speaking assistant. She identified establishing relationships and securing outside support with other districts and EL coordinators and directors with successful DLI programs to support implementation. She discussed attaining a mentor for the teacher as one of the crucial strategies for successful sustainment of the first year. She also identified this "intentional professional learning" as necessary, as the DLI kindergarten teacher was also a beginning teacher.

When reflecting on the roles of each individual, the CAO spoke of her role as a liaison, collaborating as necessary to research and identify resources and training necessary for the DLI success. She identified the director as the essential administrator for ensuring teachers were in place, having the resources necessary, and providing consistent communication with the district, educational partnership, and the classroom. Additionally, she identified the principal and assistant principal as necessary for day-to-day support and communication. Finally, the CAO identified the teacher and assistant as responsible for "daily instruction and learning with students." She reflected that the roles are like "a big umbrella, there are many spokes that represent the many roles necessary for success."

Interview With Director of Global Studies

The director identified the COVID-19 pandemic as a challenge for putting initial

plans and strategies into place successfully. She reflected on the necessary "connections and relationships with experienced districts for support, resources, planning, pacing, and professional learning. The mentor happily shared resources she had and was very giving, and we certainly appreciated that openness that was offered." She looks forward to the upcoming year when the DLI will grow from one kindergarten to also a first-grade classroom. The director shared that the DLI teachers then will have a team, a "support system on campus to support collaboration, sharing resources, celebrations, and opportunities for growth." She further reflected on an educational partnership that will offer "staff development that we will participate with this upcoming year."

Responding to the roles of individuals involved with the implementation, she identified the students as the most important. She noted they come ready "to learn, which little children do, they are little sponges and they love it." The director highlighted that observing the growth throughout the year was rewarding. She identified the parents as the second role, noting they were nervous at the beginning of the year because kindergarten is such a foundational year of learning. "It was hard for some of the parents, although they'd made the right decision for their child, because it's such an important year and it sets the tone and they were nervous their kids weren't going to be prepared." Next, she identified the teachers as an important role, instructing in Spanish, providing comfort and nurture, and collaborating with their grade level and mentor weekly. "The teacher's role is to understand their content, but then also understand the learning modalities of the different students in the classroom." She identified the teacher team and mentor as necessary for locating resources, materials, content, and curriculum understanding. She noted that this collaborative team was imperative in providing the understanding of

"learning modalities and changes in instruction as needed in terms of assessment and growth." She further identified the teacher assistant as a successful aspect of the program. She highlighted the assistant's "confidence in supporting the teacher and students." She emphasized her work as a team player and love of the program. Additionally, she noted that the school administration was necessary for evaluating the teachers and helping address needs. She emphasized their role as promoting the "culture of inclusivity" across grade levels and classrooms. Further, she identified her role as the participant who "sets up the classroom with teachers, resources, and mentors." Finally, she identified the superintendent as necessary for communicating with the board, gaining support broadly for funding.

Interview With Principal

Considering the plans, strategies that were used before and during implementation, the principal noted she was not a part of the entire process, but rather in the "peripheral." She commented on the endowment as providing the opportunity. Additionally, she highlighted visiting a neighboring district and using an organization to recruit, interview, and hire native-speaking teachers. She reflected on researching and learning the importance of "authentic materials versus material that was originally published in English and then translated into Spanish." Finally, she reflected on researching how "the dual language classroom looked like considering the structure of the day, and how the content rolled out."

In regard to the roles of each person involved, the principal highlighted the director of global studies as the district-level position who oversees the program. She mentioned the building-level administrator as the leader who oversees the "day-to-day

operations of the program and the direct supervisor of the dual immersion teachers." She highlighted the grade-level teachers who assisted with kindergarten planning, instruction, content, and pacing.

Interview With Teacher and Teacher Assistant

I also interviewed the teacher and teacher assistant of the kindergarten DLI classroom to further gain understanding of the input process of implementation. Questions for the teacher and teacher assistant interviews are as follows:

3. What plans, strategies, training did you experience prior to and during implementation?

4. Describe your experience with implementation.

5. What is your personal perception of implementation?

When considering plans, strategies, and training put into place before initiating the program, the teacher noted that due to COVID-19, she was hired late. The previous teacher was unable to come due to travel restrictions. She reflected on being hired the week before school starting and indicated that the resources and materials were in place, but that further learning and support came after she began teaching. This was her first teaching experience and she reflected on monthly work with the beginning teacher team and appointed kindergarten mentor teacher. She reflected on the feeling of a "sink or swim experience." She also emphasized the crucial work with the dual language mentor secured from a different school district that provided the true program support. This was a critical strategy to the success of the implementation of the program. She met weekly with both mentors who helped provide resources, materials, and pacing for a traditional kindergarten learning environment and the DLI learning environment. "The work with

the mentor was key, guiding me each week. She helped me put things into a better perspective."

Reflecting on the experience with implementation, the teacher stated "beautiful" as the students comfortably applied Spanish on a daily basis by the end of the academic year. She noted that the students grew academically and linguistically. She proudly shared they were "successful in the foundational skills of reading and writing in Spanish."

Reflecting on her personal perception of implementation, she believes the program to be effective. She shared that the start of the year was overwhelming due to COVID-19 and her first teaching experience. However, she felt the initiation of the program and classroom was successful based on student and parent responses and formative and summative assessments measuring student learning. She enjoyed teaching and recognized the enormous responsibility. "It was a big responsibility, but it worked. The students learned and enjoyed the year."

As the teacher assistant reflected on plans, strategies, and training, she talked of the strengthening of her "academic vocabulary." She noted how closely she worked with the teacher each day supporting student learning. The assistant expressed gratitude for the close relationship with the DLI mentor. She emphasized the "time and resources that were shared as a critical strategy" in the success of implementation.

The assistant referred to the experience with implementation as a learning experience. She highlighted it was "overwhelming at times because it was the initial year and COVID-19." She indicated the room for growth moving forward in the improvement of planning, pacing, and providing effective materials. She noted that the implementation

year allowed for much knowledge of "how to do things better next year." She responded that she was moving to first grade in an effort to support the new teacher coming from Colombia. She felt confident this move would assist in "familiarizing the teacher and supporting the students."

Reflecting on personal perceptions of the implementation, the assistant noted that "overall the experience was very rewarding." Not only did the students learn, but she and the teacher learned as well.

Head of Household Survey

I surveyed the heads of households of the kindergarten DLI classroom to gain an understanding of their perceptions in the area of input evaluation of the first year of implementation. The input questions for the survey are listed below.

Q8: Please select the top three reasons you used for enrolling your child in the Spanish immersion program?

Question 8 supports the top three reasons of the heads of households for choosing to enroll their child in the Spanish immersion program. There was 100% participation in regard to this particular question. Table 4 provides the responses of the participants.

Table 4

Head of Household Survey Top 3 Reasons for Enrolling in the Spanish Immersion

Program

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
The possibility for career opportunities for my child by being bilingual and bi-cultural	10	90
The personal benefits for my child to be bilingual and bi-cultural	7	64
To have our child learn about another culture	3	27
The ability to speak Spanish	7	64
My child was born in or adopted from a Spanish-speaking country	1	1
One or more family members speak Spanish	1	1
Spanish-speaking countries have close trade and economic relationships with the United States	1	1
Please share any additional reasons not listed above or any other thoughts you have in relation to this question.	1	1

In regard to the most important perception for enrolling a child in the Spanish immersion program, 90% of the heads of households noted the possibility for career opportunities of being bilingual and bi-cultural. The second reason chosen was the personal benefits of being bilingual and bi-cultural, with 64% agreeing with this statement. It is necessary to note that 64% further agreed the ability to speak Spanish is an important decision for enrolling their child in the program. Additionally, 27% of participants indicated that having their child learn about another language was an important area for deciding to enroll. Finally, one parent added an additional reason as their child was "extremely bright and this appeared to be an opportunity to further

enhance their learning."

Process

To further understand the process aspect of evaluating the program, Research Question 3 asked, "What strategies were employed to initiate the DLI with kindergarten students?" This question was included to discover what particular strategies were implemented during the process component of the DLI program. This question was answered with three administrative interview questions which included the following:

5. How does learning look in the DLI classroom?

6. How is the program monitored? And feedback given?

7. What specific strategies were implemented in the DLI classroom?

Interview With Superintendent

Reflecting on how learning looked in the classroom, the superintendent responded that due to COVID-19, she was not in the classroom as much as she would have liked. "I found myself tied to mini zoom meetings or working through various plans and schedules here in my office and with the district." She noted that she was in and out of the classroom as much as possible and saw "two classrooms of students placed 6ft apart at the beginning of the year." She saw a smaller one-on-one setting with the teacher-to-student ratio and thought this was a "good plan during COVID-19." After shifting back to one classroom mid school year, she observed small groups for reading and math instruction and centers with hands-on learning and multiple opportunities for collaboration. She shared that students were working and playing in two different languages. Throughout the year, she saw teachers "speaking and instructing in Spanish, using pictures for modeling." She indicated the use of technology resources, songs,

literacy, and individualized instruction. She noted that she observed whole group, small group, and individualized instruction, just like one would see in a "traditional kindergarten classroom setting."

When reflecting on how the program is monitored and feedback is given, the superintendent responded that it is "the responsibility of the principal and assistant principal as the instructional leaders for the school. They have a direct impact on all teachers in their building." She noted that because of the small number of students in the building, the principals were "more visible than ever before in all classrooms," including the DLI kindergarten. She indicated that the director had ongoing conversations with the DLI teacher to enhance the program and identify new strategies. She pointed out, "I was not involved in the monitoring of the program but was consistently informed of the happenings."

Responding to strategies for implementation, the superintendent identified that this was full immersion in Spanish. All classroom instruction was a "full immersion of Spanish." She shared that the teacher used native books, immersing them in cultures from around the world. Further, the teacher "invited visitors and guest speakers to speak and share with the students." The superintendent noted that technology and online resources were utilized. Additionally, she noted the consistent "communication between teacher and student, parent communication between school leaders and teachers and finally between teacher, school leaders, and parents."

Interview With CAO

Reflecting on how learning looks in the DLI classroom, the CAO noted it looked very similar to a "traditional kindergarten classroom with small groups, centers, and

individualized instruction except everything was in Spanish." She noted teachers used modeling and pictures to help with understanding Spanish instruction.

Reflecting on monitoring and feedback, the CAO referred to the principal and assistant principal as the instructional leaders using "observations to site effective teaching and learning." She also noted that administrators "informally dropped in throughout the year for conversations, observations, and monitoring." The CAO identified the director as the primary collaborator with the principals to "monitor success and identify any needs or concerns."

Reflecting on strategies for implementing the program, the CAO indicated the teacher was a beginning teacher, and a mentor was provided on site. This kindergarten teacher understood "child development and was a willing and helpful partner." She indicated the new teacher support program through a local university that provided monthly support meetings including observations and conversations. This program provided the teacher a mentor who "worked one-on-one to answer questions concerning behavior, assessment, instruction, and best classroom practices." She further indicated the partnership with another district which provided a "dual language mentor who spent 3 days in her classroom to help set up the learning environment, grouping students, and familiarizing the new teacher with DLI materials. This particular mentor zoomed weekly providing resources and ongoing support." The CAO additionally noted the partnership with a local university and professor to locate and purchase an authentic Spanish literacy library "through a grant that helped purchase books the teacher had requested." She emphasized these strategies as imperative for a beginning teacher embarking on her first year.

Interview With Director of Global Studies

Reflecting on how learning looks in the DLI classroom, the director noted that it "looks similar to a traditional kindergarten classroom. The language is rich. Activities are hands on, messy, and loud. The context is in Spanish." She emphasized the diverse cultural context of the two teachers sharing what happens with their families and celebrating their culture, highlighting the differences in Mexico, Honduras, Spain, and other countries. "The students gained understanding that people are from different places in the world, and cultures vary from place to place."

Reflecting on monitoring and feedback, the director felt this is an area for improvement. She noted that the monitoring has been "more informal this first year." She indicated the school administration formally observed the teacher and communicated consistently. She noted that the teacher worked closely with her DLI mentor. She reflected on the assessment piece of monitoring students in Spanish. She indicated the "multiple informal conversations throughout the year to check in." Moving forward, she plans to implement weekly PLC meetings to discuss student assessments, curriculum, and resources. She plans to implement "monthly surveys for teachers and parents to highlight and be more cognizant of particular needs." She wants to consistently build the program and support the teachers. She stressed the importance of receiving feedback from parents. She reiterated that parents were nervous as they began the year and needed reassurance that their children would receive the fundamental kindergarten learning necessary for future success. She looks forward to the "first group taking the third-grade EOG and they do well. Parents want their children to be successful and they are interested in that success." However, she did share that the parents are "happy and excited with the skills

their students attained this past year and enjoyed watching them grow. They are excited their children are actually speaking and understanding Spanish."

Reflecting on strategies, the director noted the first strategy "was to see what others were doing that made their program successful. We visited another district and observed their DLI classrooms and asked a lot of questions, and they shared a lot of information." She highlighted the establishment of the critical relationship with a successful district; closely collaborating and attaining that DLI mentor for weekly support was a crucial strategy for successful implementation. She indicated this "built a sense of community and a PLC for the teacher. It created connections and people to ensure successful implementation." She emphasized the need of supporting an effective PLC in the upcoming year to establish relationships and connections that will support strengthening and sustaining the program.

Interview With Principal

Considering how learning looked in the DLI classroom, the principal noted the classroom was similar to a traditional kindergarten. She highlighted centers, small groups, games, collaborative work, and the energy level. She did note that an observer would hear "a child speaking to another child, and they will go back and forth between Spanish and English, which is very interesting to me. Or if I ask a question in English, he'll respond in Spanish."

In regard to program monitoring and feedback, the principal spoke of the partnership with another district and using a DLI coach as a mentor for the teacher. She emphasized this partnership as a "professional learning network opportunity for the teacher." Further, she indicated her role of administrator, "conducting walkthrough

observations and noting best practices."

Considering specific strategies implemented in the DLI classroom, the principal stated, "a lot of the same strategies that are used in traditional kindergarten classrooms." She identified echo reading, blending words, small group work based on leveling, and centers. She emphasized the collaborative nature of the student's work; "the students are up and busy, talking and working with one another."

Interviews With Teacher and Teacher Assistant

I interviewed the teacher and teacher assistant to achieve a better understanding of the process aspect of the implementation of the kindergarten DLI program. Questions for the teacher interviews were as follows:

6. How does learning look in the DLI classroom?

7. How is the program monitored? And feedback given?

8. What specific strategies were implemented in the DLI classroom?

When asked how learning looks in the DLI classroom, the teacher indicated that the "classroom learning was structured." She noted that students were always engaged and active participants. She reflected on the fact there was no time to rest or offer a supplemental activity. "The learning day was full." She responded that small group instruction based on ability was utilized daily for reading and math. Students rotated through learning centers using paper/pencil, games, technology, and literacy to reinforce concepts. Both the teacher and assistant facilitated small group instruction. She referred to multiple zoom visits with other DLI classrooms to support authentic learning. The teacher also noted weekly native speakers via zoom who shared stories and songs to enhance appreciation of other cultures.

Responding to how the program was monitored and feedback was given, she noted this was an area for improvement. "I think the district has not gotten a handle on how to best monitor the program." She provided ongoing assessments in Spanish for reading and math. She noted that "both principals formally observed [her] teaching three times during the year and walked through on a daily basis." She further discussed the kindergarten mentor observations and weekly conversations for concerns and opportunities. However, she highlighted the need for strengthening program monitoring and feedback. She suggested, "quarterly surveys for teachers and parents to monitor growth and opportunity." She felt the program needed formal monitoring of progress to determine the level of support for curriculum, resources, materials, professional learning, and parent outreach.

The teacher indicated that a critical learning strategy was modeling. "There's a lot of modeling each day. Modeling provides an example of what you're doing, showing how, and then having them do it." She noted this strategy as imperative for student understanding. She reflected on providing mini-lessons and chunking as needed for learning. "I started with mini lessons for whole group instruction." The teacher indicated that small group instruction driven by student assessment was vital for individualized learning. Hands-on activities were also facilitated. She further emphasized the use of guest speakers to foster an appreciation of different cultures.

In response to how the learning looked in the DLI classroom, the teacher assistant first responded, "I want to say magical. I know that's not a measurable unit, but that is the only way I can respond." She went on to note that modeling, small groups, and individualized learning were necessary strategies. She highlighted the collaboration in

reading and math centers as an integral part of their learning. These centers were critical for kindergarten play and social development. She indicated the use of literacy, songs, technology, games, and paper/pencil activities as strategies used each day. Further, she noted the use of weekly speakers as a necessary strategy for strengthening the appreciation of diverse cultures.

Reflecting on monitoring and feedback, the teacher assistant noted that she and the teacher provided ongoing assessments in Spanish to gauge student growth in reading and math. She indicated these took place in one-on-one, small group, and whole group activities. She further responded that the principal and assistant visited the classroom daily and provided formal observations. The teacher assistant also noted that district administrators would visit and ask questions. "Administration came in and out often and the kids looked forward to sharing what they were learning."

Concerning strategies implemented in the DLI kindergarten, the teacher assistant emphasized "rotating groups of three, four, or five students based on ability for reading and math." She noted this was a crucial strategy for the opportunity to collaborate and learn from each other. She reflected this strategy motivated students. "They were able to feed off each other and help each other. It built their confidence. The higher group was really able to excel. They pushed each other further. That was a main strategy that really worked." The teacher assistant mentioned "hands-on activities and much modeling" as additional strategies for ensuring understanding.

Head of Household Survey

I surveyed heads of households to evaluate their perceptions of the process aspect of the implementation of the Spanish immersion program. The questions surrounding this

element of the evaluation are listed below:

1. Please rate your level of concern (or worry) related to your child's progress in the Spanish immersion program.

2. How much does your child like learning Spanish?

3. How often do you help your child with Spanish learning?

4. How often do you help your child with Spanish school assignments?

5. How often do you help your child with English reading and writing in general?

It is important to note that the number varied for the responses of the heads of households to the first question regarding the level of concern or worry related to their child's progress in the Spanish immersion program. The question included six different areas that included the ability to speak Spanish, ability to learn English, intellectual development, self-confidence of being bilingual, social skill development, and development of intercultural sensitivity. Table 5 provides the responses to the survey question.

Table 5

Head of Household Survey Responses to Level of Concern of Child's Progress

Ability to speak Spanish	Frequency	Percentage
Significant growth	1	7.1
Moderate growth	2	25
Some growth	5	35.7

Ability to learn English	Frequency	Percentage
Significant growth	2	14.3
Moderate growth	1	7.1
Some growth	1	7.1
No growth was observed	1	7.1

Intellectual development	Frequency	Percentage
Significant growth	1	7.1
Moderate growth	2	14.3
Some growth	3	21.4

Self-confidence of being bilingual	Frequency	Percentage
Moderate growth	1	7.1
Some growth	4	28.6
No growth was observed	2	14.3

Social skills development	Frequency	Percentage
Significant growth	2	14.3
Some growth	5	35.7
No growth was observed	1	7.1

Development of intercultural sensitivity	Frequency	Percentage
Moderate growth	1	7.1
Some growth	3	21.4
No growth was observed	2	14.3

In regard to the perceptions of heads of households of their child's ability to speak

and understand Spanish, 35.7% stated that their child presented some growth. It is

important to note that 25% agreed their child exhibited moderate growth.

Concerning the ability to learn English, only five heads of households responded. In regard to exhibiting significant growth, 14.3% agreed.

In regard to intellectual development, eight heads of households responded; 21.4% sighted some growth, while 14.3% noted moderate growth.

Concerning self-confidence of being bilingual, seven heads of households participated; 28.6% noted some growth. It is important to note that 14.3% sighted no growth in regard to self-confidence.

Relating to social skill development, there were eight responses of heads of households; 35.7% of those responded some growth was observed, while 14.3% noted significant growth.

Additionally, in regard to intercultural sensitivity, eight heads of households responded; 21.4% noted some growth. It is important to note that 14.3% emphasized that no growth was observed.

Finally, one parent wrote that the family was concerned that "she may fall behind due to no Spanish speakers in the home."

When asked how much does your child like learning Spanish, 11 heads of households responded; 73% agreed that their child likes speaking a second language, while 27% noted their child extremely likes speaking Spanish.

Table 6

Head of Household Survey Responses to Helping With Spanish Learning

Responses	Frequency	Percent
Daily	6	42.9
Weekly	1	7.1
A few times per week	4	28.6

In response to how often the heads of households help with Spanish learning, 11 responded; 42.9% agreed they help their child daily, while 28.6% responded with a few times a week.

Table 7

Head of Household Survey Responses to Helping With Spanish School Assignments

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Daily	4	28.6
Weekly	5	35.7
A few times per week	2	14.3

Concerning how often the heads of households help with Spanish school assignments, 11 responded; 35.7% stated they help weekly, while 28.6% help their child daily.

Table 8

Head of Household Survey Responses to Helping With English Reading and Writing

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Daily	6	42.9
Weekly	2	14.3
A few times per week	2	14.3
A few times per month	1	7.1

In regard to how often the heads of households help their child with English reading and writing in general, 11 responded; 42.9% agreed they help daily, and 14.3%

stated they help weekly and a few times per week.

Product

Research Questions 4 and 5 for the product aspect of the evaluation asked, "How effective was the implementation of the DLI classroom during the initial year?" and "How does a school district program implement change during a crisis?" These research questions were included to measure the success of the first year of implementation and to identify opportunities for growth for the following academic year. Additionally, the final question sought to identify how if any implementation was different based on the COVID-19 pandemic. Further, the final two questions sought to discover how leaders lead during a crisis. The product question was answered using five interview survey questions that included the following:

8. What are the strengths of the DLI classroom?

9. What are the areas for improvement?

10. How effective is the DLI program?

Crisis Leadership

11. How did COVID-19 affect the rollout of the DLI program?

12. What were key strategies implemented to address the challenges accompanying a crisis such as the pandemic?

Interview With Superintendent

The superintendent identified "communication as a key strength of the dual language kindergarten which included the communication between teacher and student, between the school leaders and teachers, and finally between teachers, school leaders, and parents." She further indicated the "investment in individuals as far as the instruction

of students." She felt the teachers were passionate about their work, establishing a true connection with their students. Finally, she responded that the "teachers persevered, never gave up, and created a loving, nurturing, learning environment where all students were appreciated and grew."

The superintendent identified pacing as an improvement moving forward. "I think having a scope and sequence, a guide for where to start and how to proceed." She felt that with the next year's addition of a first grade, the teachers needed a learning map or guide that provides a scope and sequence for the academic year. She noted that two new teachers and a teacher assistant are arriving in July from Colombia. This intentional pacing guide will provide a structure for planning and conversations. "I think just making the transition into their new school year with a scope and sequence will make it easier for them and benefit our students and parents."

The superintendent responded that the initial year of the DLI kindergarten was "highly effective." She highlighted that the program was successful even after experiencing learning and teaching during COVID-19, the hiring of a new teacher so close to the beginning of school, and the uncertainty of parents.

> We had a wonderful school year, through COVID-19, the loss of a teacher, parents unsure of the learning process, it was a successful year. The support they received from their kindergarten colleagues, school administrators, district administrators, and DLI mentor, ensured they survived and thrived.

She identified the support of mentors, school and district administrators, and kindergarten colleagues as critical to that success. She reflected on the second half of the year as instrumental where the classroom was combined and all students were learning as a

whole entity. She emphasized that parents are happy with the program. "Students are speaking Spanish at home and love the learning."

In response to how COVID-19 affected the rollout, the superintendent spoke of losing the initial teacher from Columbia because of the travel ban. She noted the district was forced to hire a beginning teacher a week before school started and emphasized the overwhelming feeling for all individuals at the time. She highlighted that "the choice to not move forward was not debatable." She noted that the "decision to not implement would have negatively impacted the program." Again, she reiterated the critical strategy of locating a DLI mentor for weekly support.

The superintendent identified communication as a key strategy during a crisis. She emphasized the necessity of transparency. "We have to prove to our families and to our staff that they are safe in school, that we are adhering to proper protocols and procedures." Further, the superintendent identified intentionality, planning, and collaboration as imperative. She reflected on the multiple hours spent with her core team planning and discussing as imperative to the success of the program implementation and the success of the school district as a whole.

> I am sure we spent 30 to 45 hours together, maybe more, and it was good healthy dialogue that put us all on the same page as far as communication of information. I think about the amount of time we spent planning and putting things in writing and getting community input and revising as needed.

Additionally, she pointed out the ongoing monitoring and revising as imperative to success. Last, she emphasized the connection with the community and the multiple meetings with families and staff as necessary for success. "We used social media, our

website, parent meetings, and virtual meetings in order to keep everyone in the know."

Interview With the CAO

The CAO pointed out the mentor support from dual immersion, kindergarten, and the local university as a major strength of the implementation process. "The number one strength was the ongoing mentor support. The second strength was that students grew academically and are becoming bilingual. Number three, I would think academically these students are going to be higher performing in the long run." An additional strength the CAO noted was the appreciation of "various cultures." Finally, a strength she foresees moving forward is student academic success as they progress through school.

When reflecting upon areas for improvement, the CAO emphasized that the teacher was a beginning teacher and with that came much-needed support. COVID-19 hindered teacher learning, as "she could not visit other DLI programs to observe and learn." Moving forward, the CAO identified the need for intentional professional learning as the program has "hired two new teachers and an assistant from Colombia." She emphasized that the teachers did have DLI experience which will be advantageous for success. Additionally, she identified the need to support the teachers who are moving here from Columbia ensuring "the district provides a smooth transition so they feel welcome and a part of the school and community. I think that support for the DLI teachers is a necessity moving forward." Finally, she indicated program monitoring as a necessary improvement for "gauging areas for necessary growth and sustainment."

The CAO emphasized that the "program was successful." Based on classroom assessment data, the students grew in reading and math. She pointed out that the Spanish skills of students improved based on assessment data. "It was a highly effective year."

The CAO felt COVID-19 did affect the implementation of the program. She referred to the process of securing a beginning teacher a week before school began. She wondered aloud if "the teacher's lack of DLI experience or kindergarten experience hindered the learning. I would say COVID definitely affected the process of attaining a teacher for the classroom." The CAO spoke of the classroom design (splitting the class first half of year) and students remaining masked throughout the year. She questioned if this might have "hindered if any their ability to speak Spanish." Again, she reiterated that the student data provided evidence of success. "We did not let COVID kill our spirits, we made the most of the year."

The CAO identified communication as the "key strategy in any crisis such as COVID-19." She additionally highlighted "patience, collaboration, and planning" as necessary strategies for leading during a pandemic or crisis. Finally, she pointed out that "maintaining a connection with staff, families, and communities as key for building trust."

Interview With Director of Global Studies

The director indicated that one major strength of the DLI classroom was "incorporating the appreciation of different cultures and celebrating the students' differences." She emphasized that both the teacher and assistant "did a beautiful job of making every child in that classroom feel like their family and their culture and how they were brought up and what their family did was the most important." She stressed that all the students felt they could "openly and proudly share their culture without being judged or measured." The director shared that the program provided a stronger identity with the native language, Spanish. Another major strength was that all students grew in reading.

She noted they were "reading with purpose and expression and comprehended what they were reading, making connections to the text." Additionally, the students learned in Spanish whether it be math, science, or reading.

Reflecting on the improvements moving forward, the director noted the need for intentional monitoring and feedback of the program. Further "authentic Spanish materials and curriculum" were two additional areas for improvement. She sighted effective learning tools for the classroom as an opportunity for improvement for the upcoming academic year. She further noted the need for ensuring a "smooth transition for the new DLI teachers who are moving from Colombia with little personal resources." The director shared that she is working to ensure that the teachers have what they need to begin living in the area, including "housing, furniture, food, and local information." She also desires to ensure the district intentionally supports establishing relationships and building that "sense of family."

Concerning the effectiveness of the program, the director emphasized, "It's amazing." She looks forward to the next 3 to 4 years and the growth the students will achieve.

In regard to COVID-19 and the implementation of the DLI program, the director did not feel it was affected because kindergarten was in person. "We were fortunate that our kindergarteners were face-to-face from the get-go." She did note that COVID-19 made it difficult for parents, teachers, and the community to fully understand the program. "They could not visit, observe, or volunteer, which would have provided a better understanding of the learning process." She did highlight that some teacher's children participated in the kindergarten classroom which assisted with "sharing

communication and ultimate buy-in." She noted that COVID-19 inhibited the district in "showcasing the program." Finally, the director indicated that the teacher could not visit other schools to observe the structure of the learning day and strategies for teaching and learning. This would have provided a beginning teacher the opportunity to observe and understand the DLI process.

The director identified communication as a "key strategy for leading during a crisis." She spoke of intentionally providing "transparency to support trust." She further indicated the need for collaboration and planning between the district and staff. Finally, the relationship with family and community was emphasized as necessary for crisis leadership.

Interview With Principal

Considering the strengths of the program, the principal stated, "students are learning to use their brain in a different way, but it's coming very naturally to them." She highlighted the level of student competence and confidence in speaking, reading, and writing in Spanish has grown consistently throughout the year. "You would go in and do walkthroughs and ask students 'what are you learning?' or 'how do you say this in Spanish?' They would not want to share, but by spring they would just begin rattling off." The principal further emphasized the level of awareness of different languages and cultures. "The culture piece is huge."

In regard to areas for improvement, the principal reflected on aligning the DLI classroom with the other kindergarten classrooms. She spoke of grade-level teams working closely so students from across classrooms are involved with the learning and experience, "creating natural alliances."

The principal indicated student growth in reading, writing, and speaking Spanish as a measure of how effective the DLI classroom was this past year. Additionally, she pointed out the differentiation necessary for student success in regard to hands-on resources and tools. She reflected on the growth of one student from February to the end of the year. "I think of one student in particular. The teacher provided the extra resources necessary to ensure the student was successful. The kid just blossomed and was on target by the time she left."

In regard to COVID-19 and affecting the implementation of the DLI program, the principal reflected upon hiring. The native teacher from Colombia was unable to leave her country because of travel restrictions. She noted that small group instruction was limited at the beginning of the year and "wearing masks and trying to teach students a different language behind the mask, I think was very difficult. However, this was difficult for all kindergartens trying to learn to read when the teacher is wearing a mask." Additionally, the principal spoke about the large number of students in the class (24) and splitting the classroom at the beginning of the year, having the teacher and assistant switching was not ideal. She indicated that parents could not visit the classroom, "to nurture that sense of community with families." She emphasized the teacher communicated effectively throughout the year; however, the "face-to-face connection was missing."

Concerning crisis leadership and necessary strategies, the principal identified communication as "number one." She reflected on the work of the leadership team, the multiple meetings, and working through scenarios and questions. She emphasized the communication between the staff, families, and communities.

Information changes quickly, and the team is making recommendations and

decisions on the information you have at that time. It is necessary to be open and

upfront so all would have confidence for next steps. I think it comes back to trust

and communication.

The principal highlighted patience and grace as key. She noted that "nobody was an

expert, because it was all brand new. We had to work together and be understanding.

Priorities had to change." Finally, the principal emphasized the safety and well-being of

the students, instructional integrity, and "just being human."

Interview With Teacher and Teacher Assistant

The teacher and teacher assistant were interviewed to gain perspective on how

successful the final product of the DLI classroom truly was. The teacher and assistant

interview questions for the product aspect of the evaluation were as follows:

9. Describe how DLI has impacted the academic achievement of students.

10. What are the areas for improvement?

11. How effective is the DLI?

When considering how the DLI process impacted student achievement, the

teacher emphasized that the "students learned and are now speaking Spanish." They are

applying concepts with confidence.

The assistant stated the same. "The kindergarten students are reading and

speaking in Spanish." They are applying their learning at home and with friends.

The teacher identified assessment of the program as an area for improvement. She

noted that the curriculum needed improvement in regard to "authentic resources and

materials." She pointed out that much of the resources were not translated properly and

many had to be produced by hand. She further emphasized the need for a DLI mentor for both kindergarten and first grade next year. She highlighted that the mentor tailored professional learning to fit the teacher and needs of the classroom and students. She also reflected that classroom visits would provide further professional learning.

The assistant identified resources and materials as areas for improvement moving forward. She suggested program evaluation for teachers and parents as an effective opportunity. Additionally, she noted that the work with the DLI mentor each week was a significant help for the teacher and students.

Both the teacher and assistant emphasized the effectiveness of the DLI kindergarten classroom. The teacher noted that students were reading and becoming bilingual. "The students understand more than they speak at this time." She further noted the quality of teaching and reflection. "I look forward to the next year." They both spoke of the growth when looking at student assessments in reading and math. They noted that student reading and math assessments proved effective in providing direction for grouping and student levels. The assistant stated, "The kids love the class and kids from other classrooms are trying to use Spanish. It's working."

Head of Household Survey

I surveyed the heads of households to evaluate the product aspect of the implementation of the Spanish kindergarten DLI program. The questions surrounding this aspect of the evaluation are listed below.

1. Please select the three most important strengths of the Spanish immersion program.

2. Please select the areas that are in need of improvement in the Spanish

immersion program.

3. How much growth in the following areas have you observed in your child since they have enrolled in the Spanish immersion program?

4. Please rate your level of satisfaction in your child's growth.

5. Please share any additional comments or feedback about your child's participation in the Spanish immersion program below.

In regard to the first survey question concerning the three most important strengths of the Spanish immersion program, 14 heads of households responded. This question included eight different choices to consider which included organization of the program, learning environment/climate, program curriculum, communication from school/teacher to you, school administrators' interest/involvement in the program, relationship between the child/children and the teacher, student progress reporting, and student relationships. Table 9 provides their responses to this question.

Table 9

Head of Household Survey Responses to the Important Strengths

Responses	Frequency	Percent
Organization of the program	3	21.4
Learning environment/ climate	9	64.3
Program curriculum	5	35.7
Communication from the school/teacher to you	5	35.7
School administrators' interest/involvement in the program	4	28.6
Relationship between your child/children and their teachers	10	71.4
Student progress reporting	5	35.7
Student relationships	1	7.1

In regard to the most important strengths of the Spanish immersion program, 71.4% of heads of households responded the relationship between the child and their teachers. The next most important strength noted was the learning environment/climate

with 64.3% in agreement; 35.7% of heads of households agreed that program curriculum, communication from the school/ teacher to you, and student progress reporting were important strengths concerning the Spanish immersion program.

I surveyed the heads of households concerning areas of improvement that included the organization of the program, program curriculum, communication from the school/teacher to you, school administrator's interest/involvement in the program, the relationship between your child/children and their teacher(s), and the student progress reporting. Table 10 provides the frequency and percentage of the responses of the heads of households.

Table 10

Head of Household Survey of Areas in Need of Improvement

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Organization of the program	5	35.7
Program curriculum	5	35.7
Communication from the school/teacher to you	7	50
School administrator's interest/involvement in the program	2	14.3
Relationship between your child/children and their teacher(s)	3	21.4
Student progress reporting	6	42.9

Concerning areas of needed improvements for the Spanish kindergarten immersion program, 50% of heads of households noted communication from the school/teacher to them, while 42.9% identified student progress reporting. Regarding the program curriculum and organization of the program, 35.7% stated both as areas of needed improvement. It is important to highlight that 21.4% of the heads of households indicated the relationship between their child/children and their teacher(s) as in need of improvement. Further, one head of household wrote that classroom management with "quarterly expectations to be given BEFORE the quarter starts," as a necessary

improvement. They went on to add, "age-appropriate homework assignments, allowing processing time, take into account not every child is heritage speaker or has access to heritage speakers, and a cheat sheet would be helpful." Finally, another parent noted that "teacher communication improved, but it was frustratingly confusing in the beginning."

In regard to growth, I surveyed heads of households concerning the ability to speak and understand Spanish, ability to learn English, intellectual development, self-confidence of being bilingual, social skills development, and development of intercultural sensitivity. It is important to note that 11 of the 14 heads of households responded to the question. Table 11 provides the responses of the heads of households to these areas of growth.

Table 11

Head of Household Survey of Student Growth Observed

Responses	Frequency	Percent
Ability to speak and understand Spanish		
Significant growth	3	21.4
Moderate growth	6	42.9
Some growth	2	14.3
Ability to learn English		
Significant growth	2	14.3
Moderate growth	1	7.1
Some growth	3	21.4
No growth observed	2	14.3
Intellectual development		
Significant growth	5	35.7
Moderate growth	4	28.6
Some growth	2	14.3
Self-confidence of being bilingual		
Significant growth	2	14.3
Moderate growth	4	28.6
Some growth	5	35.7
Social skills development		
Significant growth	4	28.6
Moderate growth	3	21.4
Some growth	4	28.6
Development of intercultural sensitivity		
Significant growth	2	14.3
Moderate growth	5	35.7
Some growth	2	14.3

In regard to growth observed in the ability to speak and understand Spanish, 11

responded; 42.9% heads of households responded moderate growth, while 21.4% noted

significant growth. Concerning the ability to learn English, only eight heads of households responded; 14.3% noted significant growth, while 21.4% observed some growth with their child. In regard to intellectual development, 11 responded; 35.7% heads of households indicated significant growth, while 28.6% observed moderate growth. Concerning self-confidence of being bilingual, 11 heads of households responded; 35.7% responded they observed some growth, while 28.6% observed moderate growth. In the area of social skill development, 11 heads of households again responded. The agreement was split with 28.6% heads of households indicating both significant growth and some growth. Additionally, 11 responded to growth in the development of intercultural sensitivity; 35.7% of heads of households identified moderate growth. Finally, one parent emphasized their child showed particular growth in the "pride of his heritage."

Finally, I surveyed the heads of households in regard to their level of satisfaction with their child's growth during the year. It is important to highlight that 11 of 14 responded to this question. Areas of growth in regard to satisfaction in the survey were Spanish speaking, Spanish reading, Spanish writing, English speaking, English reading, and English writing. Table 12 provides the satisfaction of the heads of households of their child's growth during the implementation year.

Table 12

Head of Household Survey of Satisfaction in Growth

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Spanish speaking		
Very satisfied	4	28.6
Satisfied	7	50
Spanish reading		
Very satisfied	4	28.6
Satisfied	5	35.7
Dissatisfied	2	14.3
Spanish writing		
Very satisfied	3	21.4
Satisfied	6	42.9
Dissatisfied	2	14.3
English speaking		
Very satisfied	1	7.1
Satisfied	5	35.7
Dissatisfied	2	14.3
Very dissatisfied	1	7.1
N/A	2	14.3
English reading		
Satisfied	3	21.4
Dissatisfied	2	14.3
Very dissatisfied	2	14.3
N/A	4	28.6
English writing		
Satisfied	3	21.4
Dissatisfied	3	21.4
N/A	3	21.4

Concerning the level of satisfaction with their child's Spanish-speaking growth,

28.6% noted they were very satisfied, while 50% stated satisfied. In regard to satisfaction with their child's Spanish reading growth, 28.6% were very satisfied, while 35.7% were satisfied. Considering satisfaction with their child's Spanish writing growth, over 60% were satisfied. It is important to highlight that when looking at satisfaction with their child's English-speaking growth, two chose not applicable; 35.7% of heads of households noted satisfaction with their child's growth. Regarding English reading growth, four heads of households chose not applicable; 21.4% noted satisfaction in their child's English reading growth. Additionally, in terms of English writing growth, three noted not applicable. The response was split with 21.4% noting satisfaction and 21.4% stating dissatisfaction. Finally, one parent wrote,

> I don't know how the program works. I don't know when they will begin any English instruction. I am concerned but have been told to "trust the process." My child made growth this year and I'm stepping out in faith that she won't be behind her English peers when it comes to learning English phonics. I have been told that the new DLI parents received a lot more information about the program and process than we did. I would like another session where we can learn more about the program. I still feel in the dark.

Another parent shared,

> My child had one assignment sent home once a week to complete in Spanish. I wish that after about ½ way through the year that more would have been sent home daily or on one day for the week. The teacher did offer materials to use when I asked for things to do nightly. I believe it would be very helpful for parents to have books, Spanish phrases, or something that pertains to their

learning sent home each week for children to do each night. Overall, my child

loved kindergarten and learning Spanish. I'm pleased with that and can't wait to

see how this program continues to grow.

Last, a parent emphasized, "Right now I am capable of teaching English reading and

writing. I do worry I will not be able to teach him sentence structure and English writing

skills as he gets older."

Common Themes With Administrative Team

Several common themes were identified when analyzing the administrative

interviews. Table 13 provides the overarching topics indicated by administrators.

Table 13

Common Themes Identified From Interviews With Administrative Team

CIPP evaluation	Common themes of administrators
Context (RQ 1)	
Q1 Goals	Implement DLI program
	Bilingual in Spanish
	Biliterate in Spanish
Q2 Need/purpose	Acceptance/appreciation of different cultures
	Employment opportunities
	Academic opportunities
Input (RQ 2)	
Q3 Plans, strategies, training	Collaboration with school districts
	Hiring
	Locating DLI mentor
	Professional learning
	Resources, materials for classroom
Q4 Roles	Teachers
	Local administration
	District administration
Process (RQ 3)	
Q5 How learning looks	Whole and small groups
	Centers
	Individualized/differentiated learning
	Collaboration
Q6 Monitoring/Feedback	Student assessments
	Principal/assistant formal observations
	Director conversations
	District visits and questions
Q7 Classroom Strategies	Modeling
	Differentiation
	Hands on, centers, collaboration
	Small group instruction (level)
	Principal/assistant formal observations walkthroughs
	Informal conversations
	District partnerships
	Mentor (DLI, kindergarten, BT local university)
	Professional learning

CIPP evaluation	Common themes of administrators
Product (RQ 4)	
Q8 Strengths	Student Growth in math and reading
	Appreciation of different cultures
	Mentor
	Confidence
Q9 Improvement	Program monitoring
	Professional learning (mentor, classroom visits)
	scope and sequence
	Materials
	New teacher support
Q10 Effective	Highly effective
	Reading growth
	Bilingual growth
Q11 COVID-19	Hiring
	Two classrooms
	Professional learning
	Beginning teacher support
Q12 Crisis leadership strategies	Communicate for buy-in and trust
	Collaborate
	Community and family relationship

Reflecting on the first question, pertaining to the goals of the DLI program, the administrative team noted bilingual and biliterate students by the time they enter high school. Further, all four administrators spoke of students' ability to read, speak, listen, and write in two languages, specifically Spanish.

Reflecting on the second question, pertaining to the perception of need and purpose of the program, the first common theme was the acceptance and appreciation of other cultures, specifically Hispanic. The second theme that emerged was employment in the future. The team noted academic success and also future employment and career success.

Common themes across the interviews in reference to the third question

concerning strategies and trainings were hiring, locating a mentor, staff development, and relationships with other districts. Further, the district administration identified allocation of resources and materials as necessary strategies for implementing the DLI classroom.

Common themes referenced for the fourth question in reference to the roles of those involved with implementation were the same across the interviews. They all identified the teachers, local administrators, and district administration. It is important to note that the director also included the role of students and parents as imperative to the implementation and success of the program.

Common themes for the fifth question surrounding how learning looks in the kindergarten DLI classroom were the district administration noted that it looked like a traditional kindergarten; all indicated that whole group, small group, and individualized learning were used throughout the year along with hands-on-activities that emphasized student collaboration; and the team also highlighted that consistent modeling was a necessary strategy for understanding.

Common themes for the sixth question pertaining to how the program is monitored and feedback is given were the administrative team all referred to the principal and assistant as the instructional leaders; the school leaders provided the formal observations throughout the year; walkthroughs and drop-ins were common on a daily basis; and informal conversations were used to check in. All shared that a definite area for noted improvement was program monitoring.

A common theme from the administrative interviews for the seventh question pertaining to strategies for implementation was partnerships with other experienced DLI districts. This professional learning strategy was referenced multiple times throughout the

interviews as positively supporting the teacher and students. Additionally, modeling and visuals were noted as a significant classroom strategy to ensure understanding. Differentiation was another tool for supporting individualized learning in one-on-one settings and small group instruction. Collaborative centers were referenced as a strategy used daily.

A common key strength identified in the eighth question concerning the strengths of the program was student growth in math and reading. Further, the administrative team noted the appreciation of diverse cultures.

Concerning improvement in the ninth question, the team highlighted program monitoring as an opportunity for growth. They also emphasized teacher support which includes tailored professional learning, authentic Spanish materials and curriculum, and a yearly scope and sequence. Additionally, the team pointed out the need to support the upcoming new teachers' transition to a new country and community.

In regard to the 10th question, the district team all proudly stated the DLI kindergarten implementation was highly effective. Students were comfortable with acquiring Spanish, and reading and math grew. Further, the appreciation of other cultures was a strength for the program.

A common theme concerning the 11th question and how COVID-19 affected the rollout of the implementation was the team recognized the struggles with hiring. They further identified the splitting of the DLI classroom. Additionally, supporting the beginning teacher was recognized as difficult with COVID-19 and restrictions on visiting classrooms and teachers to support professional learning and growth.

In regard to the 12th question and crisis leadership qualities, the team identified

the crucial strategy of collaboration. They felt communication was key to gaining buy-in and trust. Further, the team identified the need for collaboration and distributive leadership for researching, planning, and communicating.

Common Themes for Teacher and Teacher Assistant

Common themes were identified for the teacher and teacher assistant at the elementary school in reference to the interviews and implementation of the kindergarten DLI program. Table 14 represents the overall generalities discovered while analyzing the interviews.

Table 14

Common Themes From Interviews With Teacher and Teacher Assistant

CIPP evaluation	Common themes of participants
Context (RQ 1)	
Role	Instructional support
Goals	Biliterate/bilingual in Spanish
	Appreciation of various cultures
Input (RQ 2)	
Plans, strategies, training	Collaboration with mentors
Experience	Students reading and writing in Spanish
Perception	Overwhelming
	Successful
Process (RQ 3)	
How learning looks in classroom	Modeling, visuals
	Chunking
	Small groups based on student ability
	Centers, hands on
	Student collaboration/conversation
	Individualized learning
Monitoring/feedback	Student assessments in Spanish for reading and math
	Principal/assistant formal and informal observations
	Director conversations
	District administration visits
	Whole and small groups
Strategies in classroom	Centers
	Student collaboration
	Student assessment
	Visitors
	Literacy, technology, games, songs, paper/ pencil

(continued)

CIPP evaluation	Common themes of participants
Product (RQ 4)	
Academic Achievement	Student growth
	Speaking Spanish
	Confident
Improvement	Program evaluation
	Curriculum and materials
	Mentor, classroom visits
Effective	Highly effective
	Reading and math growth
	Bilingual growth
	Teacher as reflector

Reflecting upon common themes between the teacher and assistant when considering the first question concerning their roles in the district implementation, both the teacher and assistant referred to the instructional component. They referenced their daily work each week providing instruction and support for learning. They also referenced their work creating a community with families and caregivers as imperative to the success of the program. The teacher emphasized daily and weekly communication to provide that connection.

A common theme identified for the second question concerning the goals of the DLI program was both teacher and assistant recognized the support of developing bilingual and biliterate students. Further, they emphasized the appreciation of various cultures.

A common theme across the third, fourth, and fifth questions was collaboration with others. Also, both teacher and assistant emphasized the success of the implementation. They referenced the student data as evidence of students showing growth in reading, math, and writing in Spanish. Further, the implementation was

effective; students grew and were successful.

Common themes identified concerning the sixth question of how learning looked in the dual language kindergarten included modeling, small groups, centers, and individualized learning. The teachers noted that modeling and visuals were imperative to understanding.

A common theme concerning the seventh question was the interview assisted in identifying monitoring and feedback as areas for growth in the next school year. They both highlighted the student assessments in Spanish for reading and math as effective, principal and assistant principal observations and daily walkthroughs, district administration visits throughout the year, and the need for improvement of overall program monitoring through surveys with teachers and parents.

The common themes identified for the eighth question concerning strategies implemented in the classroom highlighted modeling and visuals as well as small groups based on ability and driven by student assessments. Collaboration in centers with hands-on activities was also noted. Weekly Zooms with visitors from various countries were used to strengthen culture. Both teachers spoke about using literacy, technology, games, songs, and paper/pencil to ensure understanding.

Reflecting upon the impact on academic achievement, the teacher and assistant reiterated the student growth in Spanish reading and writing. They further emphasized the student's confidence in speaking Spanish.

Considering improvement in the DLI program moving forward, the teacher and assistant spoke of the value in evaluating the program and sharing feedback. The teacher highlighted that she often worried that she was the "only one who knew what specifically

was occurring in the classroom." She indicated the need for quarterly teacher and parent surveys. Both the teacher and assistant mentioned the continued improvement in authentic Spanish curriculum and materials. They further reiterated the significance of the DLI mentor for the teacher and students and suggested classroom visits moving forward to support teacher growth.

Reflecting on the overall effectiveness of the implementation of the DLI kindergarten, both the teacher and assistant stated that the program was highly effective. They were pleased with student growth towards becoming bilingual and biliterate. The reading and math data revealed this growth. The teacher responded, "students and parents loved the class. I look forward to the next year. We are both much more confident in the process."

Summary

The study used a mixed method approach to evaluate the school district's first-year implementation of a kindergarten Spanish DLI program, which was facilitated using Stufflebeam's (2003) CIPP model of program evaluation. Interviews and survey data informed the following research questions.

1. **Context:** What factors were considered when the district implemented the DLI program?

2. **Input:** What specific resources were needed to implement the DLI classroom?

3. **Process:** What strategies were employed to initiate the DLI with kindergarten students?

4. **Product:** How effective was the implementation of the DLI classroom during the initial year?

5. **Crisis Leadership:** How does a school district program implement change during a crisis?

Qualitative and quantitative measures were used to evaluate the program through interviews with district administration and the elementary school's principal, teacher, and teacher assistant and a survey of the kindergarten heads of households. After analyzing the interview and survey, the following common perspectives were determined:

- District administration, teachers, and parents understood that the purpose of the DLI program is to support students' bilingual and biliterate ability, appreciation of various cultures, and academic and employment opportunities.

- The kindergarten Spanish immersion teacher benefited from the weekly collaboration with the DLI mentor.

- Teaching strategies that include modeling, chunking, collaboration, small groups, centers, and individualized learning had a positive impact on student learning.

- District administrators, teachers, and parents agreed the program had a positive impact in regard to student academic growth and confidence in reading, writing, and speaking Spanish and intercultural sensitivity and appreciation.

- District administration and teachers believed the district needs to continue to improve program monitoring and authentic Spanish materials and curriculum.

- Parents believed that the program needs improvement in regard to the communication from teacher/school to parents and student progress reporting.

- Collaboration and open communication are key strategies for leading and

establishing trust during a crisis.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Overview

School districts are implementing high-achieving academic programs that promote global learning such as the DLI program with the intent of developing skills authentically in two languages. The objective of this learning initiative is to support bilingual and biliterate students prepared for a global 21st century (Fernando, 2018). It is important to highlight that North Carolina is promoting bilingual education in its 5-year strategic plan as a strategy not only to achieve this goal but also in response to the steadily increasing Hispanic population (NCDPI, 2020).

This study sought to evaluate the implementation of a kindergarten Spanish DLI program using the CIPP evaluation model. The assessment model was designated because of its ability to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the implementation and sustainability of a program (Stufflebeam, 2003). District administration, teacher, and parent perceptions were captured using personal interviews and a survey. The data collected were provided to the district to assist in informing direction and implications for the future of the Spanish DLI program.

Restatement of the Problem

It is necessary for school districts to evaluate and identify best strategies for the successful development of a learning initiative. This requires the identification of successes, challenges, and improvements to ensure positive student outcomes (Lindholm-Leary, 2012). The evaluation and identification are necessary during a stable year, but it is even more significant during times of duress such as a global health and education crisis such as COVID-19. The purpose of the study was to evaluate the implementation of

a 90:10 model of a kindergarten Spanish DLI program using the CIPP model evaluation

to inform school districts of effective strategies they can apply during a traditional school

year and in this case, during times of duress. The school implemented the DLI program

during the 2020-2021 school year while confronted with the COVID-19 pandemic. I

sought to analyze the perceptions of district personnel, the principal, teachers, and parents

of the initial year of implementation to identify the effectiveness of the program. The

study used a mixed methods approach using a head of household survey as well as

qualitative district administration and teacher interview data.

Summary of Findings

Chapter 4 provides the data analysis to respond to the research questions aligned

to the CIPP program evaluation. Using qualitative interviews with district administration,

the elementary principal, teacher, and teacher assistant, I was able to examine their

personal perceptions of the initial year of implementation of the DLI program.

Additionally, I used a head of household survey to analyze their perspectives of the

success of the first-year kindergarten DLI program. Common themes and data gained

from both the interviews and surveys were summarized in tables presented in Chapter 4.

Context Evaluation

The context evaluation assesses the need and goals of an organization and

evaluates the ability to meet the goals identified (Stufflebeam, 2003). Personal interviews

and a survey were used to measure the context evaluation and answered Research

Question 1, "What factors were considered when the district implemented the DLI

program?"

Analyzing the district and teacher interviews, the Spanish DLI program was

implemented to support bilingual and biliterate students by middle school. All interviewed discussed the importance of accelerated learning and future employment opportunities. Further, both administration and teachers highlighted the acceptance and appreciation of various cultures as a necessary component of the DLI learning experience.

In regard to the perceptions of the heads of households, they agreed that future career opportunities were a significant reason for choosing to enroll their child in the DLI program. Further, they noted personal benefit and academic achievement. Finally, the ability to speak Spanish was indicated as an important reason for enrolling their child in the DLI program.

Lindholm-Leary (2013) wrote that bilingual instruction, particularly dual immersion, improves students' overall capabilities. Linholm-Leary (2013) found that all students score greater on standardized reading, math, and language ability assessments by the end of elementary school including those identifying as "at risk" (para. 10), EL, African American, and low socioeconomic status. Collier and Thomas (2017) found that bilingual education closes the achievement gap and specifically, bilingual students outperform monolingual students in all content after experiencing 4 to 7 years of bilingual instruction.

Thomas and Collier (2003) wrote that a bilingual education supports a blended, homogeneous experience and inclusiveness. The learning environment provides ongoing opportunities to explore different cultures and interact in a culturally appropriate and sensitive manner. Further, research has found that bilingual students exhibit greater respectful attitudes towards their peers. The dual language experience supports an

authentic global competence in which students communicate across cultures. A DLI

classroom heightens awareness of similarities and differences and promotes curiosity and

empathy (Thomas & Collier, 2012).

Furthermore, bilingualism provides employment in a global economy that

includes international business, tourism, communications, and diplomatic organizations.

These employment opportunities require competence in different languages and

specifically support earning increases of up to 20% more than a monolingual individual's

employment (Callahan & Gandara, 2014).

Finally, Howard et al. (2018) wrote that clear communication of and commitment

to the district's vision and goals are necessary strategies for successful implementation.

These goals should be centered on "bilingualism, biliteracy, and sociocultural

competence" (Howard et al., 2018, p. 10).

Input Evaluation

The input evaluation measures the success of strategies necessary for achieving

the identified needs and goals of an organization (Stufflebeam, 2003). The input

evaluation, employing the district interviews and head of household survey, assisted in

acknowledging Research Question 2, "What specific resources were needed to implement

the DLI classroom?"

Considering plans strategies, and training for the implementation of the 90:10

dual language model, the district interviews emphasized seeking and initiating

collaborative relationships with various school districts that had notable DLI experience.

They highlighted the intentional work with one particular successful district that provided

a DLI mentor for the teacher. This mentor contributed the professional learning necessary

for a rewarding initial year of learning. The district administration indicated the working relationship with an educational consortium that assisted in the hiring process as essential in locating a native-speaking teacher. Additionally, all noted the importance of finding and securing authentic resources and materials for the DLI classroom as a final essential strategy for input.

Howard and Sugarman (2007) highlighted teacher quality as essential for program and student success. Kennedy (2013) wrote that districts should use international recruitment organizations and universities to support effective and efficient hiring processes. When hiring, a district should secure a native speaker who understands bilingual theory and second language development. This particular teacher will support greater language proficiency and respond more appropriately to students of various cultures and languages. It is imperative that the native-speaking teacher fully believe in the DLI model and understand the developmental stages of both native-speaking students (L1) and non-native-speaking students (L2). Additionally, they must be proficient with classroom procedures and effective learning tools for student success (Howard et al., 2018).

Ongoing professional learning should be data-driven and personalized, employing a mentor to support effective teaching strategies and fostering language development. The study found that professional learning provides for greater student academic achievement (Howard et al., 2018). Additionally, Anderson (2019) wrote that mentors are a necessary resource to support the administration and teachers to strengthen and provide feedback for self-monitoring and assessment. Additionally, they provide ongoing conversations for planning, implementing, and instructional competency.

Finally, Howard et al. (2018) indicated that effective authentic resources are key for implementing and sustaining a DLI program. These materials include literacy, technology, and hands-on materials that are aligned to the local standards and assessment.

Considering the roles of the program, all district administration identified the superintendent, CAO, and the director of global studies as necessary for organizing and overseeing the implementation and further, key for sustaining the program. The district administration and teachers indicated the principal and assistant principal as necessary for instructional support, observing, and providing daily guidance as needed. Additionally, all noted the teachers as instrumental for daily instruction and student support. Finally, the DLI mentor and grade-level mentor were identified as crucial for successful implementation and individualized professional learning.

Howard et al. (2018) wrote that effective leadership is key for successful implementation. The principal is the instructional leader and advocate for the program. The principal requires direct collaborative support from the assistant principal, director of the program, and administrative team. The role of this team is "program advocate and liaison; supervisor of model development, planning and coordination; and facilitator of staff cohesion, collegiality, and development" (Howard et al., 2018, p. 21).

In regard to the perceptions of the heads of households of input and the communication between the school district and themselves, they felt that there was limited or only general information provided concerning the introduction and information of the DLI program and understanding of the learning process. They did feel communication improved as the program continued throughout the year. A majority felt they had learned enough details to help make a decision to keep their child in the DLI

program moving forward into first grade. One parent noted, "Communication improved throughout the year. We were often told to trust the process, but more information at the beginning would have been beneficial."

Family and community involvement are key to implementing and sustaining a DLI program. Ongoing communication concerning the learning process and decision-making is vital to supporting a welcoming environment where bilingualism and biliteracy are at the center. This intentional relationship will foster belonging and strengthen trust (Howard et al., 2007).

Process Evaluation

The process evaluation provides the measurement of effectiveness of the actual program and identifies whether the strategies and resources are achieving desired results. The process evaluation assesses to what extent the actions and strategies are implemented and informs necessary improvement to ensure sustainability (Stufflebeam, 2003). I facilitated interviews with district administration and teachers and surveys with heads of households to analyze the process evaluation and answer Research Question 3, "What strategies were employed to initiate the DLI with kindergarten students?"

In regard to district interviews, the team indicated the observation of small and whole groups developed according to student achievement levels. They further identified the use of collaborative centers integrated with problem-solving.

Considering strategies for ensuring student learning and growth, the district team and teachers identified modeling, visuals, chunking, differentiation, hands-on centers, and multiple opportunities for collaboration. They noted small group instruction based on student ability in reading, math, and language as used on a daily basis. Finally, they

indicated the partnerships with a fellow district and the mentor for ongoing personalized

professional learning as a critical strategy for the success of the program. Additionally,

they spoke of monthly ZOOM interactions with visitors of various cultures who shared

stories, history, and personal notes. Finally, the district team and teachers identified the

use of literacy, technology, games, songs, and paper/pencil strategies.

Wyman and Watson (2020) wrote that grouping homogeneously by language

proficiency and academic levels is necessary for student growth. Grouping in this manner

provides language learning activities that fit the student and further supports interaction

between the students. This collaborative grouping supports learning from their peers and

ultimately improves social skills. Additionally, the small groups and leveled centers

promote translanguaging, which supports the integration of different languages to

communicate effectively (Hammon, 2018). This promotes an authentic method of

communication between bilinguals and assists in scaffolding instruction. In these

collaborative groups, students are interacting and comprehending meaning comfortably

and fluidly (Garcia & Wei, 2014).

Modeling, visual aids, chunking, and scaffolding are necessary strategies for a

DLI classroom as it supports greater understanding and knowledge growth. This explicit

instruction intentionally reviews learned concepts step by step while demonstrating in a

slow and intentional manner. Technology resources provide an integrated experience for

supporting individualized learning. These tools assist in supporting heightened

engagement, retention of knowledge, and collaboration (Stoel et al., 2017).

Thematic lessons and units provide student engagement and enjoyment.

Additionally, supporting these lessons with problem-solving in a cooperative learning

environment promotes exploratory learning and strengthened understanding. Students connect and learn authentically and collaboratively through these planned social interactions (Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

In response to monitoring and feedback, the district team and teachers identified ongoing student assessments in reading, math, and language. They indicated that the principal and assistant provided formal observations and walkthroughs to support teacher growth in instruction and delivery. They further spoke of multiple conversations with the director and district visits as informal opportunities for monitoring and feedback.

Formative and summative assessment tools identify and monitor student needs for reading and math in both languages to evaluate the progression of bilingualism and biliteracy to provide intentional feedback for student growth (Howard et al., 2018). Instruction is adjusted based on these assessment data, supporting accountability and providing guidance on progress and driving curriculum decisions to gauge needs for improvement (Howard et al., 2007). Ongoing assessments ensure successful implementation aligned to school vision and support content and standards (Howard et al., 2018).

Product Evaluation

The product evaluation assists in determining the overall effectiveness of a program. It identifies outcomes and drives strengths and challenges. The product evaluation informs next steps for improvement. This program evaluation answered Research Questions 4 and 5, "How effective was the implementation of the DLI classroom during the initial year?" and "How does a school district program implement change during a crisis?" I used personal district and teacher interviews and a head of

household survey to define the effectiveness of the Spanish kindergarten DLI program.

The district administration and teachers noted student growth in both Spanish reading and math and student confidence in speaking and understanding as strengths of the first year. Further, they noted the appreciation of different cultures as an additional strength. Finally, all participants indicated the mentor as crucial for providing ongoing individualized learning for the beginning teacher as imperative for success of implementation.

Professional learning and development is a critical implementation to strengthen knowledge and strategies for student success and teacher capacity. The learning should promote self-assessment and reflection. This learning should be personalized according to achievement data to ensure teachers are prepared to work with dual language students, providing equitable instruction for all students (Ramírez et al., 2018). Mentors are an additional support for sustaining a DLI program. This essential tool provides ongoing conversations around planning, implementing, and content (Anderson, 2019).

Concerning improvements, the district team and teachers identified progress monitoring of the program as essential for improvements moving forward to ensure sustainability. The collaborative work within a PLC model was indicated as necessary for the following year. Creating a scope and sequence was emphasized as a strategic tool for the DLI teachers. Additionally, authentic Spanish materials and resources were highlighted as a needed improvement. Finally, new teacher support was also indicated.

Assessment and accountability are necessary to inform student progress and curriculum decisions. Language and instruction must be assessed using ongoing formative and summative evaluations (Howard et al., 2007). Further, a district should

provide ongoing evaluations of learning programs to monitor and gauge adjustments and refinements to ensure student success (Mora et al., 2001).

Effective authentic resources are critical to the success of a DLI program. These materials include computer software, literacy, and hands-on resources necessary to support learning and achievement. The curriculum and program articulation are vertical and horizontal and aligned with specific processes and competency levels based on formative and summative assessments across grade levels. The program is flexible, allowing ongoing reflection and continual improvement (Howard et al., 2018).

Crisis Leadership

Considering crisis leadership, the district administration identified collaboration as key to success during a crisis. They noted planning as a team supported distributed leadership and created a sense of community. Further, they emphasized communication as the additional link in building essential trust. Finally, all participants spoke of the close relationship with the director of the county health department as key to district success during this past year.

Crises will occur, and school districts need to be ready to act quickly and efficiently. Schoenberg (2004) wrote that there are three factors in the crisis leadership model that include information, external conscience, and experience along with two pillars, authenticity and influence. The foundation of the model is consistent communication. Effective leaders take action, learn, and communicate to build trust with their stakeholders (Schoenberg, 2004).

The first factor, information, is necessary to allow leaders to assess a situation and make informed decisions. This critical information is continual and ongoing, so the leader

can act quickly. The second factor is external conscience which includes an outside

individual who acts as a neutral advisor and provides that two-way communication for

decision-making. Finally, the third factor is experience. A leader brings preparation and

prior experience to an organization. The leader provides one-way knowledge and

understands how best to share crucial information in a timely manner. It is imperative

that the leader feel confident in taking charge, organizing, and leading without creating

division among staff. Experience offers a leader comfortability in planning, collaborating,

and brainstorming solutions for making necessary decisions (Schoenberg, 2004).

The leadership model has two pillars, authenticity and influence. These actions

are meaningful and intentional, creating a sense of trust and community. A leader who

uses authentic actions and core self-values will communicate honestly and provide

direction in a manner that motivates an organization. The ability to understand and

empathize is necessary to respond with integrity (Wooten & James, 2008).

Common perspectives were found across the data analysis of district and teacher

interviews and head of household surveys. The following statements summarize the

overall results of the data analysis from Chapter 4.

- District administration, teachers, and parents understand that the purpose of

  the DLI program is to support students' bilingual and biliterate ability,

  appreciation of various cultures, and academic and employment opportunities.

- The kindergarten Spanish immersion teacher benefited from the weekly

  collaboration with the DLI mentor.

- Teaching strategies that include modeling, chunking, collaboration, small

  groups, centers, and individualized learning had a positive impact on student

learning.

- District administrators, teachers, and parents agreed the program had a positive impact in regard to student academic growth and confidence in reading, writing, and speaking Spanish and intercultural sensitivity and appreciation.

- District administration and teachers believed the district needs to continue to improve program monitoring and authentic Spanish materials and curriculum.

- District administration and teachers agreed that individualized professional learning should continue.

- Parents believed that the program needs improvement in regard to communication from teacher/school to parents and student progress reporting.

- Collaboration and open communication are key strategies for leading and establishing trust during a crisis.

Implications for Practice

Analyzing research on successfully implementing a DLI program and the results from the district interviews and head of household surveys, common themes emerged, centering around Fullan's (2006a) three phases of change theory. These phases occur over time and include initiation, implementation, and sustainability (Fullan, 1991). The goal of any district implementing an educational initiative is sustainability, and it is necessary to note that each phase is dependent on the success of the prior phase (Fullan, 2015).

Recommendation 1: Initiation

In the initiation phase, the district identifies the needs, priorities, and purpose of a

desired change. An organization then researches and collaborates with a team to design a plan and then decide how to promote the change, and finally defines the action for promoting the change (Fullan, 1991). Various decisions are made during this phase as the administrative team along with various stakeholders selects or defines an initiative or reform. The organization then must research information concerning the implementation of the initiative. The district defines the roles of the initiative and identifies the economic resources. Fullan (2015) emphasized clear communication of the goals of the initiative and the alignment to the mission and vision of the organization.

The district administration emphasized the multiple months spent researching how best to implement a DLI program. They spoke of visiting and collaborating with successful districts. They further noted communicating the goals and objectives of the program through radio, Facebook, Zoom, billboards, and several parent meetings. These communications proved successful as both the district administration, teachers, and heads of households stated the purpose of the Spanish DLI program was to support the growth of biliterate and bilingual students, knowledge and appreciation of various cultures, and future academic and employment opportunities. All stakeholders strongly believed these goals to be true of the DLI program.

Considering the plans for hiring, the district administration talked of partnering with an educational organization to hire native speakers from Spanish-speaking countries. Kennedy (2013) recommended creating a recruitment plan that relies on international recruits and partnerships with local universities. This recruiting plan should include a collaboration of school staff and district administration to support effective outreach and screening.

In regard to plans and research for quality program structure, the district administration spoke of the commitment to a 90:10 model for students that spans kindergarten through fifth grade. This is imperative as Thomas and Collier (2012) recommended the DLI program commit to 6 to 8 years of language immersion instruction to ensure proficient bilingual students. The district has planned that the kindergarten class will receive 90% of daily instruction in Spanish, 80% in first grade, and continuing this educational sequence through the fifth grade. Collier and Thomas's (2017) research further recommended that students receive a distinct division of languages during the educational day to ensure proficient language understanding and use. Considering student demographics, Howard et al. (2018) recommended that 50% are English and 50% are the target language. For our district, we should continue to actively enroll 50% English and 50% Spanish as we move forward with the program, ensuring no more than one third of one language and two thirds of another to support successful interaction between students.

Finally, the district administration indicated the support of an educational foundation for funding the program over the next several years. Howard et al. (2018) wrote that this continual and ongoing planning will ensure the success of a DLI program. These initiation strategies noted should continue in the upcoming years to ensure sustainability.

It is important to note that heads of households spoke of the need for more intentional communication concerning the learning process and how best to support their student's learning in a DLI educational setting. One parent, in particular, spoke of hearing the statement, "trust the process" often, but felt more concrete information would support

that trust. Jacob et al. (2016) recommended implementing adult education programs that provide concrete resources to better navigate the student learning process. The district should work with the teacher to schedule monthly meetings to address questions concerning the DLI design, second language acquisition, literacy, biliteracy, homework, and strategies to best support student learning. Moving forward, the district needs to support the teacher in facilitating these parent learning opportunities to better orient the parents, ultimately promoting buy-in and student achievement. Additionally, the teacher should provide formal and informal DLI learning celebrations where student work is showcased in two languages and parents can interact across languages and cultures. Parents and guardians are key to the success and ultimate sustainability of the DLI program. This past year, parental involvement was difficult with state and local restrictions around COVID-19; moving forward, the district needs to make intentional parent communication a priority.

Recommendation 2: Implementation

Research indicates that successful implementation of a learning program occurs over the initial 2 to 3 years following adoption or initiation of an educational initiative such as the Spanish DLI program. Curriculum and materials, effective teaching practices, and sound knowledge of instruction are necessary for successful implementation. During these 3 years, an implementation dip may occur due to the need for ongoing strengthening of knowledge and capacity. During this phase, there are three characteristics. The first is the characteristic of change that includes clarifying the goals and defining the quality of the program structure. The second characteristic is the stakeholders who include administration, teachers, parents, and the local school board.

Finally, the third characteristic of the implementation phase is the external portion that includes the government mandates, policy, curriculum, and standards. It is imperative that a district provide consistent transparency and communication throughout the implementation phase (Fullan, 2015).

Considering the first characteristic, change, the district noted the need for more engaging and authentic resources and curriculum. This past year, the district has ensured the program materials and resources are aligned with state learning standards; but moving forward, the district must provide authentic leveled text to address literacy abilities in the second language, Spanish, rather than "mirroring the English literacy" (Howard et al., 2018, p. 33). These authentic leveled texts should be written in Spanish, strengthening cultural knowledge and development of Spanish reading, and support biliteracy (Howard et al., 2018).

Additionally, the district emphasized the need for a detailed scope and sequence document across grade levels to ensure fidelity to the DLI learning process. These documents should account for instruction that ensures biliteracy, integration of language and content, and instructional opportunities for learning across subjects. This vertical and horizontal alignment will provide further coordination with support services for students identifying as at risk, special education, and gifted and talented (Howard et al., 2018).

It is also important to note that the district must ensure the integration of social-emotional learning to promote positive interactions and attitudes. This intentional learning will support the development of cultural knowledge and the sense of identity in an environment of multilingual and multicultural students. The curriculum should reflect the diverse students' language and culture and promote acceptance of different

perspectives (Howard et al., 2018).

The teachers spoke of using modeling, visual aids, small groups, collaboration, and individualized learning as strategies for use in the classroom. These should continue moving forward. Echevarria et al. (2016) wrote that slow, repetitive speech is necessary for second language acquisition. Echevarria et al. further wrote that scaffolding is key for meaning and interpretation. SIOP strategies that include visual aids, modeling, and scaffolding are critical for student success. The study emphasized that student achievement scores are higher when utilizing these necessary SIOP strategies. Further, the district should continue to use explicit instruction that focuses on step-by-step practice and modeling. Stoel et al. (2017) highlighted that this explicit teaching is necessary for true student understanding. The study also emphasized that student collaboration, open-ended activities, and social engagement are key to supporting student learning. Additionally, grouping homogeneously by language proficiency and reading ability is essential for providing instruction to fit the needs of all students. This learning integration encourages collaboration and sharing of information, motivating mentoring among the students and ensuring student growth and social skills (Wyman & Watson, 2020). The district should also ensure that DLI teachers provide problem-solving and exploratory learning opportunities using thematic lessons. This collaborative environment will promote social interactions where natural language acquisition occurs. Finally, the district administration should ensure the teachers are adjusting the instruction based on student assessment data (Howard et al., 2007).

Teacher quality is essential for the success of the DLI program and student learning. The district must continue to plan and provide for professional learning that fits

the needs of the individual teacher. This past year, the district used a DLI mentor from a successful county to ensure teacher knowledge in working with dual language students and partner language proficiency, assessment data, and familiarity with standards and alignment to instruction. This partnership proved invaluable as an essential learning tool for the beginning teacher. Moving forward, the district must continue the mentor support to strengthen capacity and provide the feedback necessary for self-monitoring, reflection, and growth. This mentor support will assist the district in sustaining its DLI program (Howard et al., 2018).

Further, the district administration spoke of the need for intentional work within a PLC. This past year, there was only one DLI teacher; in the upcoming year, there will be two who can work together, sharing ideas, best strategies, and practice. School administration should coordinate and facilitate weekly PLCs to ensure regular, ongoing conversations that center around data, interventions, and instruction for student and teacher growth. Moving forward, the team of DLI teachers should engage in collective inquiry to explore what tools, strategies, and resources are most effective. Ultimately this collaborative engagement will support teachers who have a greater understanding of student data and can develop more effective lesson plans (Anderson, 2019). Fullan wrote that teachers should work as a team to transform "teaching into a true learning profession" (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2000, p. 6). Furthermore, he emphasized that these intentional conversations are necessary to sustain a learning initiative (Fullan, 2006a).

Finally, the district spoke of increasing the opportunity for professional learning through visiting other DLI classrooms and professional development to support teachers who are fluent and proficient in the language and content they teach. They spoke of

providing learning to ensure highly skilled teachers who understand the effective

strategies to promote biliteracy in second language development. To ensure improvement

of the DLI program, the district must use individual teacher data to inform the necessary

areas of learning. Trainings should include biliteracy development, appropriate pedagogy

resources, assessment tools, and self-reflection. The district should also employ veteran

DLI teachers as trainers to support teacher capacity. Finally, the district should offer

learning that strengthens culturally adept teachers to ensure equitable instruction for all

their students (Howard et al., 2018). Professional development is key to strengthening the

teacher's knowledge of effective strategies and resources to support student learning and

ultimately the sustainability of the DLI program. Research emphasizes that experience is

not a significant factor in regard to an effective teacher, but rather the ongoing and

intensive professional learning (Ramírez et al., 2018).

Recommendation 3: Continuation

Continuation refers to the decision to continue an innovation based on

perceptions, reactions to the change, and whether it is embedded in the organization. For

the success of this phase, the organization must be committed to the established

procedures and change. The change must be integrated into the school setting and include

skilled staff who believe in the innovation. Student improvement in learning, followed by

teacher attitude, and capability are imperative for the continuation of an innovation

(Fullan, 2006a).

The district administration noted that moving forward, the need for program

evaluation from teachers and heads of households is necessary. The district discussed

using quarterly surveys for teachers and heads of households to inform next steps. This

consistent and continual feedback and communication are vital to sustaining the program. Furthermore, the district should communicate these data to all stakeholders to report progress and promote transparency and ultimately trust. The continual feedback will identify specific opportunities for improvement and monitor the progress of the DLI program. Interventions are crucial to improving and sustaining an initiative. Fullan (2015) wrote that a school district will learn much from the change process and that planning and improvement are derived and developed as the program continues. Patience is key. Stakeholder ownership and buy-in will occur as the program grows and adapts. Fullan (2015) noted that problems will arise and that the district should appreciate these experiences for growth and further improvement. Fullan (2015) emphasized that the district should welcome conflict and problems as opportunities for collaboration and ultimately, positive change. This authentic learning process is necessary for the sustainability of any learning innovation; in particular, the district DLI program (Fullan, 2015).

Finally, the district and teachers noted the continued improvement in student assessment as necessary for the guidance of progress and informing curriculum decisions. In the upcoming year, the district noted plans to provide professional learning in reading and math assessments that are aligned with state standards. The school should provide numerous measures, both formative and summative, in both languages to evaluate the progress of bilingualism and biliteracy as well as curriculum and instruction. These ongoing tools will provide accountability and gauge progress to inform next steps for student growth. The district must define the means for evaluating and scheduling ongoing assessments to drive instructional practices that are aligned to the curriculum and

standards (Howard et al., 2018).

Recommendation 4: Crisis Leadership

The district administration agreed that crisis leadership requires consistent collaboration and communication. They emphasized that teamwork and ongoing communication promoted trust within the district and among the staff. Throughout the year, staff and families were consistently informed of changes to policies and procedures. The district administration emphasized collaboration and communication as imperative during COVID-19. Furthermore, the superintendent referred to her weekly and sometimes daily work with the director of the county health department as vital to the success during this time of crisis. She emphasized that this close working relationship provided the critical information necessary to inform procedure and policy changes throughout the past year. Schoenberg (2004) wrote that leaders must find resources for ongoing and continual access to information. They should use a neutral advisor as a sounding board and open communication for decision-making. This essential collaborative work supports creative planning to identify quick solutions and decisions.

Crises will occur and leaders must have strategies in place to maneuver successfully for student achievement and well-being. Christensen and Alexander (2020) wrote that schools must ensure that learning continues and highlighted that innovations should remain at the forefront even during a crisis such as COVID-19. The district chose to implement the DLI kindergarten during COVID-19, and the interviews and survey prove the program was successful. The district administrators and teachers emphasized the close relationship with the successful DLI district as crucial for program success. Moving forward, the district should continue this close relationship with an experienced

school district. This collaborative relationship will support continued growth for the teachers, the DLI program, and ultimately the sustainability of the initiative.

Christensen and Alexander (2020) wrote that teachers must continue to provide authentic learning and ongoing assessments during crises. In order for this to occur, our district must ensure effective technology resources and skills are in place to support learning and growth. Teachers must be provided the professional learning necessary for knowledge-building skills and engaging lessons from a distance if necessary. Moving forward, professional learning opportunities must be in place to support teacher preparedness for a virtual or hybrid setting. Teachers must be prepared to work comfortably with an online platform to support individual students and small groups. Further, our district must provide an online platform for collaboration among peers to ensure accountability and commitment to student learning and success.

Communication is imperative. The superintendent emphasized ongoing communication as key in regard to crisis leadership and the district's overall success and in particular to the success of the DLI implementation. Schoenberg (2004) wrote that a leader should have training and experience for how best to work alongside stakeholders and media. Schoenberg stressed that the leader is the outlet for all crucial knowledge and must be aware of how best to share critical information in a timely manner.

An effective leader uses influence to control communications to staff, community, and families which affects the outcomes and positively influences reactions and responses. This positive influence will assist in controlling a crisis and provide the transparency necessary to support trust. Information that should be shared during a crisis includes research, media, data, assessments, and decisions which will support ongoing

two-way communication (Schoenberg, 2004). Wooten and James (2008) defined this intentional communication as "sense making" and as being essential to providing direction which leads to action. Schoenberg (2004) emphasized that a leader must deliver either good or bad news in a straightforward and positive manner. They must react quickly and calmly to an event with detail and remember to connect emotionally. Covey (2006) highlighted that when a leader communicates consistently and authentically, trust is strengthened and then achievement can occur. This clear communication led to the necessary trust that ultimately supported the successful implementation of the initial year of the DLI program during COVID-19.

Wooten and James (2008) highlighted that a crisis offers the opportunity to learn new practices and strategies. Our district must reflect on the actions taken during this time of crisis to promote innovation and problem-solving moving forward. The district administration noted that they look forward to a new year and the implementation of the first-grade DLI. They highlighted changes in practice such as providing quarterly program evaluations; facilitating a PLC; locating authentic resources; and inviting parents, staff, and the community to visit the classrooms for supporting a welcoming environment and strengthening communication for better understanding and promotion of the learning initiative. Additionally, the administrative team spoke of strengthening global education across the elementary, middle, and high schools to support the cultural component the DLI promoted in the past year. The superintendent highlighted the work of the global team and the various learning opportunities planned for the upcoming school year. She noted this global emphasis "will further assist in heightening cultural appreciation across the schools, which directly supports the district's belief statement,

'Every student can be successful.'"

Recommendations for Future Research

The mixed method study intended to evaluate the first year of implementation of the Spanish DLI kindergarten classroom using Stufflebeam's (2003) CIPP model and to identify key strategies for implementation during a time of crisis such as COVID-19. The study was limited to the perceptions of the superintendent, CAO, director of global studies, principal, teacher, teacher assistant, and heads of households. As the data were analyzed, further research was identified.

One area for future research is the evaluation of the second year of the kindergarten Spanish DLI program. This study can compare perceptions and student data during the initial year and second year to compare effectiveness during a time of crisis such as COVID-19 and a year of transition to normalcy. The researcher could analyze the learning outcomes based on reading and math assessments and perceptions of heads of households to better inform effective practices and strategies for student achievement in future times of duress.

Another area for research is to continue to evaluate the effectiveness of the overall DLI program to inform opportunities for improvement. The researcher could also include student perspectives to assist in determining areas of growth. Further, the researcher could include an analysis of the student retention rate in the program, surveying parents as to why they chose to exit the program.

Additionally, an area of research is to complete a longitudinal study to track the initial kindergarten students. The researcher could analyze student reading data from kindergarten to junior year, including a survey of student perceptions of their academic

and social success in school.

Limitations and Delimitations

This study was limited to a small rural city school district that includes the superintendent, CAO, director, principal, teacher, and parents of 25 kindergarten students. Data gathered from interview methodology were used to evaluate the findings within the evaluation of the implementation of a DLI program during a crisis. The district initiated a DLI kindergarten program during COVID-19. The evaluation of the program considered the limitations of implementation during a global pandemic. An additional limitation is the presence of bias, considering I was the assistant principal of the studied school. Further, the interviews are a limitation that requires accepting various points of view, ideas, and impressions and the understanding that some participants might state what the interviewer wishes to hear. I had to consider how the responses were structured, considering emotions, tone, and nonverbal communication. Finally, a limitation is the availability and willingness of heads of households to participate in the survey. Each head of household was provided a survey electronically, and participation was voluntary. Only half of the surveys were completed; 14 of the 24 heads of households responded. The survey was emailed after the end of the school year. Perhaps participation would have been higher if the survey had been sent during the school year.

The delimitations utilized by me in this evaluation were determined by the desire to gain a better understanding of how to implement a successful DLI program during a crisis. To gain a better understanding, the methodology used was the CIPP program evaluation. The study only included one teacher, one assistant, the principal, director, CAO, and superintendent, and 24 heads of households. It did not compare other

implementations in school districts in surrounding areas. The focus was on one rural school district in North Carolina with a limited sample size, ultimately limiting the generalization of results.

Summary

The research study utilized a mixed method approach to evaluate the implementation of a Spanish kindergarten DLI program to inform effectiveness and identify strategies for implementing a learning initiative during a time of duress such as COVID-19. I used Stufflebeam's (2003) CIPP model of program evaluation. The DLI program is located at an elementary school in a rural city school district in North Carolina. The implementation of the kindergarten DLI was effective according to the district administration, teachers, and heads of households. All acknowledged the students' growth toward biliteracy, bilingualism, and cultural appreciation. The heads of households praised the program for their students' growth in confidence in speaking, reading, and writing in Spanish and noted their enjoyment in learning and interacting each day. They believed the DLI kindergarten experience was beneficial to their student. Further, the district administration emphasized that collaboration and communication were key crisis leadership strategies to ensure a successful year of learning for the school and specifically the implementation of a learning initiative. In regard to implications for future improvement, the district should continue to strengthen communication, monitoring and feedback, authentic resources, and professional learning. Overall, the kindergarten Spanish DLI program was successful in meeting the goals toward facilitating bilingual, biliterate, and culturally responsive students.

References

Acquino, M. (2020). *Year one implementation of a dual language immersion program* (Publication No. 27994034) [Doctoral dissertation, Kean University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Adesope, O., Ungerleider, C., & Lavin, T. (2010). A systematic review and meta-analysis of the cognitive correlates of bilingualism. *Review of Educational Research*, *80*(2), 207-245. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654310368803

Alladi, S., Bak T., Mekala, S., Rajan, A., Chaudhuri, J., Mioshi, E., Krovvidi, R., Suampudi, B., Duggirala, V., & Kaul, S. (2015). Impact of bilingualism on cognitive outcome after stroke. *Stroke*, *47*(1), 258-261. https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.115.010418

American Academy of Arts and Sciences. (2017). America's languages: Investing in language education for the 21st century. Commission on Language Learning. https://www.amacad.org/publication/americas-languages

American Councils for International Education. (2017). The national K-12 foreign language enrollment survey report. https://www.americancouncils.org/sites/default/files/FLE-report-June17.pdf

Anderson, S. (2019). *Preparing students for the global society: Sustaining a dual language immersion program* (Publication No. 13808006) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Aziz, S., Mahmood, M., & Zahra, R. (2018). Implementation of CIPP model for quality evaluation at school level: A case study. *Journal of Education and Educational Development, 5*(1), 189-206. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1180614.pdf

Bellamy, G. (2019). *A program evaluation on the language immersion program and student achievement* (Publication No. 27667227) [Doctoral dissertation, Wingate University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Bialystok, E. (2011). Reshaping the mind: The benefits of bilingualism. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *65*(4), 229-235. https//doi.org/10.1037/z0025406

Bialystok, E. (2017). The bilingual adaptation: How minds accommodate experience. *Psychological Bulletin*, *143*(3), 233-262. https://doi.org/10.1037/bull0000099

Bialystok, E., & Craik, F. (2010). Cognitive and linguistic processing in the bilingual mind. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 19*(1), 19-23. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721409358571

Burkhauser, S., Steele, J., Slater, R., Bacon, M., & Miller, T. (2016). Partner-language learning trajectories in dual-language immersion: Evidence from an urban district. *Foreign Language Annals, 49*(3), 415-433. https//doi.org/10.1111./flan.12218

Bush, G. (2005). *President outlines pandemic influenza preparations and response*. National Institutes of Health. https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2005/11/20051101-1.html

Bybee, E., Henderson, K., & Hinojosa, R. (2014). An overview of U.S. bilingual education: Historical roots, legal battles, and recent trends. *Faculty Publications*. https://Scholarsarchive.byu.edu/facpub/1615

Callahan, R., & Gandara, P. (2014). *The Bilingual advantage: Language, literacy and the US labor market*. Multilingual Matters.

Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition. (2020). *Frequently asked questions about immersion education*.

https://www.carla.umn.edu/immersion/FAQs.html

Center for Applied Linguistics. (2016). *Resources for two-way immersion and dual language practitioners*. https://www.cal.org/twi

Christensen, R., & Alexander, C. (2020). Preparing k-12 schools for a pandemic before it occurs. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, *28*(2), 261-272.

https://eric.ed.gov/?id=Ej1257413

Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriching education*. Heinle & Heinle.

Collier, V. (1995). Acquiring a second language for school. *Directions in Language & Education: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education*, *1*(4), 1-12.

https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED394301

Collier, V., & Thomas, W. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice, 2*(1), 1-20.

https://www.berkeleyschools.net/wp-

content/uploads/2011/10/TWIAstounding_Effectiveness_Dual_Language_Ed.pdf

?864d7e

Collier, V., & Thomas, W. (2017). Validating the power of bilingual schooling: Thirty-two years of large scale, longitudinal research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *37*, 203-217. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051700003

Covey, M. (2006). *The speed of trust: The one thing that changes everything*. Free Press.

Craik, F., & Lockhart, R. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, *11,* 671-684. https://wixtedlab.ucsd.edu/publications/psych%20218/Craik_Lockhart_1972.pdf

Creswell, J., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. J. (2016). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (5th ed.)*.* Pearson.

Ellsworth, J. B. (2000). *A survey of educational change models* (ED444597). ERIC. https://eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED444597.pdf

Ely, D. P. (1999). *New perspectives on the implementation of educational technology Innovations* (ED427775). ERIC. https://eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED427775.pdf

Eurostat. (2019). *Eurostat statistics explained*. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Foreign_language_skills_statistics

Fernando, R. (2018). Language education in elementary schools: Meeting the needs of the nation. *Foreign Language Annals*, *51*(1), 90-103. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12313

Fitzpatrick, J., Sanders, J., & Worthen, B. (2011). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.

Freeman, Y., Freeman, D., & Mercuri, S. (2005). *Dual language essentials: For teachers and administrators.* Heinemann.

Fullan, M. (1982). *The meaning of educational change*. Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. Toronto Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depth of educational reform*. The Falmer

    Press.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. (2002). The change leader. *Educational Leadership*, *59*(8), 16-21.

    http://ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/may02/vol59/num08/The-

    Change-Leader

Fullan, M. (2003). *Change forces with a vengeance.* Routledge.

Fullan, M. (2006a). *Change theory: A force for school improvement* [Seminar Series].

    Centre for Strategic Education*,* Victoria. https://www.michaelfullan.ca/wp-

    content/uploads/2020/06/13396072630.pdf

Fullan, M. (2006b). The future of educational change: System thinkers in action. *Journal

    of Educational Change, 7*(3)*,* 113-122. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-006-9003-

    9

Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact*. Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. (2015). *The new meaning of educational change* (5th ed.). Teachers College

    Press.

Fullan, M., & Scott, G. (2016). Practice change-savvy leadership to guide your

    institution. *Recruiting & Retaining Adult Learners, 18*(11), 9-9.

    https://doi.org/10.1002/nsr.30175

Fullan, M., & Steigelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change* (2nd ed.).

    Teachers College Press.

Furtak, E., Kiemer, K., Circi, R., Swanson, R., de León, V., Morrison, D., & Heredia, S. (2016). Teachers' formative assessment abilities and their relationship to student learning: Findings from a four-year intervention study. *Instructional Science, 44,* 267-291. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-016-9371-3

Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education.* Palgrave MacMillan.

Genesee, F. (1999). *Program alternatives for linguistically diverse students.* Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence. https://www.cal.org/twi/pdfs/program-alternatives-for-linguistically-diverse-students.pdf

Gill, P., & Baillie, J. (2018). Interviews and focus groups in qualitative research: An update for the digital age. *British Dental Journal.* https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.bdj.2018.815

Goldenberg, C., & Wagner, K. (2015). Reviving an American tradition. *Bilingual Education*, *39*(3), 28-32. https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/ae_fall2015goldenberg_wagner.pdf

Gonzalez, J., Makasa, B., Eppler, M., & Souris, M. (2020). Pandemic: Learning from the past, be prepared for the future. *One Health Newsletter*, *12*(2). https://www.vet.k-state.edu/about/news-events-publications/OneHealth/Previous_Issues/Vol12-Iss2/learning_from_past.html

Hamayan, E., Genesee, F., & Cloud, N. (2013). *Dual language instruction: From A to Z.* Heinemann.

Hammon, L. (2018). Tanslanguaging and positioning in two-way dual language
classrooms: A case for criticality. *Language and Education: An International
Journal, 32*(4), 21-42. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2017.1384006

Hargreaves, A., & Braun, H. (2010). *Leading for all. The code special education project.*
National Center for Education.
http://www.ontariodirectors.ca/downloads/Essential_FullReport_Final.pdf

Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2006). Redistributed leadership for sustainable professional
communities. *Journal Educational Change, 7*, 105-107.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-006-002

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2000). Mentoring in the new millennium. *Theory Into
Practice*, *39*(1), 50-56. https://ww.jstor.org/stable/1477441

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to
achievement*. Routledge.

Head Start. (2014). *Family engagement as parent involvement 2.0*.
https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/tta-system/family/center/familyengparin.htm

Howard, E. R. (2002). Two-way immersion: A key to global awareness. *Educational
Leadership*, *60*(2), 62-64.

Howard, E. R., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Rogers, D., Olague, N., Medina, J., Kennedy, B.,
Sugarman, J., & Christian, D. (2007). *Guiding principles for dual language
education* (2nd ed.). Center for Applied Linguistics.
https://www.cal.org/ndlf/pdfs/guiding-principles-for-dual-language-education.pdf

Howard, E. R., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Rogers, D., Olague, N., Medina, J., Kennedy, B., Sugarman, J., & Christian, D. (2018). *Guiding principles for dual language education* (3rd ed.). Center for Applied Linguistics. https://cal.org/media/cal/files/resources/publications/guiding-principles-for-dual-language-education-3rd-edition

Howard, E., & Sugarman, J. (2007). *Realizing the vision of two-way immersion: Fostering effective programs and classrooms.* Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.

Jackson, F., & Malone, M. (2009). *Building the foreign language capacity we need: Toward a comprehensive strategy for a national language framework.* Center for Applied Linguistics. https://www.cal.org/resources/languageframework.pdf

Jacob, B., Berger, D., Hart, C., & Loeb, S. (2016). Can technology help promote equality of educational opportunities? *The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, *2*(5), 242-271. Jstor.org/stable/10.7758/rsf.2016.2.5.12#metadata_info_tab-contents

Javor, R. (2016). Bilingualism, theory of mind and perspective-taking: The effect of early bilingual exposure. *Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 5(6), 143-148. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.pbs.20160506.13

Jones, B. (1998). Voter guide: Proposition 227. Office of the Secretary of State: Election Division. http://primary98.sos.ca.gov/VoterGuide/Progpositions/227.htm

Kay-Raining Bird, E., Genesee, F., & Verhoeven, L. (2016). Bilingualism in children with developmental disorders: A narrative review. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, *63*(5), 1-14. https://www.mcgill.ca/psychology/files/psychology/raining-bird_et_al._jcd_july_2016.pdf

Kennedy, B. (2013). *A qualitative case study of the bilingual teacher shortage in one Texas school district* (Publication No. 3606445) [Doctoral Dissertation, Lamar University-Beaumont] ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis.

Kotter, J. (2012). *Leading change*. Harvard Business Review.

Kruse, S., & Louis, K. (2009). *Leadership for learning series: Building strong school cultures: A guide to leading change.* Corwin Press.

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2001). *Dual language education.* Cromwell Press Ltd.

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2012). Success and challenges in dual language education. *Theory Into Practice*, *51*(4), 256-262. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2012.726053

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2013, October 20) *Education: Dual language instruction in the United States*. Americas Quarterly. https://www.americasquarterly.org/fulltextarticle/education-dual-language-instruction-in-the-united-states/

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2016). Students perceptions of bilingualism in Spanish and Mandarin dual language programs. *International Multilingual Research Journal*. *10*(1), 59-70. https://doi.org/10.1080/193113152.2016.1118671

Lynch, M. (2015). *Bilingual education: 5 reasons why starting early is important.* The

    Edvocate. https://www.theedvocate.org/bilingual-education-5-reasons-early-

    bilingual-education-is-important/

Mora, J., Wink, J., & Wink, D. (2001). Dueling models of dual language instruction: A

    critical review of the literature and program implementation guide. *Bilingual*

    Research Journal, *25*(4), 435-460. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2001

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2017). *Promoting the*

    educational success of children and youth learning English: Promising futures.

    The National Academies Press. https://doi.org./10.17226/24677

National Research Council. (2012). *Education for life and work: Developing transferable*

    knowledge and skills in the 21st century. Committee on Defining Deeper Learning

    and 21st Century Skills.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (2020). *North Carolina dual language*

    immersion (DLI). https://sites.google.com/dpi.nc.gov/ncdli/

Office of English Language Acquisition. (2019). *Dual language learning programs and*

    English learners. https://ncela.ed.gov/files/fast_facts/19-

    0389_Del4.4_DualLanguagePrograms_122319_508.pdf

Ovando, C. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and

    current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *27*(1), 1-24.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2003.10162389

Pliatsikas, C., Meteyard, L., Veríssimo, J., DeLuca, V., Shattuck, K., & Ullman, M. (2020). The effect of bilingualism on brain development from early childhood to young adulthood. *Brain Structure and Function*, *225,* 2131-2152. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00429-020-02115-5

Ramírez, R., López, L., & Ferron, J. (2018). Teacher characteristics that play a role in the language, literacy and math development of dual language learners. *Childhood Education Journal*, *47,* 85-96. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-018-0907-9

Ren, X. (2017). *Parents' perceptions of Chinese immersion programs in Minnesota.* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. St. Cloud State University.

Rocque, R., Ferrin, S, Hite, J., & Randall, V. (2016). The unique skills and traits of principals in one-way and two-way dual immersion schools. *Foreign Language Annals, 49*(4), 801-818. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12238

Schoenberg, A. (2004). *What it means to lead during a crisis: An exploratory examination of crisis leadership* [Unpublished chapter proposal]. Syracuse University.

Seidlitz, J., Base, M., & Lara, M. (2014). *ELLs in Texas: What administrators need to know.* Canter Press.

Serafini, E., Rozell, N., & Winsler, A. (2020). Academic and English language outcomes
for DLLs as a function of school bilingual education model: The role of two-way
immersion and home language support. *International Journal of Bilingual
Education and Bilingualism,* 1-19.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339019060_Academic_and_English_lan
guage_outcomes_for_DLLs_as_a_function_of_school_bilingual_education_mode
l_the_role_of_two-way_immersion_and_home_language_support

Sorace, A. (2011). Cognitive advantages in bilingualism: Is there a bilingual paradox?
Multilingualism, Language, Power, and Knowledge, 335-358.
http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/~antonell/Sorace2011-Gargnano.pdf

Stefanski, A., Valli, L., & Jacobson, R. (2016). Beyond involvement and engagement:
The role of family in school-community partnerships. *The School Community
Journal*, *26*(2), 135-160.

Stoel, G., van Drie, J., & van Boxtel, C. (2017). The effects of explicit teaching of
strategies, second-order concepts, and epistemological underpinnings on students'
ability to reason causally in history. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *109*(3),
321-337. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/edu0000143

Stufflebeam, D. (2003). The CIPP model for evaluation. In T. Kellaghan & D.
Stufflebeam (Eds), *International handbook of educational evaluation* (pp. 31-62).
Springer; Dordrecht.

Stufflebeam, D. (2005). CIPP model (context, input, process, product). In S. Mathison
(Ed.), *Encyclopedia of evaluation* (pp. 60-65). Sage.

Stufflebeam, D., & Shinkfield, A. (2007). *Evaluation theory models and applications*.

    Jossey Bass.

Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language*

    minority students' long term academic achievement. Center for Research on

    Education, Diversity and Excellence.

    https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED475048.pdf

Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (2003). The multiple benefits of dual language. *Educational*

    Leadership, *61*(2), 61-64.

    https://ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el200310_thomas.pdf

Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (2012). *Dual language education for a transformed world.*

    Fuente Press.

Tippett, R. (2019, September 26). *North Carolina's Hispanic community: 2019 Snapshot.*

    Carolina Population Center. https://ncdemography.org/2019/09/26/north-

    carolinas-hispanic-community-2019-snapshot/

Umansky, I., & Reardon, S. (2014). Reclassification patterns among Latino English

    learner students in bilingual, dual immersion, and English immersion classrooms.

    American Educational Research Journal, *51*(5), 879-912.

    https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831214545110

U.S. Department of Education. (2007). *Practical information on crisis planning: A guide*

    for schools and communities. The Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools.

    https://rems.ed.gov/docs/practicalinformationoncrisisplanning.pdf

U.S. Legal. (2020). Lau v. Nichols. https://education.uslegal.com/bilingualism/landmark-

    legislation/lau-v-nichols/

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Wooten, L., & James, E. (2008). Linking crisis management and leadership competencies: The role of human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *10*(3), 352-379. https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422308316450

Wyman, P., & Watson, S. (2020). Academic achievement with cooperative learning using homogeneous and heterogeneous groups. School Science and Mathematics, 120(6), 356-363. https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/1707/

Appendix

Parent Perceptions of Spanish Kindergarten Immersion Classroom Electronic

Survey

Parent Peceptions' of Spanish Kindergarten Immersion Classroom

Please take a few minutes to complete this online survey concerning your experiences with your child's Kindergarten Spanish Immersion Program. Please focus on this past year experiences as you answer each question.

Most of the questions will ask you about the program based on your experiences with your child.

I will use the information you provide to assist the school district with planning and modifications for the upcoming school year. Thank you in advance for participating in this study.

1. Acceptance to Participate in the Study
Your completion of the online survey indicates that you are at least 18 years of age and your consent to participate in the study.

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

2. Which languages are spoken in your home? (Check all that apply)

- ◯ Chinese
- ◯ English
- ◯ German
- ◯ Spanish
- ◯ French

Other (please specify)

[   ]

3. Overall, how satisfied are you with the Spanish immersion program?

- ◯ Very satisfied
- ◯ Satisfied
- ◯ Dissatisfied
- ◯ Very dissatisfied

4. Please select the 3 most important strengths of the Spanish Immersion Program. (Select only 3)

◯ The organization of the program

◯ The learning environment/climate

◯ The program curriculum

◯ The communication from the school/teacher to you

◯ The school administrators interest/involvement in the program

◯ The relationship between your child/children and their teacher(s)

◯ The student progress reporting

Please add any strengths not addressed above or share any comments you have in relation to this question.

[text box]

5. Please select the areas that are in need of improvement in the Spanish immersion program. (Select all that apply)

◯ The organization of the program

◯ The learning environment/climate

◯ The program curriculum

◯ The communication from the school/teacher to you

◯ The school administrator's interest/involvement in the program

◯ The relationship between your child/children and their teacher(s)

◯ The student progress reporting

Please add any areas needing improvement not addressed above or share any comments you have in relation to this question.

[text box]

6. What was your understanding of the Spanish immersion program before you enrolled your child in the program?

◯ I/we had limited information about the program

◯ I/we had only general information about the program

◯ I/we had learned enough details to help me understand how the program works

◯ I/we had learned enough details to help me make a decision to enroll my child in the immersion program

Please share any additional thoughts you have in relation to this question.

[text box]

7. What has been your level of understanding of the Spanish immersion program since you enrolled your child in the program?

○ I/we have received limited information about the program

○ I/we have received only general information about the program

○ I/we have learned enough details to help me understand how the program works

○ I/we have learned enough details to help me make a decision to keep my child in the immersion program

Please share any additional thoughts you have in relation to this question.

8. Please select the top 3 reasons you used for enrolling your child in the Spanish immersion program/

○ The personal benefits for my child to be bilingual and bi-cultural

○ The possibility for career opportunities for my child by being bilingual and bi-cultural

○ Information about the benefits about the Spanish immersion program read online

○ Desire to have our child to learn about another culture.

○ The ability to speak Spanish

○ My child was born in or adopted from a Spanish speaking country

○ One of parents or both parents are from a Spanish speaking country

○ One or more family members speak Spanish

○ Spanish speaking countries have close trade and economic relationships with the United States

○ Family plans to travel to a Spanish speaking country in the future

○ Family plans to live in a Spanish speaking country in the future

Please share any additional reasons not listed above or any other thoughts you have in relation to this question.

9. How much growth in the following areas have you observed in your child since they have enrolled in the Spanish immersion program?

	Significant Growth	Moderate Growth	Some Growth	No Growth was observed	N/A
Ability to speak and understand Spanish	○	○	○	○	○
Ability to learn English	○	○	○	○	○
Intellectual development	○	○	○	○	○
Self-confidence of being bilingual	○	○	○	○	○
Social skills development	○	○	○	○	○
Development of intercultural sensitivity	○	○	○	○	○
Please share any additional areas of growth	○	○	○	○	○

Please share any additional areas of growth.

10. Please rate your level of concern (or worry) related to your child progress in the Spanish immersion program.

	Significant Growth	Moderate Growth	Some Growth	No Growth was observed		N/A
Ability to speak and understand Spanish	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ability to learn English	○	○	○	○	○	○
Intellectual development	○	○	○	○	○	○
Self-confidence of being bilingual	○	○	○	○	○	○
Social skills development	○	○	○	○	○	○
Development of intercultural sensitivity	○	○	○	○	○	○

Please share additional areas of concern.

11. How much does your child like learning Spanish?

○ Extremely Likes

○ Likes

○ Dislikes

○ Extremely Dislikes

12. How often do you help your child with Spanish learning?

○ Never   ○ A few times per week

○ Daily   ○ Monthly

○ Weekly   ○ A few times per month

13. How often do you help your child with Spanish school assignments?

○ Never

○ Daily

○ Weekly

○ A few times per week

○ Monthly

○ A few times per month

14. How often do you help your child with English reading and writing in general?

○ Never

○ Daily

○ Weekly

○ A few times per week

○ Monthly

○ A few times per month

15. For the following questions, please rate your level of satisfaction with your child's growth.

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	N/A
How satisfied are you with your child's Spanish speaking growth?	○	○	○	○	○
How satisfied are you with your child's Spanish reading growth?	○	○	○	○	○
How satisfied are you with your child's Spanish writing growth?	○	○	○	○	○
How satisfied are you with your child's English speaking growth?	○	○	○	○	○
How satisfied are you with childr English reading growth?	○	○	○	○	○
How satisfied are you with your child's English writing growth?	○	○	○	○	○

16. Please share any additional comments or feedback about your child's participation in the Spanish immersion program below.

[   ]